***DRAFT***

**ACADEMIC STAFF ASSEMBLY MEETING MINUTES**

**Varsity Hall, Union South**

**Monday, February 9, 2014**

**3:30 to 5:00 p.m.**

Provost Sarah Mangelsdorf called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

**Automatic Consent:** The Academic Staff Assembly minutes of Monday,

December 8, 2015, were approved.

**CEBC Revised Annual Report (ASA #543A)**

Compensation and Economic Benefits Committee (CEBC)-Jason Jankoski reported that CEBC had changed the language regarding multiple roles within the report at the request of the Assembly. He presented the new language to the Assembly for informational purposes.

**Standing Committee and Other Reports**

* Academic Staff Executive Committee (ASEC) – Heather McFadden reported that the Assembly should have received a copy of the ASEC report at the door. She encouraged academic staff who are interested to complete a survey if they would like to serve on a new ad hoc committee on instructional titles. The Academic Staff Institute will be held on March 18 with keynote speakers, Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration, Darrell Bazzell, and a panel of founding members of academic staff governance. A call for the next round of Professional Development grants will be sent this week. Assembly members received a copy of the response from the administration to the Bridge Funding resolution that was passed by the Assembly. A list of HR Design forums was also distributed.
* Academic Staff Professionals Representation Organization (ASPRO) – ASPRO Board member Kevin Niemi introduced Kathi Kilgore, the lobbyist for ASPRO. ASPRO board members have been meeting with senators and representatives on the Joint Finance Committee. They have also been meeting with representatives on the Assembly Committee on Colleges and Universities. At these meetings, ASPRO talks about who academic staff are, what academic staff do, and why it is important for academic staff pay to remain coupled to faculty pay. ASPRO has also met with ASM and PROFS to coordinate messaging and exchange ideas. Other UW-Madison board members include Michael Moscicke, Julie Klein and Tori Richardson.

**Business**

**Changes to ASPP 1.03 (ASA #549)**

Heather McFadden (ASEC) moved approval of ASPP (Academic Staff Policies and Procedures) 1.03. Seconded. This would change the definition of academic staff that is found in the ASPP. The proposed change clearly defines academic staff responsibilities on campus and adds the possibility of an ancillary role that is defined by the mission of their unit and would be a natural extension to the principal role. The proposed changes were shared with the University Committee

Jeanne Hendricks (District #458) moved to add “subject to prior approval by the university faculty” after the word professor in the second to last sentence and delete “which is authorized by.” Second. Motion approved.

David Parter (District #482) moved to remove “research, teaching, outreach, student services, information technology, libraries, communications, clinical/health services, or other responsibilities” in the second sentence and add “to the missions of the University” in the same place. Second. Motion failed.

Motion to add “supporting the core missions of the University” at the end of the second sentence. Second. Motion approved.

Motion to approve the ASPP 1.03 language changes with the amendments approved.

Motion to recess until 4:00. Second. Motion approved.

Assembly called to order following the recess.

The Provost introduced Jo Ellen Fair, chair of the University Committee. Jo Ellen thanked the Assembly for allowing the Classified Staff Congress and Faculty Senate to join the meeting to hear from and ask questions of Chancellor Blank regarding the biennial budget proposal.

**Guest: Chancellor Rebecca Blank**

Chancellor Blank thanked those gathered for their work at the University. She acknowledged that there is still much that is unknown both about the effects on campus as well as what some things mean in the budget. It is still early in the budget process and is still a proposal. There are months of debate before the bill will be voted on and signed into law. The UW-Madison website (<http://budget.wisc.edu>) will have information about the budget as well as FAQs. She spoke regarding the size of the budget cut. UW-Madison’s share will be $57 million of $150 million cut that is proposed. In addition, there is another $6 million campus will have to pay for a matching payment for the Wisconsin Bioenergy Initiative grant as well as municipal services. The budget cut of $23 million from last biennium that was paid with reserves that were available for one-time use will also need to be covered.

The cut is equivalent to the Chancellor eliminating five small schools (law, business, veterinary medicine, pharmacy, and nursing) or two mid-size schools (engineering and agriculture and life sciences).

The university administration is going to do three things to deal with the budget cuts. First, they will look for new revenues. There is a two-year freeze for in state undergraduates. They will look at increasing the out of state undergraduate tuition as well as tuition as some of the professional schools. The current tuition rates for these students are well below the median of UW-Madison’s peers. They will also ask for a slightly higher cap for out of state students. These changes would bring in extra income of approximately $36 million.

Secondly, the university administration will look at budget cuts across the university. The schools/colleges have modeled budget cuts. Deans are ultimately responsible for how budget cuts are administered in a school/college. Administration will do everything they can to save money using lapses as far as staff, but there are going to be some layoffs. It is unlikely there will be layoffs of tenure-track and tenured faculty members. Administrative units will take larger cuts than schools/colleges. UW-Madison is a big institution, but does not have a bloated administration by almost every comparison with other educational institutions.

Lastly, the university administration is looking at other ways to raise revenue such as increasing the tuition remission charge on grants. Even with these changes, additional funds will be required to fill the full budget gap.

The public authority proposal would turn the Board of Regents into a public authority board. The Regents would have control and flexibility to run the entire UW System. The public authority would be effective July 1, 2016. UW System would no longer be a state agency. There are aspects of Wisconsin State Statute Chapter 36 that are important to the way the University runs, including shared governance and tenure. These things would need to be included in new Regent policies.

Employees of UW System would become public employees and still have access to state health care and state pension program. There would be flexibilities in procurement and capital building projects. The ability of UW System to take advantage of these new flexibilities to save money would take several years.

The Wisconsin Alumni Association has sent letters to alumni and parents of current students. UW-Madison is working with PROFS, ASPRO and student legislative committee to coordinate messaging. There is also work being done with business and civic leaders to carry the message to the legislature.

There are three messages: the cuts are too big; they will jeopardize the educational quality of this institution and the educational experience students have, and that they will jeopardize the investments that generations of Wisconsin citizens have made to make UW-Madison a world class institution.

The Chancellor took questions from the audience.

Adjourned 5:03 pm.

*Minutes submitted by Heather Daniels, Secretary of the Academic Staff*