

>> Chancellor Rebecca Blank: It is after 3:30, and I'm told we have a quorum, so I'm going to call the meeting to order and ask the faculty to rise for the reading of memorial resolutions. And let me call on Professor Francisco Scarano to read the memorial resolution for Professor Emeritus Stanley Kutler.

>> Francisco Scarano: Stanley Kutler, Professor Emeritus of History and Law, passed away peacefully on April 7th, 2015 in Madison. A distinguished member of the UW-Madison faculty for 32 years, Kutler was one of the nation's most influential legal and constitutional historians, a public intellectual, and a highly acclaimed teacher. Although perhaps best known for his work on the Watergate scandal he wrote a half dozen key monographs on subjects such as the Dred Scott case, the judiciary during reconstruction, the Supreme Court on property rights, and political trials. To supplement his scholarship he performed valuable service to the profession as author and editor of sourcebooks and encyclopedias and is the founding editor of the journal "Reviews in American History."

>> Chancellor Rebecca Blank: Thank you very much, and I want to recognize that Professor Kutler's wife Sandy is here today in attendance. Thank you very much for coming.

[ Applause ]

Let me recognize Professor Paula Gottlieb to present the memorial resolution for Professor Emerita Claudia Card.

>> Paula Gottlieb: Claudia Card, Emma Goldman Professor of Philosophy, passed away on September 12th surrounded by family and friends and her beloved cats. She had continued teaching even while undergoing chemotherapy. Claudia was a pioneer in interdisciplinary work on feminist and lesbian philosophy, receiving many academic accolades. Her recent work was an original theory of evil addressing issues that are among the hardest to deal with both philosophically and in human terms. Far from grim herself, Claudia Card inspired numerous graduates and junior colleagues to excel in the profession. She liked music and women's sports, and her generosity in the latter is acknowledged on the wall of the Kohl Center. Claudia Card was a true Badger, and is very much missed.

>> Chancellor Rebecca Blank: Thank you, Paula. Let me recognize Dean Katharyn May to present the memorial resolution for Professor Emerita Signe Skott Cooper.

>> Dean Katharyn May: Signe Skott Cooper, Professor Emerita of the School of Nursing, died in Madison, Wisconsin on July 16th, 2013 at the age of 92. Professor Cooper began her career in a characteristically simple and humble way and earned a reputation as an exemplary educator, author, historian, and leader in her profession. Her impact on the profession of nursing remains today in literature and through the many in the field whom she inspired. Her legacy will continue through the students of nursing who will be educated in Signe Skott Cooper Hall, the new home for the School of Nursing at Wisconsin, recently built and named in her honor.

>> Chancellor Rebecca Blank: Thank you, Katharyn. And let me recognize Professor Tom Broman to present the memorial resolution for Professor Emeritus David Lindberg.

>> Tom Broman: Born in Chicago in 1935, David Lindberg attended Wheaton College where he majored in Physics and met his future wife Greta. After earning an MS in Physics at Northwestern he switched to the History of Science, earning a PhD from Indiana in 1965. He spent two years in the History Department in Ann Arbor, and then moved to UW in 1967 where he remained for the rest of his career. He died on January 5th, 2015 of Alzheimer's disease. Dave Lindberg was a prolific author, and editor, and internationally renowned historian of medieval science. He is most well-known for "The Beginnings of Western Science," the most widely-read general survey of the subject from antiquity through the later Middle Ages. First published

in 1992, it has sold tens of thousands of copies worldwide in more than half a dozen languages. Dave was no less respected, and indeed beloved, as a classroom teacher. He taught his ILS201 course to many thousands of undergraduates over his career, winning several distinguished teaching awards along the way. Many of those students who were inspired by his teaching have come forward since his death to offer tribute to his formative role in their education. It is how he would best like to be remembered.

>> Chancellor Rebecca Blank: Thank you, Tom. And Professor Lindberg's wife Greta is with us today as well. Thank you for coming.

[ Applause ]

You may all be seated. And thank you for everyone coming with the memorial resolutions. You are welcome to stay, but it could be a long meeting, so. Thank you for coming. We turn next to announcements and information items, and I have a number of things that I want to make sure everyone knows about. First, there was a handout from the Office of the Secretary of the Faculty in the back of the room encouraging faculty to join one of the many fun committees that are very important for the shared governance of this campus and for the ongoing work that is done here. So there are four divisional committees. There's several other committees that are looking for candidates for the spring elections, and I hope that those of you here present will encourage your colleagues back in your own departments to consider applying and running for those, and take a handout and pass it around to your colleagues if you will. Let me start my comments with a couple of good news stories that it's important if you didn't pick them up in our news releases that I hope you've -- you know something about. We have long been making some real improvements in our graduation rates, but we were recently recognized this past week in a report released by the Education Trust which said something that I and everyone who looks at our data know, but which always has more credibility when someone from outside says it as well, which is that not only have we seen significant increases in graduation rates, but with those increasing graduation rates we've seen steadily-declining gaps in graduation rates between our white students and our historically-disadvantaged students. And the University of Wisconsin is recognized in that article, which looks across a very large number of universities and colleges, as being one, I think, of the top 25 in really making progress on that front. We are basically at parity in retention rates between those groups at -- between the freshman and sophomore year. We are not yet at parity in terms of graduation rates. And that is an ongoing agenda for all of us to work on. Secondly, if you haven't heard it, we have a new Rhodes Scholar who was just named from the University of Wisconsin, Collin Higgins who graduated last May, triple majoring in comprehensive honors in Environmental Studies, Geography, and History, who has stayed in the -- at the University in the accelerated Master of Public Affairs degree at the La Follette School. Is going to be going off to Oxford for a Rhodes next year. Bill Mulligan, a senior Biochemistry major was a Rhodes finalist. And for those of you who remember the story about our alum William Campbell who won a Nobel Prize, he received that in Oslo on Thursday, December 10th. We retained our third-place ranking in the listing of research expenditures across all of the major universities. We've been in the top five in that ranking every year since that listing began, I think at least three if not four decades ago. A lot of schools, like us, actually went down in research expenditures last year, and this data is lagged a year, so we actually expect to go down further again next year given what's been happening with the federal budget. And I will say that we've drifted a little in those rankings. We were three, we were two, three, now four. And we're a little closer to number five than we were, and that is of concern and something that our research office, I know, is looking at very closely and thinking about how we retain our place there. On the fundraising side, I hope all of you saw the announcement last week about our gift from the Mead Witter Foundation. George Mead and Susan Feith are long-time friends of the University. They are part of a very extended family that was -- the Meads were actually the founders of. I think it's called -- is it International Paper is the name of the company, which has been sold off since, but a company that was in Wisconsin Rapids for many, many years. There were several generations of Meads running that, and many of them came to the university here. And the Mead Witter Foundation has given us a \$25 million gift to finish off and complete our School of Music Performance building. Now many of you may know that site right next to the Chase, and it's had a sign for a long time. We -- just about the time that I arrived the decision was made that after quite a few years of fundraising we would only be able to complete two phases, and not all three phases, of the building, and that we would drop off the big concert hall that had originally been part of the original plans. So we were moving forward with the two-phase building and basically allowing space for that concert hall to be built at some point in the future. And the Mead Witter Foundation called us and said, "You know, we would like to fund that concert hall. What's it going to cost?" And unfortunately the answer

was a little bigger than 25 million, but we are working on raising the remainder of that and are moving forward now with the full School of Music performance building project which I'm very pleased about, which will include the full conference hall, due to the generosity of that foundation. So that's good news for the School of Music, and it's good news, I think, for all of the arts here on campus. So that's the -- I guess I have one last list of good news, those of you who are paying attention, Coach Chryst and our football team are headed to San Diego for the Holiday Bowl on December 30th, and you better get your tickets and your plane reservations now if you're planning on going. Let me move to a few more serious issues that are ongoing that I just want to make sure I touch on, and there may well be some questions and comments on these, I understand. As you know, at last week's -- last month's Faculty Senate we adopted a proposed tenure policy to deal with the changes that came out of the budget last year around educational changes in programs, focused particularly on program discontinuance. As you know, the Board of Regents through their Tenure Taskforce is working on building a broad umbrella policy that will address that. These are -- they are moving forward with that. They are meeting again on the 23rd. They are hoping to take this to the Regents on -- in February and vote on a final policy. They want to get feedback to the policies they propose no later than next April, and sooner if they can. The -- you know, there was a lot of input into that process from the first bullet point -- they didn't actually release a draft. They released bullet points. And you know, I do believe that they have listened to some of that input, and I'm hopeful that this is moving forward. There is a second stage of this which is a discussion of post-tenure review. And of course you're going to be discussing a proposed post-tenure review policy here as will they. At this point without us having a policy or they having anything other than a few bullet points it's not clear how well those will correlate. But the first part of this I think is moving forward, I hope in a good way. Diversity conversations and conversations about free speech. As you know, on this campus and on virtually every campus there is particularly an ongoing conversation right now with our black students about the inclusiveness or lack of inclusiveness of this community for students of color. And Patrick Sims, our Vice Provost for Diversity, Lori Berquam, our Dean of Students, have together with a lot of other people been very involved with a lot of those conversations over time. I've been involved with some of them. These are obviously very important conversations, and this is not -- this is -- as you all know, this is a process. We are in the midst of trying to implement a diversity framework for the next five to ten years coming out of committee work that you and other governance can see it. And those are all important issues to talk about. At the same time there is also an ongoing discussion about free speech and what free speech means. And I just want to say quite clearly from my point of view respect for diversity, listening to multiple voices, being a diverse and inclusive campus is never and should never be in any way antithetical to the principles of free speech. And I hope that those conversations can coexist, and move together, and work together rather than be seen in conflict with each other. So again, one that you are reading about in the news nationally, you're surely going to hear about here. And thirdly, let me just mention, again many of you I suspect have read some things on this and know quite a bit about it, we are in the process of rolling out a new policy around compensation for graduate students, and I want to clarify some misperceptions that have been out there in the media. Because there's been some communicational issues we are slowing down this process and its implementation. So you know, we -- just to make sure that we have plenty of voices in the process. But we are very committed to paying competitive wages to graduate assistants, even in difficult budget times. And if you look at the last three years, two years ago teaching assistants program, project assistants all received almost a 5% wage increase. In the next year, last year, that group received a 2% increase. And we've already approved another 2% increase for the coming year. Now you all know what sort of across-the-board wage increases have happened for anyone else. We know that we are underpaying our graduate students, and we are trying to move them up closer to equity, and are making as much progress as we can even in difficult budget times. And I want to really give a shout-out of our finance office and our graduate school who have been working hard on making sure that we are moving forward with that. We still do have work to do to bring our TA pay rates up to their peers' levels, but we are committed to continuing that. At the same time we are also working on trying to provide what, I have to say, most of us view as relatively minor changes to the ways in which we set those compensation levels. And those changes are basically about setting a base level, which is where we are now, or where we will be with another 2% increase, but allowing those departments for whom the average compensation of graduate students at their peer institutions and peer departments are substantially higher to be able to raise that to a higher level. Now let me tell you, you do that already because to keep your graduate students you have to pay them at a level that is somewhat close to where your peer institutions are. But the way we do it right now is, to be honest, incredibly cumbersome, quite nonsensical, and even in a few cases I think it is believed it might even be illegal, something I probably should not say aloud. So we are trying very hard to create a process and a policy that is much closer to what our peers have, in terms of

setting base salaries within different departments for what are paid to graduate school students. And for better or for worse, and you all know this, you know, chemistry professors get paid differently than some professors in the arts. And it is also true that graduate students that come into chemistry expect a higher level of compensation for some of their work than some students who come into the arts. And that's just a -- these are different markets with different demands and very different alternatives as to where they can go as opposed to coming here. So that's what we're working on. And I want to give a real shout-out to Bill Karpus who's been doing great work on this. We did find that the work done last year did not include all the students as well as it should have, and we'll take full responsibility for that. And in part we are trying to include more students in that process. And that's one reason we've slowed down the implementation. I think that is enough. I'm sure there are going to be questions or comments. And before we open up to that, Beth do you have anything you want to say on the part of UC?

>> Beth: No.

>> Chancellor Rebecca Blank: Okay, over there -- yeah, Judith?

>> Judith Burstyn: Judith Burstyn, District 48, chemistry. So since you have chosen to mention the word chemistry in that context I will note that the Chemistry Department actually felt quite strongly that it would be impossible to pay our graduate students competitively under the proposed changes. And that I trust that you will work with us to make sure that we can.

>> Chancellor Rebecca Blank: Yeah, and Chemistry I'm sure was at the front of my mind because we have two departments in particular, Chemistry and English, who for a variety of historical reasons this new policy is difficult for, and we are in very detailed conversations with those two departments and a few other places around campus as well, to try to put together a transition plan and to make sure that this policy works for them. And I probably should not have used chemistry as the example, but I know it's one that we're really talking with quite closely because they and English are the two where there's the most anomalies on this. This is extremely important, because as you know those are also to departments where teaching assistants are very important for the campus.

>> Judith Burstyn: Yeah, yeah, yep.

>> Noah Feinstein: Noah [inaudible] Feinstein, Community and Environmental Sociology. I'm actually speaking in my other departmental role, which is the Director of Graduate Studies for Curriculum and Instruction. In that role I've become increasingly concerned with the possible implications of the rate-based plan, in particular because I've come to feel that although it is clearly designed with the best of intentions it seems to have been designed with incomplete knowledge about the way that many of our graduate students, perhaps most, negotiate funding from semester to semester and year to year. For a large percentage of the students on our campus funding is not something that you receive in one -- from one department, in one assistantship that progress from semester to semester and year to year. Many of the students in our department cobble together funding in what must -- what might best be described as a stressful, occasionally frantic process of trying to scrape together money for their families in a difficult budgetary time. In light of that, it strikes me as disingenuous to say that these students will not receive a pay cut corresponding to one piece of the plan which is setting the cap at the 50% assistantship, where students who, for instance, might only be able to find a 33% assistantship in one semester, might be looking for a higher percentage in the following semester, just for example, to be able to average out an amount of money with which they can support their families. I would like to ask for flexibility in consideration of this plan moving forward. So that we are hearing as faculty members concerned for our students, what we are able to tell them is not this is a juggernaut which will be implemented more slowly, but that it is an ongoing process which is amenable to feedback which has our students' and our department's best interests at heart.

>> Chancellor Rebecca Blank: So I know that the dean of our graduate school is here. Bill, do you want to respond to that? Yeah, come on down to the mic so everyone can hear you.

>> Noah Feinstein: I should note that I have written to the graduate school about these concerns.

>> Dean Karpus: So we're aware of the multiple appointments for students, and really out of the 50 -- I just

had this data pulled this week, and on the 5200 students that are on some sort of assistantship at our university only 210 of those really are problematic and what you would describe as these multiple appointments that would exceed 50%. And so one of the reasons for delaying this was for us now to go out to students, to faculty, to departmental leadership and tell you what the proposed changes are going to look like, and then get your feedback so that we can work with these departments that have these 210 cases that on paper today would be problematic to try to resolve that problem. And so we will be working with departments, with students. So I have planned a December 16th communication session for graduate students, Director of Graduate Studies agenda item in January will include this topic. And then I planned more faculty communication sessions in the early spring.

>> Noah Feinstein: So just to be very clear, I really appreciate hearing that. What I'm hearing is that there still is flexibility in the specific ways that this policy will be implemented.

>> Dean Karpus: We will work -- the short answer is yes, there's always flexibility. We want to -- the thing we don't want to do is hurt graduate students. And we don't want to hurt the competitiveness of the great research programs that are going on at this institution. So there is flexibility. We do want to resolve this. I was at a CIC graduate deans meeting Thursday night, and I'll have to say none of my colleagues have a system like this. And other -- I met with other deans across the country this past week, too, and this was a foreign concept to them, the way we calculate and assign assistantships.

>> Chancellor Rebecca Blank: Currently, I mean, I think the right answer is we have got to move away from our current processes, but we are very open to talking to the people about what the details are of where we move and how. And I want to answer another comment that's sort of a little bit larger-level comment to what you said. And Bill is very familiar with this. I've been talking with the graduate school about this since I came. We need to be in the process across all departments. We will be able to do this faster in some than in others. To making sure that we make not one-year or one-semester offers, that when graduate students come in as far as possible we give them four or five years of, "Here's what we're going to do, and here's the guarantees." And you know, some of that might be involving TAs for some years, and RAs for others, and stipends for others. But that is where we have to be moving at this university to explicitly address that type of uncertainty, because at the end of the day the vast majority of our students do get funding every year to four-to-five years, so we should be putting that on the table up front rather than having them live with the sort of uncertainty they live with. And that's something that Bill has been very directly tasked with and is working on as well.

>> Noah Feinstein: Tis a consummation devoutly to be wished.

>> Chad Goldberg: Chad Allen Goldberg, District 71. I'm afraid I'm going to echo the concerns and reservations that my colleagues as you know have already expressed about the new proposed policy concerning graduate student employee pay. I was deeply concerned when I learned that the TAA was not involved in the initial deliberations about this. I thought this was very puzzling seeing as how they're the organized voice of the people who are most directly affected by this policy change. I was further very much concerned when I was told by the co-presidents of the TAA that they were told that the train has already left the station in terms of this policy. And so my question is really a question of clarification. So I understand that a delay has been put in place now, as you indicated. And so my question is has the train really left the station, in which case the delay is perhaps for an exercise in public relations to sell a policy that's already been decided? Or is this really open to rethinking, to change, to revision, to modification by bringing in people who were excluded from the earlier process [inaudible] the policy.

>> Chancellor Rebecca Blank: So you know, I will say that -- and I want to really make it clear that Bill is completely absolved from this problem, that he was handed this and told, "This is ready to implement." And then when we -- he started on the implementation process discovered that there had not been the sort of consultation that there should have been. So he is, therefore, backing up and doing some of that consultation. I will repeat exactly what I said before, the previous mishmash of policies that we had in place is not acceptable, and we cannot use. We do have to make changes. I think the general outline of where we want to go, which is basically what virtually all of our peer schools are doing in one form or another, is probably where we want to be, but always the devil is in the details. And those details very much are still in process. And you know, what -- we clearly are listening and trying to figure out where there are going to be

problems on campus with this policy as currently proposed and what do we need to do to make it more effective across the entire campus.

>> Chad Goldberg: And just a follow-up question, so I understand that there's some objectives that the Chancellor's Office wants to achieve. So, but I -- am I hearing correctly that there is some room here for revision and modification of the policy, in which case the train maybe hasn't fully left the station?

>> Chancellor Rebecca Blank: I mean, I would repeat exactly what Bill and I have both said, that this is still in a listening process. And we are still hearing some things. And I, you know, speak here for Bill because I am a part of the day-to-day conversations about some issues that I think were not fully understood. And some of that may be simply involving a transition plan. Some of it may involve some changes in the policy as currently proposed. But that is what all of these listening sessions and consultation that Bill is doing for the entire year. We've delayed the implementation until 2017, so quite a while, to find -- you know, to hear all of these concerns and to move forward.

>> Chad Goldberg: I'm glad to hear that there is some room for this as we're continuing to think about what kind of policy would be best. I would hate to see policies made in a way that doesn't involve the full participation and deliberation of the groups most directly affected.

>> Chancellor Rebecca Blank: I appreciate that.

>> Chad Goldberg: So glad to hear that.

>> Chancellor Rebecca Blank: And I will promise you, however, no matter what policy we adopt there will be someone who will be unhappy with it. So that's just a given. Yeah?

>> Amos Ron: Amos Ron, District 52, that's Computer Science. I have a clarification question. You mentioned the fact that the faculty at the university are paid on a differential basis, in some departments the faculty are being paid more than the faculty at other departments. This is paid by the university. Now if we go to the TA and we create a similar profile where some TAs are being paid more than others who is going to be responsible for this differentiability [sic] in the payment? Again the university?

>> Chancellor Rebecca Blank: Yeah, so again, this depends upon the department. There is a lot of graduate student funding that actually does not come directly from the university. It's either paid off of federal grants, or it's awarded through WARF funding and through other -- you know, it's not on our basic funds. Those sorts of decisions are a process of decisions that each -- that departments are going to have to make based on what money they have available and on what their markets are. And in some -- you know, we provide a great deal of graduate research assistants out of our core and central funds, much of it coming from WARF, right? And exactly how we administer that I think is part of the discussion we are clearly going to have because that is at the core of the questions that a number of people have raised. And it's what Bill is talking with people about and what we're looking at. So I'm not going to give you a specific answer here. I think this has to be worked out as to how much -- if you're going to have differentials -- because there are differentials in the market, as you well know. For me to attract a graduate student in computer science I've got to give them different amounts of funding than in some other fields. And how much of that is reflected in say the WARF grants we make, or in the 101 money we allocate, and how much of that is left to departments that might have differential [inaudible] available. That is not yet determined.

>> Amos Ron: Okay, thank you.

>> Chancellor Rebecca Blank: Other questions? Notes? All right, in that case I think we need to adopt the minutes from October 2nd which you will find on page 11 of your outline. Do I hear a motion to accept the minutes as written? I take a motion here. Is there a second? All those in -- do I see any comments, or questions, or issues? If not, all those in favor of approving the minutes indicate by saying aye.

>> Aye.

>> Chancellor Rebecca Blank: Any opposed? All right, we have done that. Next on the agenda is to -- let me

make sure I'm on the right place here -- to recognize Judith Burstyn who is going to submit for informational purposes only the PROFS annual report for 2013 and '14. Judith?

>> Judith Burstyn: So good afternoon. I'm Judith Burstyn, President of PROFS. PROFS, as you know, is the Professional Representational Organization of the -- Public Representational Organization of the Faculty Senate, and its job is to represent the interests of the UW-Madison faculty in the context of state and federal government. We're a voluntary organization, a dues organization, and I would encourage all of you to consider joining PROFS. Some of the things that we do, in the past year we spent a great deal of time downtown during the budget discussions lobbying, ultimately unsuccessfully, along with the Chancellor and her office against the budget cuts. But there was at least the one big plus, PROFS did get involved in helping to lobby for the Chemistry building -- instructional building for which I am extremely grateful. And the legislature did, in fact, fund that building. We continue to work against -- there's a number of things you'll see on your legislative update. We're working actively -- we have registered an opposition to the restrictions on fetal cell research and also in opposition to concealed carry on campus. And we continue to take active positions on issues that relate to faculty within the university. I would encourage you also not only to join yourselves but also to recruit new members to PROFS. Our membership has stayed fairly stable over time despite retirements. We're continuing to pick up new members. And we would love to have you encourage your colleagues to join also. I'd also point to our social media presence which has grown substantially over the last year. There was a lot of interest in the PROFS website and the PROFS Twitter feed during the budget discussions. And I would encourage you to follow those if you are a social media user. Basically what we're working on for the coming year is building our relationships with state legislators, continuing to monitor the issues that we have followed in the past. And this is a long game with respect to getting involved with our state legislators. The -- if you want to see details of who's involved, if you're interested in getting involved yourselves, please let me know. Thank you very much.

>> Chancellor Rebecca Blank: Are there any questions for Judith? All right, thank you very much. Let me recognize Professor Natalia de Leon Gatti who will present for informational purposes only the Committee on Women in the University annual report for 2013-14 and 2014-15 on page 19 of your document.

>> Natalia de Leon Gatti: Thank you very much, my name is Natalia de Leon, and it's my honor to introduce -- or provide the report for the 2013, '15 Committee on Women at the University. So among the -- -- there we go. So the mission of this committee, there are three primary functions. It provides for accommodation to improve the status of women on campus. It collaborates across campus to support gender equity, employment, engagement, inclusivity, and respect, and diversity. And it also is responsible for evaluating and monitoring data related to women employees. So our primary accomplishments for the year, we established a change from a majority faculty committee to now an equal committee with six participants from the faculty, six from university staff, and six from academic staff, and also undergraduate, graduate, and post-doctoral members. We have been working really closely with the -- Provost DeLuca and Lynn Edlefson, Director of the campus childcare. We submitted a proposal, and we were able to increase the number of infant and toddler spaces on campus. And we are working very closely with the School of Human Ecology, and there is a campus childcare unit that was outside of campus that was closed, and we are working together with this group to maintain childcare capacity on campus. And we are also worked very closely in the last two years evaluating also what we call a very significant leakage pipeline in the Social Studies Division, and I am just presenting a quick graph here showing the nine year promotion rate for the divisional affiliation, and you can see the four different divisions. And the social studies having the lowest percentage. This percentage is lower compared to faculty. So the female faculties have a lower percentage than males, and a significantly lower percentage compared to other divisions. And our committee is proposing to the leadership of the university to look into the reasons for these situations. And also, very importantly to be able to accumulate the necessary data to actually do a proper evaluation of what might be the reasons. I want to also clarify that these promotion percentages happen before arriving to the divisional committee. So it happens during the process of faculty being hired in the university and the time that they actually get promoted for tenure. Additional accomplishments of the committee, we have had significant participation of members of the committee. Ruth Litovsky here in the room, she was the -- she led the ad hoc diversity planning committee that produced this very important forward together -- framework for diversity and exclusive excellence. And our committee worked very closely with that group. Also we have member participation and [inaudible] participation on the ad hoc committee [inaudible], and its sister committee, the faculty committee on stability in the academic workplace. And you're going to see many of the results of that

committee that are surfacing already in this current academic year. And our committee also works very closely with the development of the preferred-name policy and the support of different activities for women on campus, including that [inaudible] conversation. The goals for 2015 and 2017, we continue to work -- one of our main priorities is this issue of childcare on campus. We have created a subcommittee together with the childcare committee on campus in response to a memo provided by Chancellor Blank, Provost Mangelsdorf, and Vice Chancellor [inaudible] and inviting us to look into opportunities and challenges honestly about the -- related to the ability to maintain and retain childcare -- high-quality childcare on campus and affiliated units. Our committee also recently unanimously endorsed a resolution that will be presented to this group I believe in February related to the recent campus climate survey on sexual assault and sexual misconduct. And our committee is very involved in activities supporting these recommendations and also ensuring -- or helping ensure implementation of all 91 -- 39 recommendations that are part of that report. We continue to work or consider the parental leave in equality and compensation issues that are primarily related to women are issues that our committee is very closely concerned about. They're -- a lot of those are sort of on hold until the classification and compensation study is completed, and we have heard that it's going to be about a year and a half after the start. So we are waiting to hear what the outcome of that is and stay very vigilant about it. So with that I will be happy to answer any questions if there is the opportunity. And here is my contact information and my current co-chair, Rebecca Scheller from the School of Law. Thank you very much.

>> Chancellor Rebecca Blank: Are there questions?

>> Chad Goldberg: Chad Allen Goldberg, District 71. So I want to commend the members of the committee for the important work they've been doing. I'm especially interested in the aspect of the family and parental leave policy. This I think is really vitally important. I was -- I know this is coming up later in the meeting in a different agenda item. I think it's very problematic for faculty recruitment and retention that our family and parental leave policies are lagging way behind most of our peer institutions. So I was going to ask about when this university-wide classification and compensation study will be completed. You addressed that already in your remarks. I'm wondering if the committee members have plans for what we the faculty might be able to do in the meantime. The year and a half seems like a long time to wait for improvements in these policies.

>> Natalia de Leon Gatti: Yeah, and our committee has been historically very involved in this issue. I want to clarify that actually our parental leave, as bad as it feels, is not actually lagging far behind other federal and state institutions. Actually this is -- we are constrained by state and federal laws in terms of what is possible to do. We have made quite a bit of progress in the last few years creating best policy alternatives and mechanisms that different -- that faculty, staff, and currently also students can have access to to help more than anything navigate through the limitations of our system. We don't really have a pool of money, which is -- would be the ideal thing, a pool of money that we could use to be able to pay. So currently parental leave is mostly paid through sick leave that people accrue during their period here. And one of the things that we have been able to do is to ensure that assistant professors as soon as they join the university they have a certain amount of sick leave that they accrue right away. So they have -- if they come here and they have -- not only for parental leave, but any kind of other leave, that there is that opportunity right away, that they don't need to accrue a certain amount in order to be able to use it. But I want to make that clear, that we are constrained in many ways by state and federal law, not necessarily the university alone.

>> Chad Goldberg: I just would like to add that I know that the TAA is embarking on a campaign to improve family and parental leave for graduate student employees.

>> Natalia de Leon Gatti: Right.

>> Chad Goldberg: So the time seems right to think about that seriously for faculty as well.

>> Natalia de Leon Gatti: Yeah, and Tonya Schmidt actually presented to our group a couple of meetings ago, and we're working very closely with her to not only help implement some of those recommendations and actions but also maybe use some of that information to inform other groups as well.

>> Chad Goldberg: Thank you.

>> Natalia de Leon Gatti: Thank you.

>> Chancellor Rebecca Blank: Any other questions?

>> William Brockliss: Will Brockliss, District 110. Just on the parental leave policy, general questions on that, should we wait until later? If so, will do.

>> Chancellor Rebecca Blank: If this is about our discussion of parental -- the parental leave proposal that should wait until later --

>> Will Brockliss: Which is tabled until later, okay.

>> Chancellor Rebecca Blank: That will come. It's on the agenda.

>> Will Brockliss: Okay, thank you, right.

>> Chancellor Rebecca Blank: Anything else? Great, thank you, Natalia. Let me call upon Professor Phil Brown who will present for informational purposes the University Curriculum Committee annual reports for 2013-14 and 2014-15 found on page 31.

>> Phil Brown: Good afternoon, those of you who have been on campus for more than four years perhaps know that all new course proposals, course change proposals, etcetera, used to go -- after your department ended up in the divisional committees whose major job -- most of the people who end up in the divisional committees think, reasonably enough, is associated with tenure decisions. In 2012 the University Committee started an ad hoc committee that took all those jobs, all those new change course proposals, and gave them to the committee, which has -- was then voted two years ago almost exactly in this committee -- or in this meeting to the University Curriculum Committee. And we have -- I've been on -- I was both on the ad hoc committee and now continuing, although with a little luck my last year on this. It's quite amazing the number of proposals that come through from this -- in the last two years if you've seen the agenda item here nearly 1300 course proposals came to the University Curriculum Committee. Many of them, a significant percentage, were discontinuation proposals, which they roughly get rubber stamped. But the changes in others get anything but rubber stamped. And we have found it quite challenging to bring together disparate approaches to new and -- course proposals from different parts of the campus. And so we've -- it's -- we now meet twice a month during the academic year and still find little time to talk about the policy issues which are also waiting for us to deal with here. So the paperwork that you have in front of you indicates that we have been dealing with issues such as the graduate course attribute, which is a new bonus to -- that you all have dealt with in your own departments over the last couple of years, or last year, I guess. We continue to try to give more than just passing concern to the accreditation-related things like what is a student credit hour and what do we have to do to meet that? And that becomes -- that is becoming increasingly challenging as we flip, and blend, and online all our courses -- or not all our courses, but many of our courses, and trying to decide what is -- meets the bar. So that's part of the policy. The other thing we're trying to do is produce some documentation that will make it less likely that proposals that come from your departments get sent back to your departments because we can't understand them or we don't think they meet the bar that we are hoping to set. Right now we have -- and you voted in this meeting, I think, two meetings ago, I think it was October, to -- that the 12-member committee is now going to be composed of eight faculty and four instructional academic staff to help both find staffing for the committee, but realistically involve those members of our community who really -- whose job is instruction more, perhaps, than some of -- those of us who have more of a research aspect to our lives. We're dealing this year with things like how to implement the portion of the graduate attribute that says that in those courses between -- numbered between 300 and 699 graduate students, if you -- if they -- if that course gets the graduate attribute which means that it fits in the 50% of the credits that a graduate student needs to come from courses that are designated as for graduates or at least -- how in fact -- are the graduates in mixed graduate/undergraduate courses actually assessed and graded differently than the undergraduates? We've seen proposals that say undergraduates get an A if it's 90 -- if they get a 90%, but graduates need a 93 to get an A. That's not going to get it. That's not going to go through. All right, that's not what that's -- so we need details in the syllabi about how exactly the graduate's life is different in that class. So these are the

things -- and we know that you -- you're not supposed to go back and figure that out based on what I just said. We need to get words on paper and get them implemented and distributed. So those are the things that we're doing. Tomorrow -- not tomorrow, thank goodness, Friday this week the Vice Provost for Faculty and Staff is going to come in and talk to us about a document that's entitled minimum instructional qualifications. So we're part of a -- this committee now is part of the consultative body that the higher-ups in the university use to vet policy changes that are related to instruction and courses. And so that's what we've done. Where we're going, we're not on that list of things that we're being asked to nominate your fellow faculty for because this is not an elected committee in that sense. But I would encourage those of you who have members of your department that are particularly interested in these kinds of topics to remember that this committee has old members, and they are serving three-year terms, so. I guess I'll take any questions that anybody has.

>> Chancellor Rebecca Blank: Questions? All right, thank you very much, Phil. All right, let me recognize -- we move now to old business. Let me recognize Professor Dorothy Farrar-Edwards who's going to move to approve the proposed revisions to faculty policies and procedures chapter seven, otherwise known as the tenure review policy, starting on page 45 in your booklet. Dorothy?

>> Dorothy Farrar-Edwards: Chancellor. So I move to approve faculty document 2583A which is the post-tenure review policy. And I just want to provide just a couple of contextual comments before we start the discussion. I send you regrets from my committee co-chair Caroline Levine who I'm sure wishes she could be here, but unfortunately is out of town. The document that you received as part of your Senate packet of materials reflects to our best ability all of the comments and written suggestions that we received through the Secretary of the Faculty's office. And I want to thank everybody for all of their hard work. This document is much improved because of all the input, and we really, really appreciate the time and energy that our fellow faculty put into this. This is very important. This document is the primary focus of the next Tenure Taskforce meeting which Regent Behling was -- in response to really a demand by the Tenure Taskforce faculty members wanted another meeting in December, and so he went ahead and scheduled that meeting. And so we'll be meeting on the afternoon of December 23rd. We have -- yes, we will, 1 o'clock. The Provost changed her travel plans. I changed my travel plans. We wanted to be very sure that we were there physically. He suggested that people could call in, but we wanted to be present. So we will be present. It's important to note that we have a post-tenure review policy that was adapted by -- adopted by this body in 1993, that the majority of departments in the university actually actively conduct post-tenure reviews. So this is not new. The benefits of this proposed policy is that it actually structures and standardizes the process so that faculty actually have a role in the selection of the reviewers, can file a protest to the review, and that the policy also provides for resources for individuals who request them as part of the post-tenure review process. I'm not talking about merit pay here. I'm actually talking about resources for career redirection or support. So with all of that said I think we'll open it up.

>> Chancellor Rebecca Blank: All right, questions, and comments, and other things?

>> Chad Goldberg: Chad Allen Goldberg, District 71. So I -- when the previous draft of this policy was presented at the previous Faculty Senate meeting in November I had really grave concerns and deep reservations about it. And then when I read the revised version here I was very happy to see that it addressed all of my concerns. And so I want to say that -- I just want to commend the members of the University Committee for being so open to constructive criticism and engagement and working with your colleagues to improve the previous draft. When I read the version that we will be voting on today I actually thought that it's much improved. It's better even than the old tenure review policy that we've had since 1993. So I just want to say thank you for listening and for working so hard to make this a policy that certainly I can support and that I hope my colleagues and the school support as well.

>> Howard Schweber: Sorry. Howard Schweber, District 73. I rise to speak in support of the policy and to commend the University Committee for its work. I wanted to make a very general point in response to some comments that I've heard outside this room and also in our last meeting. Some of the comments I've heard from my colleagues have suggested that somehow once we have tenure we should just be if not beyond review at least subject to review of only the most glancing sort. And obviously there is a political context to this conversation which we are debating with the legislature and trying to assert for ourselves authority and responsibility, against some opposition. In light of that background I wanted to make an observation which is

this, only we approve PhDs. There's no state office that gives people PhDs. We're academics. Only we get to decide who gets to join our ranks. Only we propose promotion [inaudible] tenure. Without a recommendation from the department no one gets tenured as an academic because we are the academics. We are the ones who have the qualifications, the responsibility, and the willingness to maintain the standards of our profession. That dual role, that responsibility that goes along with our authority has always been the fundamental assumption underlying our claim to be entitled to govern ourselves in a way different from most public employees and most public offices. And that doesn't cease to be true after the moment someone gets tenure. It is in our interest, and it is our responsibility to ensure that post-tenure, just as pre-tenure, just as pre-PhD, we the academics maintain the standards of our own profession. And I want to thank the University Committee for contributing to that process.

>> Chancellor Rebecca Blank: Thank you. This could be fast. Are you ready to vote?

>> Yes.

>> Chancellor Rebecca Blank: In that case, all in favor of the motion to approve the proposed revisions to Faculty Policies and Procedures chapter seven indicate by saying aye.

>> Aye.

>> Chancellor Rebecca Blank: Are there any opposed? Thank you to the committee. You should take that as a very strong vote of confidence and thanks.

[ Applause ]

We have two more items on the agenda, and one which is a closed-session item. We had promised we would start no later than 4:45, and I'm a little worried if we start into the faculty -- the next discussion on faculty compensation and parental leave that will take us more than 15 minutes. And because we posted the fact we would start in on closed-session by 4:45 I'm going to propose that we do the closed session, come - deal with that -- the issue there, come out of closed session and deal with our final topic which would then be the Faculty Compensation Committee report, because otherwise we're going to have to stop and table it at 4:45 and then come back to it. And I think that would be a bad idea. So I think I have the authority to do that under whatever authority is vested in me. So I would like a motion to move into closed session pursuant to Wisconsin Statutes 19.85 (1)(c) and (f) to consider recommendations of the Committee on Honorary Degrees. Do I have such a motion? Judith Burstyn, and we need the name and the -- you know, Judith's connections. You said a second? All those in favor of moving into closed session please indicate by saying aye.

>> Aye.

>> Chancellor Rebecca Blank: Any opposed? The Senate's going to now consider the confidential report of the Committee on Honorary Degrees pursuant to Wisconsin Statutes 19.85 (1)(c) and (f). The report must be held in a closed executive session, so anyone who is not an elected representative of the Faculty Senate must leave the room. We will call you all back in when the Faculty Senate is done. But a closed session does require that all non-Senate members be out of the room. All right, we are back in open session. Michael, can you tell anyone out there that they can come in? And we return to our previously-scheduled program which was to recognize Professor Bob Hamers who will submit for informational purposes the report of the Commission on Faculty Compensation and Economic Benefits, which is page 53, and present the Commission's recommendation for Senate endorsement. Bob?

>> Bob Hamers: Thank you very much. So our -- the Commission was charged in the beginning of last year to undertake a number of issues related to family and parental leave policies at the university, to evaluate how those compare to some of our peer institutions, to develop some recommendations, and to assess what the economic impact of those might be. So just briefly let me start by just summarizing the current situation which is primarily dictated by two documents, one of them being the Wisconsin Family Medical Leave Act, and a UW document called Balancing Family and Work. And under the terms of the Wisconsin Family Medical Leave Act it basically specifies conditions under which someone for medical reasons or parental duties is

allowed to temporarily leave their position and be guaranteed a job when they come back. However, that is - does not in any way indicate that the person will be paid while they are absent. So the way that UW implements the Family Medical Leave Act is to allow faculty to use sick leave up to a limit of six weeks for birthmothers and an additional six weeks for mothers and their spouses. The -- and for faculty who are on 12-month appointment they're also allowed to use vacation if they have it. So one of the challenges here is if we were to sort of start from a new faculty -- so often this -- these policies affect very young faculty, often assistant professors. So when faculty are hired they're given some initial sick leave, but it takes about a year and a half to accumulate enough sick leave to allow for a -- six weeks of paid leave. And a second issue is that if a woman has a child that it takes and uses that sick leave it takes about another three years to build up enough sick leave to allow another six weeks of medical leave. Okay, so a second issue that is associated with the current policy is that it requires individual negotiations with the chair and/or dean. There is not a consistent policy on how to handle covering teaching responsibilities while a birthmother, or adoptive parent, or a spouse are temporarily out with their child. So under the terms of the UW policy there are several options that are laid out for department chairs. That could include things like providing teaching relief. That could include developing a team teaching assignment. It can include something called colleague coverage. Now for those of you who have been here a long time like I have, colleague coverage used to mean something really different. And the way it is implemented now colleague coverage means nothing more than having another colleague cover for you while you are temporarily out. So the important thing is that these policies all require use of sick leave. There is an issue of some apparent discrepancies between UW policies and Board of Regent policies, and in particular the questions arise of what happens if there is what I'll refer to as colleague coverage. So under the terms of the UW document it basically says that any time a birth parent is out for six weeks of leave under the Family Medical Leave Act she or her spouse are required to use sick leave, whereas the Regents document that is outlined on page three seems to indicate that that may not necessarily be true if the department chair can find someone to -- a colleague to cover. If an appointment needs to be made for someone new to cover that course then it's clear that teaching leave needs to be used, but there is an apparent discrepancy and confusion among the policies. And perhaps more importantly is that these policies are, number one, are not applied consistently across the college. The Commission attempted to get documents from all the different colleges and schools on campus as to what their policies were. We did get a working document from the College of Letters and Science, but could not get documents from most of the other colleges on campus. But it is clear that the policies are not applied uniformly across campus. And secondly is that if a department chair chooses to have someone substitute for someone who is temporarily on leave there is no funding provided for the department in order to pay that person. So the need is a number of things. First off, this current policy requiring sick leave provides a financial hardship for a number of faculty. Certainly if they don't have sufficient sick leave and decide to take the six-week Family Medical Leave Act that they're entitled to under law then they simply will not be paid during that time. Oftentimes it leaves the faculty member vulnerable, often at a time early in their career. And again, this most often affects assistant professors who are not in a very good position to be negotiating with their department chair or the dean over benefits they should get. And then from the standpoint of the department chair there's no funding in order to pay someone to fill in. And so it's not very good from both sides. So our Commission decided to take a look at what some of our peer institutions do, and so we evaluated the -- what are the policies of the 14 members of the Council on Institutional Cooperation? So the 14 CIC institutions plus four other institutions that UW commonly uses in assessing various rankings. And that -- the result of that is shown on page six of the report. So let me emphasize here that in thinking about what we view as being -- or what we discussed within the Commission, we made a big distinction between leave and teaching relief in the sense that leave implies that a faculty member is not fulfilling their teaching, administrative, or potentially research and administrative responsibilities. For many faculty who have federal research grants that's really not an option, right? They're basically required to continue fulfilling that research obligation as associated with the federal funding, and so we really focus on what we're simply calling teaching relief. And by teaching relief we simply mean not having to teach a regular course load or have significant committee work, but during teaching relief it was assumed that the birthmother, adoptive parent, and/or spouse would be maintaining full supervision over their research group and any activities associated with those federally-funded research activities. So as you can see on page six Wisconsin and Iowa are near the bottom. We divided the groups into three categories. One was those providing no-pay teaching relief, so that's UW and Iowa. Those that provided paid teaching relief for six weeks or more, but less than 12 weeks. And so six institutions in that category. And then finally, the institutions that provide teaching relief of 12 or more weeks, and you can see that approximately 3/4 of the institutions on the list here are providing benefits in that range. So when we evaluated some of the practices that we thought might work at

Madison and what the cost might be we primarily looked economically at two different scenarios. One would be what would be the cost of providing teaching relief by paying a lecture replacement for one semester? And we obtained data on the birth rate over a period of three years that was obtained by looking at the number of children that were added to university insurance policies from faculty over a three-week period. That was 46 children per year on average. And so if we make an assessment of what the average cost of a lecture would be at 46 children that turns out to be a cost of about \$640,000 a year to provide that one semester of teaching relief by paying a lecture replacement for a birthmother. We also looked at what it would cost to provide -- to allow a person to take six weeks of leave, and instead of requiring that they use sick leave in order to do that to have that money backfilled in, perhaps from private sources -- probably not from federal dollars or state dollars, but from private dollars, and that cost was estimated to be about \$737,000 a year. As two potential options, and those of course could be combined. So ultimately the recommendation of the Committee are somewhat vague, and this is done in part because we knew at the -- about the middle of this last year that there was this large, ongoing HR redesign process, and we knew that they were going to be evaluating many different aspects of job classifications across the university. And so instead of getting bogged down in very specifics we decided to take a little bit of a -- step back a little bit and look at what we thought might be possible. So basically we came up with primarily three recommendations. So recommendation one was that the overall issue of faculty leave for birthmothers, adoptive parents, and their spouses should be investigated and looked at as part of a more comprehensive analysis of the benefits package that's provided to faculty since, for example, this might compete with raises or other benefits that the faculty get. And we thought that it really needed to be looked at in a more comprehensive evaluation of the faculty benefits package. The second one and third one we're a little bit more specific in that we felt that at the very least there should be one semester of paid teaching relief to parents upon birth or adoption of a child, and in particular that this leave should be granted automatically without a specific request, that is no negotiation with the department chairman. It should be basically given outright. And the third one is that there should be a mechanism provided to department chairs or deans to allow funding so that the faculty member can take -- or spouse -- can take time off for that childcare need. And then finally, although not highlighted as a specific recommendation, we recognize that our specific committee is the Commission on Faculty Compensation and Economic Benefits, so while we targeted most of this to the specific needs of faculty we also recognize that these same issue apply to people in many other categories across the university, and we felt that, you know, we didn't want to look at this in isolation which is why in the end we felt it should be integrated into the more comprehensive HR redesign and re-evaluation that's already started and which we recognize may take another year or year and a half to complete. So with that, that's the report, and do I take questions?

>> Chancellor Rebecca Blank: So are you presenting those recommendations --

>> Bob Hamers: Yes.

>> Chancellor Rebecca Blank: -- for vote to Senate? Is there a second to those recommendations? Okay, in that case we are then open for comments and questions.

>> Christa Olson: Christa Olson, District 55. I have no vested interest in this conversation. Although, actually two of my comments -- I have three quick comments. Two of them have to do not with people I'm -- me. The first is, I definitely want to support how important it is that this also include graduate students. I know that was not the charge of the committee, but I want to support what you just said. They have essentially nothing and also need that. The second is in the report it says that assistant professor, that you can add another year to tenure clock, but it has to go through the Executive Committee, the University Committee, and something else. I think that's not true. I think pregnancy and childbirth are --

>> Bob Hamers: That --

>> Christa Olson: -- automatic, and I wouldn't want that to change.

>> Bob Hamers: Okay, thank you.

>> Christa Olson: And then the third piece is just from the way you were phrasing it now and then looking at the recommendations, the use of male and female and of spouse could run us into trouble, especially for

people who -- so even though gay marriage now exists, the law is actually very, very uncertain about the status of children, and so being clear that we would apply this to anybody who identifies themselves [sic] as a parent, regardless of gender identity or legal status would be a huge benefit to -- that's a small group, but a -- that deserves respect.

>> Chancellor Rebecca Blank: Right, yeah.

>> Bob Hamers: I mean, certainly that was our intent was to construe, you know, being a parent as broadly as possible, so.

>> Chad Goldberg: Chad Allen Goldberg, District 71. So again, just echoing the remarks I made earlier in the meeting about the Committee on Women in the University, I also want to commend the Committee on Faculty Compensation and Benefits. This work on family and parental leave is -- as I said before -- is enormously important. I'm -- I was really distressed to see that in this diagram that you mentioned that among our peer institutions Iowa and Wisconsin are down here at the bottom. And you know, our motto is forward. We shouldn't be lagging behind our peer institutions in terms of teaching relief. So I hope that the policies here can be improved speedily. I want to echo the point about other categories of university staff. I'm really glad that you included that. Obviously, as we said before, it's important to include graduate student employees in that. And my question, I guess, is I'm all in favor of these recommendations. I think it's important to move forward in terms of improving family and parental leave on campus. What are the next steps? You mentioned the HR design. There is a study that we're waiting on that will take a year and a half. What I really don't want to see is that these very valuable and important recommendations get made and then forgotten about in a year and a half we're talking about this anymore. So I think it's important to -- that we have a process and a timeline by which these recommendations will be considered seriously by -- not only by HR, but by the university in general, and that we have a way to move forward on this. So how do you envision the next steps?

>> Bob Hamers: Well, let's see, we weren't specifically charged with addressing next steps. But personally -- my own personal opinion is that I think there's a lot of room for improvement in evaluating how are the current policies being applied campus-wide? Again, we could not find clear and consistent documentation from any colleges. And because of the fact that it is applied very much on a case-by-case basis I think that immediate thing that could actually be done would be to start evaluating how are these policies currently being applied and trying to develop a clear and transparent systematic way of applying them so that there's clarity. But that's my personal opinion, not that of the committee.

>> Noah Feinstein: Noah [inaudible] Feinstein, Community and Environmental Sociology. Does anyone here have twins? So this question pertains to something very specific which is that historically campus policies on, for instance, extension of the tenure clock have treated the birth of twins in the same way as the birth of a single baby. And I think that we all know -- hopefully we all know that that's not the same thing logistically, practically, emotionally, and so forth. What I would ask is that in future consideration of this policy that allowance be made for the birth of multiples, recognition that it is not the same thing, that it requires additional demands of all sorts on the parents, and then that be part of whatever policies we adopt.

>> Bob Hamers: I would fully support that. And again, our intent was not to get bogged down in precise definitions at this point. Same thing comes up with who is a parent, right? But all those things should get fleshed out as part of this broader evaluation.

>> Lisa Everett: Hello, Lisa Everett, District I don't know, Physics. I actually wanted to make one comment specifically that's not about my own personal experience. I want to say, first of all, from my own experience I'm very happy with the recommendations of this policy, particularly about not having to negotiate with chairs and having things be automatic. But one thing I remember in going to some conversations about family leave after I had my kid and sort of realized all these things was that somebody mentioned when you adopt the time scale for when you find out that you have a baby that's going to come to you is actually very short as opposed to when you have a -- you know, when you're pregnant or something, and it takes -- you have some time to plan. And given that this is about teaching relief and things like that, that was something cited by a person with this experience who is a much older person than me, and when there was not much flexibility in terms of doing anything. So I'd like to make that point on her behalf to say that I think this is

something one really has to be careful of, because you don't want couple weeks, and suddenly you've got to come up with somebody to teach a class. Thank you.

>> Bob Hamers: Right, good.

>> Jill Wildonger: Hi, Jill Wildonger, District 6, Biochemistry. I really appreciate that the committee has taken into account both parents, both the father and the mother. And I was wondering if your calculations took into consideration the fact that there are a lot of couple professors on campus? So dual parent assistant professors, dual parent professors?

>> Bob Hamers: Right, we discussed that, you know, the various, you know, factors of two that could be applied various places. I mean, so we recognize that. You know, we didn't have enough statistics to identify how many times that particular case came up. And I'm not sure we could even get that data if we wanted to.

>> Jill Wildonger: So in my experience it's fairly common, so thanks.

>> Chancellor Rebecca Blank: Can I make a comment on timing?

>> Bob Hamers: Yes.

>> Chancellor Rebecca Blank: So neither our chief HR person nor Darrell Bazzell had seen this proposal until it got presented in this last week, so no one has done any detailed planning on this. I want to emphasize to everybody that you cannot give paid financial leave for a certain number of weeks to one group of your employees and not to others. So that we have to consider this in light of paid financial leave to all staff in the university. And we just are going to have to do a whole bunch of work on cost and issues before we can come back with anything that looks like a specific proposal. And we are at some point going to have to have a conversation with a number of key groups amongst both staff, faculty, and if we're discussing graduate students, graduate students about priorities around how you spend limited money on compensation increases that apply to a broader group as opposed to this. And those are just the choices and conversations that we will have to be in over the next couple of years. And I just want to say that clearly without, you know, any indication of anything other than I would love for this university to have paid leave for our staff and our faculty. I think it is a very important issue. This is one that is going to take a little bit of time to work out, and the cost is going to be substantially bigger than any estimates you see in this document. Are there any other comments or questions? If not you have a resolution in front of you. Are you ready to vote? All those in favor indicate by saying aye.

>> Aye.

>> Chancellor Rebecca Blank: Any opposed? The motion carries. Thank you, Bob. We are at the end of our agenda, and I'm declaring this the end of the meeting. Thank you very much for coming.