

**University of Wisconsin-Madison  
Secretary of the Faculty  
133 Bascom Hall**

**FACULTY SENATE AGENDA MATERIALS  
for  
7 December 2015**

*The University Committee encourages senators to discuss  
the agenda with their departmental faculty prior to meeting.*



**FACULTY SENATE AGENDAS, MINUTES, RECORDINGS,  
TRANSCRIPTIONS AND FACULTY DOCUMENTS, INCLUDING FACULTY  
POLICIES AND PROCEDURES, ARE AVAILABLE:**

*[secfac.wisc.edu/Faculty-Senate.htm](http://secfac.wisc.edu/Faculty-Senate.htm)*



**FACULTY SENATE MEETING  
Monday, 7 December 2015 - 3:30 p.m.  
272 Bascom Hall**

**AGENDA**

---

**1. Memorial Resolutions for:**

Professor Emeritus Stanley Kutler	Fac Doc 2587
Professor Emerita Claudia Card	Fac Doc 2588
Professor Emerita Signe Skott Cooper	Fac Doc 2589
Professor Emeritus David Lindberg	Fac Doc 2590

**2. Announcements/Information Items.**

**3. Question Period.**

**AUTOMATIC CONSENT BUSINESS**

**4. Minutes of November 2.**

**REPORTS**

5. PROFS, Inc. Annual Report for 2013-2014.	Fac Doc 2591
6. Committee on Women in the University Annual Report for 2013-2014 and 2014-2015.	Fac Doc 2592
7. University Curriculum Committee Annual Reports for 2013-2014 and 2014-2015.	Fac Doc 2593

**OLD BUSINESS**

8. Proposed Revisions to Faculty Policies and Procedures Chapter 7 (Post-Tenure Review policy).	
	Fac Doc 2583a

**NEW BUSINESS**

9. Report and Recommendations, Commission on Faculty Compensation and Economic Benefits.	
	Fac Doc 2594

**SPECIAL ORDER—NO LATER THAN 4:45 PM**

10. Executive Session of the Faculty Senate to Receive the Confidential Report of the Committee on Honorary Degrees.
--



## **Memorial Resolution of the Faculty of the University of Wisconsin-Madison On the Death of Professor Emeritus Stanley I. Kutler**

Stanley I. Kutler, professor emeritus of history at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, passed away peacefully on April 7, 2015 in Madison. A member of the UW-Madison faculty for 32 years until his retirement in 1996, Kutler was also a public intellectual and a highly acclaimed teacher. He was a distinguished American constitutional and legal historian, endearing professor, and beloved colleague. Generations of students, both from the Department and from the Law School, where he also had an appointment, admired his dynamic and stimulating teaching. In his courses, he challenged them to critically question the real-life application of the Constitution and admonished them to view it, not as an infallible pronouncement, an artifact, but as an unfinished and deliberative democratic experiment. Many of those students continued to be his lifelong friends, seeking his sage advice and enlightening perspectives on history and current affairs decades after graduation.

Based on patient archival research, brilliant analysis, and elegant argumentation, Kutler's scholarship cut a wide swath through American legal and constitutional history. His monographs tackled such subjects as the Dred Scott case (*The Dred Scott Decision: Law or Politics?*, 1967), the judiciary during Reconstruction (*Judicial Power and Reconstruction Politics*, 1968), the Supreme Court on property rights (*Privilege and Creative Destruction: The Charles River Bridge Case*, 1971), political trials (*American Inquisition: Justice and Injustice in the Cold War*, 1982), and the Watergate scandal (*The Wars of Watergate: The Last Crisis of Richard Nixon*, 1990; and *Abuse of Power: The New Nixon Tapes*, 1997). To supplement his scholarship, he performed valuable service to the profession as author and editor of sourcebooks and encyclopedias, and as the founding editor of the influential journal *Reviews in American History*.

Despite this variety of research themes and scholarly activities, Kutler's name would forever be associated with the Watergate affair and the figure of Richard Nixon. *The Wars of Watergate*, the definitive account, to date, of the affair that culminated in Nixon's resignation, narrated the causes, contexts, and consequences of the worst scandal in American political history. It did not, however, end Kutler's involvement with Watergate and in many ways launched for him a new phase. In 1992, he joined Public Citizen, a consumer advocacy group, in a lawsuit against the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) to force the release of the majority of conversations recorded in the Oval Office, which had not been made public during the Watergate hearings and prosecutions. Four years later, Kutler and his co-litigants won the release of more than 3,000 hours of the Oval Office recordings, some of which he transcribed with commentary in a highly praised book, *Abuse of Power* (1997).

Thus, despite the prodigious range of Kutler's work on American legal and constitutional history, many came to associate him primarily with Watergate and Nixon. "I guess it's my lot in life to be identified with Nixon," he acknowledged in a 1998 interview. After retirement, he wrote a play, *I Nixon*, that enacts portions of the transcripts, exploring with them the former president's personality and political missteps. He also collaborated with comedian Harry Shearer on a television program, "Nixon's the One," a series of vignettes based on the recordings.

Born in Cleveland on August 10, 1934, Kutler went to college at Bowling Green and graduate school at Ohio State, where he obtained his doctorate in 1960. As an undergraduate he had the good fortune to meet Sandra Sachs, a Cincinnatian who would be his life companion (the couple

married in 1956). They had four children: Jeffrey (deceased), David, Susan, and Andy.

After short stints at Penn State and San Diego State, the family arrived in UW-Madison in 1964. Here, Kutler found a stimulating environment for his work in legal and constitutional history, a field that already had distinguished antecedents in Madison. At the time, the Department cultivated other critical traditions in American history, such as the Wisconsin School of Diplomatic History, which stimulated specialties like his. The Law School, his second home at the University, also complemented the Department in significant ways. It had a well-deserved reputation for the study of law and society, a standing Kutler's work enhanced. Kutler particularly admired the work of James Willard Hurst, one of the founders of the field of legal history and the author of the seminal *Law and the Conditions of Freedom in the Nineteenth Century United States* (1956). With Hurst, as with many colleagues in both History and Law, Kutler forged a strong intellectual bond and an enduring friendship. Indeed, throughout his career he took advantage of the synergy between History and the Law School, as well as with other scholarly communities on campus. He always thought it was his good fortune to have worked in a stimulating History department, Law School, and University.

In History, Kutler trained scores of students in American legal/constitutional history and related fields. Moreover, he enriched departmental life in multiple ways. Along with Mauri Meisner, he was a co-founder of the Harvey Goldberg Center for the Study of Contemporary History, dedicated to sustaining the intellectual and political values of that legendary historian. Kutler was crucial in organizing a worldwide fund-raising drive among Goldberg's former students and admirers. The resulting fund helped to create the annual Harvey Goldberg Lecture in contemporary history, bringing progressive historians like William Appleman Williams and Howard Zinn to campus; revived Goldberg's famous course on Contemporary Societies; joined with the Eugene Havens Center to organize a prestigious, international conference reexamining the Cold War epoch and its demise; provided financial assistance to other campus groups pursuing compatible projects; and archived transcripts and tapes of Goldberg's lectures. Two decades after Kutler's retirement, the Center remains a vital and viable part of the History Department.

Among his many endearing qualities, Kutler was a supportive and caring colleague. He took an interest in the younger members of the Department, providing valuable mentoring and support. He became a close friend to many. Those of us who had the good fortune of receiving his kindness will forever miss him.

#### MEMORIAL COMMITTEE

Francisco A. Scarano  
Thomas McCormick  
Richard Sewell

**Memorial Resolution of the Faculty of the University of Wisconsin-Madison  
On the Death of Professor Emerita Claudia Card**

Claudia Card, Emma Goldman Professor of Philosophy and affiliate Professor of Women's Studies, Jewish Studies, Environmental Studies and LGBT studies, passed away September 12, 2015.

Claudia Card was a true Wisconsinite. Born in Pardeeville, September 30, 1940, she did her undergraduate work at the University of Wisconsin-Madison with Marcus Singer and returned to teach in Madison after studying with John Rawls at Harvard. At that time women were not accepted for the Ph.D. at Harvard except under the aegis of Radcliffe College. Professor Card almost threw away her acceptance letter because she did not recognize the sender.

Professor Card was a pioneer, not just at Harvard, but especially in her work on feminist and lesbian philosophy. When she began teaching, there were hardly any classes in feminist philosophy in the country, few text books on the subject, the premier journal of feminist philosophy, *Hypatia*, did not exist, and there was certainly no formal discussion of gay and lesbian issues within the academy. Her own books and anthologies on these topics are now widely used, both here and abroad. (She gave invited talks in China, Europe and South America as well as at many universities in the U.S.) She was a proud member of the editorial board of *Hypatia* since 1989 and the Board of Associate Editors since 2004. She was a member of the committee that created the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Studies program at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, and, on the national stage, she was co-founder of the Society of Lesbian and Gay Philosophy which sponsors sessions at meetings of the *American Philosophical Association* and also publishes its own newsletter.

When Professor Claudia Card began writing, feminist philosophy was not published by any mainstream press, a point that makes her own prolific publication record (she wrote four books and edited or co-edited another 6 and she also wrote 94 articles and 50 book reviews and book notes) even more impressive. She is one of those who broke that glass ceiling. To take just a few examples, Professor Claudia Card was editor of the *Cambridge Companion to Simone de Beauvoir* for Cambridge University Press, served on the editorial board of the feminist philosophy book series of Oxford University Press, and was under contract to write an introduction to feminist philosophy for Blackwell.

Professor Claudia Card addressed issues that are among the hardest to deal with, both philosophically and in human terms. Her latest work is a trilogy on evil. While evil has long been studied as a theological problem by philosophers--How can an all-powerful and benevolent god allow evil to exist in the world?--Professor Claudia Card addresses the issue from a new angle. She provides an account of evil, "the atrocity paradigm," that is not only a philosophical theory about what evil is, but also addresses particular evils, for example, rape in war, homophobia, domestic violence and poverty, and how to combat them. As she said herself in the Dewey lecture, an honor bestowed by the *American Philosophical Association* on a distinguished philosopher, "My current work on torture, terrorism, and genocide addresses the problem of how to respond to atrocities without perpetrating atrocities oneself in responding. The challenge is to find ways to respond that preserve humanitarian values...Much of this work is not focused on women. Yet all of it is permeated and shaped by my experience with feminism."

Professor Card received many accolades during her career, including Distinguished Woman Philosopher of the year, a named professorship in honor of Emma Goldman (WARF), the Hilldale Professorship, Presidency of the Central *American Philosophical Association*, and numerous fellowships. Most recently, she was chosen to give the prestigious Carus lectures which will be read *in absentia* at the upcoming Central meeting of the *American Philosophical Association*.

One might expect a person with such grim interests to be an uncongenial mentor. Far from it. With her encouraging demeanor, Professor Claudia Card inspired numerous Ph.D. students and other advisees to excel in the profession, and mentored her more junior colleagues as much by her example as by her help and ever tactful advice. She was a great supporter of women's sports and particularly liked to take her mentees to watch the games, where her generosity is acknowledged on the wall of the Kohl Center. If the best tribute to the qualities of any professor is the admiration of past students, then it must be noted that past students from all over the US and from Puerto Rico came to pay their respects at the recent celebration of Claudia's life at the Pyle Center.

Claudia continued to teach while undergoing chemotherapy, and even in her last weeks at the hospice, she kept up her indomitable spirit, enjoying Babcock ice-cream, Amish pastries and music and watching hundreds of movies. In her last days, she said that she had had a good life and was pleased that she would have a good death. That she did, surrounded by family and friends and her beloved cats, Mischief and Persia.

**MEMORIAL COMMITTEE**

Paula Gottlieb (Chair)

Lester Hunt

Steve Nadler

**Memorial Resolution of the Faculty of the University of Wisconsin-Madison  
On the Death of Professor Emerita Signe Skott Cooper**

Signe Skott Cooper, who devoted over 60 years of her life to nursing education at UW-Madison and within the UW System, passed away on July 16, 2013, at Agrace HospiceCare in Madison at the age of 92.

Cooper was born in 1921 in Iowa. Her family moved to Middleton, Wisconsin in 1937; she graduated from East High School in Madison. She enrolled at the University of Wisconsin School of Nursing (later known as the UW-Madison School of Nursing), and upon licensure as a registered nurse in 1943, enlisted in the Army Nurse Corps and served in the China-Burma-India theatre during World War II.

Upon her return in 1946, Cooper accepted a position at University of Wisconsin Hospital as head nurse on the obstetrical unit, and completed her B.S. degree. In 1948, she was appointed as an instructor at the nursing school and was promoted to assistant professor in 1951. While teaching full-time, she also pursued graduate education at Teachers College and later at the University of Minnesota, earning a master's degree in education.

In 1955, Cooper joined the faculty of the Extension Division (later known as UW-Extension) and held a joint appointment in the School of Nursing. For two years, she was the only nurse faculty member in extension — a "one-woman department," developing and offering credit courses in ward management and teaching for nurses across Wisconsin.

Cooper was involved in a number of innovative programs over the next decade, including the development of extension courses in death and dying and the care of the elderly — areas that were not added to university nursing curricula until years later. In 1966, Cooper developed one of the first distance-delivered courses at Wisconsin, broadcasting lectures from Old Radio Hall on the Madison campus to more than 600 nurses at 24 "listening posts" across the state. The program was later expanded through the Educational Telephone Network to reach all 72 Wisconsin counties and 170 listening posts across the Upper Midwest.

Cooper was a leader in professional nursing throughout her career. She wrote two nursing textbooks and edited three others. In recognition of her leadership, she received numerous awards, including the Pioneer Award from the Adult Education Association, the American Nurses Association Honorary Recognition Award for her leadership in continuing nursing education, and election to the American Academy of Nursing. In 1984, she became the first recipient of the Distinguished Achievement Award from the Nurses Alumni Organization at the University of Wisconsin. In 2000, Cooper was inducted into the American Nurses Association's "Hall of Fame"; in 2003, she was named a "Living Legend" by the American Academy of Nursing.

After her retirement in 1983, Cooper developed a new field of expertise: nursing history. Over the next 15 years, she served as the School of Nursing's resident historian. She began a history of the school, and published more than one hundred brief biographies of influential nurses. In 1981, Cooper received the President's Award from the American Association for the History of Nursing for her contributions to the field.

Signe Skott Cooper's long career in Wisconsin nursing education embodied the Wisconsin Idea. She was described as one of nursing's greatest national resources. Not only did Cooper help to build the modern nursing profession, but she also helped "her school" to attain the international reputation for innovation and excellence that it enjoys today.

Memorial Committee  
Patricia A. Lasky, Chair  
Barbara Gessner  
Ruth Lutze

**Memorial Resolution of the Faculty of the University of Wisconsin-Madison  
On the Death of Professor Emeritus David C. Lindberg**

The son of a Christian fundamentalist preacher, David C. Lindberg grew up in Chicago and attended the nearby evangelical Wheaton College, where he majored in physics and met Greta Johnson, his future wife. After earning an M.S. in physics at Northwestern University (1959), he attended a National Science Foundation workshop, where the UW historian of medieval science Marshall Clagett inspired him to become a historian of science. After visiting the University of Wisconsin, Lindberg chose instead enroll in the graduate program at Indiana University, where studied with Edward Grant, a former student of Clagett's. He earned his Ph.D. degree in 1965 and took up his first history of science position in the History department at the University of Michigan. After two years in Ann Arbor (1965–1967), Lindberg left for the University of Wisconsin, at which, despite several attempts to lure him away, he remained for the duration of his career.

A prolific author with more than a dozen books and scores of articles to his credit, Lindberg published on a wide range of topics, beginning with the early history of optics. His revised doctoral dissertation became his first book: *John Pecham and the Science of Optics: Perspectiva communis* (1970). His *Theories of Vision from al-Kindi to Kepler* (1976), an impressive example of cross-cultural history of over a long span of time, argued that Kepler's solution to the problem of vision made no sense without an understanding of both the problem that Ibn al-Haytham had set up in eleventh-century Islamic civilization and complementary developments in the intervening medieval Latin tradition. In 1983 Lindberg capped his detailed studies of medieval science with an English translation and critical edition of Roger Bacon's *De multiplicatione specierum* and *De speculis comburentibus*.

Lindberg shone in particular when writing synthetic overviews outside his expertise in medieval science. He sought to educate the broadest possible audience about the history of science generally. His most well-known achievement in this arena was *The Beginnings of Western Science: The European Scientific Tradition in Philosophical, Religious, and Institutional Context, 600 b.c. to a.d. 1450* (1992; rev. ed., 2008) a book which sold tens of thousands copies worldwide and translated into German, Dutch, Greek, Chinese, Spanish, Italian, and Korean. Lindberg's grandest vision for the field found expression in the eight-volume *Cambridge History of Science* (2003–), of which he served as general editor with Ronald L. Numbers. Shortly before Alzheimer's disease overtook him completely, he proudly held the second volume in the series, *Medieval Science* (2013), which he had coedited with Michael H. Shank.

Throughout his academic life Lindberg took special pride in his teaching. At the University of Wisconsin Lindberg was a star of the large lecture hall, where he taught more than twelve thousand undergraduates and won several distinguished teaching awards. He was a master of perfectly timed and accessible lectures. Later in his career, he ritually infused into them a half-time joke drawn from a list as canonical and regular as a high-church calendar. Although he did not like the unpredictability of the graduate seminar format, he mentored some nineteen doctoral students.

In 1982 the University of Wisconsin awarded him an Evjue-Bascom professorship. A decade later (1993) he received an even more distinguished Hilldale professorship. Among his many administrative duties, Lindberg served as chair of the History of Science department on several

occasions and also served two terms as Director of the Institute for Research in the Humanities (1987–1993, 2002–2003), a scholarly center that had been founded by fellow historian of medieval science Marshall Clagett in 1959.

Beyond his teaching and administrative work for the UW, Lindberg contributed considerable time and energy to the History of Science Society, serving on its Council in 1970–1972 and again in 1981–1983 and 1992–1997. He was also elected President in 1994 for a two-year term. At various times he chaired the Local Arrangements Committee for the Annual Meeting, the Committee on Publications, the Committee on Meetings and Programs, and the Nominating Committee. In 1981 he co-chaired, with Ronald L. Numbers, the Annual Meeting Program Committee that, without funding or approval, launched the Society Lecture. In 1992 the Society elected him president for a two-year term (1994–1995). In recognition of his many contributions to the field, the History of Science Society in 1999 bestowed on him the Sarton Medal for lifetime scholarly achievement, his most treasured award.

Over the years he received many other honors as well. Among the most appreciated were an appointment in the School of Historical Studies at the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton (1970–1971), a Guggenheim Fellowship spent at the University of Oxford (1977–1978), his election to fellowship in the Medieval Academy of America (1984), corresponding (1986) and full (1991) membership in the Académie Internationale d’Histoire des Sciences, and a fellowship in the American Academy of Arts and Sciences (1991).

In the mid-1990s the physically vigorous Lindberg fell victim to the early stages of Alzheimer’s disease. As his memory failed, he continued to attend departmental colloquia and brown-bag seminars. On 6 January 2015, surrounded by his immediate family, he died peacefully at Covenant Oaks Memory Care in Madison. He is survived by his wife, Greta; his daughter, Christin Lindberg; his son, Erik Lindberg; and four grandchildren. Countless former colleagues, students, and friends have for some years been missing the Lindberg we knew—and now mourn his passing.

Memorial Committee  
Michael H Shank  
Ronald L. Numbers  
Thomas H. Broman

**FACULTY SENATE  
MINUTES  
2 November 2015**

---

Chancellor Rebecca Blank called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. with 166 voting members present (111 needed for quorum).

1. Memorial Resolutions were offered for:

Professor Emeritus Richard “Doc” Greiner (Fac Doc 2575)  
Professor Emeritus Robert Huntington (Fac Doc 2576)  
Professor Emeritus Howard Karp (Fac Doc 2577)  
Professor Emeritus Allan K. Scidmore (Fac Doc 2578)  
Professor Emeritus Steven Winspur (Fac Doc 2579)  
Professor Emeritus Robert Clodius (Fac Doc 2574)

2. Announcements/Information Items.

Chancellor Blank called attention to the PROFS legislative update distributed at the door.

Chancellor Blank provided an update on the launch of the comprehensive fundraising campaign, the success of its silent phase, and context on what the campaign means for the university. The chancellor reported and explained the Board of Regents’ passage of a four-year waiver of the cap on non-resident students, combined with a reinforcement of the campus commitment to in-state students. Chancellor Blank reported on the improvement of retention and graduation rates and provided updates on WARF’s lawsuit against Apple, recent state legislative activity, Exact Sciences’ expansion at the research park, and interactions with UW System on tenure policy.

3. Question Period.

There were questions on tenure policy and voter IDs for students.

**AUTOMATIC CONSENT BUSINESS**

4. The minutes of the October 5, 2015, meeting were approved as distributed.

**CONFIRMATION OF APPOINTMENTS**

5. Professor Beth Meyerand (chair, University Committee) moved to confirm the appointment of Professor David Vanness (Population Health Sciences) to serve on the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities for spring semester 2016, replacing Professor Susan Lederer who will be on sabbatical.

The motion passed without negative vote.

## **REPORTS**

6. Provost Sarah Mangelsdorf presented the annual report of the University Academic Planning Council for 2014-2015 (Fac Doc 2580).

There was one question on enforcement of prerequisites.

## **OLD BUSINESS**

7. Professor Dorothy Farrar-Edwards (chair, Ad Hoc Committee on Tenure and Termination) moved approval of Faculty Document 2569a on layoff and termination with the addition of the word “salary” after “six months” in section i and after “one year” in section ii.

Professor Karma Chávez (Communication Arts) moved to amend section 10.01.A. to add “a department-like body” between “department” and “or similar administrative unit” and to remove “that offers majors and.” The motion to amend was seconded and, after some discussion, passed by voice vote.

Professor Chávez moved to amend section 10.05.C. to make it consistent with 10.02.A. by changing the second sentence to: “If placement in another position would be facilitated by a reasonable period of training, such retraining and relocation will be provided and the institution will bear the cost.” The motion to amend was seconded and passed by voice vote.

Professor Chávez moved to amend section 10.03.E. to add “elected” between “appropriate” and “faculty body” so that the line reads “an appropriate elected faculty body.” The motion to amend was seconded and, after clarification that selection by an elected body is equivalent to election, passed by voice vote.

Professor Bill Tracy (Agronomy) moved to amend section 5.02.C. to the following.

No proposal to discontinue or restructure an academic program, regardless of its origin or rationale, shall move forward without an affirmative vote of each of the following bodies in this order:

1. The faculty of the affected department(s).
2. The school/college governance body, usually the academic planning council (APC).
3. For undergraduate programs, the University Academic Planning Council (UAPC).
4. For graduate programs,
  - a. the Graduate Faculty Executive Committee (GFEC) and
  - b. the UAPC.

The motion to amend was seconded and, after some discussion, passed by voice vote.

The motion to approve Faculty Document 2569a as amended passed by unanimous voice vote.



**NEW BUSINESS**

13. Professor Chad Goldberg (Sociology) moved to suspend the order of the day to take up agenda item 13. The motion was seconded and passed by voice vote.

Professor Goldberg moved to substitute the motion which was postponed at the October meeting with Faculty Document 2586. The motion to substitute was seconded and passed by voice vote.

Professor Goldberg moved to approve Faculty Document 2586, a resolution on the AFT-Wisconsin Higher Education Council Statement on Tenure and Indefinite Status. The motion was seconded and, after several comments, passed by voice vote.

8. Professor Meyerand moved adoption of a faculty resolution on concealed carry (Fac Doc 2581). Following animated discussion, the motion to adopt passed by voice vote.
9. Professor Meyerand moved adoption of a faculty resolution on fetal tissue research (Fac Doc 2582) with the substitution of “cell strains/lines” for each instance of “cell lines.” The motion to adopt passed by voice vote.
10. Professor Caroline Levine (chair, Ad Hoc Committee on Post-Tenure Review) introduced Faculty Policies and Procedures (FPP) Chapter 7 proposal for discussion, providing context, explaining process, and summarizing input to date (Fac Doc 2583).

There were multiple comments and extensive discussion, which will be incorporated, along with listening session input, into draft for second reading and vote at December meeting.

11. Professor Meyerand moved adoption of changes to the membership of the University Curriculum Committee (Fac Doc 2584) with the substitution of “academic staff nominating body” for “Academic Staff Nominating Committee.” After brief discussion, the motion passed unanimously by voice vote.
12. Professor Amy Wendt (Electrical & Computer Engineering) moved endorsement of a statement of support for the faculty senate at the University of Iowa (Fac Doc 2585). The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:17 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven K. Smith  
Secretary of the Faculty

---

**PROFS, Inc., Annual Report: July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2015****I. CHARGE**

PROFS, the Public Representation Organization of the Faculty Senate, is a non-profit organization established by the Faculty Senate in 1976. The function of PROFS is to represent the UW-Madison faculty's interests – with particular emphasis on compensation and benefits, the university budget, legislation affecting the university and important regulatory issues – before the state legislature, the governor, other state and federal governmental agencies, the U.S. Congress, and the public.

**II. PARTICIPATION**

PROFS is a voluntary dues-supported organization, funded through payroll deductions by faculty. Contributions are one-tenth of one percent of one's salary deducted once each month in which salary is earned.

**III. ORGANIZATION****Leadership**

The elected members of the University Committee serve as the board of directors of PROFS. For the 2014-15 academic year, the following individuals served on the Board of Directors:

- Jo Ellen Fair (Journalism & Mass Communication), chair
- Grant Petty (Atmospheric & Oceanic Sciences), secretary/treasurer
- Dorothy Farrar-Edwards (Kinesiology)
- Mary Elizabeth Meyerand (Biomedical Engineering and Medical Physics)
- Thomas Broman (History of Science)
- Amy Wendt (Electrical and Computer Engineering)

Much of the day-to-day work of PROFS occurs under the supervision of the president and steering committee. William Tracy served as president until September 2014 and was succeeded by Grant Petty. The 2014-15 members of the PROFS Steering Committee consisted of:

- William Tracy (Agronomy), president, former University Committee member, member of the Faculty Senate
- Grant Petty (Atmospheric & Oceanic Sciences), president
- Sue Babcock (Materials Science & Engineering), former University Committee member, member of the Faculty Senate
- Michael Bernard-Donals (English and Jewish Studies) former University Committee member
- Judith Burstyn, former University Committee member, member of the Faculty Senate
- Bradley Christian (Medical Physics), member of the Faculty Senate
- Murray K. Clayton (Plant Pathology and Statistics), former University Committee member
- Mark Cook (Animal Science), former University Committee member

- Irwin Goldman (Horticulture), member of the Faculty Senate
- Donald Moynihan (La Follette School of Public Affairs)
- Eric Raimy (English)
- Joseph C. Salmons (German)
- Ronald D. Schultz (Comparative Biosciences), former University Committee member
- Terry Warfield (Business)
- Plus University Committee members:
  - Tom Broman
  - M. Elizabeth Meyerand
  - Grant Petty

### **PROFS Bylaws**

The by-laws of PROFS are on file in the PROFS office, 258 Bascom Hall. They specify that the University Committee serves as the PROFS board of directors. The steering committee consists of at least three current members of the University Committee; at least three members with prior experience on the University Committee; one or more at-large members selected from the UW-Madison faculty; at least one member from the Faculty Senate; and one member of the Commission on Faculty Compensation and Economic Benefits. Members who do not serve on the University Committee serve three-year renewable terms. Current University Committee members may serve renewable one-year terms.

### **Legislative Representative**

Jack O'Meara continued to serve as PROFS Legislative Representative. Mr. O'Meara meets regularly with the board of directors and the steering committee to update them on legislative proposals affecting the faculty, establish PROFS' positions on legislation, and determine action. Mr. O'Meara meets with individual legislators and other officials at appropriate times to discuss PROFS issues and urge support of the faculty's position. PROFS arranges for members of the steering committee and other faculty members to meet with legislators, state officials, regents, the media and the general public, and to testify for or against key legislation.

### **Administration**

Michelle Felber is the half-time administrator and website/social media editor. She communicates regularly with faculty with email and through posts to the PROFS website, Facebook, and Twitter. Laura Laurenzi, an outside financial assistant, continued to maintain the financial records and accounts payable of PROFS. The treasurer or president is responsible for check signing. The by-laws were amended in 2011 to require a financial review at least every three years. A financial review was completed in 2014 and is available in the PROFS office for review.

### **Lobbying**

As an organization engaged in lobbying, PROFS is required to register with and report to the State of Wisconsin Government Accountability Board (GAB), filing a lobbying report twice each year. PROFS also reports its interest in any legislative bill, proposal, or budget item, and if it is taking a position, its positions. All reporting is available on the GAB website, <http://gab.wi.gov/>.

(continued)

#### **IV. COMMUNICATION**

PROFS communicates regularly with all faculty through e-mail updates and posts to the PROFS website (<http://profs.wisc.edu>), Facebook (facebook.com/PROFSUWMadison) and Twitter (@PROFSUWMadison). Communication through social media grew tremendously during the state budget process in 2015. PROFS more than doubled its Twitter followers and certain Facebook posts were read by thousands of Facebook users.

#### **V. MEMBERSHIP**

PROFS reaches out to new faculty every fall and continues outreach efforts to veteran faculty members. Membership held steady at about 750 members. Twenty-seven new members joined in 2014-15. In cultivating membership, PROFS emphasizes its past achievements, including:

- Led campaign for pre-tax retirement contributions, saving faculty about \$1,800 per year
- Enactment of domestic partner benefits for faculty and staff
- Implementation of first-day health insurance coverage
- A continuing focus on competitive compensation, which in the past led to increased pay plans and catch-up pay plans

PROFS also emphasizes its platform for the future:

- Competitive compensation for all faculty
- Increased funding for graduate education
- Adequate state funding for the UW budget
- Increased federal funding for research and relaxation of certain rules on funding
- Improved communication between faculty and the Legislature

For 40 years, PROFS has played a key role in advocating for UW-Madison and its faculty. PROFS' sole charge is to advocate on behalf of faculty and needs continued support of the faculty to maintain its efforts. Faculty are always welcome to support PROFS by completing the form in the PROFS brochure or on PROFS web site, <http://profs.wisc.edu>.

#### **VI. 2014-15 LOBBYING & LEGISLATION: PROFS' ACTIONS AND POSITIONS**

PROFS was active during the 2014-15 legislative session, participating almost two-dozen formal meetings. Prior to the introduction of the 2015-17 state budget in February, PROFS met with Jason Vick, Governor Scott Walker's higher education policy staffer and Michael Heifetz, Wisconsin state budget director. PROFS also met with 18 legislators and/or staff, including Senator Sheila Harsdorf, chair of the Senate Committee on Universities and Technical Colleges, Representative David Murphy, chair of the Assembly Committee on Colleges and Universities, Assembly Speaker Robin Vos, and Senator Alberta Darling, co-chair of the Joint Finance Committee.

PROFS participates in more informal discussions, sending emails, making telephone calls, stopping in offices, and talking with people at meetings and in the halls of the Capitol.

(continued)

## **2015-17 Biennial Budget Process**

The state budget process began in February when Governor Scott Walker announced an historic \$300 million cut to the University of Wisconsin System coupled with public authority status for the system. Ultimately, the legislature passed a budget that included a \$250 million cut coupled with a handful of management flexibilities rather than full public authority status.

The governor's budget proposal also included a proposal to remove tenure protections from state statute and leave them to the discretion of the Board of Regents. In a surprise move, the Joint Finance Committee went further and redefined shared governance and tenure as part of an omnibus motion in the final days of the budget process. PROFS spoke out swiftly and strongly against these provisions, but they were included in the final budget.

The budget process included one bright spot – \$86 million in state-supported bonding for the Chemistry Building project. PROFS worked hard to ensure this important building project was not delayed.

## **VII. FEDERAL RELATIONS PROGRAM**

**Next Generation Research Act** PROFS Legislative Representative Jack O'Meara met with Congressman Mark Pocan and staff for Senator Tammy Baldwin in September to discuss Pocan's and Baldwin's Next Generation Research Act (HR 5451 in 2013-14, HR 3466/S 2014 in 2014-15). This proposal would create an office within the National Institutes for Health to determine how to best invest in the next generation of scientific research. The initiative would improve grant opportunities for young researchers. O'Meara met with several other congressional offices while on that trip.

## **VIII. CAMPUS OUTREACH**

- **78<sup>th</sup> Assembly District Candidate Forum** PROFS hosted a forum featuring candidates in the Democratic primary for the 78<sup>th</sup> Assembly District (west Madison) on July 21. Political science professor Kathy Cramer moderated.
- **WAA Fall Forum** PROFS legislative representative Jack O'Meara and administrator Michelle Felber attended the annual Wisconsin Alumni Association fall legislative advocacy forum on November 15.
- **State Budget Forum** PROFS sponsored a campus forum to discuss the state budget on March 25. State Representative and Joint Committee on Finance member Chris Taylor, former Department of Administration Secretary George Lightbourn, and Associate Vice Chancellor for Government and Corporate Affairs Charles Hoslet were panelists.

---

**Committee on Women in the University**  
**(*Faculty Policies & Procedures 6.56.*)**  
**Annual Report, 2013-2015**

**I. Statement of Committee Functions**

On November 2013, by unanimous vote, the committee elected to propose a new membership structure and description of committee functions. The Faculty Senate approved the committee's proposed amendments to *Faculty Policies & Procedures 6.56.* on 5 May 2014:

*Faculty Policies & Procedures*

**6.56. WOMEN IN THE UNIVERSITY, COMMITTEE ON.**

**A. MEMBERSHIP:** The Committee on Women in the University consists of the following members:

1. Six faculty members appointed by the faculty Committee on Committees for terms of three years
2. Six academic staff member appointed for terms of three years
3. Six classified staff members appointed for terms of three years
4. One graduate student and one undergraduate student, appointed by the recognized student governance organization
5. One postdoctoral fellow, appointed by the Graduate School
6. The Vice Provost for Diversity & Climate and the director of the Office for Equity & Diversity, ex officio, non-voting
7. The chair shall be appointed from among the faculty members appointed pursuant to section A.1. Academic staff appointed pursuant to A.2. may be appointed to serve as co-chair. Classified staff appointed pursuant to A.3. may be appointed to serve as co-chair.

**B. FUNCTIONS:**

1. Recommends to administrative offices and governance bodies changes in university priorities, policies, practices, and programs that would improve the status of women
2. Collaborates and consults with administrative offices and governance bodies to more fully support gender equity, employee engagement, an inclusive and respectful culture, and diversity
3. Evaluates and monitors the status of women employees at the university.

The committee's "Current Internal Procedures" (reaffirmed 21 October 2015) and "Statement on Diversity in the Committee" (adopted December 1999, revised and reaffirmed 21 October 2015) are available upon request from the Office of the Secretary of the Faculty.

Associate Professor Natalia De Leon (Agronomy) and Assistant Dean for Admissions & Financial Aid Rebecca Scheller (Law) co-chaired the committee in 2013-2014.

Professor Pam Herd (La Follette School of Public Affairs) and Assistant Dean for Admissions & Financial Aid Rebecca Scheller (Law) co-chaired the committee in 2014-2015.

Associate Professor Natalia De Leon (La Follette School of Public Affairs), Assistant Dean for Admissions & Financial Aid Rebecca Scheller (Law) and Program Assistant Advanced Confidential Kate O'Conner are co-chairing the committee in 2015-2016.

## II. Current and Past Year Activities

The Committee on Women in the University values partnering with fellow governance committees and the university administration in an ongoing, collaborative effort to achieve gender equity and create inclusive environments for work and learning.

We are pleased to partner with women deans and the Office of Learning & Talent Development [formerly, the Office of Human Resource Development] in developing and presenting the annual Women & Leadership Symposium and related events.

We are enormously grateful to Distinguished Policy & Planning Analyst Margaret Harrigan of Academic Planning & Institutional Research for providing institutional data on the status of women each year to the committee and university administration, and for her help in interpreting these data.

### Diversity & Climate.

In 2013-2014, committee member Ruth Litovsky (Communication Sciences & Disorders) led the **Ad Hoc Diversity Planning Committee** with student co-chair Ryan Adserias. She regularly briefed the Committee on Women in the University on the composition, focus, and progress of the Ad Hoc Diversity Committee and invited members to contribute to the evolving dialogue as the ad hoc committee held campus and community engagement sessions and drafted a new diversity framework: *Forward Together: A Framework for Diversity & Inclusive Excellence*. The framework, reviewed by all four shared governance groups and finalized on 19 May 2014, and implementation details are posted at <http://diversityframework.wisc.edu/documents.htm>

In August 2013, co-chairs Natalia De Leon and Rebecca Scheller, committee member DeAnn Pillers, and Lindsey Stoddard Cameron joined the **Ad Hoc Committee on Bullying**, led by School of Human Ecology Dean Soyeon Shim and Wisconsin School of Business Dean François Ortalo-Magné, bringing the committee's earlier work on campus climate and sexual harassment to bear in a new conversation about hostile and intimidating behavior. The University Committee charged the **Ad Hoc Faculty Committee on Civility in the Academic Workplace**, a sister committee, to develop policy solutions.

Accomplishments of the Ad Hoc Committee on Bullying include:

- benchmarking K-12 and postsecondary approaches for preventing and mitigating bullying
- collecting case examples to inform a definition of hostile and/or intimidating behavior
- developing two workshops offering members of the campus community an opportunity to learn about and discuss key issues
- identifying key communication needs: e.g., defining and recognizing bullying; understanding the importance of bystander intervention; awareness and development of skills to intervene; promoting and practicing behaviors that create more inclusive, engaged, and trusting environments; and signposting campus processes and resources

Faculty Legislation proposed by the Ad Hoc Faculty Committee on Civility in the Academic Workplace, Section II-332. Defining Language Describing Hostile and/or Intimidating Behavior (Faculty Document 2511a) was adopted by the Faculty Senate on 3 November 2014:  
<https://kb.wisc.edu/images/group222/shared/2014-11-03FacultySenate/2511a.pdf>

Several members of the Committee on Women attended a **Women & Leadership Coffee & Conversation** on *Civility and Healthy Workplaces in Academia* (3 October 2014). The first of a number of campus-wide discussions, this session was co-presented by Dean Soyeon Shim, OQI Consultant Jim Gray, and Rothermel-Bascom Professor of Human Development and Family Studies Dave Riley. This workshop also was presented at the 15<sup>th</sup> **Annual Leadership & Management**

(continued)

**Development Conference** (6 November 2014). A second Women & Leadership Coffee & Conversation, *The Workplace as a Forgiving Community* (20 February 2014), featured Professor Robert Enright's work on forgiveness as a foundation for a just and merciful community.

The committee celebrates accomplishments of individuals who receive **Awards & Recognition**. Professor Sharon Long (Soil Science, State Laboratory of Hygiene) continues to represent the Committee on Women on the Vice Provost for Diversity & Climate's selection committee for UW System's Outstanding Women of Color in Education Award and UW-Madison's Outstanding Women of Color Awards. The entire committee congratulates award recipients, all of whom are prominent on campus and in the broader community for their notable professional accomplishments and efforts to achieve social justice:

**UW System – 18<sup>th</sup> Annual Outstanding Women of Color in Education Award**

Karma Chávez, Assistant Professor, Communication Arts and Chican@ & Latin@ Studies  
Roberta Hill, Professor, English and American Indian Studies

**UW System – 19<sup>th</sup> Annual Outstanding Women of Color in Education Award**

Carmen Valdez, Associate Professor, Counseling Psychology

**UW-Madison – 6<sup>th</sup> Annual Outstanding Women of Color Awards**

Desiree Alva, Assistant Director, Diversity Affairs Office, College of Engineering  
Wilma Callaway, Assistant Director & Mentor Program Director, Center for Educational Opportunity  
Karma Chávez, Assistant Professor, Communication Arts and Chican@ & Latin@ Studies  
Roberta Hill, Professor, English and American Indian Studies  
Li Chiao-Ping, Professor & Chair, Dance  
Saemyi Park, Ph.D., Political Science  
Carmen Valdez, Associate Professor, Counseling Psychology

**UW-Madison – 7<sup>th</sup> Annual Outstanding Women of Color Awards**

Angela Byars-Winston, Associate Professor, Medicine  
Ruttananip (Dang) Chonwerawong, Assistant Dean for Student Diversity Programs, School of Education  
Marla Delgado-Guererro, Ph.D. candidate, Counseling Psychology  
Carla Pugh, Associate Professor, Surgery  
Michelle Robinson, Ph.D. candidate, Sociology  
Eva Vivian, Associate Professor (CHS), School of Pharmacy  
Shawnika Hull, Assistant Professor, School of Journalism & Mass Communication  
Lillian Tong, Faculty Associate, WISCIENCE

Biographies for current recipients of UW System's Annual Outstanding Women of Color in Education Award are posted on the UW System website: <https://www.wisconsin.edu/grants-awards/women-of-color/>

Brief introductions to each of the 2013 UW-Madison Annual Outstanding Women of Color Award recipients are presented in Valeria Davis's University of Wisconsin News story, "Seven Honored as UW-Madison Outstanding Women of Color" (19 September 2013): <http://news.wisc.edu/22133>

Brief introductions to each of the 2014 UW-Madison Annual Outstanding Women of Color Award recipients are presented in Ngijol Songolo's University of Wisconsin News story "Eight honored by UW-Madison as Outstanding Women of Color" (22 July 2014): <http://www.news.wisc.edu/23006>

The committee joins the Women Faculty Mentoring Program in applauding outstanding mentoring of women assistant professors:

**2013 Slesinger Award for Excellence in Mentoring**  
Beth Graue, Professor, Curriculum & Instruction

(continued)

2014 Slesinger Award for Excellence in Mentoring

Linda Schuler, Professor & Interim Chair, Comparative Biosciences

Professors Graue and Schuler each received a \$2,500 award from the Women's Philanthropy Council, which has generously supported the Slesinger Award since 2004.

Finally, the committee acknowledges and thanks one man and one woman honored as "champions for women" by the Women's Philanthropy Council:

2013 Champion Awards

Steven M. Cramer, Professor, Civil & Environmental Engineering and Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, College of Engineering

Lynn Edlefson, Campus Child Care Coordinator and Director, Office of Child Care & Family Resources

This award provides an opportunity for each recipient to designate a Women's Philanthropy Council gift of \$5,000 to a campus initiative of his or her choice. Dean Steven M. Cramer elected to support the Women in Science & Engineering Leadership Institute and Campus Child Care Coordinator Lynn Edlefson elected to create paid internships in early childhood education.

Additional details are available in a press release by UW Foundation's Lynne Johnson, "Two honored for advancing status of UW women" (5 November 2013): [www.news.wisc.edu/22269](http://www.news.wisc.edu/22269)

The Committee on Women in the University congratulates past chair Jo Handelsman, now Frederick Phineas Rose Professor and Howard Hughes Medical Institute Professor of Molecular, Cellular and Developmental Biology at Yale University, who was nominated by President Barack Obama to serve as Associate Director for Science in the Office of Science & Technology on 31 July 2013: [www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2013/07/31/president-obama-announces-more-key-administration-posts](http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2013/07/31/president-obama-announces-more-key-administration-posts)

Dr. Handelsman returned to UW-Madison to present the 2013 Denice D. Denton Distinguished Lecture, *The National Transformation of Science Education* (8 November).

The committee congratulates Professor Patrick Sims and Assistant Vice Chancellor Ruby Paredes on their recent respective appointments as Interim Vice Provost & Chief Diversity Officer and Interim Associate Vice Provost in the Division of Diversity, Equity, & Educational Achievement: [www.news.wisc.edu/21991](http://www.news.wisc.edu/21991)

...and on Professor Sims' permanent appointment to the role of Vice Provost & Chief Diversity Officer in May 2015: <http://news.wisc.edu/23751>

We thank you for your past work with the committee and appreciate the opportunity to partner with you in your new roles. Our committee has benefitted greatly from more active communication and engagement with your office.

**Domestic Partner Health Insurance.** The Committee on Women in the University has advocated since 2006 for marriage equality and provision of equitable employment benefits. The committee was pleased to see Employee Reimbursement Account (ERA) benefits, including medical and dependent care expenses for a spouse and spouse's children, extended to employees with a legally recognized same-sex spouse (November 2013). We applaud the legal recognition of same-sex marriage in Wisconsin (6 October 2014) and our glad that our LGBT colleagues with marriages recognized in Wisconsin, the United States, and other countries can now enroll in all benefit plans that are administered by Employee Trust Funds (ETF) and offer family coverage.

(continued)

**Early Childhood Care & Education.** The Committee on Women continues to promote affordable access to high quality early childhood care and education and to advocate for additional infant and toddler care options for faculty, staff, and students. The committee discussed an opportunity to re-develop and expand at Chicken Soup/Little Chicks (601 North Whitney Way). Lynn Edlefson subsequently developed and presented a proposal to Provost Paul M. DeLuca, Jr. and Vice Chancellor for Finance & Administration Darrell Bazzell. The Committee on Women thanks Provost DeLuca and Vice Chancellor Bazzell for funding this project, which added 16 infant and toddler spaces and 4 preschool spaces (20 FTE). Full-time care and flexible scheduling are available.

In February 2014, the Office of Child Care & Family Resources developed Bumblebee, a single electronic application including all six campus early childhood care & education programs. Between 1 February and 31 October, 424 families applied through the program for care for 462 children, including 270 children under two (~58%). 124 children were enrolled during that time period. Bumblebee has received enthusiastic reviews from campus users.

In 2014-2015, the committee met with Dean Soyeon Shim to discuss changes at the Preschool Laboratory's Mineral Point Road and Linden sites. Committee members are grateful for the investment of significant resources in university child care programs and services and recognize the budget constraints faced by the university. Members also expressed concern that program changes, and the perceived risk that valued campus programs and services might be lost, can have a negative effect on workplace climate and morale. The Mineral Point site now serves the greater Madison community as an early childhood Headstart program. The Linden Drive site continues to serve children 6 weeks to 5 years and to support the university's research and pre-service training missions. In the transition, families from the Mineral Point Road site had an opportunity to enroll at the Linden Drive site or another campus program. The number of children served remains constant. Five infant care spaces were lost. Dean Shim shared her vision for the Preschool Lab and new developments in Human Development & Family Studies. She proposed that a newly formed SoHE Early Childhood Task Force consult with the committee in 2015-2016.

The Committee on Women and University Child Care Committee sent a joint letter to Chancellor Rebecca Blank, Provost Sarah Mangelsdorf, and Vice Chancellor for Finance & Administration Darrell Bazzell, requesting their active engagement in developing a campus-level plan to protect and build high quality child care capacity at UW-Madison. Chancellor Blank, Provost Mangelsdorf, and Vice Chancellor Bazzell replied, inviting the committees to propose how the university might best proceed in better coordinating efforts to build collaboration and capacity.

**EVOC (End Violence on Campus).** Since March 2011, the Committee on Women in the University has partnered with the University Health Services' Violence Prevention Team and nearly two dozen current campus and community partners who are committed to reducing sexual assault, dating/domestic violence and stalking. Following Violence Prevention Coordinator Carmen Hotvedt's March 2013 briefing on the Violence Against Women Act and changes to the Cleary Act, the committee voted unanimously to recommend that UW-Madison provide universal first-year prevention education, with a strong focus on bystander intervention. The committee strongly supports educating UW-Madison students about issues related to sexual assault, dating/domestic violence, stalking, and healthy relationships, and applauds UHS Director Sarah Van Orman and Dean of Students Lori Berquam for championing the effort to require education for first-year students. The implementation of UW-Madison's violence prevention program, *Tonight*, has been highly successful. In the program's first year, 90% of incoming students completed the requirement by mid-October. Additional details are available on the University Health Services website:  
<http://www.uhs.wisc.edu/tonight/>

(continued)

**Family Leave/Parental Leave.** Since April 2013, Natalia De Leon has been working with the CALS Equity & Diversity Committee, Dean Kathryn VandenBosch, and others to identify possible avenues for improving family leave/parental leave in the College of Agricultural & Life Sciences. In Fall 2013, Natalia De Leon joined the CALS Equity & Diversity Committee to further integrate the work of the two committees. She has shared findings and outcomes of the Committee on Women's parental leave work group to inform development of a proposed parental leave policy for the college.

Rebecca Scheller served as a liaison to the Faculty Commission on Compensation & Economic Benefits, which was charged to study options for parental leave and make recommendations to the University Committee and Faculty Senate in Spring 2015. A report to the Faculty Senate is expected.

In addition to collecting examples of family leave policies at peer institutions, the commission consulted with administrators including Vice Chancellor for Finance & Administration Darrell Bazzell, Vice Chancellor for Legal Affairs Ray Taffora, HR Specialist Advanced Catharine DeRubeis (OHR), and Vice Provost for Faculty & Staff Michael Bernard-Donals.

The College of Letters & Science policy regarding the use of sick leave following the birth or adoption of a child may provide a useful model for other schools and colleges. No new benefits are expected before a university-wide classification and compensation study is completed.

In response to the question "What are leverage points for faculty, academic staff, classified/university staff, students?" committee members identified several themes, including:

- Communication/education – addressing inconsistent awareness, knowledge, and acceptance of existing policies and practices; identifying and promulgating best practices
- Modified duties – identifying what alternate assignments are possible and effective for employees in different job categories
- Revenue streams – determining how to fund leave (e.g., for researchers, for residents, for faculty and staff with clinical appointments/obligations); how to fund replacement staff (e.g., locum tenens)
- Transition back to work – including options for PT work following family leave
- Workplace flexibility

**Preferred Name Policy.** In May 2013, LGBT Campus Center Director Gabe Javier briefed the committee on an initiative to develop a policy and process enabling students to record and use a preferred name. Recognizing the links between a person's name and personal identity, and the benefits of such a policy for specific constituencies, including members of our academic community who are transgender-identified, the committee unanimously endorsed adoption of a preferred name policy for students and recommended developing a preferred name policy and processes as quickly as possible for employees. A policy for students was adopted and promulgated by the Office of the Registrar: [http://registrar.wisc.edu/preferred\\_name.htm](http://registrar.wisc.edu/preferred_name.htm) (an FAQ is available on the site) in Fall 2013. In addition, changes to My UW enabled employees to use a preferred name. The committee acknowledges the significant challenges to achieving this outcome and thanks the preferred name team for their intensive effort to serve both students and employees.

**Suicide Prevention.** In October 2013, Suicide Prevention Coordinator Valerie Kowis provided materials introducing *At Risk*, an interactive online educational program designed to help faculty and staff recognize signs that students are distressed (including verbal, behavioral and situational cues), respond effectively, and refer appropriately to campus and community suicide prevention resources and services. *At Risk* was launched with a campus-wide e-mail message to all faculty and staff providing instructions and an access code. In addition, Kowis reached out to graduate assistants in partnership with Associate Dean for Graduate Education Wendy Crone in the Graduate School and to faculty participating in the MTLE (Madison Teaching & Learning Excellence) program. *At Risk* will

(continued)

be available through an institution-wide license for three years. The program takes approximately 45 minutes to complete. Committee members encourage colleagues to invest time in learning how to provide support and prevent suicide.

**Tenure Outcomes in the Social Studies.** For several years, the committee has been concerned about a “leaky pipeline” to tenure in the social studies. A work group consulted with Vice Provost for Faculty & Staff Steve J. Stern, studied existing and new data from the Office of Academic Planning & Institutional Research, the Office of the Secretary of the Faculty, and the Women in Science & Engineering Leadership Institute (WISELI), and found that:

- Women assistant professors in the Division of Social Studies are more likely to separate from UW-Madison than female peers in other faculty divisions and their male counterparts in Social Studies.
- Much of this attrition occurs early, before divisional committee review. In the most recent cohort observed (faculty hired between 2008-2009 and 2009-2010), 40% of female assistant professors and 32% of male assistant professors have already left UW-Madison without tenure.
- Between 1999 and 2015, the Social Studies Divisional Committee recommended tenure for 90% of women and 96% of men reviewed. Since 2007, the committee has recommended tenure at nearly equal rates for women and men.

The committee recommends that UW-Madison leaders work to identify and evaluate factors influencing retention and promotion in the Division of Social Studies. The committee also recommends continuing, systematic collection and analysis of data that draw a clear “line of sight” between hiring and promotion to tenure, to better describe and inform gender disparities in tenure and promotion rates. A copy of the work group’s report and recommendations is attached (*Appendix 1*).

**Women & Leadership Symposium.** The Committee on Women continues to partner with women deans, the Office of Human Resource Development, the Women’s Philanthropy Council, and others to present the *UW-Madison Women & Leadership Symposium* each summer. Co-Chair Ruth Litovsky and Co-Chair Elect Rebecca Scheller gave opening remarks at the *5<sup>th</sup> Annual UW-Madison Women & Leadership Symposium* (11 July 2013). Co-Chairs Natalia DeLeon and Rebecca Scheller introduced the *6<sup>th</sup> Annual UW-Madison Women & Leadership Symposium* (10 July 2014), and Rebecca Scheller spoke at the *7<sup>th</sup> Annual UW-Madison Women & Leadership Symposium* (9 July 2015).

The committee thanks the Women’s Philanthropy Council for underwriting the symposium and supporting follow-up “Coffee & Conversation” programming presented by the Office of Human Resource Development and UW-Madison’s women deans with gifts totaling \$60,000 between 2010-2011 and 2015-2016.

### III. Data on Women Faculty & Staff

The committee thanks Distinguished Policy & Planning Analyst Margaret Harrigan for her help in obtaining and interpreting institutional data on women academic staff and faculty, and the Office of Academic Planning and Institutional Research for providing both current and historic data on gender and race/ethnicity in the university’s Data Digest: <https://apir.wisc.edu/datadigest>

Readers will find additional information about data provided to the committee on the APIR website (<https://apir.wisc.edu/diversity-faculty.htm>), including memos from Margaret Harrigan regarding

“Data on Women and Minority Faculty and Staff at UW-Madison” (29 July 2014):  
<http://apir.wisc.edu/diversity/CWUfacandstaffcountsmemo2014.pdf>

“Data on Women and Minority Faculty and Staff at UW-Madison (31 August 2015):  
[http://apir.wisc.edu/facultystaff/CWU\\_faculty\\_and\\_staff\\_trends\\_2015\\_final.pdf](http://apir.wisc.edu/facultystaff/CWU_faculty_and_staff_trends_2015_final.pdf)

(continued)

The Committee on Women in the University continues to monitor the percentage of women in the University of Wisconsin-Madison's workforce (*Appendix 2*):

<b>Women Employed at UW-Madison</b>	<b>1990-1991</b>	<b>2013-2014</b>	<b>2014-2015</b>
Faculty	17.96%	32.6%	33.4%
Executive/Director/Administrator (Academic Staff)	38.83%	48.8%	48.7%
Academic Staff	49.09%	53.6%	54%
University Staff	55.57%	51.9%	50.9%
Employees in Training (including post-doctoral fellows)	26.61%	43.2%	43.6%
Graduate Assistants	34.47%	44.4%	43.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>41.78%</b>	<b>48.1%</b>	<b>48%</b>

The percentage of women in the faculty has increased from 15.2% in 1987 to 33.4% in 2014. In 1987, fewer than 9% of faculty holding the title of professor were women; today, 27% of faculty at this rank are women. 39% of associate professors and 45% of assistant professors are women (*Appendices 2, 6*). Since 2003, over 40% of all faculty hires have been women (*Appendix 8*).

In 1987, 6.2% of faculty were Black, Asian, Native American, or Hispanic. Today 18.3% of faculty (21% of female faculty and 18% of male faculty; 155 women and 271 men, including 11 women and 9 men who identify as belonging to two or more races) come from these historically underrepresented groups. Within this cohort, the percentage holding the rank of professor has risen from 5% in 1987 to 16% in 2014. 23.7% of associate professors and 24.2% of assistant professors are members of underrepresented groups (*Appendices 3, 4, 7*). Over the past ten years, 24% of faculty hires have identified as Black, Asian/Pacific Islander, American Indian, Hispanic, or members of two or more races. In 2014-2015, 27% of all tenure-track faculty hired were members of one or more of these historically underrepresented groups (*Appendix 9*).

Women hold 34% of higher-level administrative appointments. In October 2014, 6 of 14 academic deans were women and 34% of faculty and CHS faculty associate deans were women. Two deans and three associate deans were faculty of color (*Appendices 15, 16*).

In a cohort of 183 department chairs and academic program directors holding faculty appointments, 54 (30%) are women and 22 (12%) are faculty of color. In the same cohort, women lead 37.2% of arts & humanities departments/programs, 19.4% of the biological sciences departments/programs, 12.5% of the physical sciences departments/programs, and 42.6% of the social studies departments/programs. Faculty of color hold 16.3% of these leadership positions in the arts & humanities, 8% in the biological sciences, 8.3% in the physical sciences, and 14.8% in the social studies (*Appendices 17, 18*).

The number of women in science hired at UW-Madison has fluctuated from year to year. Overall, since 2003, approximately 39% of faculty members hired in the biological sciences and 21% of faculty members hired in the physical sciences have been women. In the biological sciences, women were appointed in 51% of searches in 2014-2015. In the physical sciences, women were appointed in 31% of searches in 2014-2015 (*Appendix 8*).

(continued)

Among 35 women and 48 men hired at the rank of assistant professor in 2006-2007, the most recent year for which these data are available, 83% of the women and 81% of the men were tenured within nine years. In this same cohort, 78% of minority faculty and 83% of non-minority faculty were tenured (*Appendices 10, 11*).

A review of faculty hired between 1993-1998, 1999-2004, and 2005-2007 shows that the average nine-year tenure rate is 69% for minority women, 68% for non-minority women, 67% for minority men, and 75% for non-minority men. The committee once again emphasizes the vital importance of mentoring women and faculty of color effectively through tenure, and creating a climate conducive to their retention in the faculty (*Appendix 12*).

Women and men in the social studies remain significantly less likely to win tenure than their peers, with an average ten-year tenure rate of only 57%, versus 81% in the arts & humanities, 74% in the biological sciences, and 82% in the physical sciences. Women in the social studies fare the worst, with an average nine-year tenure rate of 54% (*Appendices 13, 14*).

Overall, including executive appointments, 53.8% of academic staff are women. 46.7% of instructional academic staff and 41.1% of research doctoral academic staff are women. In this same cohort, 12.7% of academic staff identify as Black, Asian/Pacific Islander, American Indian, Hispanic, or two or more races. 11.8% of instructional academic staff and 21.6% of research doctoral academic staff belong to these historically underrepresented groups (*Appendices 2, 3*).

In 1988, 38% of academic staff executive positions were held by women; today, 48.7% of these positions are held by women, with 11.7% held by women of color. In October 2014, 84 (55.6%) of 151 higher-level administrative positions (e.g., associate or assistant vice chancellor, associate or assistant dean) were held by women. Among academic staff associate deans, 57.9% were women, and among academic staff assistant deans, 58.5% were women. 5 associate deans and 19 assistant deans (18%) are academic staff who identify as Black, Asian/Pacific Islander, American Indian, Hispanic, or two or more races (*Appendices 2, 3, 15, 16*).

Among university staff, 43.2% of FLSA exempt (“salaried”) positions and 54% of FLSA non-exempt (“hourly”) positions were held by women in 2014. 8.4% of FLSA exempt positions and 16.6% of FLSA non-exempt positions are held by employees identifying as Black, Asian/Pacific Islander, American Indian, Hispanic, or members of two or more races (*Appendices 2, 3*).

### **III. Current and Future Issues or Concerns**

In 2015-2016, the committee is focusing on:

- Protecting and building UW-Madison’s early childhood care and education capacity, with an emphasis on sustainably resourcing programs and services, and better coordinating efforts to build collaboration and capacity
- Contributing to the development of a new UW-Madison *Children in the Workplace* policy
- Consulting with the Dean of Students Office on a parental leave policy for students
- Preventing and addressing sexual assault and harassment, in partnership with University Health Services EVOC (End Violence on Campus), with a focus on providing prevention education and information about resources/policies to employees:  
[www.uhs.wisc.edu/assault/grademployee](http://www.uhs.wisc.edu/assault/grademployee)

(continued)

## V. Committee Membership

Committee on Women in the University, 2013-2014

Faculty:

		Member Since	Term Ends
Angela Byars Winston (s. II)	Medicine: Internal Medicine	2013	2014
Katherine Corby (on leave s. II)	Dance	2012	2015
Natalia de Leon (co-chair)	Agronomy	2010	2016
Laurel Goodwin	Geoscience	2011	2014
Pamela Herd	La Follette School of Public Affairs	2009	2015
Shawn Kaeppeler	Agronomy	2009	2015
Ruth Litovsky	Communicative Disorders	2010	2016
Sharon Long	Soil Science	2009	2014
Katherine Magnuson	School of Social Work	2010	2016
De-Ann Pillers	Pediatrics	2011	2014

Academic Staff:

Randi Cartmill	Ctr. for Quality & Productivity Improvement	2010	2016
Tina Hatch	International Student Services/Student Life	2011	2014
Kelly Mallon	Surgery	2010	2016
Rebecca Scheller (co-chair)	Law	2012	2015
Nancy Schultz-Darken	Primate Research Center	2012	2015
B. Ann Ward	Kinesiology	2011	2014

Ex-Officio/Non-Voting:

Patrick Sims	Office of the Provost, Diversity & Climate	2013	
Luis Piñero	Office for Equity & Diversity	1999	
Susan Nelson (designee)	Office for Equity & Diversity	2006	2014

CNCS Liaison:

Tammy Starr	Office of Human Resource Development	2013	2014
-------------	--------------------------------------	------	------

Staff:

Lindsey Stoddard Cameron	Office of the Secretary of the Faculty	1996
--------------------------	--	------

*The Committee on Women welcomes:*

Angela Byars Winston	<i>Medicine: Internal Medicine</i>	2013	2014
Patrick Sims	<i>Office of the Provost, Diversity &amp; Climate</i>	2013	
Tammy Starr	<i>Office of Human Resource Development</i>	2013	2014

*The Committee on Women in the University thanks friends of the committee and departing members:*

Katherine Corby	<i>Dance</i>	2012	2015
Laurel Goodwin	<i>Geoscience</i>	2011	2014
Sharon Long	<i>Soil Science</i>	2009	2014
Tammy Starr	<i>Office of Human Resource Development</i>	2013	2014
B. Ann Ward	<i>Kinesiology</i>	2011	2014

(continued)

## V. Committee Membership

### Committee on Women in the University, 2014-2015

		Member <u>Since</u>	Term <u>Ends</u>
<u>Faculty:</u>			
Angela Byars-Winston filling Kate Corby's seat	Medicine: Internal Medicine	2014	2015
Natalia de Leon (on leave s. II)	Agronomy	2010	2016
Pamela Herd (co-chair)	La Follette School of Public Affairs	2009	2015
Shawn Kaeppeler	Agronomy	2009	2015
Katherine Magnuson	School of Social Work	2010	2016
De-Ann Pillers filling Ruth Litovsky's seat	Pediatrics	2011	2015
<u>Academic Staff:</u>			
Randi Cartmill	Ctr. for Quality & Productivity Improvement	2010	2016
Tina Hatch	International Student Services/Student Life	2011	2017
Heidi Lang	Wisconsin Union: Social Education Office	2014	2017
Kelly Mallon	Surgery	2010	2016
Rebecca Scheller (co-chair)	Law	2012	2018
Nancy Schultz-Darken	Primate Research Center	2012	2018
<u>Classified Staff:</u>			
Antoinette Coles	University Marketing	2014	2017
Lisa Griesel	Accounting Services	Fall 2014	
Christine Hrenak	Physics	2014	2015
Tina Hunter	Sociology	2014	2017
Chris Lalande	DoIT Academic Technology	2014	2018
Kate O'Connor	Office for Equity & Diversity	2014	2017
Emily Diamond	CALS Administrative Services	Fall 2014	
Angela Thorp	Computer Sciences	2014	2018
<u>Post-Doctoral Fellow:</u>			
Katie Brenner		2014	2015
<u>Students:</u>			
Rachel Feldman (graduate student)		2014	2015
Samantha Nitschke (undergraduate student)		2014	2015
<u>Ex-Officio/Non-Voting:</u>			
Patrick Sims	Office of the Provost, Diversity & Climate	2013	
Luis Piñero	Office for Equity & Diversity	1999	
Susan Nelson (designee)	Office for Equity & Diversity	2006	2014
<u>Staff:</u>			
Lindsey Stoddard Cameron	Office of the Secretary of the Faculty	1996	
<i>The Committee on Women welcomes:</i>			
<i>Katie Brenner</i>		2014	2015
<i>Antoinette Coles</i>	<i>University Marketing</i>	2014	2017
<i>Emily Diamond</i>	<i>CALS Administrative Services</i>	<i>Fall 2014</i>	
<i>Rachel Feldman</i>		2014	2015

(continued)

<i>Lisa Griesel</i>	<i>Accounting Services</i>	<i>Fall 2014</i>
<i>Christine Hrenak</i>	<i>Physics</i>	<i>2014 2015</i>
<i>Tina Hunter</i>	<i>Sociology</i>	<i>2014 2017</i>
<i>Chris Lalande</i>	<i>DoIT Academic Technology</i>	<i>2014 2018</i>
<i>Heidi Lang</i>	<i>Wisconsin Union: Social Education Office</i>	<i>2014 2017</i>
<i>Samantha Nitschke</i>		<i>2014 2015</i>
<i>Kate O'Connor</i>	<i>Office for Equity &amp; Diversity</i>	<i>2014 2017</i>
<i>Angela Thorp</i>	<i>Computer Sciences</i>	<i>2014 2018</i>

*The Committee on Women in the University thanks friends of the committee and departing members:*

<i>Angela Byars-Winston</i>	<i>Medicine: Internal Medicine</i>	<i>2013 2015</i>
<i>Emily Diamond</i>	<i>CALS Administrative Services</i>	<i>Fall 2014</i>
<i>Laurel Goodwin</i>	<i>Geoscience</i>	<i>2011 2014</i>
<i>Lisa Griesel</i>	<i>Accounting Services</i>	<i>Fall 2014</i>
<i>Pamela Herd</i>	<i>La Follette School of Public Affairs</i>	<i>2009 2015</i>
<i>Christine Hrenak</i>	<i>Physics</i>	<i>2014 2015</i>
<i>Shawn Kaepller</i>	<i>Agronomy</i>	<i>2009 2015</i>
<i>Ruth Litovsky</i>	<i>Communicative Disorders</i>	<i>2010 2016</i>
<i>Samantha Nitschke</i>		<i>2014 2015</i>
<i>De-Ann Pillers</i>	<i>Pediatrics</i>	<i>2011 2015</i>
<i>Tammy Starr</i>	<i>Office of Human Resource Development</i>	<i>2013 2014</i>

[Also see the appendices to this report \(Link\)](#)

**University Curriculum Committee Annual Report for 2013-2014 (pp. 1-13)****University Curriculum Committee Annual Report for 2014-2015 (pp. 9-14)****I. Overview of Changes to the Course Proposal Review Structure (2013-2014)**

In April 2012, the University Committee approved the creation of the Ad Hoc Interdivisional Curriculum Committee on a trial basis and charged it with responsibility for the review of all course proposals during the 2012-2013 (and later the 2013-2014) academic year. Prior to that, each course proposal was reviewed by one of the four Divisional Executive Committees, or, in the case of cross- or multi-disciplinary courses, by ad hoc sub-committees of members from more than one Divisional Executive Committee. The Divisional Executive Committees had two primary roles – the review of course proposals and the review of faculty for tenure decisions. The pairing of these two distinct review processes created challenges when members were motivated to serve on the divisional committee in order to conduct tenure review rather than course review. Both course review and tenure review are time-consuming and require specific expertise; as the number of cross- or multi-disciplinary courses grew, appointing ad-hoc subcommittees became burdensome. Additionally, because four separate committees were involved, making changes in policy and process related to the curriculum and the course approval was extremely cumbersome. At times, interdisciplinary courses would need to be reviewed by multiple committees or would not be thoroughly reviewed.

The Ad Hoc Interdivisional Curriculum Committee was very successful and shortly after it was established committee members worked with the University Committee to draft a proposal for a permanent University Curriculum Committee.

On December 2, 2013 the Faculty Senate voted unanimously to approve the proposal to establish a University Curriculum Committee (Faculty Senate document 2452 to amend *Faculty Policies and Procedures* 4.20., 4.32., 4.40. and 5.31. and add 6.53).

The University Curriculum Committee provides the university with a single faculty entity responsible for reviewing all course proposals and course related policy. By working with the full array of courses across campus, UCC members are able to see patterns in course proposals, consider proposals in a broader context, carefully consider curricular issues that are interdisciplinary or span multiple colleges and provide a campus-wide venue to respond to curricular matters such as educational innovation, distance learning, and a range of policy issues that arise as a result of the changing higher education landscape.

At the end of the 2012-13 academic year the administrative responsibility for support of the course approval process and the nascent University Curriculum Committee was moved from the Office of the Secretary of the Faculty to Academic Planning and Institutional Research in the Office of the Provost.

**II. Functions and Meetings**

The functions of the University Curriculum Committee are specified in Chapter 6.53 of FPP as follows:

**“APPROVAL OF COURSES.** Proposals for new credit courses, or for modifications of or discontinuation of existing credit courses, shall be approved by the department (or department-like body), then by the school or college, and finally by the University Curriculum Committee.

**REVIEW OF COURSE OFFERINGS.** The University Curriculum Committee may review and recommend the alteration or discontinuance of existing credit courses, and the establishment of new courses.

ADVICE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY AND PLANNING. On its own initiative or on request, the University Curriculum Committee may advise the chancellor, provost, deans, or other administrative officers of the university on educational policy and planning and their implementation.”

In 2013-2014 the committee met on the second Friday of the month on the following dates: September 13, 2013; October 11, 2013; November 8, 2013; December 13, 2013; January 31, 2014; February 14, 2014; March 14, 2014; April 11, 2014; May 9, 2014; May 23, 2014 (policy discussion).

Agendas and minutes for UCC meetings are available from the Office of Academic Planning and Institutional Research and are posted on-line at <http://apir.wisc.edu/uccmeetings.htm>.

### **III. Approval of Courses**

In 2013-2014 the UCC reviewed 649 course proposals.

- 219 were new course proposals
- 320 were course change proposals
- 110 were course discontinuation proposals

Subjects	Change	Discontinuation	New Course	Grand Total
African Languages & Literature			2	2
Agriculture and Applied Econ			1	1
Agronomy	2			2
Animal Sciences			1	1
Art Department	13		6	19
Art History	9		5	14
Asian American Studies			1	1
Atmospheric & Oceanic Sciences	1		2	3
Biochemistry	3		3	6
Botany	1			1
Biological Systems Engineering	1		1	2
Cell and Regenerative Biology	2		5	7
Chemical & Biological Engr			1	1
Chemistry	3			3
Civil and Environmental Engr	1			1
Classics	2	2	2	6
Collaborative Nursing Program	2	4	6	12
Communication Arts	1		1	2
Communication Sci. & Disorders	1		2	3
Comparative Biosciences		1	1	2
Computer Sciences			2	2
Counseling Psychology	1			1
Curriculum & Instruction	4	11	17	32
Dairy Science	1	1	2	4
E Asian Languages & Literature	3			3
Economics	4		10	14

(continued)

Subjects	Change	Discontinuation	New Course	Grand Total
Educational Policy Studies			4	4
Educational Psychology	2	1	6	9
Emergency Medicine			2	2
Engineering Physics			1	1
English	31	61	31	123
English as a Second Language			4	4
Engr Mechanics & Astronautics	1			1
Engr Professional Development	4		1	5
Entomology			2	2
Environmental Studies	4	3	4	11
Family Medicine			2	2
Folklore Program	2			2
Food Science	1			1
Forest and Wildlife Ecology	1		1	2
Gender And Women's Studies	6	2	8	16
Genetics			1	1
Geography	1		2	3
Geoscience	1			1
German			1	1
Hebrew Studies	11	12	0	22
History	10	1	8	19
History of Science			1	1
Horticulture	4	2	1	7
Human Devel & Family Studies	1			1
Integrated Liberal Studies	1			1
Jewish Studies	2			2
Journ and Mass Communication	1		2	3
Kinesiology	3		11	14
Lang & Cultures of Asia	4			4
Law	2			2
Legal Studies			1	1
Library & Information Studies	6	3		9
Life Science Communication	1		1	2
Literature in Translation	1			1
Mathematics			1	1
Mechanical Engineering	3		1	4
Medical History and Bioethics			1	1
Medical Microbiol & Immunology	2			2
Medical Physics	1		1	2
Medical Sciences - Vet Med			1	1
Medicine	11			11

(continued)

Subjects	Change	Discontinuation	New Course	Grand Total
Molecular & Environmental Tox	1			1
Neuroscience			1	1
Nursing	6		3	9
Obstetrics and Gynecology			2	2
Pathology and Laboratory Med			2	2
Pharmaceutical Sciences	2			2
Pharmacy Practice	6		5	11
Philosophy	2			2
Pharmaceutical Science	1			1
Physical Education Activity Program	4			4
Physician Assistant	1			1
Political Science	4	1	7	12
Population Health Sciences	1		6	7
Psychiatry			6	6
Psychology	2			2
Radiology			1	1
Rehab Psych & Special Education	2	1	4	7
Religious Studies			1	1
Science & Technology Studies	1			1
Social & Administrative Pharm	4	1		5
Social Work			3	3
Sociology	97	3	1	101
Spanish	3		1	3
Statistics	4			4
Surgery			4	4
Surgical Sciences	2			2
Theatre and Drama	3			3
Zoology	1		1	2
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>320</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>649</b>

Large scale curricular projects in the English and Sociology departments account for 227 of these proposals.

#### **IV. Policy**

##### **Graduate Course Attribute**

The UCC approved a request from the Graduate School to create a new course attribute to be used to track progress toward the new Minimum Graduate Course Work (50%) Requirement. A series of new policies were approved by the Graduate Faculty Executive Committee (GFEC) on October 11, 2013 and the University Academic Planning Council (UAPC) on October 24, 2013. Prompted by the Higher Learning Commission's (HLC) institutional accreditation criteria, these policy changes are one of the many ways in which our campus ensures the integrity of its degrees and the quality of the student experience. One of the new policies addresses which courses can count toward the minimum graduate coursework (50%) requirement.

(continued)

The requirement states that at least 50% of credits applied toward the program's graduate degree credit requirement must be courses designed for graduate work (this includes but is not limited to online, thesis/research, independent study, and practicum/internship credits).

Graduate coursework can include UW-Madison courses:

- numbered 700 and above;
- numbered 300-699 that are specifically designed for graduate students in a graduate program; or
- numbered 300-699 that assess graduate students separately from undergraduate students.

Across campus course numbering has been handled very differently. Renumbering courses was an option but when discussed as a solution it was quickly determined that this would be a very time consuming and cumbersome process. In order to facilitate easy identification of courses that are countable toward the graduate course work (50%) requirement, a course attribute was created that will be attached to appropriate, approved courses at the catalog level. All courses numbered 700+ will automatically have the attribute applied. Courses that are numbered 300-699 that are either specifically designed for graduate students in a graduate program or that assess graduate students separately from undergraduate students will also have this attribute applied following a review process. Once a course has the graduate course attribute assigned, all graduate students taking the course will be assessed at the graduate level regardless of their purpose for taking the course.

The ability to request the attribute is being incorporated into the online course proposal (OCP) system. For existing courses a one-time implementation project will be undertaken during the 2014-15 academic year that will allow subject owners to indicate which courses are eligible to have the graduate course attribute. Subject owners will review lists of courses rather than submitting individual course proposals. Once this project is complete, all courses (whether existing or new) that should count toward the minimum graduate course work (50%) requirement will need to go through the course proposal process to have the attribute assigned.

The attribute being created will be G50%. The Course Guide and Class Search will be updated to allow users to search for courses that have the attribute. The attribute will also be searchable through InfoAccess queries and the Query Library.

#### Approval of Practice as Policy

As time permitted, the committee had brief discussions about topics related to the application of the federal credit hour definition to non-face-to-face courses, variable credit courses, the content of the sample syllabi submitted with course proposals and the use and purpose of various course components (lecture, discussion, laboratory etc.).

- Credits

The increasing use of flipped classrooms, blended and online courses, and so on, will require the university to develop additional policies and practices regarding how credits are assigned. These issues will require the committee to think carefully about how to operationalize the second provision of the federal credit hour definition: "A credit hour is an amount of work represented in intended learning outcomes and verified by evidence of student achievement that is an institutionally established equivalency that reasonably approximates not less than -

1. "One hour" (one instructional hour equals 50 minutes) of classroom or direct faculty instruction and a minimum of two hours of out of class student work each week for approximately fifteen weeks for one semester hour of credit, or the equivalent amount of work over a different amount of time; or
2. "At least an equivalent amount of work as required in paragraph (1) of this definition for other academic activities as established by the institution including laboratory work, internships, practica, studio work, and other academic work leading to the award of credit hours."

(continued)

- Variable Credit Courses

The committee discussed whether to require language in syllabi to explain work expectations for variable course credit. Members also discussed the use of variable credit to award fewer credits to graduate students than undergraduates (graduate students at times have had problems with maximum credits enrolled for limit).

- Syllabus

The committee discussed the information provided on the syllabus regarding how students are evaluated. Is the grading scale an essential piece? It was decided that it is not, but that it is essential that students have an understanding of how they will be evaluated in the course. The committee agreed that the sample syllabus included with course proposals must include all of the following components:

- Proposed course number (not an existing temporary number)
- Proposed course title
- An indication of the time devoted to individual topics together with the hours of instructor-student instruction and/or discussion
- Learning outcomes
- Text(s) or reference(s) to be used
- Representative list of readings
- How students will be evaluated: Assignments, papers, exams, etc., and the weight assigned to each of these requirements; and
- What constitutes an A, AB, B, BC, C, D, F. Or, if the course will be graded on a curve, the syllabus states the standards upon which the curve will be set.

- Course components

The committee discussed the need to update definitions of the “course components” as they currently exist on the course proposal form.

The definition currently used for “lecture” is outdated; “lecture” does not currently mean that an instructor speaks for the entire session. There are different practices across campus for how the term “discussion” sessions is used; for some this means review of problem sets, while in other disciplines a discussion section means in-depth, carefully planned discussion of course materials, and the acquisition of skills. The numbers of credits awarded for different activities should account appropriately for variation in the levels of engagement. The definitions provided should help students understand the structure of the course.

“Laboratory” covers the work done in a science laboratory and an art studio but does not apply accurately to studio work. The committee discussed whether there should be a separate course component type called “studio”. The committee considered whether a cost-benefit analysis would justify the introduction of a new component label, as it considered the amount of technical work that would be required to incorporate it into data systems and reports. The committee did not move forward with this idea. “Field study” is likely to be a less focused learning experience than a “lab” or “lecture”. A qualified instructor in “field study” may in some cases be a preceptor who is approved by, and works under supervision of, university faculty members and who is trained in techniques of evaluation. The category “field study” may also raise concerns about travel time to an off-campus site. Having discussed existing practices and gaps, the committee will take up this issue again next year and develop language that will assist course proposers in identifying the proper component type for their course.

(continued)

### Establishing Committee Practices

The committee decided to select a vice chair each year who will automatically become the chair the following year. This will give the vice chair a year to observe and prepare for the position; the vice chair will also chair committee meetings in the chair's absence. It was decided that in future years the committee vice chair would be selected using the same process as the divisional executive committees employ. The committee would select the vice chair in May each year. The vice chair for 2014-2105 will be selected in December 2014 and the vice chair for 2014-2015 will be selected in May 2015.

The committee realized that the work load associated with reviewing course proposals and discussing policy requires meeting more frequently than once a month during the fall and spring terms. In future the committee will therefore meet twice a month during the fall and spring terms. The meeting time for committee meetings was set for the 2nd and 4th Fridays from 9:30–11:30 A.M.

The committee will undertake additional discussion and policy development during the 2014-2015 academic year.

### **V. Future Issues**

The UCC plans to take up several policy issues in the near future:

- Credit policy related to independent study
- Credit policy related to internships, practicum, field work and service learning
- Credit policy related to online courses
- Impact and implications of new budget model
- Review policy related to qualified instructors
- Complete the review and revision of KnowledgeBase documents related to course policy.
  - Variable Credit Courses
  - Credits
  - Definitions of "course components" such as "lecture," "discussion," "laboratory," etc.
  - Syllabus
  - Crosslisting
  - Selecting a Course Number
  - Prerequisites
  - Course Description
  - Topics Courses

### **VI. Summary**

The University Curriculum Committee was formally established by the Faculty Senate in December, 2013. In this newly established format, the UCC is able to focus on the course approval process, take on a comprehensive role in the oversight of the development of the curriculum, and attend to a range of matters of policy and practice that are important to the success of our educational enterprise. The committee reviewed a large volume of course proposals this academic year. Some of that volume was due to significant changes made to the undergraduate curriculums in English and Sociology. Additional reasons for the large number of course proposals that were reviewed include other smaller-scale curricular revisions, Educational Innovation projects, new certificate programs and the creation and updating of courses to match technological and other innovations. The UCC also began a review of established practices and policies, and identified a number of policy topics to be addressed in the coming year.

(continued)

**VII. Curriculum Committee Membership 2013-2014 (term expires)**

Each of the four divisions had three representatives who are appointed to staggered 3 year terms.

David Bohnhoff, Biological Systems Engineering, Physical Sciences (2014)

Harry Brighouse, Philosophy, Arts and Humanities (2016)

Philip Brown, Geoscience, Physical Sciences (2016)

Gary Green, Community and Environmental Sociology, Social Studies (2016)

Barbara Ingham, Food Science, Biological Sciences (2015)

Paul Marker, School of Pharmacy, Biological Sciences (2016)

Dennis Miller, Art, Arts and Humanities (2014)

Regina Murphy, Chemical and Biological Engineering, Physical Sciences (2015)

Peter Rahko, Medicine, Biological Sciences (2014)

Mark Seidenberg, Psychology, Social Studies (2014)

Jolanda Vanderwal Taylor, German, Arts and Humanities (chair) (2015)

Kimber Wilkerson, Rehabilitation Psychology and Special Education, Social Studies (2015)

Michelle Young, Academic Planning and Institutional Research, consultant to the UCC

## University Curriculum Committee Annual Report for 2014-2015

### I. Functions and Meetings

The functions of the University Curriculum Committee are specified in Chapter 6.53 of FPP as follows:

**APPROVAL OF COURSES.** Proposals for new credit courses, or for modifications of or discontinuation of existing credit courses, shall be approved by the department (or department-like body), then by the school or college, and finally by the University Curriculum Committee.

**REVIEW OF COURSE OFFERINGS.** The University Curriculum Committee may review and recommend the alteration or discontinuance of existing credit courses, and the establishment of new courses.

**ADVICE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY AND PLANNING.** On its own initiative or on request, the University Curriculum Committee may advise the chancellor, provost, deans, or other administrative officers of the university on educational policy and planning and their implementation.

In 2014-2015 the committee met on the second and fourth Fridays of the month on the following dates: September 12, September 26, October 10, October 24, November 21, December 12, 2014, January 9, February 13, February 27, March 13, March 27, April 10, April 24, May 8, May 22, 2015.

Agendas and minutes for UCC meetings are available from the Office of Academic Planning and Institutional Research and are posted on-line at <http://apir.wisc.edu/uccmeetings.htm>.

### II. Approval of Courses

One of the major functions of the UCC is to review proposals to create new, change existing or discontinue courses. In 2014-2015 the UCC reviewed 644 course proposals.

- 207 were new course proposals
- 308 were course change proposals
- 129 were course discontinuation proposals

	Change	Discontinu e	New	Total
Accounting and Info Systems			1	1
African Languages & Literature	1		2	2
Afro-American Studies	5		2	7
Agriculture and Applied Econ			6	6
Agroecology			1	1
Agronomy	1	2		3
Air Force Aerospace Studies	2			2
Animal Science			1	1
Anthropology	1			1
Art Department	4		4	8
Art History	9		16	25
Atmospheric & Oceanic Sciences	5		1	6
Biochemistry	5		1	6

(continued)

Biological Systems Engineering  
Biology  
Biomedical Engineering  
Biostatistics & Med Informatics  
Botany  
Cell and Regenerative Biology  
Chemistry  
Civil and Environmental Engr  
Classics  
Communication Arts  
Communication Sci. & Disorders  
Comparative Biosciences  
Comparative Literature  
Computer Science  
Consumer Science  
Counseling Psychology  
Curriculum and Instruction  
Dance  
Design Studies  
Economics  
Ed Leadership & Policy Analysis  
Educational Policy Studies  
Educational Psychology  
Electrical and Computer Engr  
Emergency Medicine  
English  
Engr Mechanics & Astronautics  
Engr Professional Development  
Envir St - Gaylord Nelson Inst  
Environmental Studies  
Family Medicine  
Finance, Investment & Banking  
Folklore  
Food Science  
Forest & Wildlife Ecology  
French  
Gender And Womens Studies  
General Business  
Genetics  
Geography  
German  
Greek  
Hebrew (Hebrew And Semitic St)

1			1
		1	1
		2	2
1		1	2
		2	2
		1	1
5		6	11
4	1	5	10
2	1	2	5
3		6	9
1			1
1			1
4			4
3		2	4
3	3	10	16
10		1	11
6		10	16
		1	1
		5	5
1			1
		4	4
		3	3
		3	3
		1	1
		1	1
15		14	29
		1	1
	1		1
2	2	6	10
		1	1
2			2
4		1	5
		1	1
	1		1
2		3	5
4		1	5
	1	3	4
1		5	6
		1	1
2	33	1	36
2		3	5
1			1
24	10		34

(continued)

Hebrew Studies  
History  
Horticulture  
Human Devel & Family Studies  
Industrial & Systems Engr  
Industrial Relations  
Integrated Liberal Studies  
Interdis Coures (Sohe)  
Interdis Courses (CALS)  
Interdis Courses (L&S)  
Interdis Courses (Sohe)  
Italian  
Jewish Studies  
Journ And Mass Communication  
Kinesiology  
Landscape Architecture  
Latin  
Law  
Legal Studies  
Library & Information Studies  
Life Sciences Communication  
Literature In Translation  
Mathematics  
Mechanical Engineering  
Medical History and Bioethics  
Medical Microbiol & Immunology  
Medical Physics  
Medical Sciences - Med School  
Medicine  
Microbiology  
Music  
Music-Performance  
Naval Science  
Nutritional Sciences  
Operations & Technology Mgmt  
Pediatrics  
Pharmaceutical Sciences  
Pharmacy  
Pharmacy Practice  
Physical Therapy  
Physics  
Political Science  
Population Health Sciences

7			7
16	15	3	34
		1	1
3			3
15	1	3	19
	2		2
2			2
		1	1
	3		1
	3	1	4
25			25
3			3
9			9
		2	2
		1	1
		5	5
2			2
1			1
		1	1
2			2
4			4
		3	3
5		2	7
2		4	6
2			2
2	2	3	7
4		1	5
1			1
1	10		11
2			2
2		2	4
	1	1	2
1			1
1			1
		1	1
1		3	4
4			4
1			1
		1	1
2	1		3
2			2
5		4	9
1	4	2	7

(continued)

Psychology	5	22	1	28
Religious Studies	2		1	3
Risk Management And Insurance			1	1
Slavic	4	1		5
Social Work	5		3	8
Sociology	10	1	2	13
Spanish			2	2
Statistics	1	1	6	8
Surgery			1	1
Surgical Sciences	1			1
Theatre and Drama	9			9
Transportation and Public Util		9		9
Zoology	6	1	2	9
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>308</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>207</b>	<b>644</b>

### III. Policy

#### Approved committee procedures

As is appropriate and necessary for a new governance committee the UCC developed a set of standard operating procedures that describe the role of the chair, vice chair, committee members and coordinator as well as guidelines for holding regular meetings, reviewing course proposals and considering matters of policy. The Operating Procedures of the University Curriculum Committee document was unanimously approved by the committee at the December 12, 2014 meeting. This document is available at <http://apir.wisc.edu/uccmembers.htm>.

#### Graduate Course Attribute

The UCC approved a request from the Graduate School to create a new course attribute to be used to track progress toward the new Minimum Graduate Course Work (50%) Requirement.

The ability for those proposing courses to request the application of the attribute to the course was added to the online course proposal (OCP) system. For existing courses a one-time implementation project was undertaken to allow subject owners to indicate which courses are eligible to have the graduate course attribute. Subject owners reviewed lists of courses and marked courses that would have the attribute applied. This approach to implementation was necessary in order to efficiently process the large number of courses; a course-by-course approach was deemed to be unmanageable. This one time project is complete and the attribute was applied to 2,303 existing courses. Going forward, all courses (whether existing or new) that should count toward the minimum graduate course work (50%) requirement will need to go through the course proposal process to have the attribute assigned. The attribute created is "G50%". The Course Guide and Class Search will be updated to allow users to search for courses that have this attribute. Courses with this attribute can also be identified through InfoAccess queries.

#### Obsolete Course Policy

The UCC reviewed and endorsed a policy to automatically discontinue obsolete courses.

The Obsolete Course Policy establishes automatic course discontinuation for courses not taught in eight or more years with a two year extension available by request. Eight years was chosen for the policy because it is twice the standard amount of time it takes for an undergraduate to complete a degree. Current policy requires that course numbers must be dormant (no student will have earned any credits from that course) for eight years before the number can be reused. The discontinuation of courses will

(continued)

occur as a batch process and thus will not require a separate proposal for each course to be removed from the course catalog. The degree audit system will also be updated to remove references to discontinued courses. Based on current analysis, the first batch of obsolete courses will be over a thousand courses. The Obsolete Course Policy was also reviewed and approved unanimously by the University Academic Planning Council.

#### Credit by Departmental Exam

The UCC endorsed a new Credit by Departmental Exam Policy. The Credit by Departmental Exam Policy is meant to fill a gap in the spectrum of how students can earn credits. The policy sets out a framework for departments to develop exams or other assessments of learning that UW-Madison undergraduate students can complete to earn credit for prior learning. The policy establishes a process to approve courses for credit by departmental exam that will be similar to though simpler than the process for a new course approval. A fee will be charged to subsidize the costs associated with developing and administering the assessments.

#### Course component types

The committee discussed the need to update the definitions of course component types (LEC, lecture; DIS, discussion; LAB, laboratory; FLD, field; IND, independent study; SEM, seminar). The primary purpose of course component types is to support course scheduling. They are also associated with credit-assignment. In addition, they communicate to students the structure and arrangement of these distinct features of a course. Different component types generally indicate a different type of experience either in the classroom or in other settings. Accurate component descriptions will help students get a realistic sense of the amount and type of work associated with a course. It is important to note that because scheduling is their primary purpose, component types are not intended to fully describe the pedagogical model of the course. The UCC developed, updated and approved the updated definitions. The changes as approved by the committee are available at: <https://kb.wisc.edu/vesta/page.php?id=24558>

### **V. Future Issues**

In the next year the UCC has plans to take up several issues:

- Policy related to internships, practicum, field work and service learning
- Policy related to online courses
- Use of special topics courses
- Preparation for implementation of a new course proposal system (CourseLeaf)
- Complete the review and revision of KnowledgeBase documents related to course policy

### **VI. Summary**

In its second year of existence a set of operating procedures was developed to guide the work of the committee and a review of existing course related policy was started that included a revision of the descriptions associated with course component types. The committee plans to continue the review of course related policies in the next year while also reviewing a significant number of course proposals. The implementation of the graduate course attribute and the review of well over 5,000 existing courses by departments, school/colleges and the UCC was a significant accomplishment.

(continued)

**VII. Curriculum Committee Membership 2014-2015 (term expires)**

Each of the four divisions has three representatives who are appointed to staggered 3 year terms.

Harry Brighouse, Philosophy (2016)  
Philip Brown, Geoscience (2016)  
Amin Fadl, Animal Sciences (2017)  
Gary Green, Community and Environmental Sociology (2016)  
Robert Glenn Howard, Communication Arts (2017)  
Barbara Ingham, Food Science (2015)  
Paul Marker, Pharmacy (resigned December 2014)  
Regina Murphy, Chemical and Biological Engineering (2015)  
Leslie Smith, Mathematics (2017)  
Jolanda Vanderwal Taylor, German (chair) (2015)  
David Weimer, LaFollette School of Public Affairs (2017)  
Kimber Wilkerson, Rehabilitation Psychology and Special Education (2015)

Michelle Young, Academic Planning and Institutional Research, consultant to the UCC

---

**Proposed Revisions to Faculty Policies and Procedures Chapter 7**  
**(Post-Tenure Review policy)**

*passed by ad hoc committee on 20 October 2015; accepted and approved with revisions by University Committee on 26 October 2015; discussed at November 2 Faculty Senate; faculty listening sessions 10 and 11 November; accepted and approved with revisions by University Committee on 30 November 2015*

**Actions**

- Rename FPP 7.03. to “RECRUITING AND APPOINTMENTS”
- Renumber existing FPP 7.16. → 7.03.D.
- Renumber existing FPP 7.18. → 7.03.E. and 7.03.F.
- Create new 7.17. (below, drawing from II-106)
- Create new 7.18. (below)
- Rescind II-106 (existing “Policy on Review of Tenured Faculty”)
- Revise FPP 5.21.D.1. to: “The departmental executive committee shall provide for the periodic review of the performance of every tenured faculty member as indicated in 7.17. of these rules. ~~Such reviews shall be conducted as part of the annual determination of recommendations for merit salary increments. Such reviews shall provide for a faculty member to be heard on his/her own case, if he/she wishes, and for the faculty member to be informed of the outcome of the review.~~”
- Pass the following separate motion after passage of these policies (not incorporated into FPP): “Each departmental executive committee shall establish written criteria and procedures governing the periodic review of each tenured faculty member consistent with FPP 7.17., to be submitted to the relevant dean’s office, the provost, and the secretary of the faculty by April 30, 2015.”

*Marked up version (pp. 1-4)*

*proposed language below is based on November Senate version with mark-up reflecting input from Senate, November listening sessions and other input, and UC 30 November 2015 meeting*

*No mark-up version (pp. 5-8)*

*See also the version approved by the Faculty Senate, 2 November*

**7.17. REVIEW OF TENURED FACULTY**

**A. PURPOSE**

The purposes of the review of tenured faculty are:

- a. to recognize outstanding achievement;
- b. to provide opportunities for mentoring and professional development;
- c. to help identify and remedy, from a developmental point of view, any deficiencies.

The process of post-tenure review is the periodic assessment of each faculty member's activities and performance, in accordance with the mission of the department, college, and institution, and the responsibilities of the faculty as described in FPP 8.02., ~~in such a way as to determine that the faculty member is meeting his or her obligations to the university and the State of Wisconsin~~. The review is to be appropriately linked to the merit process, and should not involve the creation of unnecessary additional bureaucracy. ~~Review of tenured faculty builds on and complements other aspects of the tenure process in order to develop faculty capacity and strengthen and promote the public benefits of tenure. Post-tenure review is not a reevaluation of tenure and is not undertaken for the purposes of discipline or dismissal. Faculty shall be subject to discipline or dismissal only for just cause (see FPP 9). Departments, schools, and colleges may not use post-tenure reviews as the basis for budgetary decisions or for program modification or redirection.~~

## B. CRITERIA

1. The basic standard for review shall be whether the faculty member under review discharges conscientiously and with professional competence the duties appropriately associated with the faculty member's position.
2. Each department shall develop criteria to measure progress in scholarly productivity as appropriate to the field. The criteria for review shall be periodically reviewed by the executive committee of each department and the school or college APC.
3. The criteria for review should reflect the overall mission of the department and should, be sufficiently flexible to accommodate faculty with differing responsibilities, and recognize that careers and levels of productivity may change over time. In developing such criteria, departments may draw on statements used in their existing other faculty review procedures, such as merit or promotion review. Special care should be taken to ensure that the scholarly productivity of jointly appointed and interdisciplinary faculty is appropriately evaluated.
4. The executive committee of each department shall ensure that the criteria governing faculty review do not infringe on the accepted standards of academic freedom of faculty, including the freedom to pursue novel, unpopular, or unfashionable lines of inquiry or innovative methods of teaching, and recognize that scholarly projects take varying amounts of time to come to fruition. Nothing in the criteria or application of these policies shall allow the review to be prejudiced by factors proscribed by applicable state or federal law, such as race, religion, sex, sexual orientation, ethnicity, age, and handicap.

## C. PROCEDURES

1. Reviews shall occur at least once every five years. These reviews may be incorporated into the annual merit review process or combined with promotion, retention, salary, or other reviews, including but not limited to nominations for chaired professorships, major teaching awards, and national professional honors or awards. In the case of combined reviews, the department may require supplementary documentation from the faculty member, which meets the criteria below, that would not otherwise be required for the other review.
2. Each review, as determined by each department's executive committee, shall be carried out by two or more tenured faculty members, who may be drawn from outside the department. If the faculty member under review formally objects to a reviewer, the chair, in consultation with the relevant dean, shall identify other appropriate reviewers. Such formal objections should be kept confidential. In the case of a faculty member with appointments in more than one department, the department chairs of the affected departments shall agree on procedures for the conduct of the review.
3. Review procedures shall include
  - a. A review of qualitative and quantitative evidence of the faculty member's performance over at least the previous five-year period. The evidence should include a current curriculum vitae, annual activity reports, teaching evaluations or summaries of evaluations, and other materials providing evidence of the faculty member's accomplishments and contributions that the department or the faculty member feel are relevant to the review. The faculty member should provide the reviewers with a brief summary of career plans for the future. Letters from outside the university would not ordinarily be a part of the review process. The faculty member under review, however, may submit appropriate letters if she or he so chooses. The reviewers shall examine materials to the degree needed to accomplish the purposes of this review, which are to assess whether the faculty member is satisfactorily performing his or her duties to the university and the State of Wisconsin, and to encourage the improvement of faculty skills.

(continued)

- b. Discussion with the faculty member about his or her contributions to the profession, the department, and the university if either the reviewers or the faculty member so desire.
- c. Appropriate consideration of a faculty member's contributions outside the department to interdisciplinary and other programs, governance, and administration.
- d. Other steps the reviewers consider useful in making a fair and informed judgment, including but not limited to consultation with individuals who have knowledge of the faculty member's work.
- e. ~~Determination of an overall ranking of "satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory" performance. An "unsatisfactory" ranking indicates that a faculty member has failed to meet basic expectations of the position as described in FPP 8.02. and as specified by criteria set forward by the department in 7.17.B. Departments may develop other ranking levels, provided that there is a distinction between satisfactory and unsatisfactory performance.~~
4. The reviewers shall provide the faculty member with a ~~ranking of satisfactory or unsatisfactory performance and a written summary~~ of the review by the end of the academic year. The faculty member shall have the ~~opportunity right~~ to prepare a written response to the summary within 30 days after receipt of ~~the summary and ranking~~.
5. A copy of the summary and any written response to it shall be given to the department chair and shall be placed in the personnel file of the faculty member. The department shall also preserve in the faculty member's personnel file all documents that played a substantive role in the review (other than documents such as publications that are readily accessible elsewhere), and a record of any action taken as a result of the review. The summary and outcome of the review shall remain confidential, that is, confined to the appropriate departmental, college, or university persons or bodies and the faculty member being evaluated, released otherwise only at the discretion, or with the explicit consent of, the faculty member, or as otherwise required by law.
6. Every effort should be made to offer tangible recognition to those faculty identified as exceptionally good, including but not limited to, Faculty identified as exceptional should be considered for nomination for university, national, and international awards.
7. In the event of an unsatisfactory ranking a review indicates substantial deficiencies, support from institutional resources for professional development shall be proffered. The the department chair and the faculty member shall develop a written plan for mentoring and professional development to address all issues identified in the review, with the faculty member and in consultation, if necessary, with the appropriate dean(s). This plan shall be the product of mutual negotiation between the faculty member and the chair and/or dean(s), shall respect academic freedom and professional self-direction, and shall be flexible enough to allow for subsequent alteration. Such a plan could include review and adjustment of the faculty member's responsibilities, development of a new research program or teaching strategy, referral to campus resources, assignment of a mentoring committee, institution of mandatory annual reviews for a specified period, written performance expectations, and/or other elements. The faculty member shall have the right to provide a written response, as well as the right of appeal through the grievance procedure outlined in FPP 8.15. regarding the manner in which any written development plan is formulated, the plan's content, and any resulting evaluation. Following an unsatisfactory ranking, the department shall conduct a review in the following year.
8. In the event a review identifies substantial deficiencies, the faculty member shall have the right to request a second review (peer review), following the above procedures except that the reviewers shall be selected by mutual consent of the faculty member and the dean.
9. The faculty member shall have the right to challenge the findings of reviews and correct the record through the appeal procedure in section 7.18. below.
10. In the event of that recurring reviews reveal continuing and persistent problems with a faculty member's performance that do not lend themselves to improvement after several efforts, and that call into question the faculty member's ability to function in that position, then other possibilities, such as a mutually agreeable reassignment to other duties or separation, should be explored. If these are not practicable, or no other solution acceptable to the parties can be found, then the administration must convene a committee of faculty to review proposed sanctions.

(continued)

11. The standard for discipline or dismissal remains that of just cause as outlined in FPP 9.02. and 9.03. The fact of successive negative reviews does not diminish the obligation of the institution to show such cause in a separate forum, following the procedures outlined in FPP 9. Records from post-tenure review may be relied upon and are admissible, but rebuttable as to accuracy. The administration bears the ultimate burden of proof on the issue of just cause for discipline and dismissal. three unsatisfactory rankings, the dean shall refer the faculty member to the provost for review of performance of responsibilities defined in FPP 8.02. and possible further action under the process described in FPP 9.06.
12. The faculty member retains all protections guaranteed in FPP, including, but not limited to, the rights to appeal specified above and the right to appeal disciplinary action to the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities as described in FPP 9.07.

#### D. ACCOUNTABILITY

1. Copies of the departmental criteria and procedures for reviews of tenured faculty shall be filed with the appropriate dean, the provost, and the secretary of the faculty.
2. At the beginning of each academic year, the chair shall identify faculty to be reviewed by the end of that year and the executive committee shall establish a calendar for reviews.
3. Departments shall maintain a record of reviews completed, including the names of all reviewers.
4. At the end of each academic year, department chairs shall send a report to the appropriate dean(s) listing the names of faculty members reviewed during that academic year and summarizing the outcomes of those reviews. For reviews resulting in unsatisfactory rankings, the appropriate dean will be notified per section 7.17.C.7. above.
5. If a department fails to conduct requisite reviews by the end of the academic year, the dean shall appoint reviewers to conduct reviews based on the department's specified criteria.
6. The periodic review of each department, in which the department's mission, personnel, and development are now evaluated, shall include review of the process for review of tenured faculty in the department.

#### 7.18. APPEAL OF POST-TENURE REVIEWS

- A. By written request, within twenty days, a faculty member may appeal the findings of post-tenure reviews. If a second review has been requested per 7.17.C.8., then both reviews shall be submitted for consideration. The appeal shall be heard by the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities no later than twenty days after the request, except that this time limit may be enlarged by mutual consent of the parties, or by order of the committee. The faculty member shall be given at least ten days' notice of such review.
- B. The Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities shall report on the validity of the appeal to the faculty member, the departmental executive committee, the appropriate dean, and the provost.
- C. If the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities finds that a review was based in any significant degree upon impermissible factors as defined in UWS 3.08(1)(a)-(c), with material prejudice to the individual faculty member, and elects not to remand the case back to the department because it would serve no useful purpose, the University Committee, after appropriate consultation, shall appoint an ad hoc post-tenure review committee to perform a de novo review to replace the contested review. Members of the ad hoc committee shall be tenured faculty members at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, but they shall not be members of the executive committee of the faculty member's academic department(s) or functional equivalent, nor shall they be members of the committee conducting the contested review.
- D. The Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities shall retain jurisdiction pending the resolution of all appeal.

(continued)

## **Proposed Revisions to Faculty Policies and Procedures Chapter 7 (Post-Tenure Review policy)**

### **No mark-up**

#### **A. PURPOSE**

The purposes of the review of tenured faculty are:

- a. to recognize outstanding achievement;
- b. to provide opportunities for mentoring and professional development;
- c. to help identify and remedy, from a developmental point of view, any deficiencies.

The process of post-tenure review is the periodic assessment of each faculty member's activities and performance, in accordance with the mission of the department, college, and institution, and the responsibilities of the faculty as described in FPP 8.02. The review is to be appropriately linked to the merit process, and should not involve the creation of unnecessary additional bureaucracy. Review of tenured faculty builds on and complements other aspects of the tenure process in order to develop faculty capacity and strengthen and promote the public benefits of tenure. Post-tenure review is not a reevaluation of tenure and is not undertaken for the purposes of discipline or dismissal. Faculty shall be subject to discipline or dismissal only for just cause (see FPP 9). Departments, schools, and colleges may not use post-tenure reviews as the basis for budgetary decisions or for program modification or redirection.

#### **B. CRITERIA**

1. The basic standard for review shall be whether the faculty member under review discharges conscientiously and with professional competence the duties appropriately associated with the faculty member's position.
2. Each department shall develop criteria to measure progress in scholarly productivity as appropriate to the field. The criteria for review shall be periodically reviewed by the executive committee of each department and the school or college APC.
3. The criteria for review should reflect the overall mission of the department, be sufficiently flexible to accommodate faculty with differing responsibilities, and recognize that careers and levels of productivity may change over time. In developing such criteria, departments may draw on statements used in other faculty review procedures, such as merit or promotion review. Special care should be taken to ensure that the scholarly productivity of jointly appointed and interdisciplinary faculty is appropriately evaluated.
4. The executive committee of each department shall ensure that the criteria governing faculty review do not infringe on the accepted standards of academic freedom of faculty, including the freedom to pursue novel, unpopular, or unfashionable lines of inquiry or innovative methods of teaching, and recognize that scholarly projects take varying amounts of time to come to fruition. Nothing in the criteria or application of these policies shall allow the review to be prejudiced by factors proscribed by applicable state or federal law, such as race, religion, sex, sexual orientation, ethnicity, age, and handicap.

#### **C. PROCEDURES**

1. Reviews shall occur at least once every five years. These reviews may be incorporated into the annual merit review process or combined with promotion, retention, salary, or other reviews, including but not limited to nominations for chaired professorships, major teaching awards, and national professional honors or awards. In the case of combined reviews, the department may require supplementary documentation from the faculty member, which meets the criteria below, that would not otherwise be required for the other review.

(continued)

2. Each review, as determined by each department's executive committee, shall be carried out by two or more tenured faculty members, who may be drawn from outside the department. If the faculty member under review formally objects to a reviewer, the chair, in consultation with the relevant dean, shall identify other appropriate reviewers. Such formal objections should be kept confidential. In the case of a faculty member with appointments in more than one department, the department chairs of the affected departments shall agree on procedures for the conduct of the review.
3. Review procedures shall include
  - a. A review of qualitative and quantitative evidence of the faculty member's performance over at least the previous five-year period. The evidence should include a current curriculum vitae, annual activity reports, teaching evaluations or summaries of evaluations, and other materials providing evidence of the faculty member's accomplishments and contributions that the department or the faculty member feel are relevant to the review. The faculty member should provide the reviewers with a brief summary of career plans for the future. Letters from outside the university would not ordinarily be a part of the review process. The faculty member under review, however, may submit appropriate letters if she or he so chooses. The reviewers shall examine materials to the degree needed to accomplish the purposes of this review.
  - b. Discussion with the faculty member about his or her contributions to the profession, the department, and the university if either the reviewers or the faculty member so desire.
  - c. Appropriate consideration of a faculty member's contributions outside the department to interdisciplinary and other programs, governance, and administration.
  - d. Other steps the reviewers consider useful in making a fair and informed judgment, including but not limited to consultation with individuals who have knowledge of the faculty member's work.
4. The reviewers shall provide the faculty member with a written summary of the review by the end of the academic year. The faculty member shall have the right to prepare a written response to the summary within 30 days after receipt.
5. A copy of the summary and any written response to it shall be given to the department chair and shall be placed in the personnel file of the faculty member. The department shall also preserve in the faculty member's personnel file all documents that played a substantive role in the review (other than documents such as publications that are readily accessible elsewhere), and a record of any action taken as a result of the review. The summary and outcome of the review shall remain confidential, that is, confined to the appropriate departmental, college, or university persons or bodies and the faculty member being evaluated, released otherwise only at the discretion, or with the explicit consent of, the faculty member, or as otherwise required by law.
6. Every effort should be made to offer tangible recognition to those faculty identified as exceptionally good, including but not limited to, nomination for university, national, and international awards.
7. In the event a review indicates substantial deficiencies, support from institutional resources for professional development shall be proffered. The department chair and the faculty member shall develop a written plan for mentoring and professional development to address all issues identified in the review, in consultation, if necessary, with the appropriate dean(s). This plan shall be the product of mutual negotiation between the faculty member and the chair and/or dean(s), shall respect academic freedom and professional self-direction, and shall be flexible enough to allow for subsequent alteration. Such a plan could include review and adjustment of the faculty member's responsibilities, development of a new research program or teaching strategy, referral to campus resources, assignment of a mentoring committee, institution of mandatory annual reviews for a specified period, written performance expectations, and/or other elements. The faculty member shall have the right to provide a written response, as well as the right of appeal through the grievance procedure outlined in FPP 8.15. regarding the manner in which any written development plan is formulated, the plan's content, and any resulting evaluation.

(continued)

8. In the event a review identifies substantial deficiencies, the faculty member shall have the right to request a second review (peer review), following the above procedures except that the reviewers shall be selected by mutual consent of the faculty member and the dean.
9. The faculty member shall have the right to challenge the findings of reviews and correct the record through the appeal procedure in section 7.18. below.
10. In the event that recurring reviews reveal continuing and persistent problems with a faculty member's performance that do not lend themselves to improvement after several efforts, and that call into question the faculty member's ability to function in that position, then other possibilities, such as a mutually agreeable reassignment to other duties or separation, should be explored. If these are not practicable, or no other solution acceptable to the parties can be found, then the administration must convene a committee of faculty to review proposed sanctions.
11. The standard for discipline or dismissal remains that of just cause as outlined in FPP 9.02. and 9.03. The fact of successive negative reviews does not diminish the obligation of the institution to show such cause in a separate forum, following the procedures outlined in FPP 9. Records from post-tenure review may be relied upon and are admissible, but rebuttable as to accuracy. The administration bears the ultimate burden of proof on the issue of just cause for discipline and dismissal.
12. The faculty member retains all protections guaranteed in FPP, including, but not limited to, the rights to appeal specified above and the right to appeal disciplinary action to the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities as described in FPP 9.07.

#### D. ACCOUNTABILITY

1. Copies of the departmental criteria and procedures for reviews of tenured faculty shall be filed with the appropriate dean, the provost, and the secretary of the faculty.
2. At the beginning of each academic year, the chair shall identify faculty to be reviewed by the end of that year and the executive committee shall establish a calendar for reviews.
3. Departments shall maintain a record of reviews completed, including the names of all reviewers.
4. At the end of each academic year, department chairs shall send a report to the appropriate dean(s) listing the names of faculty members reviewed during that academic year and summarizing the outcomes of those reviews.
5. If a department fails to conduct requisite reviews by the end of the academic year, the dean shall appoint reviewers to conduct reviews based on the department's specified criteria.
6. The periodic review of each department, in which the department's mission, personnel, and development are now evaluated, shall include review of the process for review of tenured faculty in the department.

#### 7.18. APPEAL OF POST-TENURE REVIEWS

- A. By written request, within twenty days, a faculty member may appeal the findings of post-tenure reviews. If a second review has been requested per 7.17.C.8., then both reviews shall be submitted for consideration. The appeal shall be heard by the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities no later than twenty days after the request, except that this time limit may be enlarged by mutual consent of the parties, or by order of the committee. The faculty member shall be given at least ten days' notice of such review.
- B. The Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities shall report on the validity of the appeal to the faculty member, the departmental executive committee, the appropriate dean, and the provost

(continued)

- C. If the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities finds that a review was based in any significant degree upon impermissible factors as defined in UWS 3.08(1)(a)-(c), with material prejudice to the individual faculty member, and elects not to remand the case back to the department because it would serve no useful purpose, the University Committee, after appropriate consultation, shall appoint an ad hoc post-tenure review committee to perform a de novo review to replace the contested review. Members of the ad hoc committee shall be tenured faculty members at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, but they shall not be members of the executive committee of the faculty member's academic department(s) or functional equivalent, nor shall they be members of the committee conducting the contested review.
- D. The Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities shall retain jurisdiction pending the resolution of all appeal.

## Report of the Commission on Faculty Compensation and Economic Benefits

April, 2015

### **I. Charge to the Commission:**

The commission was charged by the University Committee with the following tasks:

1. Undertake a comparison study of family leave policies at the UW-Madison and peer institutions.
2. Conduct a needs assessment for the UW- Madison.
3. Identify alternative parental leave practices, including though not necessarily limited to innovative practices used elsewhere that might be practicable here.
4. Make parental leave policy recommendations for UW-Madison faculty, working closely with ASEC, the governance body for academic staff.
5. Evaluate current UW-Madison practices for communicating parental leave options.
6. Evaluate the budgetary implications of proposed recommendations.

### **Commission Members:**

Julie Allen, L&S/Scandinavian Studies

Randolph Ashton, ENGR/Biomedical Engineering

Anna Haley-Lock, L&S/Social Work

Robert Hamers, L&S/Chemistry

Rebecca Scheller, Academic Staff representative and co-chair of CWU, *ex officio* & non-voting

David Thomas, CALS/Animal Sciences

James Timjun, ENGR/Engineering Professional Development

Jessica Weeks, L&S/Political Science

Amy Wendt, UC representative, *ex officio* and non-voting

Jason Yackee, LAW/Law

### **Introduction**

Family leave policies are a critical part of the overall compensation and benefits package for faculty at all academic institutions. Parental leave is especially important for faculty at research-focused (R1) institutions such as UW-Madison because research plays a critical role in tenure and promotion and because even a temporary decline in research productivity due to family obligations can be irrecoverable. In recent years, many of UW's peer institutions have implemented benefits packages that provide teaching release, reduced committee loads, and other forms of relief to help ensure that faculty parents can adapt to their changed family situation while maintaining their research programs. While the Wisconsin Family Medical Leave Act requires employers to provide six weeks of leave upon adoption or birth of a child, the current UW policy requires use of sick leave or unpaid leave. The current policy does not meet the needs of many faculty and is not competitive with benefits offered at most peer institutions.

### **Current Benefits: What does UW-Madison Provide?**

The UW-Madison Office of Human Resources summarizes family-related leave policy for faculty in a document titled *Balancing Family and Work*, last revised in November 2009.<sup>1</sup> Current policy is based upon the Federal Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA), the Wisconsin Family and Medical Leave Act (WFMLA) and UW-System policy on sick leave. The document notes that "the integration of these laws and policies can be quite complicated" and advises faculty to contact Human Resources to discuss their specific situation.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.ohr.wisc.edu/polproced/fambroch.pdf>

The core of the current paid parental leave policy is the ability of faculty to use accrued sick leave as paid “family leave” under the W FMLA. UW allows faculty to use sick leave in this manner even if not actually ill; this benefit is also applied equally to birth mothers and non-birth parents. However, parents can use no more than six weeks of sick leave per calendar year in this manner, even if they have accrued sick leave beyond six weeks. Some faculty may also use accrued vacation leave to supplement or as a replacement for accrued sick leave. However as discussed further below, faculty on 9-month appointments (representing the vast majority of UW faculty) do not accrue vacation, and therefore the majority of faculty on campus must rely exclusively on sick leave. Birth mothers are separately entitled to use sick leave if they have a medical condition that precludes work, as are faculty whose child or spouse/partner has a medical condition that requires direct care; in those cases, the maximum amount of leave available is not limited to six weeks, but rather by the amount of sick leave that the employee has accumulated.

Parental use of “sick leave” as family leave under the W FMLA must be initiated within 16 weeks of the birth or adoption of a child. For faculty on 9-month appointments, summer months off-payroll are not included in the 16-week time-frame. Faculty are permitted to take part of their paid leave on an intermittent or part-time basis, but only if doing so does not create an undue hardship on the University.

*To summarize: for the vast majority of faculty on campus, birth mothers are allowed up to use up to six weeks of leave on a medical basis, and all new parents are allowed up to six weeks of additional family leave. In all cases, salary may continue only if sick leave is used. Therefore, paid leave for medical and/or family is only available to the extent that the individuals have sufficient accrued sick leave.*

According to the University of Wisconsin System’s 2015 Employee Benefit Summary document, all new faculty hires are provided 176 hours (22 days) of sick leave for use during their first 18- months of employment. Afterwards, they are eligible to accumulate an additional 96 hours (12 days) of sick leave per fiscal year. The majority of faculty are on 9-month appointments. A small percentage of faculty are on 12-month appointments; in addition to the above benefits, these faculty also accrue 176 hours (22 days) of vacation days per fiscal year, and can take 36 hours (4.5 days) of personal holidays that are not carried over each year. Looking only at the accrual of sick leave (the typical situation for most faculty, who are on 9-month appointments), it will take a new faculty member about 1.5 years to obtain enough sick leave days to cover the maximum 6-week W FMLA family leave period granted under current policy. This calculation assumes that the faculty member does not need to use any of the sick days for other purposes, such as illness. Should the faculty member wish to use W FMLA family leave for a second child, the faculty member would have to wait approximately three more years to again accrue six weeks of sick leave.

Faculty members are also permitted to extend their parental leave by adding a period of unpaid leave to any period of paid leave. Under the federal FMLA, full-time employees are entitled to a total of 12 weeks of leave (including the 6 weeks guaranteed by the W FMLA) for childbirth, adoption or foster care child placement, dependent care, or due to a serious illness that precludes work. In the case of childbirth or child placement, unpaid FMLA leave must start within one year from the birth or placement. During unpaid leave the faculty member’s group health insurance benefits must be maintained under the same terms and conditions as if the leave had not been taken, and the faculty member will remain responsible for paying any premium contribution (even though the faculty member is not drawing a salary). At the end of the leave period, the faculty member is entitled to return to the same or a comparable working position.

The *Balancing Family and Work* document emphasizes that structuring parental leave under current policy can be especially difficult when faculty members have instructional duties. The difficulties

(continued)

primarily arise because the maximum amount of paid family leave (six weeks) is insufficient to cover a full semester's worth of class sessions. The document says that "each situation [involving a faculty member with teaching responsibilities] carries its own unique circumstances, and there is no single, easy answer to offer." The document emphasizes that the faculty member considering taking family leave should talk with their department chair or dean to arrange a personalized plan. The department chair, in consultation with the Dean's office, is given authority to make the "final decision" on any plan for use of leave, including how to structure the leave to account for a faculty member's teaching duties. The department's executive committee may also play a role. The effect of this policy is to require the faculty member to negotiate with his or her chair or dean about the precise contours of their leave plan. The document mentions a number of options that a chair or dean might select from, including asking another faculty member to cover his/her course ("colleague coverage"); relieving the faculty member from teaching duties for the entire semester; having the faculty member "team teach"; doubling up class sessions before and/or after the birth; taking on extra service-type work in exchange for teaching release. In the case of colleague coverage, it is very important to note that the faculty member must still use sick leave during the period in which the colleague is covering the course, even though no funding is supplied to the department for a replacement lecturer. UW policy does not permit a faculty member to rely on colleague coverage in lieu of using accrued sick leave.<sup>2</sup> Current UW leave policy provides units with some degree of flexibility in designing unit-specific policies.

It should be noted that there is some confusion regarding colleague coverage given current Board of Regents Policy Document 20-1. This policy states:

**Faculty with Teaching Responsibilities:** In any semester in which a faculty member who has teaching responsibilities is entitled to use sick leave, the provisions of this policy shall be modified as follows:

1. If a faculty member's duties are assumed by colleagues for the duration of the semester, as has been the traditional way of covering teaching responsibilities, the absent individual will not be required to use sick leave until the end of the semester in which the absence began.
2. If a replacement is appointed to assume the faculty member's responsibilities he or she must use sick leave.

Whichever of the above situations occurs during the semester in which the absence commences, the absent staff member will be required to use sick leave thereafter.

The above Policy Document seems to suggest that a faculty member might be exempt from reporting sick leave if his or her courses are assumed by colleagues, but a faculty member would need to report sick leave if a replacement is appointed. The Policy Document goes on to state that whichever situation occurs, a "staff member" must use sick leave thereafter. This language makes it unclear as to whether (and under what conditions) a faculty member must report sick leave, and implies that a faculty member might be exempt from reporting sick leave, which conflicts with the December 14, 2007 memo from Catharine DeRubeis of the Academic Personnel Office to Human Resources Representatives.

In addition to the leave policies discussed above, *Faculty Policies and Procedures* 7.04.(H)(1) allows untenured (probationary) faculty members (birth mothers and non-birth parents) to receive an extension of their maximum probationary period ("tenure clock"), even if leave is not taken. The tenure clock can be extended by up to one year for each childbirth and in cases of unexpected medical leave, and must be approved by the department's executive committee, the relevant dean, and the University Committee. The intent of the policy is to give probationary faculty a sort of "release" from research expectations by their faculty colleagues; however, federal, state, or private sponsors of the faculty member's research

---

<sup>2</sup> Memorandum from Catharine DeRubeis, Academic Personnel Office to Human Resources Representatives/Payroll Coordinators, December 14, 2007

(continued)

may still expect undiminished productivity. There is no equivalent benefit for tenured faculty members.

### **What is the need?**

Parental leave is a necessity for the physical and mental health of both parents and child, as well as an integral part of a healthy workplace climate.<sup>3,4,5,6,7</sup> Current UW policies impose financial hardships on faculty parents, especially in cases where faculty do not have sufficient sick leave and therefore must take unpaid leave. The workplace climate for parent(s) employed by UW- Madison would be enhanced by the knowledge that their salary will continue during the parental leave period without the use of (perhaps non-existent) accumulated sick leave or vacation days, and their work duties, primarily teaching, are being covered in an equitable and fair manner through a system that is applied consistently across the campus.

In many cases, UW-Madison faculty are entitled to claim up to 6 weeks of paid medical leave for the birth of a child and 6 weeks of paid family leave for the birth or adoption of a child (see details at <http://www.ohr.wisc.edu/polproced/fambroch.pdf>). However, paid parental leave is available only if the parent has accrued enough sick leave or vacation days to cover the period.

This is especially problematic for new faculty on 9-month appointments who do not accumulate vacation days and who may not have accumulated enough sick leave to cover the parental leave period. Requiring use of accumulated sick leave and/or vacation days for payment of salary during a parental leave can present a hardship on both new and longer-serving faculty because these days are no longer available for other medical situations and family emergencies that require time off.

Another issue regarding parental leave is coverage of instructional responsibilities of the parent(s) while on leave. Currently, the responsibility for finding course coverage is on a case-by-case basis for the faculty member, the department chair, or the college. While larger departments can often “absorb” the duties of faculty members taking a semester off from teaching for parental leave, smaller departments might be less able to provide colleague coverage or short-term staffing for courses. Putting the responsibility on the faculty member to find a colleague to cover their teaching responsibilities places them in a very awkward situation, especially for junior faculty, and lack of sufficient flexible funds at the department or college level makes the hiring of short-term staff for course coverage difficult.

A consistent policy for the UW-Madison campus on parental leave that includes paid leave without the use of sick leave or vacation days and the automatic availability of funds to hire short-term staff for coverage of courses taught by faculty on parental leave is required for an enhanced work environment for the UW-Madison faculty and for the well-being of their children.

Since UW-Madison lags behind most of its peer institutions in the parental leave benefit, the improvement of this benefit also will assist in the recruitment and retention of quality faculty.

---

<sup>3</sup> L.P. Howell, L.A. Beckett, J. Nittiksimmons, and A.C. Villablanca, Generational and Gender Perspectives on Career Flexibility: Ensuring the Faculty Workforce of the Future, *American Journal of Medicine* **2012**, 125, 719-728

<sup>4</sup> A.C. Villablancak, L. Beckett, J. Nettiksimmons, and L.P. Howell, Career Flexibility and Family-Friendly Policies: An NIH\_Funded Study to Enhance Women's Careers in Biomedical Sciences, *Journal of Womens Health* **2011**, 20, 1485-1496

<sup>5</sup> T.A. Scandura and M.J. Lankau, Relationships of gender, family responsibility and flexible work hours to organizational commitment and job satisfaction. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* **1997**, 18, 377-391

<sup>6</sup> T.D. Allen, Family-supportive work environments: The role of organizational perceptions, *Journal of Vocational Behavior* **2001**, 58, 414-435

<sup>7</sup> S.C. Eaton, If You Can Use Them: Flexibility Policies, Organizational Commitment, and Perceived Performance, *Industrial Relations* **2003**, 42, 145-167

(continued)

In order to assess how UW-Madison's parental leave policies compare to those of UW- Madison's peer institutions, The Commission performed an in-depth review of peer institute policies. To form our comparison peer group, we followed standard practice at UW-Madison: we included the 14 other universities in the Committee on Institutional Cooperation<sup>8</sup> (CIC) and four other top public universities. The comparison list is shown below, with the footnotes providing the URL for each institution's current university-wide parental leave policy (as of February 2015).

Comparison institutions:

1. Indiana University<sup>9</sup>
2. Michigan State University<sup>10</sup>
3. Northwestern University<sup>11</sup>
4. Ohio State University<sup>12</sup>
5. Pennsylvania State University<sup>13</sup>
6. Purdue University<sup>14</sup>
7. Rutgers University<sup>15</sup>
8. University of California<sup>16</sup>
9. University of Chicago<sup>17</sup>
10. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign<sup>18</sup>
11. University of Iowa<sup>19</sup>
12. University of Maryland<sup>20</sup>
13. University of Michigan<sup>21</sup>
14. University of Minnesota (Twin Cities)<sup>22</sup>
15. University of Nebraska-Lincoln<sup>23</sup>
16. University of North Carolina<sup>24</sup>
17. University of Texas at Austin<sup>25</sup>
18. University of Virginia<sup>26</sup>
19. *University of Wisconsin-Madison*<sup>27</sup>

<sup>8</sup> <https://www.cic.net/about-cic/member-universities>

<sup>9</sup> [https://www.indiana.edu/~vpfaa/academicguide/index.php/Policy\\_F-4](https://www.indiana.edu/~vpfaa/academicguide/index.php/Policy_F-4)

<sup>10</sup> <http://www.hr.msu.edu/documents/facacadhandbooks/facultyhandbook/parentalLeave.htm>

<sup>11</sup> <http://www.northwestern.edu/provost/policies/faculty-leave-and-holidays/policy-on-faculty-family-leave.html>

<sup>12</sup> <http://hr.osu.edu/public/documents/worklife/Parentalcareguidebook.pdf?t=201411343650>

<sup>13</sup> <http://guru.psu.edu/policies/OHR/hrg18.html>

<sup>14</sup> <http://www.purdue.edu/policies/human-resources/vie3.html> and

<http://www.purdue.edu/discoverypark/advance/assets/pdfs/documents/worklife/work-family-policies.pdf>

<sup>15</sup> [http://rutgerssaup.org/sites/default/files/images/FT\\_Agreement\\_2007-2011.pdf](http://rutgerssaup.org/sites/default/files/images/FT_Agreement_2007-2011.pdf)

<sup>16</sup> [http://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/\\_files/apm/apm-760.pdf](http://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/_files/apm/apm-760.pdf)

<sup>17</sup> <https://facultyhandbook.uchicago.edu/page/parental-leave-three-quarter-faculty-appointments>

<sup>18</sup> [https://nessie.uahr.uillinois.edu/cf/leave/index.cfm?Item\\_id=1343&rlink=1](https://nessie.uahr.uillinois.edu/cf/leave/index.cfm?Item_id=1343&rlink=1) and

<http://www.cam.illinois.edu/ix/ix-c/ix-c-45.htm>

<sup>19</sup> <http://www.uiowa.edu/~our/opmanual/iii/22.htm#228>

<sup>20</sup> [http://faculty.umd.edu/faculty/leave\\_ppl.html](http://faculty.umd.edu/faculty/leave_ppl.html)

<sup>21</sup> <http://spg.umich.edu/policy/201.93>

<sup>22</sup> <http://www1.umn.edu/ohr/benefits/leaves/parental/index.html>

<sup>23</sup> [http://svcaa.unl.edu/faculty/policies/work\\_life\\_balance.shtml](http://svcaa.unl.edu/faculty/policies/work_life_balance.shtml)

<sup>24</sup> <http://academicpersonnel.unc.edu/faculty-policies-procedures-guidelines/leave/faculty-serious-illness-major-disability-and-parental-leave-policy/>

<sup>25</sup> <https://www.policies.utexas.edu/policies/modified-instructional-duties>

<sup>26</sup> [https://policy.itc.virginia.edu/policy/policydisplay?id=HRM-038#Parental\\_Leave](https://policy.itc.virginia.edu/policy/policydisplay?id=HRM-038#Parental_Leave)

<sup>27</sup> <http://www.ohr.wisc.edu/apo/policies/index.htm>

(continued)

To illustrate how UW's parental leave policy compares to that of its peers, we first quantified the policies for biological mothers. We focused on teaching relief and divided institutions into three categories:

1. those providing paid teaching relief of 12 or more weeks;
2. those providing paid teaching relief for 6-12 weeks; and
3. those providing no paid teaching relief (for example, institutions where the only way for a parent to take paid teaching relief is if they are able to use accrued sick leave).

Figure 1 below illustrates that UW lags well behind its peers. Out of the 18 peer institutions surveyed, only one does not provide paid teaching relief without the use of accrued sick leave for birth mothers.

Indiana	North-western	Penn State	Purdue	Rutgers	Cal	Illinois	Michigan	Nebraska	North Carolina	Texas
Michigan State	Ohio State	U. of Chicago	Maryland	Minnesota	Virginia					
Iowa	Wisconsin									

*Figure 1. Comparison of family leave policy at peer Institutions with the top row (green) representing institutions with paid teach relief of 12 weeks or more; the middle row (blue) representing those with paid teaching relief of 6 to 11 weeks; and the lowest row (red) representing those with no teaching relief without taking sick leave*

We next undertook a qualitative assessment of the policies for parents other than biological mothers, including but not limited to partners of the biological mother and adoptive parents. The data show that UW is not competitive with its peers, as according to UW-Madison's policy, parents other than non-biological mothers are at best allowed to take 6 weeks of teaching relief, which they must fund using sick leave or take leave without pay. At many other institutions, all new parents are treated equally, sometimes receiving up to a semester of teaching relief without the use of accumulated sick leave.

#### **What are some of the practices that might work at Madison, and what would be the approximate cost?**

One approach (described below) would be to relieve faculty of their teaching responsibilities for one semester, with the understanding that it is essential for faculty to continue research activities, often as a required element of federally sponsored research grants. Assuming the most common scenario of a faculty member on a 9-month appointment and with a teaching load of two 3-credit courses per semester, an Associate Lecturer hired at a 67% appointment and based on the minimum \$29,500 9-month salary would cost \$9883 in salary and \$3410 in fringe benefits (34.5% of salary, 2013-2014 rate), for a total of \$13,923 for one semester of teaching relief.

Data compiled in 2011-2013 indicate that an average of 46 children were added to faculty insurance policies. Assuming that this number is an accurate reflection of the number of births and adoptions, the cost of providing lecturer replacement funds for eligible faculty parents would be approximately \$640,000/year.

---

(continued)

As noted earlier, many faculty do not have sufficient accrued sick leave, and many other universities do not require faculty to use sick leave in cases of childbirth/adoption. Another practice at some universities is to provide 6 weeks of paid leave for new parents. Based on the 2012-2013 Assistant Professor salary of \$77468 (UW-Madison Data Digest), for 9 months (39 weeks) we estimate the 6 weeks of leave would cost \$11918 salary + 4112 benefits = 16,030. Assuming 46 childbirth/adoptions take place each year, this would cost approximately \$737,000/year.

### **What is our recommendation?**

The Commission recommends that the University undertake a comprehensive analysis of benefits for male and female faculty associated with childbirth, adoption, and the resulting burdens placed on new parents. Faculty are in a unique position among university staff because of the long-term, multi-year responsibilities associated with advising Ph.D. students and maintaining research programs—duties that must be maintained even when birth or adoption of children take place. In the recommendations below, we define “teaching relief” to be relief from group instruction/classroom teaching, outreach, and from extensive service work, with the expectation that faculty would continue to fulfill obligations associated with their research and clinical activities and continue to advise graduate students.

**Recommendation 1:** The commission recommends that the university should work within the human resources redesign program to develop and establish policies that would enhance the ability of new parents to adapt to their changing family situation. These policies should be flexible to accommodate the diversity of needs of different families while providing a uniform set of minimum benefits.

**Recommendation 2:** The commission recommends that the university provide at least one semester of paid teaching relief to all parents upon birth or adoption of a child. This leave should be granted automatically without a specific request and should not require the use of “sick leave.”

**Recommendation 3:** It is essential that teaching relief provided to new parents be accompanied by a mechanism to provide funds as necessary to the faculty member’s department sufficient to provide a replacement instructor without imposing additional burdens on other faculty.

While our charge is to address needs of faculty, our investigation suggests that similar benefits should also be considered for other categories of university staff.