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MEMORIAL RESOLUTION OF THE FACULTY
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON

ON THE DEATH OF PROFESSOR EMERITUS DEANE C. ARNY

Deane Cedric Arny was born into an academic family on May 22, 1917 at St. Paul, Minnesota. His father was professor of agronomy at the University of Minnesota, and his brother became a medical doctor. Not surprisingly, Deane was destined for a life of scholarly inquiry. As a youth, he became an avid outdoor explorer and Eagle Scout, a harbinger of the expert naturalist in later life. Indeed he lived consistently with the scouting philosophy of love of nature, loyalty, service to others, and of ‘being prepared’: Deane always carried a Swiss army knife, a bandaid in his wallet, and a can of oatmeal cookies when he travelled – later to be shared with students on field trips.

Arny followed his father’s footsteps into agronomy. He graduated in 1939 from the University of Minnesota with a BS in agronomy and plant pathology, and immediately took a bus to Madison to begin graduate studies. He completed a PhD program jointly in agronomy and plant pathology in 1943 under the supervision of H.L. Shands (Agronomy) and J.G. Dickson (Plant Pathology). Following graduation, Arny took up a joint faculty appointment in the departments of Plant Pathology and Agronomy (in 1964 the appointment was changed to 100% Plant Pathology). He retired in 1984.

As a field crops pathologist, Deane did both basic and applied research primarily on the etiology and control of diseases of corn, small grains, and alfalfa. Among his many accomplishments was advancing the understanding of the genetic basis of disease resistance in oats and corn to economically important pathogens. Furthermore, he fostered and embraced collaboration with fellow faculty in CALS and other land-grant institutions to solve complex disease problems faced by growers in Wisconsin and beyond its borders. Perhaps his seminal contribution was as a member of a team including Christen Upper, Steven Lindow and later, Susan Hirano, that determined how certain microbial populations on corn leaves act to increase frost sensitivity. Early season frost injury is a recurring problem to crops in Wisconsin and results in millions of dollars of damage annually in temperate and subtropical regions worldwide. Until the work by Arny and collaborators, frost damage had been interpreted as a purely physical or physiological phenomenon. In the absence of bacteria, water supercools and does not freeze until about -6°C. However, in the presence of certain bacteria, which they identified, water freezes, disrupting and killing plant cells at relatively warm temperatures of -2°C to -4°C. Although bacteria had previously been implicated as being among ice nucleators in the atmosphere, the role of naturally occurring bacteria on plant surfaces in promoting frost damage had not been recognized. Their work not only explained the basic mechanism of frost injury to plants but provided an avenue for controlling the bacteria responsible, thus avoiding the injury. It was Arny’s keen insight gained through years of observations and field experiments on corn that provided the clue to unraveling the mystery. In 1987, Arny, Lindow, and Upper received the prestigious Ruth Allen Award of the American Phytopathological Society (APS) in recognition of their breakthrough.

Arny made noteworthy service contributions to academia and in agriculture overseas. With respect to the former, he engaged his interest as a historian and archivist by serving on the relevant APS committee and also as president and later, historian, of the Wisconsin Chapter, Gamma Sigma Delta. Deane devoted countless hours over many decades meticulously updating the archival records of the plant pathology department. These proved to be pivotal in compiling the two historical volumes that recognize our 75th and 100th anniversaries. With respect to foreign agriculture, Arny mentored several international students and from 1966-1968 was head of the newly formed plant science department at the University of Ife, Nigeria as part of the decade-long, USAID-funded project through the University of Wisconsin College of Agricultural and Life Sciences in collaboration with that country. Following this mission, he spent six months doing research at the Agricultural University, Wageningen, The Netherlands. In 1975, he was a
member of the U.S. study team formed to assess the status of food crops in Kenya and later served as a consultant to Andalas University in Padang, Indonesia.

During his long career, Deane taught in various capacities but will be remembered most by students for his role in what became known as the ‘summer field course.’ Shortly after its formation in 1970, Arny became the organizer and lead instructor of “Plant Pathology 559: Diseases of Economic Plants” until his retirement. Its hallmark was the one day each week spent on the road observing crops and diseases throughout Wisconsin. Although the class focused on diseases of plants, Deane used the opportunity for teachable moments on human and geologic history of Wisconsin. He was an excellent plant taxonomist, and students came away from the course with a wealth of information about the natural world. For many years, the enrollment was so large that Deane drove the students in an old school bus, which came to be known affectionately as the ‘White Whale.’ And a large can of oatmeal cookies always came along for everyone. In tribute to him, the students organized annually for many years “Deane Arny Day,” which took the form of talks by various speakers and a departmental picnic.

In retirement, Arny expanded his volunteer work and service to charitable organizations. He contributed his time generously to the University Arboretum, where his skills as a naturalist were in demand. For over 40 years, Deane, Edith and their family devoted much time to the restoration of a ‘worn out’ farm they had purchased in the driftless region of Wisconsin. In 2003, the restored land was registered as a conservation easement, and in 2008 became the Valley Ridge Preserve under the trusteeship of the nonprofit Leonardo Academy.

When Arny died at Madison on January 30, 2013, he had been affiliated with the plant pathology department for some 73 of his 95 years. He is survived by his wife of 66 years, Edith; by their five children; five grandchildren; and one great-grandchild. Deane Arny will be fondly remembered by his colleagues and generations of students. He emulated the well-balanced professor – a man of science who exhibited grace and civility, and the enduring human values of kindness, integrity, generosity and humility.

MEMORIAL COMMITTEE
John Andrews
Craig Grau
MEMORIAL RESOLUTION OF THE FACULTY
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON

ON THE DEATH OF PROFESSOR EMERITUS GEORGE E.P. BOX

Dr. George Edward Pelham Box, professor emeritus in the departments of Statistics and of Industrial and Systems Engineering, died on Thursday, March 28, 2013, at the age of 93. George founded the Department of Statistics in 1960 and co-founded the Center for Quality and Productivity Improvement. George had profound contributions to time series, experimental design and quality improvement. He mentored several generations of students who extended his influence far and wide, and he was known for his sense of humor, genial nature and compelling storytelling abilities. His most famous quote is “All models are wrong but some are useful.”

George was born in Gravesend, Kent, England in 1919. Born into modest means, both he and his brother Jack earned scholarships at an elite public school in Kent. George began his scientific life as a chemist, publishing his first paper at the age of 19 on an activated sludge process to produce clean effluent. Understanding the dangers of fascism, he abandoned his education and enlisted in the army on the very first day he was eligible. During his six years in the army, he eventually was sent to Porton Down Experimental Station to study the impact of poison gases. George realized that only a statistician could get reliable conclusions from experiments, so he taught himself statistics and a career was born.

After the war, George obtained a BSc in mathematical statistics from University College London in 1947. He interrupted a master’s program to begin working in the Dyestuffs Division of Imperial Chemical Industries for eight years. While at ICI, he completed a PhD at University College in 1952, under Egon Pearson. He spent the academic year 1953-1954 at the North Carolina State College (now University) in Raleigh, where he met some of the preeminent statisticians of the day. In 1957, he left ICI and became director of the Statistical Techniques Research Group at Princeton University.

Milton Friedman suggested in 1940 that the University of Wisconsin establish a Department of Statistics. That early suggestion was unsuccessful. However, in 1959, UW-Madison invited George Box to establish the Department of Statistics, which he created in 1960. George became the Ronald Aylmer Fisher Professor of Statistics in 1971. He co-founded the UW Center for Quality and Productivity Improvement with William “Bill” Hunter in 1985. He retired as an emeritus professor in 1992, though he continued to contribute research papers and write books until his death.

George wrote or co-authored over 200 scientific papers and nine major statistical books on evolutionary operation, times-series, Bayesian analysis, the design of experiments, statistical control, and quality improvement. Box, Hunter and Hunter’s Statistics for Experimenters remains a classic today. George loved his students and was proud all their contributions. His last book, a memoir called, An Accidental Statistician: The Life and Memories of G.E.P. Box, will be published in 2013 by Wiley.

George received many honors, including a DSc from University College London (1961); the American Society of Quality Shewhart Medal (1968) and honorary society membership; the Royal Statistical Society Guy Medal in Silver (1964) and in Gold (1993) as well as an honorary fellowship (1993); American Statistical Association Wilks Award (1972); membership of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences (1974); a UW-Madison Vilas Research Professorship of Statistics (1980); and a fellow of the Royal Society (1985). Additional awards include the Youden Prize, the Deming Medal, the British Empire Medal and the Byron Bird Award for Excellence in Engineering Research. He was a visiting professor at Harvard Business School (1965-1966) and University of Essex (1970-1971). He served as president of the American Statistics Association (1978) and the Institute of Mathematical Statistics (1979). The Box Medal
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for Outstanding Contributions to Industrial Statistics, from the European Network for Business and Industrial Statistics, recognizes in his honor the development and the application of statistical methods in European business and industry. Several well-known statistical concepts bear his name: Box-Jenkins model, Box-Cox transformations, Box-Behnken designs, Box-Muller transform, Ljung-Box test, Box-Pierce test. George Box received honorary degrees from the University of Rochester, New York (1985), Carnegie Mellon University (1989), Universidad de Don Carlos III, Madrid (1995), and the University of Waterloo, Canada (1999).

George is especially remembered for his long-running Monday Night Beer and Statistics sessions, held at his house and open to all campus researchers and students. He provided analysis and suggestions for all, and many students later said that they learned more from these sessions than from any classroom or textbook. George was very keen about reaching out to the local community and helping spread the word about quality improvement in all areas including the public sector. He and others were at the origin of the City of Madison Quality Improvement (QI) program.

George had encyclopedic knowledge of song lyrics and almost every poem or verse he had ever heard. His favorite book, however, was *Alice in Wonderland*. We also remember his holiday party skits and song lyrics such as “There’s no theorem like Bayes’ Theorem” sung to the tune of “There’s no business like show business” from *Annie Get Your Gun*. We treasure his memory for his wit, modesty, kindness and warmth, his love of family and friends, and his joy in teaching his students.

MEMORIAL COMMITTEE
Pascale Carayon
Norman Draper
Harold Steudel
Brian Yandell, chair
MEMORIAL RESOLUTION OF THE FACULTY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON

ON THE DEATH OF PROFESSOR WILLIAM WALLACE CLELAND

William Wallace Cleland, professor of biochemistry at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, passed away on March 6, 2013 of injuries sustained in an accident.

Professor Cleland preferred to be addressed as “Mo,” and all of his friends knew him by this name. Mo was born to Elizabeth and Ralph E. Cleland in Baltimore, Maryland on January 6, 1930. His family moved to Bloomington, Indiana, where his father served on the faculty and administration of Indiana University. Mo graduated from Oberlin College, AB 1950, and from the University of Wisconsin, MS 1953 and PhD 1955. He served in the Medical Corps of the U.S. Army for two years, and he carried out postdoctoral research under Eugene P. Kennedy at the University of Chicago. He returned to the University of Wisconsin-Madison as assistant professor of biochemistry in 1959 and advanced to professor of biochemistry in 1966. He served as the Marvin J. Johnson Professor of Biochemistry in 1978 and the Steenbock Professor of Chemical Sciences from 1982-2003.

Mo made many influential contributions to enzymology. He brought order into the field of multisubstrate steady-state enzyme kinetics. In 1963, he published a series of three papers on this topic in *Biochimica et Biophysica Acta*; paper I. Nomenclature and rate equations; II. Inhibition: nomenclature and theory; III. Prediction of initial velocity and inhibition patterns by inspection. In this work, Mo derived the basis for Cleland’s rules, which allow one to write the rate equation for a multisubstrate enzyme by inspection of kinetic patterns. In connection with this work, Mo coined the term “ping pong kinetics” for a kinetic pattern implicating a covalently modified enzyme-substrate intermediate. These papers have been widely cited and led to his inclusion among the 300 most-cited scientists in 1978.

Prior to Mo’s report in the early 1960s, proteins were often purified in the presence of mercaptoethanol, which countered the detrimental effects of oxygen. Mercaptoethanol had an unpleasant odor, and two equivalents were required to reduce a disulfide. Mo studied the reducing properties of a number of dithiol compounds and found that dithiothreitol, also known as DTT or Cleland’s Reagent, fitted the bill perfectly. He found DTT to be a water-soluble solid with little odor and a strong reducing agent. Cleland’s Reagent or DTT has been on the shelf in most biochemical laboratories for nearly half a century.

The analyses of bond changes in nonenzymatic chemical reactions often employ kinetic isotope effects (KIEs) because heavy isotopes alter reaction rates, usually with minimal effects on chemical properties. In enzyme studies, such analyses are complicated by noncovalent steps, such as the binding of reactants and release of products, plus conformation changes of the protein. In early collaborations with University of Wisconsin-Madison colleagues Dexter Northrop and Marion O’Leary, Mo undertook to overcome the problems and apply KIEs to analyze chemical mechanisms in enzymes. In the process, Mo invented the equilibrium perturbation method for measuring KIEs. This method was brilliantly conceived and enabled a KIE to be measured at chemical equilibrium in a single experiment.

Mo continued with this work and became a master of enzymatic kinetic isotope effects. He worked to neutralize the masking of chemical steps by the use of alternative substrates to increase ligand dissociation rates, by determining pH-effects in search of conditions where chemical steps limit rates, and by site-directed mutagenesis to decrease rates of chemical steps. When any of these methods worked, KIEs on maximum turnover velocity could be measured.
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Mo extended these methods by employing multiple KIEs to refine structures of transition states and even to distinguish between step-wise and concerted chemical mechanisms.

Mo was elected to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences in 1977 and to the National Academy of Sciences in 1985. He received the Merck Award from the American Society for Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, the Alfred Bader Award in Bioinorganic or Bioorganic Chemistry from the American Chemical Society (ACS), the Repligen Award in the Chemistry of Biological Processes from the Division of Biological Chemistry of the ACS, the Stein and Moore Award from the Protein Society, and the Hilldale Award in the Physical Sciences from the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Mo enjoyed sailing and ice boating on Lake Mendota and was the commodore of the Mendota Yacht Club in 1966. He was a patron of the arts and was honored last fall as one of a handful of 50-year subscribers to the Madison Symphony Orchestra concert series. He loved the opera and supported Madison Opera as well as opera companies across the United States.

Mo was a world-class philatelist and held leadership positions in the United States Stamp Society, as well as its presidency in 1992. He published more than 300 articles in the United States Specialist and the Canal Zone Philatelist. He received the Hopkinson Memorial Literature Award in 1986, 2002, and 2006. He received the Smithsonian Institution’s Philatelic Achievement Award in 2008. In 2009, the Stamp Society inducted Mo into the United States Stamp Society Hall of Fame.

Mo was a proud and devoted parent, with his former wife Joan Cleland, to daughters Elsa and Erica and grandparent to Max, Finn, and Griffin. He was generous to colleagues everywhere who consulted him on enzyme kinetics, often insisting that he be given no attribution. Postdoctoral students and young faculty members commented on their pleasant experiences with Mo’s quick answers to their questions. He was a kind and generous friend to colleagues and collaborators, and a dominant force in mechanistic enzymology.

MEMORIAL COMMITTEE
Perry A. Frey, chair
Dexter B. Northrop
George H. Reed
Dr. Edwin Michael “Mike” Foster, professor emeritus at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, passed away in Madison on February 11, 2013. Born on January 1, 1917 in rural Alba, Texas, Mike leaves behind a legacy as an internationally respected food microbiologist and as an academic administrator who greatly enhanced the University of Wisconsin-Madison’s prominence in the world of food safety research. Mike spent his childhood on a small cotton farm where he learned the value of honesty, sincere communication, fairness, trustworthiness and leadership. From an early age, he displayed academic promise and a drive to succeed. Encouraged by his mother and other family members, he rode a horse several miles each way, in all weather, to attend school. His down-to-earth character followed him through his illustrious career, and he gained the highest respect from the food industry, regulatory agencies, and academic colleagues.

He was the first in his family to attend college, earning BS and MS degrees from North Texas State Teachers College. With encouragement from his MS mentor, he applied to a number of graduate programs in microbiology. He received one admittance, from the UW-Madison Department of Bacteriology. That, together with a $400 annual scholarship from the Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation, led him to take a long, dusty bus ride in the heat of summer to begin his graduate studies in Madison. Mike earned his PhD in 1941 under the direction of Dr. William Frazier. He then went to the University of Texas where he taught bacteriology and married his life-long companion, Winona Lively, with whom he shared 65 years of marriage.

During World War II, Mike was commissioned as an officer in the U.S. Army Sanitary Corps, and served at Fort Dix, New Jersey and at the Chemical Warfare Service in Fort Detrick, Maryland. His activities at the latter are recounted in the 2007 PBS American Experience documentary, “The Living Weapon.” In 1945, he was discharged as a captain and returned to UW-Madison, where he served with distinction for the next 42 years. Mike established a national reputation in the public health aspects of food microbiology and rose through the professorial ranks. He received numerous honors and awards from many governmental and private organizations throughout his distinguished career. Mike also was an active leader in his discipline: he served as secretary and president of the American Society for Microbiology; he was named a charter fellow and served as president of the American Academy of Microbiology; he was a charter fellow of the Institute of Food Technologists; and he served on food safety advisory committees for the National Academy of Sciences/National Research Council, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and the World Health Organization.

Although the above alone would constitute an admirable career, Mike established his greatest impact in 1966 when he coordinated the transfer of the Food Research Institute (FRI) from the University of Chicago to UW-Madison. Under his guidance, FRI became the source for food safety expertise and established a tradition of excellence that continues to this day. Mike served as director of FRI in its new home and oversaw its growth from a small research group into a world leader in food safety and foodborne disease research. Under Mike’s leadership, FRI was recognized as an effective and impartial group that encouraged academic, regulatory and food industry personnel to come together to discuss openly and address important food safety and public health issues. In 1975, Mike established the Department of Food Microbiology and Toxicology to complement FRI and became its first chair. He insisted on a multi-disciplinary approach to problem-solving, enlisting expert help from faculty in other UW-Madison departments to address pressing and emerging food safety challenges.
Mike was well known for his research in food microbiology. His studies on vacuum-packaging and plastic films allowed meat processors to extend from two to eight weeks the shelf life of refrigerated, ready-to-eat meat products. He was an international authority on the use of sodium nitrite to prevent botulism and spoilage. He recruited scientists to FRI whose expertise included the microbiology of food pathogens, the relationship of food with cancer prevention, harnessing botulinum toxin for medical use, food allergies, and the toxicology of food additives and preservatives. He nurtured the development of many faculty and was proud to see many become leaders in food safety in industry, government and academics.

As a faculty member, Mike directed the graduate programs of 18 PhD students, many of whom went on to achieve prominence in the food industry and academia. Mike was an exceptional role model, teaching and demanding rigorous scientific inquiry and effective communication of the results. The impact he had on his students and other food microbiologists who came under his influence cannot be overstated. After retirement, Dr. Foster made generous contributions to establish three awards: the E. Michael and Winona Foster Wisconsin Distinguished Graduate Fellowship in Food Microbiology at FRI; the E. Michael and Winona Foster-WARF Wisconsin Idea Graduate Fellow in Microbiology in the Department of Bacteriology; and the E. Michael and Winona Foster Antibiotic Research Fund in Bacteriology. Grateful that his original WARF scholarship opened the world to him, he wanted to do the same for other deserving young people.

Dr. Mike Foster’s extraordinary accomplishments benefitted the university, the State of Wisconsin, and the nation. He is profoundly missed.

MEMORIAL COMMITTEE
Chuck Czuprynski
Eric Johnson, chair
Mike Pariza
Amy Wong
MEMORIAL RESOLUTION OF THE FACULTY
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON

ON THE DEATH OF PROFESSOR EMERITUS JEROME L. KAUFMAN

Jerome L. “Jerry” Kaufman, professor emeritus of urban and regional planning, died in Madison on January 10, 2013 at age 79 after a long, courageous battle with cancer. He was surrounded by family and friends and exhibited his unshakable warmth and humor to the very end. He remains with us through his pioneering professional and academic efforts and foresight, as well as through his unique ability to help organizations and people more fully realize their capacities and humanity.

Jerry was born on April 25, 1933, in Middleton, Connecticut, and at the age of two he moved to Queens, New York, where he grew up. After graduating from Queens College, he studied with the famed historian and urban planner Lewis Mumford at the University of Pennsylvania. For fourteen years, he practiced planning in various organizations, eventually becoming associate director of the American Society of Planning Officials (now the American Planning Association). In 1971, he left that post for a tenured position at UW-Madison. Professor Kaufman exemplified the “Wisconsin Idea” locally, nationally, and internationally. Professionally, he was at the forefront in numerous areas in his profession including planning for older cities, planning ethics and dispute resolution, increasing the presence and roles of women and minorities in planning, strategic planning for the public sector, and most recently, the development of planning for food systems. In each of these subfields, he produced seminal works that serve as standard references today. He worked unselfishly with students and colleagues, shaping their visions and activities to work better with communities and organizations so as to help them determine and reach their goals and aspirations. In these and in all his professional capacities, his work was singularly focused on his central concerns – equity and social justice.

Professor Kaufman was a member of the UW faculty from 1971-2001. He served as associate director of the Center for Public Policy and Administration (1980-83), chair of the Department of Urban and Regional Planning (1983-87), and as a member of the Campus Planning Committee. He realized his vision for a more just society through other scholarly commitments that included chairing the American Institute of Planners’ committee, Policy on Equity for Women in Planning (1972-75), and serving as a member of the organization’s Social Responsibility of Planners, and Code of Ethics and Professional Responsibility committees. His work was never far from the realities that shape individual lives and organizational capacities. He chaired dozens of graduate student committees and created new courses at the cutting edge of the planning discipline. On behalf of the Planning Accreditation Board, he also chaired reaccreditation site-visits of planning programs at eight universities, evidence of his regard among colleagues around the country for his measured and valuable professional perspective. He served as president of the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning (1991-93).

Jerry has been honored in many ways. Fellowships and scholarships exist in his name at Wisconsin and at SUNY-Buffalo. He was accorded the Distinguished Service Award of the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning, the first-ever Outstanding Site Visitor Award from the Planning Accreditation Board, and he was elected (the first person from the State of Wisconsin) as a fellow of the American Institute of Certified Planners (FAICP), the highest professional honor in planning. Though he was instrumental and honored for his many planning education and practice initiatives, arguably his greatest professional contribution is his most recent. From 1996-2001, Professor Kaufman launched and co-directed the Madison Food System Project, one of the earliest efforts to examine the food system from the many perspectives represented by planning. His professional and scholarly publications are the scaffolding for food system work across social science disciplines. With his various collaborators, many of them students and junior faculty whom he mentored, Professor Kaufman mapped the many intersections of municipal

(continued)
planning and the food system. His work motivated significant policy change around the country and helped support community organizations in realizing their goals. A conference honoring Jerry’s work and legacy, “Good Food for All” was held at the University of Wisconsin on August 1, 2011, with hundreds of participants recognizing Jerry as the father of “food systems” planning.

All Professor Kaufman’s interests coalesced and were instrumental in shaping cities. His scholarly interests became reflected in professional practice; he persistently engaged planning officials in adapting academic lessons for professional practice. Over the decades, he served on the Madison Planning Commission, the Madison Urban League Board, and the Madison Committee on Diversity, which he founded and chaired. He was also a key figure in establishing the Troy Gardens farm and affordable housing development in the City of Madison. Beginning in 2000 and until his death, he served as president of Growing Power, a Milwaukee-based grassroots organization led by Will Allen that is the nation’s preeminent urban agriculture organization. To recognize Professor Kaufman’s invaluable contribution to Growing Power, the organization announced that its forthcoming multi-million dollar “vertical farm” will be named in Jerry’s honor. Professor Kaufman imparted lessons he learned from these community-oriented experiences and scholarship in more than a hundred lectures and trainings on strategic planning, planning ethics, alternative dispute resolution, and the food system to professionals and scholars around the country and the world. Of vital and ongoing importance to practitioners in many disciplines was his work in 2007 facilitating the development and adoption of the first policy guidance document on food planning within the American Planning Association. The American Public Health Association, the American Nurses Association, and the American Dietetic Association have since joined the APA in adopting a version of this document that enshrines Professor Kaufman’s emphasis on equity and social justice.

Professor Kaufman’s rich experience, humility, patience, and good humor made him an effective planner. His foresight, his knack for asking the right question at the right time, his ability to diffuse conflict and direct that energy to advancing goals, his inclusive and measured approach – and perhaps most important, his elemental hope for a better future – made him the foundational and influential figure that he was in the academy, the profession, and in the lives of so many colleagues and students.

Jerry Kaufman was an ideal colleague, cherished mentor, and beloved spouse and father. He is survived by his spouse Judith Zukerman Kaufman; his two children Ariel, of Madison, and Daniel, of Brooklyn, New York; their spouses Michael Kissick and Juliette Mapp; his beloved grandsons Benjamin and Luca; and his sisters Elyse Zukerman and Betty Kaufman.

MEMORIAL COMMITTEE
Stephen M. Born, chair
James A. LaGro
Alfonso Morales
Brian W. Ohm
Kurt G. Paulsen
MEMORIAL RESOLUTION OF THE FACULTY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON

ON THE DEATH OF PROFESSOR EMERITUS WILLIAM E. SAUPE

Professor Emeritus William Edward “Bill” Saupe, age 85, died on Sunday, March 17, 2013. Bill was born on a farm near Sheldon, Iowa, on January 23, 1928. He received a BS degree in agricultural education from Iowa State University in 1951. After farming with his father for several years and service in the U.S. Marine Corps, Bill returned to Iowa State to obtain his MS degree (1961) in agricultural education and PhD (1965) in agricultural economics. He joined the faculty of the University of Wisconsin-Madison Department of Agricultural Economics (now Agricultural and Applied Economics) as an assistant professor in 1965 and was promoted to associate professor in 1967 and to professor in 1973. Bill retired in 1995.

Professor Saupe was a dedicated and conscientious teacher, a beloved and effective extension specialist, a pioneering researcher, and a truly outstanding departmental citizen. His 30-year career at the University of Wisconsin-Madison involved an integrated program of research, extension, and classroom teaching emphasizing the well-being of farm families and rural communities. Although primarily Midwest and USA in orientation, this work led to professional endeavors in ten other countries on six continents plus shorter professional activities and travel in the agricultural areas of an additional 15 countries.

Professor Saupe was author or co-author of over 70 research publications, including 20 Research Division reports published by the University of Wisconsin-Madison, 12 refereed journal articles, 11 reports published by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) and eight chapters in books. He regularly presented papers and participated in the annual meetings of the American Agricultural Economics Association. His analyses of farm and rural poverty, the unequal treatment of farm families under some federal assistance programs, and the limited health insurance coverage of farm children helped draw public attention to those issues.

Reflecting his farm roots, much of his extension work was directed at assisting low-income and beginning farmers become financially successful. His research was focused on the incidence, causes, and consequences of rural poverty in Wisconsin. In collaboration with the USDA’s Economic Research Service, Bill directed and coordinated a major innovative research project that tracked the fate of Wisconsin farmers displaced by the farm financial crisis of the mid-1980s. Bill later became interested in quantifying the economic importance of agriculture to rural communities. Working with University of Wisconsin-Extension county agents, he generated and periodically updated agricultural sector monetary contribution for every Wisconsin county. This was foundational work that spawned subsequent research related to measuring economic impact.

Professor Saupe and his family lived in southern Brazil for two years (1971 and 1972) while he participated in a University of Wisconsin-Madison/U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) institution building program at the Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul. There he helped develop and teach courses, assisted faculty and graduate students in farm research, and co-authored a provisional text on the economics of agricultural production. This experience led to involvement in additional Portuguese speaking countries.

Bill understood the importance of the department collectively engaging in outreach beyond the formal programs of extension specialists. For many years, he edited Economic Issues, a periodical with 1,800 readers nationwide that offered a lay perspective on the gamut of research issues being addressed by faculty. He also edited Managing the Farm, a periodical that focused on farm business and financial
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management topics and had readers in all 50 states. His ability to gently persuade faculty to contribute to the periodicals was uncanny. Bill was a quiet, unassuming man with dry sense of humor—qualities that made him a de facto mentor to new faculty and a friend and counselor to all faculty.

His classroom teaching included post-high school rural youth in farm short courses, undergraduate students, and graduate students. He served on graduate thesis committees for students from many countries and in several departments including agricultural economics, continuing and vocational education, economics, and agronomy. One of his graduate advisees became a distinguished professor at Cornell University. Others became faculty members at Iowa State University, Ohio State University, Milwaukee Technical College, University of Zulia (Venezuela), and the Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul (Brazil).

Professor Saupe’s impressive career was recognized on June 30, 1995, when he was inducted into the Prairie Museum Hall of Fame in his home town of Sheldon, Iowa—the 22nd person to be so honored in 35 years.

Upon his retirement from the University of Wisconsin-Madison, Bill engaged in volunteer work including for several years the daily filling of his van with surplus produce and other items from local food stores, bakeries and farmers market for delivery to food pantries. He also continued to participate in marathons, something he began after reaching age 50. Bill was a devoted member of Asbury United Methodist Church for 47 years and served in many leadership roles.

Bill is survived by Lorna, his wife of 60 years, daughters Rebecca (David) Luther and Barbara (Barry) Hein, daughter-in-law Nancy Sweitzer, and seven grandchildren. His son, Kurt W. Saupe, associate professor of medicine at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, died in 2012.

MEMORIAL COMMITTEE
Philip E. Harris
Edward V. Jesse, chair
MEMORIAL RESOLUTION OF THE FACULTY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON

ON THE DEATH OF PROFESSOR EMERITUS LORIS H. “BUD” SCHULTZ

Professor Emeritus Loris H. “Bud” Schultz died on December 7, 2012 at age 93. He was born on February 9, 1919 at Mondovi, Wisconsin. He graduated from Mondovi High School in 1936 then began study in the College of Agriculture at the University of Wisconsin. He graduated from UW in 1941 followed by the master of science degree in dairy physiology at the University of Minnesota in 1942. From 1943 to 1946, Bud served in the U.S. Navy, Pacific Theater, as an officer aboard the destroyer USS Meade; he earned five battle stars and retired as lieutenant senior grade. He returned to UW and earned the PhD in dairy science and biochemistry in 1949. Bud joined the faculty of the animal science department at Cornell University where he was promoted to professor in 1955. In 1957, he returned to the University of Wisconsin in Madison as professor of dairy science until he retired in 1985.

Professor Schultz taught courses in dairy herd management and physiology of lactation. His courses were noted for their rigor and thoroughness and for their practical application based on sound scientific principles. Professor Schultz served as major professor for 62 graduate and post-doctoral students. Most of these students went on to careers as university professors, scientists in USDA laboratories, or key roles in industry.

The product of a Wisconsin dairy farm, Bud was continuously motivated by a desire to find solutions to problems of milk production on dairy farms. His research led to some of the most important improvements in dairy cattle health and management during mid- and late-20th century. He published 91 journal articles and more than 45 symposium papers, abstracts, and others. He was honored by the American Dairy Science Association (ADSA) with the American Feed Manufacturers Award for nutrition research (1973), West Agro-Award for research on mastitis and milk quality (1980), fellow (1997), and Award of Honor for service to ADSA (1989).

Throughout his career, Professor Schultz carried out innovative and seminal studies of rumen metabolism and how the products of rumen fermentation influenced intermediary metabolism and milk synthesis in the dairy cow. These studies contributed significantly to understanding a) the etiology, diagnosis, and treatment for ketosis, a costly metabolic disease in dairy cattle, and b) the cause of reduced milk fat synthesis, an economically important problem. His research sought the underlying nutritional and physiological causes of these problems. He investigated diet and various supplements as means for preventing milk fat depression. He developed a milk ketone test for diagnosis of ketosis and demonstrated its advantages over other methods in use at the time. He proposed treatments and studied them in depth to understand the biological mechanisms that led to their effectiveness. These diagnosis and treatment procedures remain standards in the industry 60 years after his discovery.

Professor Schultz made contributions of lasting significance in the areas of milking management, milking hygiene, and mastitis control. Conducting studies in both commercial and research herds, he examined how milking time and udder health were influenced, respectively, by milking machine design and sanitation at milking time. He developed a quantitative, lower cost screening test for mastitis and milk quality. This test was implemented on a pilot basis by Dodge County Dairy Herd Improvement in collaboration with UW-Madison dairy extension specialist Allan Bringe and UW-Extension in Dodge County. For the first time, in the mid-1970s, producers had a means of monitoring milk quality and udder health of every cow every month. The program, although using a competing test, was soon enlarged to other Wisconsin counties and, by 1980, throughout the U.S. In addition, his studies found that mastitis reduces casein content of milk and consequently the yield of cheese from that milk. This finding led dairy processors to provide an economic incentive to milk producers based on milk quality. These incentives remain in most U.S. milk markets.

(continued)
Bud’s intellect and work ethic often took him to the head of his class. He was valedictorian of his high school class and won the Steenbock Award as outstanding senior in the College of Agriculture in 1941. He held key roles in ADSA including editorial board for the Journal of Dairy Science, president in 1983, and treasurer from 1983 to 1986. He was a founding member of the National Mastitis Council (NMC) in 1962 and served on many of its committees. He was elected NMC president in 1979 and received the council’s Distinguished Service Award in 1980.

Bud served in many important service roles during his career. He chaired the writing committee for the second edition of Current Concepts of Bovine Mastitis published by NMC. As a member of the National Academy of Science’s Committee on Animal Nutrition, he co-authored the 1978 edition of Nutrient Requirements of Dairy Animals. These publications were widely distributed and frequently consulted for their guidance on dairy cattle health and nutrition. At the UW, he was a member of the executive committee of the biological sciences division and served on the Faculty Senate. He chaired the planning committee for the Animal Sciences Building that opened in 1972. His History of the UW Dairy Science Department was published in 2009 at age 90.

Professor Schultz’s considerable accomplishments were done in a quiet, modest manner. Bud was an unassuming individual of steadfast integrity. His work, in both the laboratory and classroom, was thorough and rigorous. He was held in high esteem by his former students and colleagues.

Bud was an active member of Midvale Community Lutheran Church where he served on the church council and chaired the youth and buildings and grounds committees. He worked many hours over many years as a member of the Oakwood Village buildings and grounds committee. Also, he was a member of Madison West Kiwanis Club and Middleton Couples Golf League.

Professor Schultz is survived by Myra Baumann Schultz, his wife of 63 years; brother Gary (Jean) of Georgia; three sons, Steven (Nancy) of California, and Mark (Leanne) and David (Helen) of Minnesota; and four grandchildren, Sara, Rachel, Will, and Eric Schultz.

MEMORIAL COMMITTEE
Louis E. Armentano
David K. Combs
George E. Shook, chair
MEMORIAL RESOLUTION OF THE FACULTY
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON

ON THE DEATH OF PROFESSOR NEIL LANCELOT WHITEHEAD

Neil Lancelot Whitehead, an internationally renowned anthropologist and ethnohistorian of lowland South America, died in Madison, Wisconsin on March 22, 2012 of liver cancer. He was chair of the Department of Anthropology until a few days before his untimely death. Born in 1956 in London, he grew up in the borough of Harrow with his father Kenneth, himself born in India, mother Irene, and sister Kim. He attended the Merchant Taylors’ School, founded in 1561, then matriculated at Balliol College, University of Oxford, now marking its 750th anniversary. He earned a BA in psychology and philosophy in 1977, continuing in Oxford’s doctoral program in social anthropology. He prepared for ethnographic research in French Guiana under the supervision of Professor Peter Riviere, a distinguished anthropologist of lowland South America whose work focused on the history of European exploration of Amazonia, interests that clearly inspired his postgraduate student. Due to difficulties in obtaining permission for ethnographic research, Neil Whitehead submitted a largely historical dissertation, for which he was awarded the DPhil in 1984. A revised version of the dissertation became his first book, Lords of the Tiger Spirit: A History of Caribs in Colonial Venezuela and Guyana (1988), on the violent encounters between the Caribs and Europeans. In 1986, he married Theresa Murphy, whom he met through their mutual engagement in the movement against the presence of British troops in Northern Ireland.

After a series of temporary positions, Neil Whitehead accepted a faculty appointment at the University of Wisconsin-Madison in 1993, moving permanently across the Atlantic with his wife and two young children. He was promoted to full professor in 2001. Professor Whitehead flourished at UW-Madison, rising to prominence as an ethnographer, ethnohistorian and editor. His intellectual interests in colonial encounters and in warfare and violence are threaded throughout his scholarly career. He became widely known for a still influential volume he co-edited with R. Brian Ferguson, War in the Tribal Zone: Expanding States and Indigenous Warfare, published in 2002 by the School of American Research in Santa Fe, New Mexico, based on a conference funded by the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research. Professor Whitehead began a field research project in Guyana in 1992 that was originally intended to focus on the region’s ancient societies by way of an archaeological field survey, searching for evidence for European visions of El Dorado, the South American city of gold. He indeed published several articles on the topic. But he quickly became embroiled in Patamuna assault sorcery, known as kanaima, in which, he recounts, shamans transform themselves into spirit jaguars and physically attack and mutilate their victims, resulting in a lingering and painful death. Touching a burial urn left in a cave had made him, he writes, along with his Englishness in this former colony, a current and future target for sorcery attack. Professor Whitehead returned to the region in 1995 and 1997, with support from the UW Graduate School and external funding agencies, to carry out ethnographic research on kanaima. This eventually resulted in his remarkable account, Dark Shamans: Kanaima and the Poetics of Violent Death (2002). His interests in magical death—the poetics, performance, and ideologies of violence—and the violence of the state, from colonial encounters to the wars and asymmetrical engagements of the American military, unfolded as a consequence of the Patamuna experience.

Professor Whitehead was editor of the journal Ethnohistory for the decade beginning in 1997, changing its focus from largely North Americanist to an international one. He also edited or co-edited a series of sixteen volumes. These range from new editions of the Guiana explorations of Sir Walter Raleigh (1997) to German sailor Hans Staden’s 16th century account of captivity and cannibalism in Brazil (2008, co-edited with Michael Harbsmeir) as well as major scholarly collections such as Histories and Historicities in Amazonia (2003), In Darkness and Secrecy: The Anthropology of Assault Sorcery and Witchcraft in Amazonia (2004, co-edited with Robin Wright), nineteenth century travel writing in South America (2004), (continued)
Anthropologies of Guyana (2009, co-edited with former advisee Stephanie Aleman), and Human No More: Digital Subjectivities, Unhuman Subjects, and the End of Anthropology (2012, co-edited with Michael Wesch). The 2012 edited volume reflects Professor Whitehead’s growing fascination with “the post-human,” an extension of his intellectual interests in human-animal relations. The latter resulted in “Loving, Being, Killing Animals” in an edited volume in press on writing animals into South American history. Neil Whitehead would no doubt be pleased that his editorship and authorship continue in the post-human domain. He is listed as senior editor, with Swedish anthropologist Sverker Finnstrom, of Virtual War and Magical Death (Duke, 2013), whose chapters range from the virtual warfare of drones, high-altitude bombing, U.S. Army human terrain systems, and computer gaming to the magical assaults of indigenous sorcerers. Another co-edited volume, on ethnopornography, is currently under submission. He also became fascinated with the poetics of Goth performance, joining the band Blood Jewel, traveling to Kiev, Ukraine for the Children of the Night Festival, and theorizing it in his writings.

Professor Whitehead’s classroom teaching included an innovative course on “The Anthropology of Landscape,” seminars on “Contemporary Theory in Cultural Anthropology,” and “The Anthropology of Shamanism and the Occult,” which he insisted bear the number Anthropology 666. His challenging graduate seminar, “The Anthropologies of Violence and Sexuality,” theorized both violence and “ethnopornography.” He was a demanding, supportive, and fiercely loyal adviser to the many graduate students he supervised on subjects ranging from suicide bombers in Ramallah to landscape and ethnogenesis on the Guyana-Brazilian border. His students counted themselves as his close friends, and he and Theresa often invited them to their Shorewood Hills home for feasts of venison or walleye that he had himself procured. Neil Whitehead is survived by his wife Theresa; his children Luke, Florence, Rose, and Natalie; his sister Kim; and his nieces Begum, Indira, and Banu. Felled by an untreatable cancer at the height of his intellectual powers, he leaves behind a legacy of brilliant, often provocative, scholarly writings that will long continue to influence the discipline of anthropology.

MEMORIAL COMMITTEE
Maria Lepowsky
MEMORIAL RESOLUTION OF THE FACULTY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON
ON THE DEATH OF PROFESSOR EMERITUS WARREN C. YOUNG

Warren Clarence Young passed away on March 2, 2012 in Gainesville, Florida at the age of 88 after a brief illness. Warren was born to Clarence and Atha (Hungerford) Young in Mauston, Wisconsin, on September 7, 1923. He graduated from Mauston High School and earned a BS in mechanical engineering at the University of Wisconsin in 1944. Upon graduation, he joined the U.S. Navy, trained as a radio signalman at Fort Sill, Oklahoma, spent time in Washington, DC, and served aboard an aircraft carrier stationed in Boston until the end of WWII. Warren married Mary Currier of Kensington, Kansas, on March 3, 1945, while he was still in the service. Upon returning to Wisconsin at the end of the war, Warren completed his MS in mechanical engineering and PhD in engineering mechanics at UW-Madison, while he and Mary raised their three boys. Warren taught at the University of Wisconsin from 1956 until his retirement in 1984. He was a highly regarded teacher who graduated many doctoral students, authored several scientific papers, and held a patent. Warren taught courses in mechanics/strength of materials, experimental stress analysis, plates and shells, and structural instability. He was particularly capable in experimental mechanics and related aspects of theoretical mechanics, physics, and instrumentation. His work was interdisciplinary and of the highest quality. During the 1960s and 1970s, he was a major participant in the College of Engineering’s Energy Storage Program. Warren was the continuing author of Roark’s Formulas for Stress and Strain, best known as Roark and Young, an internationally respected handbook of engineering, and coauthor of Advanced Mechanics of Materials by Cook and Young. Warren was a registered professional engineer in the state of Wisconsin and an active member of both the Society for Experimental Mechanics and the American Society for Engineering Education. He served as a consultant in theoretical and experimental stress analysis for national laboratories involved in research on high energy physics, as well as for manufacturers and users of pressure vessels, cranes, grinding mills, and Great Lakes ore carriers. Warren had an impeccable reputation as an honest and fair gentleman and was great to work with or to work for.

Compatible with his interest in people and passion for adventure and technology, Warren (accompanied by Mary and their children) served for two years as a visiting professor and directed a United States Agency for International Development (USAID) project associated with the Bengal Engineering College, Calcutta, India during the mid-1960s and in the summer of 1968. In Indonesia, he was a team leader working with other U.S. faculty located in numerous Indian cities. Warren and Mary lived in Indonesia from the summer of 1981 through summer of 1983. During this period, he led an energy research team at the University in Bandung, West Java, again under USAID sponsorship.

Being a true Wisconsinite, Warren was an avid deer hunter, and the family enjoyed considerable time on a piece of country woods near Mauston, better known as “the farm.” Warren was a warm, humble, patient, honest, straightforward man of quiet faith, great integrity, boundless curiosity, and an uncanny ability to fix just about anything. He (with Mary’s help) designed and built his own homes, repaired his own cars, and was a private pilot. He and Mary shared a love of adventure, from tent camping to cruises, and traveled on five continents. They were quiet but effective leaders in their church (Orchard Ridge United Church of Christ) while Madison residents and worked hard for community outreach projects. Warren and Mary moved to Homosassa, Florida in 1989 and to Gainesville, Florida in 2005, during which time they continued their strong church affiliations.
Warren was preceded in death by his parents; his sister, Janet Amsrud (Wausau, Wisconsin); sister-in-law Lillian Currier (Madison, Wisconsin); and four nephews. He is survived by his devoted wife of 67 years, Mary; sons Richard (Brown County, Indiana), James (Jones County, Iowa), and John (Eau Claire, Wisconsin); grandchildren Rebecca Young (Alaska), Annabeth Young (Indiana), and Bryan Young (Wisconsin); brother-in-law Fred Currier of Madison; and numerous cousins, nieces and nephews.

MEMORIAL COMMITTEE
Robert D. Cook
Roxann L. Engelstad
Edward G. Lovell
Michael E. Plesha
Robert E. Rowlands, chair
The meeting was called to order by Interim Chancellor David Ward at 3:32 p.m. with 154 voting members present.

1. Memorial resolutions were presented for: Doc. No.
   Professor Emerita Patricia A. Hummel 2407
   Professor Emeritus Maurice J. Meisner 2408
   Professor Emeritus Charles R. Stearns 2409

2. Chancellor Ward presided over the presentation of the 2012-2013 Hilldale Awards. The recipients are: Arts and Humanities Division: Jack F. Damer (Art); Biological Sciences Division: Barry S. Ganetzky (Genetics); Physical Sciences Division: Francis L. Halzen (Physics); Social Studies Division: Sharon L. Dunwoody (Journalism and Mass Communication).

3. Announcements/Informational Items.
   Interim Vice Provost Christopher Olsen spoke about the university’s religious observances policy, particularly with respect to the timing of Rosh Hashanah in fall 2013, which will occur on the second day of classes. He asked senators to make their departments aware of the issue as it pertains to the notification guidelines contained in the policy.
   Professor Mark Cook updated the senate on the proposed College of the Arts and responded to a question and a comment about the matter. He also asked senators to remind their departmental colleagues to vote in the elections for faculty-elected committees.

4. Question Period.
   Chancellor Ward responded to a question from Assistant Professor Noah Feinstein (district 27) regarding whether the university is obliged to act on a shared governance committee’s recommendation, which is based on university policy, and why a particular case would merit an exception.

**AUTOMATIC CONSENT BUSINESS**

5. The minutes of 4 March 2013 were approved as distributed.

**REPORTS**

   There were several questions and comments.
REPORTS, cont’d

7. Professor Que Lan submitted for informational purposes the Advisory Committee for the Office for Equity and Diversity Annual Report for 2010-2011. There were no questions or comments.

8. Professor Katrina Forest submitted for informational purposes the Information Technology Committee Annual Report for 2011-2012. There were no questions or comments.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

9. Professor Cook moved to adopt the University Committee Recommendation to Amend Faculty Policies and Procedures 4.10. Divisional Executive Committees: Membership. The motion passed without negative vote.

The meeting adjourned at 5:01 p.m.

Andrea Poehling
Secretary of the Faculty
REPORT OF ELECTIONS TO UW-MADISON FACULTY COMMITTEES FOR 2013-2014

As a result of the regular elections held in April 2013, the following faculty members have been elected to the committees listed below. A total of 670 eligible voters cast votes in the spring election.

COMMISSION ON FACULTY COMPENSATION AND ECONOMIC BENEFITS
(605 eligible voters cast votes in this election)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor Dominique Brossard</td>
<td>Life Sciences Communication; CALS</td>
<td>social studies</td>
<td>3-year term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Robert Hamers</td>
<td>Chemistry; L&amp;S</td>
<td>physical sciences</td>
<td>3-year term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor Eric Raimy</td>
<td>English; L&amp;S</td>
<td>arts and humanities</td>
<td>1-year term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor James Sweet</td>
<td>History; L&amp;S</td>
<td>arts and humanities</td>
<td>3-year term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMITTEE ON FACULTY RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES
(582 eligible voters cast votes in this election)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor Susan Coppersmith</td>
<td>Physics; L&amp;S</td>
<td>physical sciences</td>
<td>3-year term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor Nancy Kendall</td>
<td>Educational Policy Studies; EDUC</td>
<td>social studies</td>
<td>3-year term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Caroline Levine</td>
<td>English; L&amp;S</td>
<td>arts and humanities</td>
<td>3-year term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LIBRARY COMMITTEE
(552 eligible voters cast votes in this election)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor Kyung-Sun Kim</td>
<td>Library and Information Studies; L&amp;S</td>
<td>social studies</td>
<td>4-year term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Daniel Klingenberg</td>
<td>Chemical and Biological Engineering; ENGR</td>
<td>physical sciences</td>
<td>4-year term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE
(601 eligible voters cast votes in this election)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor Dorothy Farrar-Edwards</td>
<td>Kinesiology; EDUC</td>
<td>social studies</td>
<td>3-year term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor M. Elizabeth Meyerand</td>
<td>Biomedical Engineering; ENGR / Medical Physics; SMPH</td>
<td>biological sciences</td>
<td>3-year term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
(Only members of the Faculty Senate are eligible to vote for candidates to serve on the Committee on Committees; 95 senators cast votes in this election)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor Judith Burstyn</td>
<td>Chemistry; L&amp;S</td>
<td>physical sciences</td>
<td>4-year term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. Functions of the Campus Diversity and Climate Committee (CDCC)

The functions of the Campus Diversity and Climate Committee, as outlined in Faculty Policies and Procedures 6.27., are as follows:

FUNCTIONS. This shared governance body advises the administration, the faculty, the academic staff, the classified staff, and the recognized student governance organization on campus diversity and climate policy, which strives to create an environment where each individual feels respected, valued and supported, while respecting academic freedom and freedom of speech.

1. Provides for faculty, staff and student participation in long-range planning.
2. Meets twice annually with the chancellor and provost to discuss policy and progress.
3. Hears reports from groups, units, programs and administrators.
4. Holds the annual campus-wide policy and progress forum.
5. Assists the administration in the preparation of annual reports to the UW System, Faculty Senate, Academic Staff Assembly, the Council for Nonrepresented Classified Staff, represented labor groups, and student governance body.
6. Meets periodically with deans and directors to discuss policy and progress.
7. Collaborates with other groups, programs and units on matters of diversity and climate.

II. Current Year’s Activities

In spring semester 2012, the CDCC elected a new co-chair, Professor Marlys Macken from the Department of Linguistics. During the summer, Co-chair Macken met several times with 2011-2012 CDCC Co-chair Tim Shedd (on sabbatical 2012-2013) and several of the spring 2012 subcommittees to review the work and recommendations of the past year, discuss issues and concerns, and prepare for the transition in co-chairs and the upcoming academic year. In early fall 2012, Professor Macken met with shared governance groups to hear concerns and goals of the groups for diversity and climate. In October, Professor Macken with the University Committee (UC) regarding the functions of the CDCC, a meeting that followed up on Co-chair Shedd’s meeting with the UC spring 2012.

2012-2013 projects included:

Monthly Meetings. The CDCC meets the fourth Wednesday of each month September through May. This academic year, the CDCC met several additional times to meet the goal of developing a process to create a new diversity plan to replace Plan 2008.

Long-range Diversity Planning. At the beginning of the new academic year, the Committee on Committees, the Academic Staff Executive Committee, the Associated Students of Madison, and the chancellor made new appointments to the CDCC. In early November, the University Committee, in consultation with Provost Paul M. DeLuca, Jr., charged the CDCC to appoint a representative ad hoc committee of faculty, staff and students to develop a comprehensive proposal for a new diversity plan for UW-Madison. The UC charge asked the CDCC to communicate and consult with the relevant governance bodies and the administration and requested that the draft diversity plan be completed by no later than 1 April 2013 so that it can be presented for review and endorsement by the Faculty Senate, the Academic Staff Assembly and the ASM Student Council prior to the end of the academic year. The UC charge letter to the CDCC is presented in Appendix A.
At the CDCC meeting on November 14, 2012, each of the four shared governance groups gave presentations to the CDCC on their group, membership, governance structure, and goals in anticipation of creating the ad hoc committee. The CDCC discussed the UC charge and how best to meet the goals outlined: the new committee was named the “Ad Hoc Diversity Planning Committee (AHDPC),” and CDCC planned a campus-wide nomination process, including nominations from CDCC members. Concern was expressed over the due date of April 1, 2013, which gave the ad hoc committee only a short timeline within which to complete its work.

Nomination Process.  (i) CDCC Co-chair Macken invited deans, directors, and diversity-and-climate-related campus committees, programs and advising units to nominate persons through the shared governance process to serve on the AHDPC. All nominations received by the CDCC were sent on to the respective shared governance groups. (ii) In addition, the vice provost’s office set up a website nomination process.

Password-Protected Website of Key Diversity Documents. Co-chair Macken created a password-protected website and uploaded key diversity documents to inform CDCC members about earlier diversity planning efforts and to serve as a resource guide. AHDPC members were given authorized access to the website. In addition, the Office of the Vice Provost compiled a resource binder for use by the AHDPC, with copies to the CDCC.

Ad Hoc Diversity Planning Committee. The membership of the AHDPC and the CDCC charge to the AHDPC were passed by motions at the December CDCC meeting. The membership list of the AHDPC is presented in Appendix B. The CDCC charge to the AHDPC is presented in Appendix C.

Reports from Groups, Units, Programs and Administrators. At meetings in the fall and spring, reports were presented to the CDCC by Vice Provost Williams’ staff on diversity activities with his office and across campus, and on the diversity forums (two reports); and updates on the diversity planning process by AHDPC Co-chairs Ruth Litovsky, Professor of Communication Sciences and Disorders, and Michael Jackson, MBA candidate. Presentations by Human Resources Director Bob Lavigna on the HR Design Project’s processes and Sara Lazenby of the Office of Academic Planning and Institutional Research on critical diversity data are on schedule for the CDCC regular meeting in April. The CDCC has worked closely with the UC and Provost DeLuca through the AHDPC planning months, and Provost DeLuca is scheduled to attend the CDCC May meeting. An invitation to attend has been extended to the chancellor, but it may be difficult to add this meeting to chancellor’s full calendar.

III. Current Issues and Concerns

CDCC Functions. Discussions have focused on the need to clarify the committee’s main functions, with the agreement to create subcommittees or small working groups vested with responsibility and oversight for specific aspects of the committee’s charge, i.e., its advisory functions, the review of policy and progress with deans, directors and administration, and the CDCC role in planning and holding the annual campus-wide forum.

IV. Future Issues and Goals

The New Campus Diversity Plan and CDCC’s role.  Looking ahead to the roll-out of the new campus diversity plan, the CDCC will work toward strengthening its committee structure and processes to fulfill its charge to maximum effect as the standing shared governance committee to advise the administration, the faculty, the academic staff, the classified staff, and the recognized student governance organization on campus diversity and climate policy. To this end, the CDCC will work closely with the University Committee and the administration to align its efforts campus-wide.

(continued)
V. Summary / Recommendations

The CDCC will continue to work intensively the coming year on the new diversity plan for UW-Madison in alignment with the University Committee, the administration and the AHDPC. Additional recommendations for academic year 2013-2014 and possible reorganization of the CDCC will be considered at the May 22, 2013 meeting.

VI. 2012-2013 CDCC Committee Membership

Chancellor’s Designee
Damon Williams, Vice Provost and Chief Diversity Officer; CDCC co-chair

Faculty
Joan Fujimura, Sociology
Marlys Macken, Linguistics; CDCC co-chair
Steven Nakada, Urology
Timothy Shedd, Mechanical Engineering
Karl Shoemaker, History

Academic Staff
Carolyn Kruse, College Library
Maria Muniagurria, Economics
Claudia Mosley, Center for Educational Opportunity

Classified Staff
Rosana Ellmann, Chemistry
Adin Palau, Office of Human Resources
John Peterson, Molecular Biology

Students
Allie Gardner
Beth Huang
Courtney Jackson (spring)
Brittany Moes (fall)
Emily Reich

Alumni and Community
Mario Garcia Sierra, MG&E, Centro Hispano
Jonathan Gramling, Capital City Hues
Astra Iheukumere, City of Madison Mayor’s Office
Annette Miller, MG&E

Ex officio, non-voting
Jacqueline DeWalt, Division of Diversity, Equity and Educational Achievement
Seema Kapani, Learning Communities
Heidi Lang, Wisconsin Union
Sara Lazenby, Academic Planning and Institutional Research
Jocelyn Milner, Academic Planning and Institutional Research
Ruby Paredes, Office of the Vice Provost and Chief Diversity Officer
Luis Piñero, Office for Equity and Diversity
Terry Ruzicka, Division of Enrollment Management
Argyle Wade, Division of Student Life

(continued)
14 November 2012

Professor Marlys Macken
1168 Van Hise Hall
Campus

Dear Professor Macken:

Thank you for meeting with the University Committee on 29 October 2012 regarding the functions of the Campus Diversity and Climate Committee, which you co-chair.

As part of the discussion, the UC indicated that it would be developing a charge to the CDCC in order to advance the next campus diversity plan. As provided in Faculty Policies and Procedures, the Campus Diversity and Climate Committee has the responsibility to advise the administration, the faculty, the academic and classified staff, and the students on campus diversity and climate policy and to participate in long-range planning for the campus. In that context, the University Committee charges the CDCC to appoint a representative ad hoc committee of faculty, staff, and students to develop a comprehensive proposal for a new diversity plan for UW-Madison. We ask that because this will be a shared governance committee that you work with ASM, ASPC and the UC to identify individuals to appoint to it. The University Committee stands ready to provide advice and support for the CDCC as it develops a charge for the ad hoc committee, and once appointed requests that it provide periodic updates on its progress to the CDCC, which in turn is asked to communicate and consult with the relevant governance bodies and the administration.

The UC asks that the draft diversity plan be completed by no later than 1 April 2013 so that it can be presented for endorsement by the faculty senate, the academic staff assembly, and the ASM student council prior to the end of the academic year.

The UC very much appreciates your dedication and contributions to shared governance and your service on the CDCC.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Mark Cook, chair

c: Provost Paul DeLuca
   Vice Provost Damon Williams

The University Committee
133 Bascom Hall   University of Wisconsin-Madison   500 Lincoln Drive   Madison, Wisconsin 53706-1380
608/262-3956   Fax: 608/265-5728   http://www.uwm.edu/ucncomm/

(continued)
Appendix B

Ad Hoc Diversity Planning Committee

Students
Ryan Adserias
Justin Bloesch
Haley Frieler
Jincheng Huang
Aliya Iftikhar, alternate
Michael Jackson (co-chair)

Classified Staff
Robert Anderson, Inventory Control Coordinator Advanced, Materials Distribution Services
Ladera Barnes, Program and Policy Supervisor, School of Medicine and Public Health
Nicolas Davis, IS Technical Services Consultant/Admin, Division of Information Technology
Paula Gates, HR Assistant, Division of Enrollment Management
Vanika Mock, Payroll and Benefits Specialist, Division of Continuing Studies

Faculty
Larry Church, Sherwood R. Volkman-Bascom Professor of Law, Law School
Joan Fujimura, Professor, Department of Sociology, College of Letters and Science
Alberta Gloria, Professor, Department of Counseling Psychology, School of Education
Amaud Johnson, Associate Professor, Department of English, L&S; Director, Wisconsin Institute for Creative Writing
Ruth Litovsky (co-chair), Professor, Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders, College of Letters and Science

Academic Staff
Ida Balderama-Trudell, Assistant Director and Academic Advisor, POSSE Program
Rodney Horikawa, Senior Student Services Coordinator, Community Partnerships and Outreach, University Health Services
Erica Laughlin, Senior Administrative Program Specialist, IT Academy, Division of Information Technology
Heather McFadden, Administrative Program Specialist, Research Compliance, Graduate School; Lecturer, Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis, School of Education
Lillian Tong, Faculty Associate, Institute for Biology Education

Ex officio
Kaleem Caire, President/CEO, Urban League of Greater Madison
Frances Huntley Cooper, Chair of the Madison College Board
Margaret Harrigan, Distinguished Policy and Planning Analyst, Academic Planning and Institutional Research
Amy Kerwin, Chief Educational Opportunities Officer at Great Lakes Higher Education
Robert Lavigna, Director, Office of Human Resources
Marlys Macken, Professor, Department of Linguistics; Campus Diversity and Climate Committee Co-chair
Ruby Paredes, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Office of the Vice Provost for Diversity and Climate
Gloria Reyes, President of the Board of Directors, Centro Hispano
Floyd Rose, President of 100 Black Men of Madison
Lindsey Stoddard Cameron, Coordinator New Faculty Services, Office of the Secretary of the Faculty
Damon Williams, Associate Vice Chancellor; Campus Diversity and Climate Committee Co-chair
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# University of Wisconsin–Madison
## Ad Hoc Diversity Planning Committee Charter
### December 12, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ad Hoc Committee Name</th>
<th>Ad Hoc Diversity Planning Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>Campus Diversity and Climate Committee. University Committee charge letter to the CDCC attached.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair(s)</td>
<td>Student co-chair selected by ASM. Faculty co-chair selected by the University Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>OQI staff member at the request of the ad hoc committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad Hoc Committee Members</td>
<td>Five members appointed by each of the four university shared governance bodies for classified staff, academic staff (ASEC), students (ASM), faculty (University Committee). Ten ex officio non-voting members: five alumni and community members appointed by the chancellor; three members appointed by the Offices of Administrative Legal Services, Academic Planning and Institutional Research, and Human Resources; co-chairs of the Campus Diversity and Climate Committee. Member list attached.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aims</td>
<td>Develop a comprehensive proposal for a new diversity plan for UW-Madison.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignments</td>
<td>Draft diversity plan. Periodic reports provided to the CDCC, relevant governance bodies, and the administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline</td>
<td>Draft diversity plan by no later than April 1, 2013, so that it can be presented for endorsement by the Faculty Senate, the Academic Staff Assembly and the ASM Student Council prior to the end of the academic year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Resources</td>
<td>Cross-campus resource team provided by the CDCC. Password-protected website with key documents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. STATEMENT OF COMMITTEE FUNCTIONS/CHARGE

Pursuant to Faculty Policies and Procedures 6.30.B., the functions of the Campus Transportation Committee (CTC) are as follows:

1. Provides advice and recommendations to the administration and all governance bodies on policies and budgetary matters, including rates, relating to all aspects of pedestrian and motorized and nonmotorized vehicular transportation and parking on the campus.

2. Interprets policies related to transportation and parking adopted by governance bodies.

3. Ensures appropriate consultation of governance bodies regarding proposed changes in any policies.

4. Initiates and recommends projects for addressing campus transportation needs including projects to enhance pedestrian, bicycle, bus, and automobile access to the campus. Such recommendations are to be considered in detail by the Division of Facilities Planning and Management, or other appropriate divisions of the university, and the Campus Planning Committee.

5. Provides representation on all building committees for projects that include or affect transportation facilities.

6. Creates subcommittees to address issues related to particular aspects of the campus transportation system.

II. REPORT SUMMARY

The following report contains information for the last two years of CTC activities. Two years are included to provide a longer history of committee activity and votes, and to provide information for academic year 2010-2011 in which a report was not formally submitted and presented. The report contains summaries of committee discussions, actions and votes. Additional details are provided in the meeting minutes found at http://transportation.wisc.edu/customergroups/committee.aspx.

III. CURRENT OR PAST YEAR’S ACTIVITIES

September 2010 to August 2011
• 8 Campus Transportation Committee Meetings
• Subcommittee(s) met as needed

Subcommittee:
• Bicycle-Pedestrian

SEE APPENDIX A FOR MINORITY DISSENT STATEMENT 1

Transportation Services recommended a number of changes as a result of an internal review of their budget and based on feedback from open forums held across the campus. Over 400 comments were received from forum and website responses. Transportation Services was operating with a $1 million structural budget deficit. The goals of the program changes were to eliminate the structural deficit by asking all users of

(continued)
parking and transportation programs to pay an equitable share, improve the efficiency of parking operations, and reduce the burden on permit holders. Additionally, Chair David Noyce completed a small study of moped use on campus to provide quantitative information for future decisions on moped operations. The Bicycle-Pedestrian Subcommittee voted on and approved a recommendation to consolidate moped parking and eliminate moped parking in front of buildings that was considered with the moped discussion.

SEE APPENDIX A FOR MINORITY DISSENT STATEMENT

Actions taken by the CTC – September 2010-May 2011

Voted to approve:
- Increased parking citation rates an average of $15.
- Increased cost of Business Alternate permits to 1/3rd the cost of the base lot permit rate.
- Changed the Departmental reserved stall fee to $500 plus the cost of the base lot permit.
- Eliminated the Departmental permit that allowed unrestricted access into all lots and created a Service permit with designated stalls throughout campus. Departments are now required to purchase Service permits.

Important Votes:

December 2010 – CTC had a lengthy discussion at the December 2010 meeting on the subsidized bus pass. Discussion focused on whether a small fee should be charged to acquire a bus pass to help offset the rising cost of this service. Other possible bus pass options discussed included a winter pass for those who bike or walk in the warmer months, or limited ride passes for those who do not use the bus regularly. Continuing to subsidize the current bus pass program will add $300-$400 to the cost of an annual permit. After considerable discussion:

- Initial motion was made to end the debate on the bus pass issue. Vote: 3 YES, 6 NO, 0 ABSTAINED.
- Amendment to the motion was made to keep the bus pass subsidized. Vote: 2 YES, 4 NO, 3 ABSTAINED. Motion failed and returned back to original motion.
- Amended motion to phase in a fee of $50 over a 4 year period. Vote: 3 YES, 4 NO, 2 ABSTAINED. Motion failed and returned back to original motion.
- Motion was made to postpone charging for bus pass; free for two years and charging third and fourth years to complete the four-year parking (revenue) plan. Vote: 4 YES, 4 NO, 1 ABSTAINED. Motion tied and return back to original motion to charge $50 for bus pass and increase parking rates as stated above.
- Motion to reconsider original amendment (keep bus pass subsidized). Vote: 5 YES, 4 NO, 0 ABSTAINED. Motion passed.
- Motion was made to reconsider the charging plan for the annual bus pass program; bus pass remains free for two years and then start charging in the third and fourth years to complete a four-year plan. Vote: 5 YES, 4 NO, 0 ABSTAIN. Motion passed.

A following motion was made to take this recommendation to the Vice Chancellor for Administration:

Motion to delay charging for the bus pas until FY14; in favor of the increase of parking fees and change in parking levels proposed. Vote: 6 YES, 3 NO, 0 ABSTAINED. Motion passed.
January 2011 – CTC considered a resolution from academic staff to not charge for a bus pass. Patrick Kass met with Vice Chancellor Darrell Bazzell on January 6, 2011 to discuss. The vice chancellor approved all of the other recommended changes including no charge for the bus pass. Changes included:

- Business Alternates permit at 1/3 the cost of the annual base lot permit rate.
- Add new descriptors for citations and raise rates accordingly.
- Allow individual to purchase reserved stalls.
- Change department reservation stall rates.
- Change Universal Department permits to Service Stall permits.
- Increase bagged meter fees.
- Create an hourly rate for parking garages.
- Migrate away from non-dated permits.
- Restructure of permit prices – convert from three levels to two with an evening permit option over four years.
- Charge departments that are not currently paying for parking stalls on campus.
- Continue to convert state disabled stalls to UW disabled stalls (note: a motion in February was made and passed that did not include this item).
- Restrict lots for major Special Events donors and redirect base lot holders to designated lots.
- No user charge for the subsidized bus pass this year.

Implementation of changes will occur at two separate times: July 1, 2011 and September 1, 2011.

Effective July 1, 2011 – citations, bagged meter fees, hourly rates in garages, daily rates (non-dated permits).

Effective September 1, 2011 – Any Base Lot permit related fee.

Motion was made to recommend approval of rates without Flex permits or Evening permits and individual reserved stalls with the change of base lot rates Level 1 from $571 to $575 and Level 2 from $866 to $870.

Vote: 5 YES, 0 NO, 2 ABSTAINED. Motion passed.

February 2011 – CTC learned that the chancellor requested a hold on the recommended cost changes. The chancellor is comfortable with the efficiency changes but not with all of the annual base lot rate changes. Additionally, there was no interest in individual reserved stalls. The following proposed changes in parking rates were supported by the chancellor: Level 2 to Level 3 prices $745 to $800; Level 3 rate increase from $1,085 to $1,200. Level 1 rate increase was held.

CTC considered a Flex Permit and rate proposal by Transportation Services. Even though this proposal is part of a four-year program, Transportation Services requested only the first year to be approved.

Recommended:

- Increase the cost by $1 ($3 to $4) for the first four hours
- Increase the hourly rate to $1 ($0.75 to $1) per hour after four hours
- Increase the daily maximum from $6 to $8
- Implement an evening rate of $0.75 per hour in lots that are controlled and not free after 4:30 p.m.
  - Customer would not exceed the daily limit even if they parked into the evening
  - For lots controlled on Saturday, the evening rate would apply
  - Permits would be honored in any surface lot

Motion was made to recommend the changes to the flex rates for a one-year program with the intent to maintain the rates through FY13. Vote: 7 YES, 0 NO, 1 ABSTAINED. Motion passed.

(continued)
CTC also discussed the evening parking program. Patrick Kass distributed the evening parking proposal handout, green/yellow parking lot hours of control map and yellow/red parking lot rate re-designation map.

Motion was made to recommend approval of rates without flex permits or evening permits and individual reserved stalls with the change of base lot rates Level 1 from $571 to $575 and Level 2 from $866 to $870. Vote: 5 YES, 0 NO, 2 ABSTAINED. Motion passed.

Motion was made to reconsider recommendation from January 7, 2011 meeting. Amendment was made to remove the UW disabled parking portion.


Moved to approve all items except for the item that was separated for recommendations. Roll call vote: YES – S. Arnold, A. Habel, J. Patz, C. Williams; NO – 0; ABSTAINED – T. Gloeckler, J. Matzner. Motion passed.

Moved to defer other items to next meeting. Vote: 7 YES, 0 NO, 0 ABSTAINED. Motion passed.

The items below were presented to the CTC as part of the director’s report between September 2010 and May 2011. Comments and concerns expressed by the CTC membership can be found in the individual meeting minutes.

- Began installation of a three-year project to install a new gate access and revenue control system in all campus garages and standardized the visitor parking rates. Implemented new access revenue control equipment installed at Lot 17, 20, 76, 80 and 83.
- Developed a parking validation system for departments that allows them to pay only for the parking used instead of pre-purchasing a half day or all day permit.
- Converted the state disabled parking spaces on campus over to spaces requiring a UW disabled permit or visitor parking payment.
- Restricted pre-sold parking lots during major special events only to event patrons.
- Renegotiated the revenue-sharing model with athletics from 50/50 to 60/40. The model was also changed from splitting net revenues to one where athletics leases all spaces for donor parking at a reduced rate, and Transportation Services retains all day-of-games sales.
- Eliminated free departmental parking across campus.
- Transportation Services Commuter Solutions completed a supply-and-demand analysis and inventory of all bicycle parking areas to assist in forecasting supply needs for future building construction.
- Rebid the car sharing contract to eliminate the annual cash subsidy of the program.

SEE APPENDIX A FOR MINORITY DISSENT STATEMENTS 3, 4 AND 5

September 2011 to May 2012
- 7 Campus Transportation Committee meetings
- Subcommittee met as needed

Subcommittee:
- Bicycle-Pedestrian
During this academic year, Transportation Services recommended several changes to continue the efforts to have all users of parking and transportation programs pay for the service they use and to increase the efficiency of the overall parking programs. Note that Transportation Services faced a decrease in the supply of parking due to new building construction. Transportation Services had also initiated a $30 million project to expand the UW Hospital parking structure to replace the parking lost on the west campus. CTC addressed the proposed changes as described below.

**Actions taken by the CTC – September 2011-May 2012**

**Voted to approve:**
- Increase annual permits by $45 per year.
- Increase Flex daytime parking rates and implement charging in the evenings for controlled parking lots.
- Charge $12 per space per day for construction and maintenance projects that temporarily displace parking.
- Convert the current parking payroll deduction policy from 9 deductions taken on the “A” check to deduct parking from all checks based on the payroll status of the individual. The number of deductions would be 9, 12, or 24.
- Implement a night permit; garage specific for $40 and various surface lots for $125.
- Extend hours of control of four parking structures until midnight, Monday through Friday.
- Transportation Services to implement a designated moped parking lot permit system to replace the current zone system.

*SEE APPENDIX A FOR MINORITY DISSENT STATEMENT 6*

**Important Votes:**

**February 2012** – Patrick Kass provided information describing Transportation Services program changes. The three-level conversion to two levels has been placed on hold. Recommend one year increase of $45 on annual permits for FY13. Visitor and parking meter rates will not change because an increase was implemented last year. Some meters will be removed from parking structures. No longer charging a key deposit for bike lockers; instead implementing a lost-key fee at $65. Grainger parking structure will need to relocate the current booths. Same issues as in Lot 46 Lake/ Frances Street ramp. Provost requested the lowest possible rate for garage specific night permit at $40. The night permit will be marketed to students.

Flex parking rate changes will increase in FY13 and begin to charge Flex customers at night and Saturdays in controlled lots. Begin to charge construction projects for stalls used by staging areas. The cost would be $12 per day per stall beginning July 1, 2012. Payroll deduction changes would include offering 9, 12 and 24 deductions based on job classification and how often an employee receives a paycheck. Implement in September 2012.

Motion was made to approve the FY13 Price Rate Schedule provide by Transportation Services. Vote: 6 YES, 0 NO, 1 ABSTAINED. Motion approved. Note: CTC as a whole commented that they were generally not in favor of rate increases given the current fiscal environment but understood the need of Transportation Services and hence the passing vote.

Also note that:
1. Emeriti parking and voucher not a part of the approval. Still in development stages.
2. Moped lot redesignation not a part of the approval.

(continued)
April 2012 – Moped Policy. Transportation Services conducted two moped open forums to discuss changes. First one had low turnout. Second presentation had higher attendance. Overall, individuals were concerned about the changes but understood the safety issues. Permit hours of control 7:00 a.m to 4:30 p.m.; otherwise open to all moped users. Presentation was included on website for others to view. Emailed all moped permit holders on the changes. Received limited feedback. Moped permit valid year around September 1 to August 31. Chair David Noyce noted that in all the time he has been on the committee, the moped changes are one of the most significant accomplishments, especially from a safety perspective.

Motion to approve the new moped policy. Vote: 5 YES, 0 NO, 2 ABSTAINED. Motion passed.

SEE APPENDIX A FOR MINORITY DISSENT STATEMENT 7

The items below were presented to the CTC as part of the director’s report between September 2011 and May 2012. Comments and concerns expressed by the CTC membership can be found in the individual meeting minutes.

- Provided emeriti staff with a voucher for 24 uses valid in visitor parking areas. The voucher will be issued on an annual basis. The user would be required to pay for uses above the 24.
- Transportation Services issued 1,931 moped permits, which was an increase of 137 permits from the previous year, and continued to conduct an educational campaign.
- Created a two-stage internal parking citation appeal process and eliminated bond posting for university affiliates.
- Transportation Services met with ASM to revise the campus bus funding model. Cut 10% from the campus bus service hours after negotiations with ASM over the cost share of the program. The routes were reconfigured to eliminate underperforming services and to maintain headway on high demand routes.
- Transportation Services is eliminating management of the SafeCab program effective July 1, 2012.
- Transportation Services reviewed the bus pass system, distribution of passes and eligibility. Monitored the deactivation of bus passes for staff that have ended UW employment.
- Transportation Services revised evening parking regulations to allow any valid permit to park in lots restricted after 4:30 p.m.
- Transportation Services completed the 2012 on-board campus survey administered by Transportation Services.
- Transportation Services created a formal citation process for bike parking in areas that are designated for bikes.
- Request that construction projects pay for parking spaces that are taken as staging areas.

SEE APPENDIX A FOR MINORITY DISSENT STATEMENT 8

IV. CURRENT ISSUES OR CONCERNS

CTC voted to support changes to elements of the UW parking system for academic year 2012-2013 as noted above. In general, discussion items considered by the CTC in the current academic year are focused on policy and cost changes that will allow Transportation Services to provide better parking management for both employees and visitors, eliminate policy exceptions and inconsistencies, and reduce demand for limited parking resources.
The following items were presented in the director’s report for CTC comment:

- Implement a parking replacement charge for capital projects that permanently remove parking spaces that could be used to fund the construction of new parking facilities.
- Develop an annual parking permit renewal system in lieu of the current priority ranking system since 80% of the employees get the same annual parking lot every year.
- Complete the study of the campus bus system and reconfigure routes based on the study to maximize efficiency and customer need.
- Continue to negotiate with ASM to increase their funding of the campus bus service to a level equal to student ridership.
- Develop a comprehensive maintenance plan for the campus parking structures.
- Complete the expansion of the hospital parking structure (Lot 75) to offset parking losses (Lots 60 and 85) and meet increased visitor and employee parking demands.

SEE APPENDIX A FOR MINORITY DISSENT STATEMENT 9

Operational changes beginning September 1, 2012 include:

1. **Parking Fees** –
   - Annual rates increased $45.
   - Motorcycle permits increased by $20.
   - Moped permits increased $35.
   - Monthly permits increased by $5.
   - Daytime Flex Rates – Trip charge $4 for 4 hours; Hourly rate $1 per hour; Maximum $8.
   - Evening Flex Rates – Trip charge N/A; Hourly rate $0.75 per hour; Maximum $3.75.

2. **Flex Parking Program** –
   - Continue to use Pay-by-Phone (PBP) required for all Flex customers and 1,927 permits were sold, an increase of 206 permits from the previous year.

3. **Mopeds** –
   - Transportation Services, along with other university departments, will continue the educational efforts on proper operation of mopeds. Transportation Services distributed and printed brochures, wrote press releases, and issued warnings and citations.
   - Mopeds were required to display lot-specific moped parking permit to park on campus starting September 1, 2012; moped permits will cost $120.
   - In cooperation with the UW Police Department, Transportation Services will continue outreach and education in areas where mopeds conflict with pedestrians, bicycle and/or vehicular traffic.
   - Transportation Services conducted two moped forums to discuss moped issues such as treating mopeds like other vehicles on campus.

**Commuter Solutions Initiatives presented to the CTC in the director’s reports:**
Transportation Demand Management activities continued for 2011-2012, including the use of the employee bus pass, Campus Bus, Flex Parking, and Zip Car:

(continued)
Fall 2010 survey indicated in good weather, 94% of students, 52% of faculty/staff, and 27% of hospital employees commute to campus by modes other than driving alone. The next survey will take place in spring 2013.

Continued success with the subsidized faculty/staff Madison Metro bus passes – average rides per month of about 137,000 up from 134,000 on average per month in FY11.

Routes 80, 81, 82, 84, and 85 remain among the most heavily used of all Metro routes. Route 85 was absorbed into Route 80 in fall 2012 due to budget constraints.

Transportation Services partnered with ZipCar and currently has eight vehicles placed on campus. Cars are currently located in two car pods at Helen C. White Garage (Lot 6), North Park Street Ramp (Lot 29), Fluno Center Garage (Lot 83), and Lot 59.

The university partnered with Madison B-Cycle to place four bike sharing stations on campus. Discounted memberships are available to university students and employees.

Transportation Services provided valet bicycle parking for home football games for a second year through a partnership with the Bicycle Federation of Wisconsin.

The University Bicycle Resource Center has seen steady visitors since its soft launch in summer 2012 in the lower level of Helen C. White Hall / College Library (Lot 6). The center’s grand opening was in September 2012.

Continue to replace older bus shelters with attractive and uniquely designed UW shelters with warm wooden benches and W crests at a rate of four shelters per year.

SAFEwalk continues to serve the campus community with escorted nighttime walks. Transportation Services discontinued administration of the SAFErider cab program June 30, 2012.

SEE APPENDIX A FOR MINORITY DISSENT STATEMENT 10

V. FUTURE ISSUES FOR CTC DISCUSSION AND CONSIDERATION

Continue to implement the Campus Master Plan/Transportation Master Plan objectives.
Continue exploring ways to offset rising costs of all programs.
Review the subsidized Madison Metro bus pass policy for updates and changes.
Analyze the annual parking assignment process possibly to include priority for TDM measures.
Review changes to the moped policies, permit and parking management.
Work on the hospital parking structure expansion at Lot 75.
Work with Grounds and Physical Plant on snow removal process and issues.
Review the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Athletics concerning cost share of major event parking. CTC was made aware of a potential state statutory conflict concerning how the parking costs are being charged and used.

SEE APPENDIX A FOR MINORITY DISSENT STATEMENT 11

(continued)
VI. SUMMARY/RECOMMENDATIONS

CTC has worked with Transportation Services to balance the complex and often competing needs of transportation users on campus. As traffic congestion continues to grow in the Madison region, the university, UW Hospital, Dane County, city of Madison, village of Shorewood Hills, and major employers need to continue to explore alternatives. A previously completed peer review of Transportation Services provided a springboard to the review of core current and future transportation needs. The cost of operating Transportation Services continues to increase at a rate greater than revenues. CTC will work with Transportation Services as another challenging budget cycle approaches.

SEE APPENDIX A FOR MINORITY DISSENT STATEMENTS 12 AND 13

VII. COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

2010-2011

Faculty
David Noyce (chair), Civil and Environmental Engineering
Jonathan Patz, Environmental Studies
Jason Yackee, Law School

Academic Staff
Steve Arnold, Industrial and Systems Engineering
Jason Bittner, Civil and Environmental Engineering
Timothy Gloeckler, Wisconsin Union

Students
Jo Matzner
Sharad Punuganti
Vacant

Appointments by chancellor, voting
Anne Habel, Molecular Biology
George Pilcher, UW Hospital and Clinics
Coreen Williams, Institute for Research on Poverty

Appointments by chancellor, non-voting
Gary Brown, Facilities Planning and Management
Patrick Kass, Transportation Services

2011-2012

Faculty
David Noyce (chair), Civil and Environmental Engineering
Bin Ran, Civil and Environmental Engineering
Jason Yackee, Law School

Academic Staff
Timothy Gloeckler, Wisconsin Union
Thomas Tews, Geography Library
Ryan Engel, Primate Research Center

Students
Gregory Helfrich (sem. II)
Claire Lynch (sem. I)
Jo Matzner
Christine Mumma

Appointments by chancellor, voting
Timothy Hogensen (sem. I), Center for Dairy Research
Jeffrey Keller (sem. II), Extension Conference Centers
George Pilcher, UW Hospital and Clinics
Coreen Williams, Institute for Research on Poverty

Appointments by chancellor, non-voting
Gary Brown, Facilities Planning and Management
Patrick Kass, Transportation Services

(continued)
APPENDIX A
Minority Dissenting Statements

Megan Healy, CTC Member, September 2012-Present
Herschel Kissinger, CTC Member, September 2012-February 2013
Jo Matzner, CTC Member, September 2008-Present
Brittany Moes, CTC Member, March 2013-Present

**Minority Dissent Statement 1**

Historically, consistent with its charge, the CTC has utilized subcommittees to ensure proper attention is devoted to key issues.

The Budget/Policy Subcommittee and the Transportation Demand Management (TDM)/Safety Subcommittee did not meet from September 2010-May 2012, and the Bicycle-Pedestrian Subcommittee met sporadically. Reinstating the subcommittees would help to ensure that the CTC fulfills its full charge.

Since the Budget/Policy Subcommittee and the Transportation Demand Management (TDM)/Safety Subcommittee did not meet and the Bicycle-Pedestrian Subcommittee met only sporadically, there is no longer a mechanism for the campus to address issues like properly vetting the Transportation Services budget, proposed rate hikes and concerns with snow removal, and there is no formal mechanism to address safety with bus routes, campus construction, etc.

**Minority Dissent Statement 2**

In the immediately preceding sentence of the report, a Bicycle-Pedestrian Subcommittee vote is referenced. Since no meeting minutes are posted for the Bicycle-Pedestrian Subcommittee, there does not appear to be a way to access a copy of the vote or the discussion that preceded it.

**Minority Dissent Statement 3**

As listed under January 2011:

- **Continue to convert state disabled stalls to UW disabled stalls (note: a motion in February was made and passed that did not include this item).**

At February 2011 Meeting:

“[A] motion was made to reconsider recommendation from January 7, 2011 meeting. Amendment was made to remove the UW disabled parking portion. Roll call vote: YES – S. Arnold, T. Gloeckler, J. Matzner, J. Patz. NO – D. Noyce, C. Williams. ABSTAINED – A. Habel. Motion passed.”

As listed in the points directly above:

- Converted the state disabled parking spaces on campus over to spaces requiring a UW disabled permit or visitor parking payment.

There was no vote stated in the minutes from September 2010-May 2012 to approve the conversion of state disabled parking spaces to campus disabled parking spaces.
Prior to the May 6, 2011 CTC meeting, the CTC received a number of carbon copies of emails sent to the chancellor regarding accessible parking. Monica Kamal sent a letter and also spoke at the May 6, 2011 CTC meeting. Ms. Kamal’s letter is included as Appendix B at the end of this document (reprinted with Ms. Kamal’s permission).

In the May 6, 2011 meeting, the minutes show that “T. Gloeckler talked about how at the one forum held on disabled parking that those using the disabled parking spots on campus talked about the failure of the system to meet their needs, especially the need to move around the campus to attend classes or to attend meetings. It is a ‘onesize fits all’ system based on the ‘drive to campus and park’ model in place for able bodied parkers. Whereas those requiring accessible parking spots have varying levels of needs that are not currently being addressed. Guest speaker Monica Kamal– concerns about changes with disabled accessible stalls. Three hours stalls close to building are very important. Transportation Services website is not clear or easily navigated. Looking at policy inclusive for all students. Asked about Federal funding or grants for parking. What are the distances for the relocation of these stalls. Discussed the 3 hour accessible stalls currently in lot 62. All disabled student & faculty are not equal in their in their disabilities.”

The update of the disabled stall conversion at the September 9, 2011 CTC meeting was as follows:
“– Goal for September 1, 2011 was not met. Still on going, could not get the physical work completed. Upgrading all UW Disabled stalls to be compliant with ADA regulations. Adjust space to meet supply and demand of campus needs. Met with Bascom personnel and they are satisfied with the direction of the ADA project. Email the full list of location of disabled stalls to the committee.
– Rob will check out Grainger height restrictions at the entrance.
– At the May 6, 2011 meeting, guest speaker Monica Kamal volunteered to get a working group of people who purchase UW disabled parking permits/and or pay for daily parking to UW disabled parking spots so they could meet with P. Kass and Transportation Services to help develop a system that better fit the needs of those who use those spots. J. Matzner asked if P. Kass ever met with that group. P. Kass said there was not a need to meet with them.”

The CTC should review how transportation affects people with disabilities and they should involve the disability community so people with different types of mobility concerns are involved in the discussions before policy is set and ensure the user group has input in the campus policy that is developed.

**Minority Dissent Statement 4**

- Renegotiated the revenue sharing model with athletics from 50/50 to 60/40. The model was also changed from splitting net revenues to one where athletics leases all spaces for donor parking at a reduced rate and Transportation Services retains all day-of-games sales.

According to Wisconsin Statute 36.11(8)(b), all revenue should be going to Transportation Services.

**Minority Dissent Statement 5**

The majority lists the important votes in the above section; however, this appears to be the first CTC annual report where the CTC was asked to vote on rate increases without knowledge of the budget and after the budget had already been approved by administrations.

(continued)
The 2007-2009 annual report states, “On February 22, 2008 approved the budget that includes an estimated $16,282,400 in revenue and $17,457,400 in expenses;” and the 2008-2009 annual report states, “March 6, 2009 approved the budget that includes an estimated $16,706,100 in revenue and $18,124,000 in expenses.”

Under the Chair’s Discussion, DRAFT 2010-2011 Annual CTC Work Plan, the minutes of September 3, 2010 list, “P. Kass reminded the committee member of the CTC charge states approval of the rates and not the actual budget.” The number 1 of the CTC charge is to, “Provide advice and recommendations to the administration and all governance bodies on policies and budgetary matters, including rates. . .”

In past years the Budget-Policy Subcommittee met and discussed the budget prior to votes on the budget or rate increases. The Budget-Policy Subcommittee did not meet from September 2010-May 2012. The CTC should see a detailed budget prior to voting on any rate increases and before it is submitted to the administration, and the Budget-Policy Subcommittee should be allowed to meet.

**Minority Dissent Statement 6**

- Implement a night permit; garage specific for $40 and various surface lots for $125.
- Extend hours of control of four parking structures until midnight, Monday through Friday.

Since the Transportation Demand Management (TDM)/Safety Subcommittee did not meet from September 2010-May 2012, the CTC did not have the opportunity to fully vet this issue. Included at the end of this document as Appendix C is an email from Professor William Tracy about these issues (reprinted with Professor Tracy’s permission).

**Minority Dissent Statement 7**

As the official report indicates above, “Transportation Services conducted two moped open forums to discuss changes. First one had low turnout. Second presentation had higher attendance.”

The forums were held:
Wednesday, February 15, 2012
10:00 a.m.-11:00 a.m
Memorial Union

Wednesday, February 29, 2012
5:00 p.m.-6:00 p.m.
Union South

Transportation Services reported a low turnout for moped forums. The forums were scheduled at inconvenient times for students and both were on a Wednesday. There was no data shared as to how many people attended each forum. The only student in attendance at the Wednesday morning forum at 9:55 a.m. was a student member of the CTC.

The December 2, 2011 minutes state, “Moped Forum – Request to please take into consideration student schedules. Use the ASM CTC members as venue for getting the word out.”

(continued)
From the CTC meeting minutes of April 11, 2012, “J. Matzner stated she heard students were disappointed about forums. She stated the forums were held when students were in class. The campus moped committee was not informed. Several people were furious about this.”

Minority Dissent Statement 8

- Transportation Services met with ASM to revise the campus bus funding model. Cut 10% from the campus bus service hours after negotiations with ASM over the cost share of the program. The routes were reconfigured to eliminate underperforming services and to maintain headway on high demand routes.

The CTC was not consulted on this meeting that has a considerable impact on student’s financial burden through Student Segregated Fees. As the annual report pertains to the CTC’s work, it is meant to reflect work done jointly with the CTC.

- Transportation Services completed the 2012 on-board campus survey administered by Transportation Services.

The CTC was not consulted, did not approve of, or vote on the methodology or questions within the survey. The CTC did not formally accept the results of the survey with a vote.

Minority Dissent Statement 9

- Continue to negotiate with ASM to increase their funding of the campus bus service to a level equal to student ridership.

CTC did not authorize Transportation Services to meet with ASM in this manner. As the annual report pertains to the CTC’s work, and neither the issue of ASM negotiations or route reconfigurations was brought for discussion or vote to the CTC, it is inappropriate to include this information in the report.

- Complete the expansion of the hospital parking structure (Lot 75) to offset parking losses (Lots 60 and 85) and meet increased visitor and employee parking demands.

CTC has not authorized Transportation Services to meet with the hospital or spend millions of dollars to expand parking there. Since the hospital is a “public authority,” it is unclear if this construction project is legal according to state statute. The CTC has not discussed this issue.

Minority Dissent Statement 10

- Fall 2010 survey indicated in good weather, 94% of students, 52% of faculty/staff, and 27% of hospital employees commute to campus by modes other than driving alone. The next survey will take place in spring 2013.

The same Fall 2010 survey indicated that 60% of students use the bus less than once a week or not at all.
-14-

- Routes 80, 81, 82, 84, and 85 remain among the most heavily used of all Metro routes. Route 85 was absorbed into Route 80 in fall 2012 due to budget constraints.

This action was not reviewed or approved by the CTC.

- Transportation Services provided valet bicycle parking for home football games for a second year through a partnership with the Bicycle Federation of Wisconsin.

The first year, valet parking was provided by blocking the only accessible entrance to the Computer-Aided Engineering Building. This building is an academic computing facility accessible 24 hours to all engineering students and students that take engineering classes. While the CTC staff reported on faculty and staff that were unable to park by their office when they came in to work on the weekend because of football games, the only accessible entrance was blocked for bicycle parking.

- Continue to replace older bus shelters with attractive and uniquely designed UW shelters with warm wooden benches and W crests at a rate of four shelters per year.

This topic was not discussed with the CTC. Nor was it mentioned that it may be illegal to require students to pay for capital expenditures with student segregated fees. In negotiation with the Student Transportation Board, Transportation Services has said that students must pay for these shelters out of Student Segregated Fees because Transportation Services does not have the money to pay for them. Even though students have rejected this expenditure for the last couple of years, there is no way to control the money once Transportation Services receives it.

- SAFEwalk continues to serve the campus community with escorted nighttime walks. Transportation Services discontinued administration of the SAFEride cab program June 30, 2012.

The CTC did not discuss Transportation Services’ decision to end SAFEride Cab. With the end of this long-term program, the minority saw even more need for the Transportation Demand Management (TDM)/Safety Subcommittee to meet and discuss safe transportation options, particularly at night. While the Bicycle-Pedestrian Subcommittee met only sporadically, and with it working primarily on issues of encouraging multimodal forms of transportation, the minority has been concerned that there has been no mechanism to discuss campus safety.

Minority Dissent Statement 11

The committee was not permitted to vote on the issues listed under “FUTURE ISSUES FOR CTC DISCUSSION AND CONSIDERATION,” or submit additional topics for consideration.

Minority Dissent Statement 12

The summary above references the peer review of Transportation Services. It is not clear from the annual report how the peer review came to be.

At the May 16, 2008 CTC meeting, M. Rodriguez made a motion, and D. Harmatuck seconded, for an independent review of Transportation Services. Tim Gloeckler called the question and J. Matzner seconded. The vote passed unanimously, 10-0.

(continued)
Below is the motion that passed:

“Motion to commission a review of Transportation Services operations”

“Assessment of client satisfaction, review of operations from fresh and independent viewpoints, and establishment of performance benchmarks have become standard tools in quality focused entities.”

“The Campus Transportation Committee (CTC) approves the creation of an ad hoc committee that will institute an independent review of Transportation Services operations, with particular emphases on customer service, effective use of available resources, and resources needed for future excellence.”

“The ad hoc committee will include representatives of faculty, staff, and students who are not members of CTC. The membership, procedures, and criteria for the independent review will be developed by the CTC Chair in consultation with the Director of Transportation Services, and will be submitted to the CTC for approval no later than October, 2008. The review will then be conducted by the ad hoc committee with a final report due to the CTC before the end of the spring, 2009 semester.”

The independent review of Transportation Services did not take place, and a peer review was held in place of an independent review. The peer review took on a different focus than the independent review and did not address many of the questions/concerns the CTC had regarding issues of transparency, customer service, communication with the campus, accessible parking needs, the role Transportation Services plays in campus planning, and whether or not there is a suitable process for planning and obtaining appropriate resources for achieving Transportation Services’ goals. This issue of obtaining appropriate resources for achieving its goals was raised again in 2011-2012 and not acted upon.

**Minority Dissent Statement 13**

**MINORITY DISSENT SUMMARY/RECOMMENDATIONS**

From the annual report, it appears that there was no time to discuss topics important to campus such as safety, bus routes, customer service, or improving other aspects of transportation on campus. There are no discussions of innovative attempts to develop new funding streams or cooperative efforts with the private sector to develop new models, such as what the university did with 333 East Campus Mall, that would not rely on parkers or student segregated fees.

A recommendation in both the 2003-2004 and 2004-2005 annual reports indicates that the committee should “explore ways for construction projects to include the cost of building replacement parking facilities when parking lots are lost as a result of construction.” The CTC has not yet followed up on this recommendation, and while some members requested that this recommendation be explored, the Budget/Policy Subcommittee did not meet from September 2010-May 2012, so it could not follow-up.

A recommendation in the 2000-2001 and 2001-2002 annual reports indicates that the committee should “work with the Office of the Chancellor to investigate the possibilities of setting rates in accordance with an employee’s ability to pay” and work with the Office of the Chancellor to establish permit priority system(s) that allow permit allocation on the basis of need versus longevity and highest salaries. During the past year, some CTC members voiced support for a special parking rate for those with the lowest salaries. This support was not more fully explored, and the recommendation does not appear in the 2011-2012 official report.

(continued)
The majority summary ends with, “CTC will work with Transportation Services as another challenging budget cycle approaches.” It is difficult for the CTC to complete its charge if Transportation Services does not share a detailed budget or allow members to add to the meeting agenda.

The topic of Transportation Services developing a sustainable funding model was not discussed by the Campus Transportation Committee. It was often requested that the subcommittees meet so there could be a process in which the CTC could have a discussion about Transportation Services developing a sustainable funding model and other important topics. So that this topic and other important topics are addressed, it is the minority view that the Budget/Policy Subcommittee and the Transportation Demand Management (TDM)/Safety Subcommittee be allowed to meet. It is also the minority view that the Bicycle-Pedestrian Subcommittee has enough agenda items that are critical to the campus that it be restored to its previous stature as a full shared governance committee that is run by the committee members and not by Transportation Services staff.

Given the facts outlined in this report, the minority also recommends that members of the CTC should be involved in the writing of the annual report every year and vote on it. The minority further recommends that all CTC meetings should be moved to a central, accessible meeting location on campus that includes a lot with parking available (including accessible parking) for meetings, and that meetings be restored to two hours in length.

There should be an independent review of Transportation Services.
5805 E. Open Meadow  
McFarland, WI 53558  

May 2, 2011  

Via Email: chancellor@news.wisc.edu  

Chancellor Carolyn Martin  
University of Wisconsin  
161 Bascom Hall  
500 Lincoln Drive  
Madison, WI 53706  

Re: Disabled Parking at the University of Wisconsin Madison Campus  

Dear Chancellor Martin:  

The purpose of this letter is to urge the University to stop its plan to eliminate all free Department of Transportation (DOT) accessible parking spaces for persons with disabilities on campus and replace them with accessible parking spaces obtainable only through the purchase of a permit, which now costs $495 per academic year and is expected to double with the next rate increase. If implemented, the University is furthering its message to persons with disabilities that they are not welcome on campus.  

The plan is morally flawed and short-sighted. I know of approximately 90 persons with disabilities from the community who volunteer their time, as “guest students,” to assist a number of academic programs on campus. These volunteers allow the University’s students, like those pursing degrees in physical therapy, occupational therapy, speech therapy, kinesiology, nursing, medicine, vocational rehabilitation, etc., to have some actual experience interacting with persons with disabilities. Instead of compensating them for their contributions, which has continued for the past 15 years plus, the University instead will make them pay to provide their volunteer services. A large percentage of those volunteers are unemployed or on fixed incomes. For them, they will no longer be able to afford to volunteer on campus. In these dire economic times, the University should be cultivating and encouraging more volunteerism to augment faculty and staff. Moreover, others with disabilities who utilize the facilities and services on campus may no longer be able to afford to do so. This is unconscionable.  

While the University invited persons with disabilities to the open forum to discuss their concerns over the parking plan on April 20, 2011 at TITU, Union South, its invitation was disingenuous. A large number of persons with disabilities were not able to attend, largely due to the fact of the lack of accessible parking slots around Union South and in lot #13, which serves Union South. If it truly was interested in hearing from persons with disabilities, it would have held the forum in a more accessible location with ideally ample, or at least more, accessible parking.
In addition, the University has removed a significant number of accessible parking slots immediately around or adjacent to certain buildings, like the Natatorium and others. In certain instances, its decision to do so – deliberately or ignorantly – places persons with disabilities’ safety and health at risk. Persons with disabilities must now cross heavily trafficked roads or pass behind parked vehicles to access accessible routes to buildings. Moreover, by having to travel further from the accessible parking slots to buildings, the University is jeopardizing the health of those persons who were issued DOT disabled parking identification cards or disabled license plates. They were issued such identification cards or licensed plates because an authorized healthcare professional has certified they cannot walk 200 feet or more without stopping to rest, cannot walk without use of a cane, brace, crutch, prosthetic device, wheelchair, or assistance from another; are restricted by lung disease, use portable oxygen, have a cardiac condition, or are severely limited in their ability to walk. For those persons, it is incumbent that the University provides accessible parking with the shortest route to buildings as possible.

This latest parking plan, when coupled with the other programmatic barriers and the pervasive architectural barriers throughout the campus, clearly communicates to persons with disabilities the they are unwelcomed on campus, and I believe does not meet the University’s overarching antidiscrimination mandate under title II of the Americans with Disability Act or its mandates under the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

For me, implementation of the University’s parking would significantly limit me from volunteering activities and time at the UW. I volunteer at the adaptive fitness program; for physical and occupational therapy, rehab psychology, and other classes. I also volunteer to work with engineering graduate students on their projects aimed at persons with disabilities by providing input and ideas. In the past, issues mainly attributed to my disability have limited my employment opportunities and it has already limited me from continuing my graduate studies at the university. I have been an employee at UW Madison and I paid for disabled parking. Even with that, I did not have spots to park in as I need a van accessible spot in order for me to independently get in and out of my van. In one instance, I actually had to have a meeting in a campus parking lot with my supervisor as no disabled spot was available for me to use. To further exacerbate the situation, it was winter and I cannot park farther away and push my manual wheelchair to work.

A vast number of UW employees, students, spouses of employees and students, guest students and visitors with disabilities deal with access limitations and significant barriers to parking, buildings, and bathrooms. An environment of discrimination at the campus exists because of the University’s inattention to this. Those barriers do not allow or encourage access to all aspects of university life for people with disabilities. Individuals with disabilities must have the opportunity to participate in all programs, services and activities on an equal basis with colleagues and peers. This is not the case by the transportation policies put in place and other program, services, and activities limited at the university.

I urge you to stop implementation of this parking plan and encourage you to meet with this affected population to explore this and other issues affecting persons with disabilities on campus.

Sincerely,

Monica Kamal

Cc: steve.arnold@uwebc.wisc.edu, bittner@engr.wisc.edu, abogan@fpm.wisc.edu, gbrown@fpm.wisc.edu, tigloeck@wisc.edu, afhabel@wisc.edu, pkass@fpm.wisc.edu, matzner@wisc.edu, noyce@engr.wisc.edu, patz@wisc.edu, gpilcher@uwhealth.org, punuganti@wisc.edu, cwilliam@ssc.wisc.edu, jyackee@wisc.edu
Date: Wed, 16 May 2012 22:55:40 -0500
From: William Tracy <wfracy@wisc.edu>
Subject: Re: Changes to weekend Parking
To: noyce@engr.wisc.edu
Cc: “KASS, Patrick” <pkass@fpm.wisc.edu>,
    “MENGHINI, REBECCA JO” <MENGHINI@chancellor.wisc.edu>,
    noyce@cae.wisc.edu, “COOK, MARK E” <MCOOK@wisc.edu>,
    “MUSOLF, DAVID E” <MUSOLF@secfac.wisc.edu>, rengel@primate.wisc.edu,
    tjgloeck@wisc.edu, ghelfrich@wisc.edu, jskeller@wisc.edu,
    matzner@wisc.edu, mumma@wisc.edu, gpilcher@uwhealth.org,
    bran@engr.wisc.edu, ttews@library.wisc.edu, cwilliam@ssc.wisc.edu,
    jyackee@wisc.edu, Clint Sprott <csprott@wisc.edu>,
    Michelle Felber <mfelber@secfac.wisc.edu>

Professor Noyce,

I am sure you have read Mr. Kass’s response to some of Professor Sprott’s concerns. Among other roles, I am currently the president of PROFS. Apparently for this reason someone listed me on some literature as some one to contact about this issue. In addition to Professor Sprott, I have heard from a number of graduate students including my own.

This change impacts our academic mission and public safety and I urge your committee to reconsider. Many graduate students work late nights, often after bus service stops. The work they do is vital to our research and teaching missions and this policy will reduce that work (increasing time to degree and decreasing research productivity). More importantly, this policy will jeopardize our students’ safety. More will be biking late at night and worse still, given the recent rash of muggings and assaults, many will be walking home alone after midnight.

The parking garages with which I am familiar are nearly empty at night, so I don’t find Mr Kass’s access argument compelling. As he said this is a revenue issue and this policy falls hardest on those least able to afford it. I understand that transportation is looking for new revenue sources and folks there may think $40.00 is trivial. But have you looked at how much our grad students are paid or when they last got an increase? A TA on 33% time will find $40.00 a burden. The main reason I got involved in shared governance was to work on issues affecting student life and this policy will really hurt them. This is just another step in my making UW-Madison less attractive to the very best graduate students.

I look forward to your committee’s reconsideration of this policy. I also urge the University Committee to consider the impact of this change on student safety and research and teaching effectiveness.

Bill

On Wed, May 16, 2012 at 11:09 AM, Clint Sprott <csprott@wisc.edu> wrote:
Patrick -- Thanks for taking the time to respond. I understand the arguments in favor of this change, but I still think it was a bad decision that will do more harm than good for the University.
-- Clint

(continued)
KASS, Patrick wrote:

Professor Sprott: It has been brought to my attention that you have some concerns over the changes we are making to the parking program this fall. There has been some misinformation about our changes circulating around the campus so I wanted to take the opportunity to explain what is occurring and why.

Starting on September 1st we will be extending the hours of control of four of our campus parking structures. The facilities are currently controlled Monday-Friday from 7am until 4:30pm. The new hours of control will be Monday-Friday from 7am until midnight. These facilities will not be controlled on the weekends. The specific parking structures are Lot 17 (Engineering Drive), Lot 20 (University Drive), Lot 36 (Observatory Drive) and Lot 76 (University Bay Drive). These four parking structures will not be the only facilities that are controlled at night. Currently 60% of our parking spaces are controlled at night. This percentage has been relatively constant for the last five years. The controls are in place to help facilitate employee access to their offices and labs after hours.

Understanding that individuals have limited options to access the campus during the evening, they created a garage specific evening permit at a cost of only $40 per year. This permit will allow an individual to park after 4:30pm in the selected facility. This parking permit will also be offered for the other parking structures that are currently controlled in the evening for which no evening permit is available. For those who do not wish to purchase a parking permit or are visitors to the campus, these facilities will have an evening parking rate that is substantially less than the daytime rate. The visitor rate will be $1 per hour with a $5 nightly maximum.

Transportation Services is a program revenue department and as such does not receive any State or University funding. We must pay for all their program costs, including the annual debt service payments on campus parking facilities, through revenue generated from permit and visitor parking sales. The loss of surface parking to new building construction and the need to replace this parking with more expensive structured facilities has created a structural deficit within the Transportation Services budget. In past years the burden to resolve this deficit was placed mainly on permit holders. Transportation Services has been working to develop new funding strategies to spread the cost of the overall campus parking and transportation programs to all users. By

(continued)
controlling these four facilities into the evening, Transportation Services will be able to generate additional revenue to lessen the burden on employees.

This change in policy should have no impact on the Wonders of Physics event held in February. I will offer the assistance of my staff to work with the program committee for this event to help facilitate the access needs for your visitors.

I hope I have been able to address your concerns about our policy change. This was not an easy decision to make, but given the current budgetary circumstance it was needed. We have no plans of mimicking the policies at the University of Minnesota in regards to parking, but we do need to ensure that our system is both accessible and sustainable so we can meet the needs of our customers today and in the future.

Sincerely,

Patrick Kass
*///**/**/**/Patrick J. Kass, CAPP/**
Director
Transportation Services
Facilities Planning and Management
University of Wisconsin
(608) 265-3200

| J. C. (Clint) Sprott | Tel: (608) 263-4449 | | Emeritus Professor of Physics | Fax: (608) 262-7205 |
| University of Wisconsin | E-mail: sprott@physics.wisc.edu | | Madison, WI 53706-1390 USA | WWW: http://sprott.physics.wisc.edu/ |
I. STATEMENT OF COMMITTEE FUNCTION OR CHARGE

As specified in Faculty Policies and Procedures 6.34., the commission’s charge is to address matters of faculty compensation and benefits by providing information, offering recommendations, representing the faculty in campus-wide discussions, and coordinating with the Academic Staff Executive Committee. Because of the implementation of the Critical Compensation Fund (CCF) in July 2012, the University Committee added several further elements to the commission’s charge in the current year:

1. Undertake a study of how different units determined CCF and market equity reviews during the first (fall 2012) review;
2. Assess the effectiveness of the fall 2012 CCF and market equity reviews in alleviating salary problems previously addressed in the 2011-2012 annual report of the Commission on Faculty Compensation and Economic Benefits;
3. Determine whether the CCF is an effective tool, along with other tools of compensation, in bringing the salaries of UW-Madison faculty closer to the median of peer institutions and make recommendations for its continued use;
4. Identify and assess changes that could improve such exercises in the future;
5. Identify possible additional funds (e.g., further cost savings, innovation, philanthropy, or others) that might grow the CCF or fund other exercises directed at improving compensation plans.

The full charge to the commission is attached to this report as Appendix 1.

As of the submission of this report, available data allow us to fulfill elements 1 and 4, and to make suggestions for element 5. While we cannot yet provide a quantitative assessment of elements 2 or 3, as this will take several years of data, we have good qualitative indicators to provide some evaluation of these elements.

II. CURRENT YEAR’S ACTIVITIES

The last report of the Commission on Compensation and Economic Benefits was delivered on 5 March 2012.1 Spurred on by the new opportunities to engage with compensation and benefits issues, the commission met eight times during 2012-2013, approximately every other week from October through December and twice in the spring semester. Meetings included conversations with leaders from the central campus administration as well as from the College of Letters and Science. In addition, individual committee members consulted with administrators from nearly all schools and colleges in order to review the administration of CCF within those units, and to determine what practices were most effective in the mechanism’s implementation and what measures they would seek to improve in any future exercise of the program. The commission also met with representatives from the Academic Staff Compensation and Economic Benefits Committee and the Advisory Committee on Budget Policies, Issues, and Strategies, and two members of the commission conducted follow-up visits with several key administrators.

1 http://www.secfac.wisc.edu/senate/2012/0305/2327.pdf (continued)
III. CURRENT ISSUES AND CONCERNS

As indicated in the commission’s 2011-2012 report, UW-Madison is at risk of losing its most important resource: world-class researchers who keep the university on the cutting edge of knowledge. Compared to peer institutions, faculty and staff salaries are low. In an increasingly global market for research and education, UW-Madison is falling behind in its ability to compete for the best faculty, and it faces the prospect of losing many of its most talented professors to other institutions. The situation has been critical.

For at least the past decade, UW-Madison has ranked among top 20 universities in the world based on the Academic Ranking of World Universities. UW-Madison has consistently ranked among the top three of U.S. institutions in research monies brought in and regularly places in the top ten of all institutions for doctorates conferred. For undergraduate students, UW-Madison is ranked 41st in the nation by U.S. News & World Report, higher than all but three of our peer institutions. The current Kiplinger rankings on the best values in public colleges place UW-Madison in the 13th position, also near the top of its peer group.

The impact of faculty salaries must be addressed if the university is to continue to fulfill its mission of providing its students with a first-rate education. The latest available data, published in April 2013 by the Association of American University Professors, showed that UW-Madison salaries are well below the median. Full professors at UW-Madison have been in 12th (last) place among their peers for years, while assistant professors have been in 11th place, a drop from several years ago. Associate professors are the only group at the peer median. However, in the aggregate, UW-Madison salaries are 11.6% below the peer group median. This represents a slight improvement over 2011-2012 (when they were 12.6% below the peer group median); however, this is a tentative shift, with no clear trend line. Moreover, this year’s figure is tied for the second lowest point since 1985.

Faced with a crisis in faculty retention, in recent years UW-Madison administrators have sought to develop new mechanisms to improve the compensation of its faculty. Among these are the so-called “Stern Portfolio” of tools developed and implemented since 2010 under the leadership of Vice Provost for Faculty and Staff Steve Stern, including the high-demand faculty fund, which provides limited funds for the preventive retention of faculty likely to receive outside offers; a doubling of raises linked to promotions to associate or full professor (with yearly adjustments to the promotion increment tied to the Consumer Price Index); salary increases of 5-7% as post-tenure increments for full professors, who are eligible five years after promotion; and compression equity raises of 5-10% for full professors, who are eligible ten years after promotion and in five-year increments. These tools have had significant effects for the improvement of

---

2 Peer group for purposes of faculty salary comparison, established by the Governor’s Commission on Faculty Compensation, 1984: University of Michigan; University of California, Los Angeles; University of California, Berkeley; University of Texas at Austin; University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign; Ohio State University; University of Minnesota, Twin Cities; Indiana University-Bloomington; University of Washington (Seattle); and Purdue University.

3 http://www.arwu.org/ARWU2010.jsp


(continued)
yet have also been modest, and one key tool is a short-term program—the compression equity program will sunset in 2014 after five years of use. Chancellor David Ward recognized the limitations of these tools and opted to take advantage of new allowable mechanisms developed since 2011 to supplement salary outside of a formal state-funded pay plan. In consultation with leaders of the Commission on Faculty Compensation and Economic Benefits, the Academic Staff Executive Committee, the University Committee, Associate Vice Chancellor Steve Stern, and Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration Darrell Bazzell, Chancellor Ward created the Critical Compensation Fund in spring and summer 2012.

The CCF drew in its initial implementation on reallocated funds set aside in 2011 in preparation for potential cuts in the 2011-2013 biennial budget. The central administration initially considered a 1-2% supplemental pay plan but, in consultation with governance groups, elected to develop a program that could provide for more substantial, if selective, raises, according to the following criteria:

- CCF was the first salary mechanism designed to apply to all permanent employee categories, not faculty exclusively;9
- At the same time, CCF was not an across-the-board pay plan; such a plan would have exceeded the university’s authority;
- Merit was a necessary but insufficient condition criterion for qualification for a CCF adjustment;
- Up to 30% of employees could be eligible for a CCF increase of 5-10% of the permanent base salary;10
- Faculty who had recently been hired at a market rate or who had recently received market rate adjustments should not receive first consideration for CCF adjustments.

As the report below indicates, CCF is a useful and effective tool—*in conjunction with other mechanisms*—for bringing UW-Madison faculty salaries in line with those of the peer group. Such adjustments come at a significant cost: the reallocations that have paid for the initial implementation of CCF have been painful to some units. Yet CCF represents an important step toward the investment of the university in its future. As an institution that competes in national and global markets to attract top faculty, its faculty salaries must not be allowed to languish below the median of those of its peers; indeed, they are currently at or near the bottom of the peer group (see Appendix 2). If we are to maintain our university’s high standing, it is imperative to maintain mechanisms to improve the salary climate for UW-Madison faculty for the purposes of recruiting and retaining first-rate employees. While CCF is a step in the right direction, its work is not complete.

---

8 Report on Faculty Pay-Merit Initiatives After Three Years, August 2012 Chairs/Directors Leadership Summit.
9 It is critical to note that CCF applied to academic staff and classified staff as well as faculty. Given the charge to this commission, this report focuses on the application of CCF to faculty, although the commission recognizes the importance of CCF’s implications beyond that category. Report on Faculty Pay-Merit Initiatives after Three Years, August 2012 Chairs/Directors Leadership Summit.
10 The logic behind the 30% figure was that through two exercises of the mechanism, CCF, in combination with other available tools, would allow the majority of UW-Madison faculty to be eligible for a salary increase over a several-year cycle. Personal communication from Steve Stern, 7 November 2012.
IV. DETERMINATION OF CCF AND MARKET/EQUITY REVIEWS DURING THE FIRST (FALL 2012) REVIEW

In fall 2012, individual members of the commission contacted deans and other administrators in the following campus units to discuss the ways in which those units implemented the CCF mechanism:

- College of Agriculture and Life Sciences
- Wisconsin School of Business
- School of Education
- College of Engineering
- Nelson Institute for Environmental Studies
- School of Human Ecology
- Law School
- College of Letters and Science
- School of Medicine and Public Health
- School of Nursing
- School of Pharmacy
- School of Veterinary Medicine

We received responses from all units but the School of Nursing. Subsection A of this section describes the implementation of CCF in all campus units other than the College of Letters and Science; subsection B details the particularities of the mechanism in L&S.

Sample questions to deans and administrators in individual campus units included the following:

- What process was used to distribute CCF funds, and why?
- How quickly did the campus unit complete the process?
- Did the process work well in the campus unit? Why or why not?
- What were some examples of how CCF worked well or did not work well?
- How did the campus unit prioritize equity, retention, and market priorities as it allocated CCF funds? How were these priorities set?
- What data sources did the campus unit use to gauge equity and market concerns?

A. CCF Determination and Distribution in Campus Units other than Letters and Science

Although each campus unit had its particularities, there was some degree of homogeneity in the implementation of CCF in all campus units other than Letters and Science in the first round in fall 2012. (One important exception to this statement is the School of Medicine and Public Health, where issues of leveraged non-GPR budgets mentioned below under point 4.d were acute.) There are several factors that influenced this homogeneity. One factor was that most campus units accomplished the exercise very quickly, beginning in mid-to late summer and completing the exercise in early fall; in some (particularly smaller) units, this was due to a top-down administration of the exercise. In addition, with some notable exceptions, such units are far smaller than L&S, allowing for a faster and more straightforward review of eligible faculty. Finally, in most campus units other than L&S, the CCF exercise was completed independently of other budget or salary exercises, streamlining and simplifying the task. What follows is not a detailed account of CCF distribution in all campus units, but instead is an identification of basic trends that marked the exercise in non-L&S units.

11 Engineering and Veterinary Medicine combined the CCF exercise with a High-Demand Faculty Fund exercise.
1. **Centralized administration of review and implementation (Business, Environmental Studies, Human Ecology, Law, Pharmacy).** Smaller campus units—in particular those without subdivision into departments—tended to adopt a vertical approach to the review of eligible employees and the implementation of the CCF mechanism. They generally accomplished the exercise quickly. They reviewed faculty salaries in light of national ratings where available. Most of these units sought to bring their lowest-paid faculty closer to parity with their peers either at Wisconsin or nationally. Units almost universally cited the importance of consistent periodic performance reviews and professional activities reports as essential to the process.

2. **Decentralized administration of review and implementation (Agricultural and Life Sciences, Education, Engineering, Medicine and Public Health, Veterinary Medicine).** In larger campus units with departmental structures, deans decentralized the process. Where some deans’ offices identified eligible faculty for departments, most simply distributed information about CCF, including eligibility criteria, to department chairs and allowed them to make recommendations for the CCF distribution. Prioritization of market or equity concerns was therefore a departmental matter. In general, departments submitted ranked lists of faculty eligible for adjustments, with relatively little further intervention from the deans’ offices. The degree of faculty input into the process varied in these units: some empowered executive committees to determine departmental priorities, while others relied on subcommittees or department chairs to complete the exercise and submit rankings. Most of these units completed the process before 1 September 2012.

3. **Positive responses to CCF in non-L&S units.** Many deans saw CCF in a positive but qualified light. They almost uniformly welcomed CCF as another tool to rectify a growing disparity between their faculty’s salaries and those offered by peer institutions. One respondent was pleased that CCF offered campus units flexibility to allocate salary adjustments with “few hoops to jump through,” and noted that CCF provided a mechanism to retain pre-emptively several faculty who had been hired significantly below market level. Some indicated that CCF had been useful for addressing major equity concerns in faculty salaries, while others—particularly those with readily available comparative data—indicated that CCF was an effective, if incremental, tool for addressing market disparities.

4. **Critical responses to CCF in non-L&S units.** Although most campus units welcomed the tool, all had some important criticisms. Such critical responses include:

   a. CCF was a step in the right direction but too small to address the significant disparities that these units face.
   b. CCF was rolled out too quickly, with not enough training for administrators to ensure its proper implementation.
   c. Some administrators felt that the evaluation process was cumbersome and the deadline too tight in the first roll-out. Future implementations of the same mechanism would be smoother now that everyone has been through the process once.

---

12 Business and Law deans did so in consultation with department or division heads.
13 For example, salary data published by organizations such as the American Association of Colleges and Schools of Business, the American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy, and the Association of American Universities Data Exchange. For highly anomalous units such as the Nelson Institute for Environmental Studies, no such data were available, and the unit relied on internal distributions of salary to determine equity.

(continued)
d. Units with a salary structure that relies on significant non-GPR found the process more difficult than those that rely primarily on GPR for salaries.
e. Many units indicated that by including a maximum of 30% of faculty, CCF created some problems with morale. Some units, however, offset this consequence by identifying faculty who would receive priority in a future exercise.

B. CCF Determination and Distribution in the College of Letters and Science

The College of Letters and Science warrants its own subsection of this report because the CCF allocation and distribution process differed so dramatically from that of all other campus units. This was in part due to the size of the college, its tradition of faculty governance, and the intersection of CCF with the college’s own plans for a three-year cycle of faculty salary adjustments, which was already under way when CCF was announced.

In contrast with some other campus units, the college’s governance structure is not top-down. It has a strong tradition of faculty governance through executive committees, which alone have the authority to make financial decisions for the departments. Since virtually all L&S faculty are paid on a C-basis (9-month, September to May), executive committees typically do not meet in summer, when many faculty are away conducting research. As CCF was introduced in July, this put the college at a significant time disadvantage since executive committees were not able to meet to discuss implementation until the start of the fall semester. The college compensated for this difficulty by assigning two deadlines for departmental recommendations for salary adjustments: the end of September and the end of October.

CCF also emerged when the college was already planning its own salary adjustment model. Under the L&S plan, every faculty member would be reviewed for a salary adjustment every three years, with the goal of bringing most faculty close to their peer medians within five years. With the introduction of CCF, the college elected to combine its salary adjustment plan with the new mechanism in a complex implementation involving a revolving cycle of evaluation and departmental contributions to salary adjustments. Faculty were randomized based on start dates and divided into three groups. The first group was eligible for evaluation and adjustment in fall 2012, the second in spring 2013, and the third in spring 2014. A memorandum from Dean Gary Sandefur detailing the CCF protocol and its listing of randomized start dates is included as Appendix 3.

The college determined match rates for departmental contributions based on several criteria. Primary among these were the academic quality of the departments and their place in salary rankings among peer institutions. Some of the highest-rated departments in the college have faculty with salaries as much as 40% below the peer median. Such programs earned a 2/3 match rate, with the department contributing 1/3 of salary adjustments. Others had a 50% or 1/3 match rate. In order to pay for their contributions, departments were allowed to draw on several sources of revenue or potential revenue. Most chose to eliminate positions through retirements or to “mortgage” future retirements in order to pay for adjustments. As a result, many departments were forced to downsize now and/or in the future in order to compensate faculty at closer to market rates.

The college also provided departments with two options for salary adjustments:

1. Departments could elect to provide salary adjustments of 5-10% to as many faculty as they wished over the three-year cycle, with the requirement that they would have to contribute according to the models outlined above.
2. Departments could elect to choose no more than 30% of their faculty for a 5% adjustment, for which the college would pay 100% of the cost.

(continued)
In general, the deans encouraged departments to exercise option 1, as the faculty are in general underpaid, and the only way to ameliorate a problem of this scale was to give departments a stake in improving the salary climate.

There have been good anecdotal results from the implementation of CCF in the college, with several faculty reporting that they have not applied for outside positions due to the increase that CCF provided. In addition, many faculty and department chairs have expressed their appreciation for not only the salary increases, but also a transparent process for their allocation. Yet there have also been problems with the exercise:

- As with other innovations, a result of liquidating positions in the college has the consequence of fewer smaller course offerings and larger class sizes as well as changes in the balance between graduate and undergraduate offerings.
- Liquidating faculty positions is not a sustainable practice.
- In departments without strong internal traditions of transparent merit reviews or a group of senior faculty who were experienced with the consequential merit reviews required by significant pay plans in the past, the exercise’s novelty proved difficult in implementation.
- Departments had different match rates. One critical question for future exercises is the degree of input that departments and faculty governance groups have in determining match rates, which at the very least could alleviate the morale impact of such differences.
- One department refused to participate in the exercise, citing solidarity in the face of what its executive committee felt was an arbitrary 30% cap on adjustments and in objection to the idea that the university was taking a step in the direction of a purposeful diminution of resources.\(^\text{14}\)

V. ASSESSMENT OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF CCF AS A TOOL FOR IMPROVING FACULTY COMPENSATION

As of the submission of this report, it is too early for a quantitative evaluation of the CCF mechanism as a tool for bringing faculty salaries in line with UW-Madison’s peer institutions. UW-Madison has only recently been able to assemble preliminary data on CCF’s effects for faculty salaries, and peer institutions have not yet reported their current salary data. It is also impossible to know whether peer institutions have developed similar compensation mechanisms or received pay plans, which would have the possibility of perpetuating pay disparities. This report thus concentrates on CCF’s effects on the UW-Madison campus, while urging next year’s commission and university administrators to return to this question when the data become available.

Although it was a limited salary adjustment tool, CCF had a broad reach in its initial distribution. The tool increased pay for 3,119 employees through a $14.64 million investment. Nearly 23% of faculty (485) received adjustments totaling $3.84 million.\(^\text{15}\) By rank, 20% of assistant professors received adjustments, at a mean amount of $6,476; 27% of associate professors received adjustments, at a mean amount of

\(^{14}\) Personal communications with Maria Cancian, 28 November 2012, 20 March 2013, and 31 March 2013. A memo directed to Cancian stated that the department “rejects the current university policy of contraction and the diminution of resources.”

\(^{15}\) Critical Compensation Fund Exercise: Review of Results, 31 January 2013; see full summary in Appendix 4.
$6,796; and 23% of full professors received adjustments, at a mean amount of $9,088.\textsuperscript{16} By sex, 27% of female faculty received adjustments, at a mean amount of $7,687; while 22% of male received adjustments, at a mean amount of $8,336. By ethnic status, 24% of both white and minority faculty received adjustments, with the mean amount for white faculty $8,176 and the mean amount for minority faculty $7,925. Among white women, 27% received adjustments at mean of $7,696, while 22% of white men received adjustments at a mean of $8,453. Among minorities, 26% of women received adjustments at a mean of $7,773, and 22% of men received adjustments at a mean of $8,017.\textsuperscript{17}

An assemblage of tools such as the doubling of promotion adjustments, post-tenure increments, compression equity, and CCF has now provided salary adjustments for nearly 1,200 faculty. CCF therefore served an essential role as part of a broader portfolio of tools for raising faculty compensation and, in a selective rather than a comprehensive manner, likely brought faculty salaries closer to the peer median.

Yet there are concerns that merit close attention for future faculty salary exercises:

- Achieving parity by funding source: future exercises will need either to adjust targets for GPR versus non-GPR funded allocations of CCF, or provide mechanisms by which units reliant on non-GPR can structure salary adjustments with appropriate flexibilities.\textsuperscript{18}
- A flexible calendar for achieving and reporting results: different campus units have different budget and governance structures. Allowing units more autonomy in the implementation of mechanisms such as CCF could alleviate the timetable pressures imposed by a centralized process.
- Finding a sustainable funding model: although the commission recognizes the importance of a departmental stake in raising faculty salaries, downsizing as a mechanism for paying for market adjustments can only work in the very short term in the absence of significant innovations. Central administration must also recognize that different units are differently able to fund salary adjustments through innovations, and it must find ways to offset those costs for departments that are stretched beyond their capacity to provide both for equitable salaries and to sustain their educational missions.
- Future exercises and state or supplemental pay plans: the distribution of CCF adjustments to no more than 30% of faculty has generated some morale problems. A limited exercise seeking to bring some UW-Madison faculty salaries into parity with those of peer institutions has had the paradoxical effect of producing inequities at UW-Madison. The promise of a future exercise has somewhat alleviated these problems. Central administration should note that a state or supplemental pay plan that reaches all employees would be welcome but would not necessarily alleviate the potential inequities that a one-time implementation of CCF has engendered. It would be particularly useful if central campus were to give individual units flexibility in the distribution of resources made available in any future exercises.
- One potential problem that surfaced both campus-wide and in individual units was the issue of CCF adjustments for jointly appointed faculty. As the exercise turned out, it appears as if most nominations of jointly appointed faculty met with the enthusiastic endorsement of both units. But what to do in a future case where this might be debated is unclear. For example, if the Nelson

\textsuperscript{16} These data are largely, but not entirely, complete. Final data will be available in the coming months. A summary of these data, along with CCF distributions by campus unit, is included in Appendix 5. Full data can be obtained from Jennifer Klippel in the office of the vice chancellor for finance and administration.

\textsuperscript{17} These data are included in Appendix 6.

\textsuperscript{18} This is a particularly acute issue for the School of Medicine and Public Health, which relies on significant clinical revenue for salaries of both faculty and academic staff.
Institute for Environmental Studies wishes to nominate a faculty member who is jointly appointed in Plant Pathology (CALS), but Plant Pathology wishes to nominate another faculty member and is facing the 30% cap on the number of adjustments it can make, what solution can be found?

Another potential problem emerges when different units have different match rates, and units that share joint appointments but have fewer resources are essentially forced into unaffordable matches by external nominations. (One possible solution could be a match rate based on the individual, rather than on the home unit.)

- Instructions from many deans’ offices were unclear about how to prioritize market and equity concerns. While this respect for decentralized governance and departmental autonomy is welcome, a lack of clear guidelines produced some infighting at the departmental level.\footnote{The College of Letters and Science’s new category for “Market-Equity” adjustments further confounds this issue.}

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE EXERCISES AND OTHER PAY TOOLS

The commission recognizes the value of CCF as an essential program for adjusting the salaries of those who have not received adjustments through other available mechanisms. Its broad recommendation is that CCF exercises become a regular option in a larger portfolio of tools that in time can mitigate the disparities across UW-Madison faculty salaries and between theirs and those of their peers. Yet administrators and faculty must also address the difficulties realized in the program’s initial implementation, as well as the cost of this program and other tools for adjusting compensation.

The commission sees CCF as an important addition to rather than a replacement of the Stern Portfolio that has provided for meaningful adjustments to some faculty salaries. Although the Compression Equity tool is scheduled to close in 2014, other tools such as the High-Demand Faculty Fund, post-tenure increments, and substantial raises linked to promotion must be protected, and expanded where possible.\footnote{For example, the high-demand fund operates in different ways across campus, as noted in this commission’s 2011-2012 report. Uniform application of these funds for preventive and pre-emptive retention, rather than in response to serious market overtures, would likely alleviate the problem of burdensome, often unsustainable retentions.}

Department chairs who are able to make effective use of these tools have been able to use CCF to provide adjustments for faculty who have been contributing excellent work to the university’s educational and research missions but who have not fit the eligibility criteria for these highly selective, limited adjustment mechanisms.

Campus administrators are now optimistic that the 2013-2015 biennial budget will allow for a modest (and potentially supplemental) pay plan, providing a 2-3% increase for UW-Madison employees.\footnote{The exact mechanism of such a pay plan is unclear, but ideally it would apply to all permanent employee categories. Personal communication from Darrell Bazzell, 19 March 2013.} This is of course a welcome change from over five years with no broad-ranging adjustments. Yet as stated above, such a pay plan would have the furthest reach if it operated in addition to, rather than in replacement of, a second CCF exercise. A pay plan that affects all employees would leave the disparities generated by a single CCF exercise in place, while a second CCF exercise, in conjunction with effective, judicious use of other available tools, could alleviate—if not entirely eliminate—inequities in salary.
In addition, the commission urges administration to consult the recommendations included in last year’s report, briefly summarized here:22

1. The institutionalization of **new triggers** for raises for high-performing faculty, including the securing of competitive grants that have broad impact on the campus community; election to national academies or other prestigious bodies; the publication of particularly influential works; or exceptionally productive service activity;

2. The introduction of **temporary incentives or base adjustments** in certain circumstances, including:
   a. higher compensation during a major grant period;
   b. temporary base adjustments for triggers such as those indicated above in number 1;
   c. temporary endowments funded by new philanthropy (for example, a “term professorship” mechanism available to faculty at any point on the tenure clock);
   d. a bonus structure allowing departments to recognize exceptional performance through one-time incentives.

3. A restructuring of **endowed chairs** allowing for increases in salary either in addition to, or in place of, research funds.

The funding for the initial CCF exercise came through reallocations. While reallocation is a reality in an era of declining state support and educational innovation, the commission urges UW-Madison administrators to recognize that it cannot be the exclusive source of funding for future exercises. The commission therefore also urges a reconsideration of several possible funding mechanisms outlined in the 2011-2012 report, briefly summarized here:23

1. use of the chancellor’s **Educational Innovation** campaign to develop savings and new revenues;
2. new **philanthropic efforts of UW-Madison and the UW Foundation** directed towards support for human capital;
3. elevating **differential tuition** in areas such as UW-Madison’s **professional schools** as well as for **non-resident undergraduates** within limits that maintain competition with UW-Madison’s peers.

To date, only the first recommendation (the use of the chancellor’s Educational Innovation campaign) has contributed to CCF funding by allowing for departmental matches to university contributions. One further recommendation from the 2011-2012 report was the **increase of undergraduate tuition**, limited to the amount needed to offset cuts from state budget allocations. The commission recognizes that such increases may be necessary in an era of shrinking state support but also emphasizes that increases that contribute to faculty compensation should be limited to programs such as the Madison Initiative for Undergraduates, which link increased tuition to direct enhancements to undergraduate education and only when accompanied by equal increases in financial aid in order to maintain access for all qualified students.

One further potential source of funding draws on a combination of philanthropy and extramural funding that, if used creatively and carefully, could provide limited resources for the expansion or reimplementation of a CCF-like exercise. Several campus units have taken advantage of professorships funded either

---

22 Available in significantly greater detail at http://www.secfac.wisc.edu/senate/2012/0305/2327.pdf. Some of these recommendations are currently unavailable or impracticable; however, the new human resources system may allow for partial implementation of some of these suggestions.

23 In addition, central administration may wish to explore reframing the 25% to 75% ratio of non-resident to resident students at UW-Madison, a strategy recently adopted by the board of regents: additional revenues obtained from out-of-state or international tuition could offset the cost of such mechanisms.
temporarily or permanently through extramural initiatives; the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation is one prominent example. If used in the right way, such opportunities could be useful as an alternative to replacements that arise through retirements. While foundations would be reluctant to support simple replacements, departments could think creatively about how to use such support to fund positions that move into innovative directions when faculty who teach in undersubscribed areas retire, using the salary savings from the retirement to fund increases for faculty while still retaining the line through outside support. This is obviously a limited source of new revenue but is one that could be useful to departments that have had high success rates in securing such positions.

VII. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The Commission on Faculty Compensation and Economic Benefits is convinced through this year’s analysis that the Critical Compensation Fund was a strong, if limited, success, and that it should be sustained as part of a larger package of tools for elevating faculty compensation in the interest of keeping UW-Madison competitive with its peers.

Recommendations for Improving Future Implementations of CCF or Similar Mechanisms

1. CCF or a similar adjustment mechanism is critical for bringing salaries in line with UW-Madison’s peer institutions but only as part of a larger set of compensation tools and policies. CCF can also help address internal equity issues on the UW-Madison campus.
2. CCF should complement, rather than replace, these other tools and pay plans.
3. Even in the event of a state or supplemental pay plan, administrators should make every effort to ensure a second CCF exercise in order not only to elevate the salaries of those who were eligible but did not receive an adjustment in the first round, but in order to mitigate inequities produced as a consequence of the first exercise.
4. Comprehensive training and greater standardization before the rollout of initiatives such as CCF are essential to their success.
5. The commission urges administrators to seek revenue from the sources and strategies recommended in the 2011-2012 report, summarized in section VI above, to close gaps on salary inequities both among UW-Madison faculty and between UW-Madison faculty and their peers.

VIII. COMMISSION MEMBERSHIP

Louis Armentano (Dairy Science)
Jo Ellen Fair (Journalism and Mass Communication), UC ex officio appointee, non-voting
Anna Haley-Lock (Social Work)
Richard Keller (Medical History and Bioethics), chair
Alan Lockwood (Curriculum and Instruction)
Ann Macguidwin (Plant Pathology)
Donald Stone (Materials Science and Engineering)
James Tinjum (Civil and Environmental Engineering)
Mary Triana (Business)
Margarita Zamora (Spanish and Portuguese)
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Appendix 1

26 September 2012

To: Members of the Commission on Faculty Compensation and Economic Benefits
From: The University Committee (UC)
Re: Charge to the Commission: Assessment of Critical Compensation Fund and Recommendations for the Future

STATEMENT OF COMMITTEE CHARGE

As specified in Faculty Policies and Procedures 6.34, the commission’s charge is to address matters of faculty compensation and benefits by preparing information for the faculty on the state of their compensation and benefits, including comparative data from other universities and professional fields as it deems necessary. The commission represents faculty in campus-wide discussions and prepares recommendations on these matters for the faculty senate, which may transmit them to the administration, the board of regents, the governor, and the legislature. To the extent possible, it coordinates its work with the Academic Staff Executive Committee.

Funding for the 2012 Critical Compensation Fund (CCF) became available through base budget reallocations. These funds were reinvested in an attempt to increase compensation of critical faculty and staff. Faculty salaries at the UW-Madison generally have not kept pace with salaries in peer institutions. Without redress these disparities could lead to a dispirited workforce, departures, and institutional decline. A large part of the commission’s particular charge in 2012-13, therefore, involves monitoring and identifying weaknesses and potential modifications of the CCF process now underway. Specifically, the commission is charged with the following:

1. Undertake a study of how different units determined CCF and market equity reviews during the first (fall 2012) review.
3. Determine whether the CCF is an effective tool, along with other tools of compensation, in bringing the salaries of UW-Madison faculty closer to the median of peer institutions and make recommendations for its continued use.
4. Identify and assess changes that could improve such exercises in the future.
5. Identify possible additional funds (e.g., further cost savings, innovation, philanthropy, or others) that might grow the CCF or fund other exercises directed at improving compensation plans.

We look forward to receiving your report and recommendations no later than Wednesday, 13 March 2013. We will ask the commission to present briefly its work at the 8 April 2013 faculty senate meeting.

Please note that among the members listed at the bottom of the memo is Jo Ellen Fair, who is the UC’s representative to the commission. The UC has designated her to recruit a member willing to be elected by the commission to serve as chair. Volunteers are, of course, welcome. It is very likely that the commission will need

The University Committee

133 Bascom Hall  University of Wisconsin-Madison  500 Lincoln Drive  Madison, Wisconsin 53706-1380
608/262-3566  Fax: 608/262-4570  http://www.ssufac.wisc.edu/
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to meet on a frequent basis and may need to form sub-committees to achieve its goals. As always, the UC invites
the commission to offer revisions to its charge once its active deliberations are in progress.

COMMISSION MEMBERS:

Louis Armentano (Dairy Science)
Jo Ellen Fair (Journalism and Mass Communication), ex officio, non-voting
Anna Haley-Lock (Social Work)
Richard Keller (Medical History and Bioethics)
Alan Lockwood (Curriculum and Instruction)
Ann Macguidwin (Plant Pathology)
James Tinjum (Engineering Professional Development)
Mary Triana (Business)
Margarita Zamora (Spanish and Portuguese)
TBA, another voting member to be added and affirmed by the faculty senate
Appendix 2

April 9, 2013

MEMORANDUM

TO:       Interim Chancellor David Ward
           Provost Paul M. DeLuca, Jr.
           Vice-Chancellor Darrell Bazzell

FROM:     Sari Lazenby, Associate Policy and Planning Analyst, Academic Planning & Institutional Research

SUBJECT:  Faculty Salary Peer Comparison for 2012-13

Updated salary peer comparisons are now available for 2012-13. The Chronicle of Higher Education has implemented a useful online interface to the data, available at http://chronicle.com/article/aaup-survey-data2013/138369/id-240441. The standard peer comparison report is attached, and we hope to provide additional comparison information in the coming weeks.

In 2012-13, among our official faculty salary peer group, UW-Madison remained ranked 12th among full professors, rose from 8th place to 6th for associate professors, and remained 11th among assistant professors. The overall salary increase needed to place each faculty rank at its respective peer group median stands at 11.6 percent (approximately $26 M), compared to 12.6 percent ($28 M) last year. See the attached graph for the trend since 1973.

These comparisons come from the Association of American University Professors (AAUP) “Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession” for 2012-13. Attached tables provide 2012-13 average salary figures and percentage increases in average salaries for UW-Madison and the universities in our official salary peer group. Salaries reported by the AAUP are affected by several factors, including faculty turnover and promotions, and individual salary adjustments for promotion, competitive market, or equity, in addition to the institutions’ announced annual increases.

The AAUP reports an “All Ranks” combined average salary for each university. These “All Ranks” salary averages (which include instructors, lecturers, and non-ranked faculty) do not adjust for differences in rank mix between UW-Madison and peer institutions. In contrast, our rank-by-rank salary comparison controls for UW-Madison’s higher than average share of full professors. The comparison attached to this memorandum does not include any adjustments for geographical differences in the cost of living, and may differ somewhat from the information presented by UW System, which does include such adjustments.

Please contact Sari Lazenby (slazenby@wisc.edu or 3-5945) or Jocelyn Milner (jmilner@wisc.edu or 3-5658) with any questions about these peer comparisons.

xc:       Jocelyn Milner, Academic Planning and Institutional Research
           Steve Stern, Vice Provost for Faculty and Staff
           Bob Lavigna, Office of Human Resources
           Steve Lund, Academic Personnel Office
           Andrea Pochling, Secretary of the Faculty
           Amy Toburen, University Communications
           Eden Inouye-Ronnie, Provost’s Office

Sara Lazenby, Associate Policy and Planning Analyst, Academic Planning and Institutional Research
University of Wisconsin-Madison, 170 Bascom Hall, 500 Lincoln Drive, Madison, Wisconsin 53706
608/263-5945 slazenby@wisc.edu apir.wisc.edu
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>brew</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Annual Report. Faculty Members in Full-time Non-Administrative Ranks as of October 1, 2013.
### UW-Madison \( \times \) Faculty Salaries (2004-05 to 2012-13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure-Track Faculty</td>
<td>65,035</td>
<td>66,180</td>
<td>67,336</td>
<td>73,994</td>
<td>77,654</td>
<td>81,315</td>
<td>85,976</td>
<td>90,637</td>
<td>95,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured-Associate Faculty</td>
<td>86,999</td>
<td>88,125</td>
<td>89,251</td>
<td>96,420</td>
<td>99,580</td>
<td>102,741</td>
<td>105,902</td>
<td>109,062</td>
<td>112,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>99,899</td>
<td>101,026</td>
<td>102,151</td>
<td>109,320</td>
<td>112,480</td>
<td>115,641</td>
<td>118,802</td>
<td>121,962</td>
<td>125,123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Median Average Faculty Salaries by Professional Rank

- Tenure-Track Faculty: \( \$ \text{65,035} \)
- Tenured-Associate Faculty: \( \$ \text{86,999} \)
- Full Professor: \( \$ \text{99,899} \)
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• For faculty, we will incorporate the CCF initiative into the previously planned three year cycle of faculty salary reviews. We expect most departments to supplement CCF resources, though departments may choose to use CCF resources to fully fund more limited salary adjustments. Details on the L&S approach to these faculty salary reviews are included in the attached document, which also shows the schedule of reviews for the next three years (by calendar year of appointment). Department-specific information on eligible faculty and match rate will follow on September 4.

If you have additional questions after receiving department-specific information on September 4, please consult with your Academic Associate Dean, or with Anne Gunther and Mary Beth Ellis on budget issues and innovations funds, and with Cheryl Adams Kadera on Academic and Limited staff CCF recommendations. We will also have an opportunity to discuss the general L&S process at the Chairs, Directors and Administrators Orientation on August 28, and the Divisional Chairs and Directors meetings on September 24. We have also scheduled workshops to address general questions about process, the format for requests, and funding formulas (but not individual department budget questions) for Tuesday, 9/11/12 from noon-1:00 and Thursday, 9/13/12 from 3:00-4:00 (location TBA).

We recognize that there are both real opportunities and great challenges involved in implementing the CCF and this new approach to addressing salary issues. In the current context of very limited resources and large salary gaps for critical faculty and staff, our options are constrained; difficult tradeoffs are inevitable. Nonetheless, the College is committed to developing a strategy to address fundamental salary issues, and CCF funding and related authority has created important new opportunities. We look forward to working together with departments and other units to make the most of these opportunities, and to identify and address the most urgent market, retention, and equity concerns for our valued faculty and staff.

Cc: Steve Lund, Steve Stern, L&S Admin

Attachments:
L&S Academic Staff and Limited Employee CCF Process
L&S Faculty CCF Process
Schedule for L&S Faculty Market Equity Reviews (3 Year Cycle)
L&S Academic Staff and Limited Employee CCF Recommendation form
L&S Faculty CCF Recommendation form

(continued)
L&S Academic Staff and Limited Employee CCF Process

Eligibility:

- **General Criteria:** As outlined in the original CCF announcements from campus, salary adjustments for Academic Staff and Limited Employees are to address market, retention, and equity concerns, with meritorious performance a necessary but not sufficient justification.

- Academic Staff and Limited Employees who recently started their current position, or who recently received a base salary adjustment, should not receive first consideration, but may still be considered.

Scope and Funding:

- CCF policies allow L&S to support adjustments for no more than 30 percent of Academic Staff overall, and no more than one Academic Staff person or 30 percent of Academic Staff in a unit, whichever is greater.

- It is critical to have a strong review process in place with appropriate justification for requests. Please consult with all supervisors of academic staff in your unit to be sure all eligible staff are considered.

  - Units with 3 or more Academic Staff will be invited to submit requests to allocate an estimated pool of CCF resources to support salary increases for up to 30 percent of Academic Staff. The estimated resources will be sufficient to provide the minimum 5% raise to 30% of the unit’s average-paid Academic Staff.

  - Units with fewer than 3 Academic Staff will be invited to nominate at most one Academic Staff person. Nominations from these units will be reviewed and ranked by an external review committee, so that 30% of Academic Staff from smaller units also receive salary adjustments.

- Departments may request raises of no less than 5 percent or $3000, whichever is higher. The maximum increase is 10 percent for each eligible Academic Staff or Limited Employee.

  - To support approved CCF adjustments for 101-funded Academic Staff, L&S expects to provide funding equivalent to the 5% minimum adjustment for average paid Academic Staff in the unit; approved adjustments in excess of the CCF allocation will be funded jointly by L&S and the unit. L&S will provide 50% of additional funding required for approved salary adjustments, up to half the unit’s original CCF allocation associated with 101-funded Academic Staff. The remaining funding will be drawn from innovations savings in the unit’s base budget.

  - Approved CCF adjustments for non-101-funded Academic Staff will be covered from funding sources currently used for those staff.

  - CCF funding presumes that the 30 percent of Academic Staff receiving salary adjustments will not be disproportionately drawn from 101-funded Academic Staff (eligible for CCF resources). Units with a mix of 101 and non-101-funded Academic Staff that recommend a disproportionately large share of salary adjustments for 101-funded staff may be asked to offset additional costs.

(continued)
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- No more than 30% of all Limited Employees may receive CCF adjustments. Units with fewer than 3 Limited Employees may recommend a maximum of one Limited Employee for a salary adjustment. Units recommending Limited Employees for a salary adjustment may be asked for an alternative recommendation should we receive recommendations for more than 30% of all Limited Employees in the College.

Recommendation Format and Due Dates:

- Your department will receive a department-specific list of 101 and non-101 Academic Staff and Limited Employees by September 4.

- Your department will also receive, by September 4, confirmation of staff size (greater than or less than 3 total Academic Staff and/or Limited Employees). In addition, those with more than 3 staff, at least some 101-funded, will receive information on their maximum dollar allocation of CCF resources that may be applied to salary increases for 101-funded Academic Staff.

- Departments with more than 3 Academic Staff and/or Limited Employees: Recommendations should be accompanied by a completed CCF request form (attached) for each recommended salary adjustment, and a completed summary spreadsheet showing the distribution of the CCF allocation and any contribution from the department budget. L&S will review the allocation of salary increases, along with the funding and the required justification, and will confirm the adjustments.

- Departments with fewer than 3 Academic Staff and/or Limited Employees: A recommendation for at most one Academic Staff and/or Limited Employee should be submitted using the attached CCF request form. Information on the department contribution to the recommended raise (if over 5% requested) is to be provided in the justification. Nominations from these units will be reviewed and ranked by an external review committee, so that 30% of Academic Staff and/or Limited Employees from smaller units also receive salary adjustments. L&S will review the funding and confirm approved adjustments.

- Recommendations for Academic Staff and/or Limited Employee salary adjustments will be due to L&S no later than Wednesday September 26th, in order that approved salary adjustments may take effect with the next pay period (9/27/12 for 9 month or 10/1/12 for 12 month Academic Staff). Units requiring additional time to consider their recommendations may submit final recommendations no later than Monday October 22, in order that approved salary adjustments may take effect in the following pay period (10/27/12 for 9 month or 11/4/12 for 12 month Academic Staff).

(continued)
L&S Faculty CCF Process

Eligibility:

- **General Criteria:** As outlined in the original CCF announcements from campus, faculty salary adjustments are to address market, retention, and equity concerns, with meritorious performance a necessary but not sufficient justification. Those hired within the last three years, or who received a market rate base adjustment for retention purposes within the last three years, should not receive first consideration.

- **Timing of 3 year cycle:** CCF resources will be used to support our previously planned three year cycle of market equity faculty salary adjustments. Faculty are eligible for consideration three years after initial UW faculty appointment, and every three years thereafter (see attached chart). Year 1 faculty should be considered for the current round of adjustments (Year 2 faculty will be eligible to be considered for adjustments effective in 2013-14, and Year 3 faculty for adjustments effective in 2014-15). Departments may request salary adjustments for all eligible faculty, if adjustments would be consistent with the General Criteria (above), and if department matching funds are available. In the absence of department matching funds, departments may request salary adjustments for 30 percent of eligible faculty over the full three year cycle, as discussed in Option 2 below.

Scope and Funding:

- **Resources for the three year cycle of strategic faculty salary adjustments** will be drawn from a combination of CCF, L&S and department resources from innovations. Innovations resources are those generated by approved innovation plans. These plans may include, for example, curricular innovations that allow the department to effectively serve the same number of undergraduates with fewer faculty or TAs, reorganizations that reduce administrative staff, or income-generating programs.

- **We expect most departments will opt to partner with the College to supplement the resources available for faculty salary adjustments.** In that case, the College will provide at least one-third of salary adjustments, with the remaining two-thirds provided by the department share of funds made available through innovations (i.e. the college will “match” every 2 dollars of funding from department innovations with 1 dollar of additional support from the college). In some cases, for example when salary gaps are unusually large (relative to other departments in the college), a higher match rate may be provided. Departments opting to supplement the pool of resources with department innovations funds may request raises of no less than 5 percent and no more than 10 percent for each eligible faculty member. Note, in these departments up to 100% of all eligible faculty may receive adjustments over the full three year cycle. ([Option 1](#))

- **Alternatively, departments may opt to use CCF resources to provide a 5% increase for up to 30% of faculty eligible in Year 1.** Note, in these departments, a maximum of 30% of all eligible faculty may receive adjustments over the full three year cycle. ([Option 2](#))

- **We expect the same match rate to apply for the full three-year cycle and for retention and supplementary promotional base adjustments over this period.** The choice of Option 1 or Option 2 for CCF will not alter the match available for other approved adjustments.

(continued)
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Recommendation Format and Due Dates:

1. Your department will receive a department specific list of faculty, with year of hire and eligibility (Year 1, 2, or 3) by September 4.

2. Your department will also receive, no later than September 4, confirmation of the match rate. We expect this rate to be applied across all three years of this cycle of market equity salary adjustments, as well as to any salary adjustments related to promotions or retentions over this period. (If your department is considering Option 2, please contact Associate Dean Maria Candel for additional details on the available resources, which will be equivalent to 5% or 30% of the salaries of faculty eligible this year (i.e. Year 1 faculty who have not had a base adjustment in the last 3 years).

3. Recommendations should be accompanied by a completed Faculty CCF request form (attached) for each recommended salary adjustment, and a completed summary spreadsheet showing the distribution of the CCF allocation and contributions from the department budget. L&S will review the allocation of salary increases, along with the funding, and will confirm the adjustments.

4. Recommendations for faculty salary adjustments will be due to L&S by Wednesday September 26th in order that approved salary adjustments may take effect with the next pay period (9/27/12 for 9 month or 10/1/12 for 12 month faculty). Units requiring additional time to consider their recommendations may submit final recommendations no later than Monday October 22, in order that approved salary adjustments may take effect in the following pay period (10/27/12 for 9 month or 11/1/12 for 12 month faculty).
### Schedule of I&S Faculty CCF and Market Equity Reviews

#### Year of Reviews and Adjustments through 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar Year of Appointment</th>
<th>1st Review</th>
<th>1st potential effective date</th>
<th>2nd Review</th>
<th>2nd potential effective date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2017 spring</td>
<td>2017 fall</td>
<td>2017 spring</td>
<td>2017 fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2016 spring</td>
<td>2015 fall</td>
<td>2017 spring</td>
<td>2017 fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2015 spring</td>
<td>2015 fall</td>
<td>2017 spring</td>
<td>2017 fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2014 spring</td>
<td>2014 fall</td>
<td>2017 spring</td>
<td>2017 fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2013 spring</td>
<td>2013 fall</td>
<td>2016 spring</td>
<td>2016 fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2012 fall</td>
<td>2012 fall</td>
<td>2015 spring</td>
<td>2015 fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2014 spring</td>
<td>2014 fall</td>
<td>2017 spring</td>
<td>2017 fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2013 spring</td>
<td>2013 fall</td>
<td>2016 spring</td>
<td>2016 fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2012 fall</td>
<td>2012 fall</td>
<td>2015 spring</td>
<td>2015 fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2014 spring</td>
<td>2014 fall</td>
<td>2017 spring</td>
<td>2017 fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2013 spring</td>
<td>2013 fall</td>
<td>2016 spring</td>
<td>2016 fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2012 fall</td>
<td>2012 fall</td>
<td>2015 spring</td>
<td>2015 fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2014 spring</td>
<td>2014 fall</td>
<td>2017 spring</td>
<td>2017 fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2013 spring</td>
<td>2013 fall</td>
<td>2016 spring</td>
<td>2016 fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2012 fall</td>
<td>2012 fall</td>
<td>2015 spring</td>
<td>2015 fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>2014 spring</td>
<td>2014 fall</td>
<td>2017 spring</td>
<td>2017 fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>2013 spring</td>
<td>2013 fall</td>
<td>2016 spring</td>
<td>2016 fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>2012 fall</td>
<td>2012 fall</td>
<td>2015 spring</td>
<td>2015 fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>2014 spring</td>
<td>2014 fall</td>
<td>2017 spring</td>
<td>2017 fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>2013 spring</td>
<td>2013 fall</td>
<td>2016 spring</td>
<td>2016 fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>2012 fall</td>
<td>2012 fall</td>
<td>2015 spring</td>
<td>2015 fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>2014 spring</td>
<td>2014 fall</td>
<td>2017 spring</td>
<td>2017 fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>2013 spring</td>
<td>2013 fall</td>
<td>2016 spring</td>
<td>2016 fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>2012 fall</td>
<td>2012 fall</td>
<td>2015 spring</td>
<td>2015 fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>2014 spring</td>
<td>2014 fall</td>
<td>2017 spring</td>
<td>2017 fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>2013 spring</td>
<td>2013 fall</td>
<td>2016 spring</td>
<td>2016 fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>2012 fall</td>
<td>2012 fall</td>
<td>2015 spring</td>
<td>2015 fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>2014 spring</td>
<td>2014 fall</td>
<td>2017 spring</td>
<td>2017 fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>2013 spring</td>
<td>2013 fall</td>
<td>2016 spring</td>
<td>2016 fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>2012 fall</td>
<td>2012 fall</td>
<td>2015 spring</td>
<td>2015 fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>2014 spring</td>
<td>2014 fall</td>
<td>2017 spring</td>
<td>2017 fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>2013 spring</td>
<td>2013 fall</td>
<td>2016 spring</td>
<td>2016 fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>2012 fall</td>
<td>2012 fall</td>
<td>2015 spring</td>
<td>2015 fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>2014 spring</td>
<td>2014 fall</td>
<td>2017 spring</td>
<td>2017 fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>2013 spring</td>
<td>2013 fall</td>
<td>2016 spring</td>
<td>2016 fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>2012 fall</td>
<td>2012 fall</td>
<td>2015 spring</td>
<td>2015 fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>2014 spring</td>
<td>2014 fall</td>
<td>2017 spring</td>
<td>2017 fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>2013 spring</td>
<td>2013 fall</td>
<td>2016 spring</td>
<td>2016 fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>2012 fall</td>
<td>2012 fall</td>
<td>2015 spring</td>
<td>2015 fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>2014 spring</td>
<td>2014 fall</td>
<td>2017 spring</td>
<td>2017 fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>2013 spring</td>
<td>2013 fall</td>
<td>2016 spring</td>
<td>2016 fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>2012 fall</td>
<td>2012 fall</td>
<td>2015 spring</td>
<td>2015 fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>2014 spring</td>
<td>2014 fall</td>
<td>2017 spring</td>
<td>2017 fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>2013 spring</td>
<td>2013 fall</td>
<td>2016 spring</td>
<td>2016 fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>2012 fall</td>
<td>2012 fall</td>
<td>2015 spring</td>
<td>2015 fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>2014 spring</td>
<td>2014 fall</td>
<td>2017 spring</td>
<td>2017 fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>2013 spring</td>
<td>2013 fall</td>
<td>2016 spring</td>
<td>2016 fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>2012 fall</td>
<td>2012 fall</td>
<td>2015 spring</td>
<td>2015 fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>2014 spring</td>
<td>2014 fall</td>
<td>2017 spring</td>
<td>2017 fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>2013 spring</td>
<td>2013 fall</td>
<td>2016 spring</td>
<td>2016 fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>2012 fall</td>
<td>2012 fall</td>
<td>2015 spring</td>
<td>2015 fall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Italicized reviews are projected for the second cycle*
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Critical Compensation Fund Exercise: Review of Results, 31 January 2013

Background:

The CCF (Critical Compensation Fund) exercise in 2012, an initiative undertaken by Chancellor David Ward in collaboration with campus governance and leadership, was the first pay tool in recent years designed to apply to all permanent employee categories. CCF was not a pay plan; adjustments under CCF were limited to no more than 30% of employees. CCF is one useful instrument within an emerging portfolio of pay tools. The resource target for CCF investment was 2% of base payroll.

The decision-making and implementation of CCF was highly decentralized. Central campus instructions provided parameters including GPR and non-GPR allocation targets, and including an expectation (albeit not an absolute requirement) that units meet the targets.

Statistics:

Tables 1 and 2 distill the statistical results of CCF, and inform the narrative points below. Campus-wide data in Table 2 are preliminary; the final data on total number of adjustments and dollars may go up, but not down. More detailed analysis by the Budget Office and APIR, including data on variation across the major units (colleges/schools, divisions), are the foundation for the results summarized here.

Positive Results:

1. Overall reach: The CCF tool increased pay of 3,119 employees and amounted to an investment of $1.464 million. Permanent base adjustments affected 2,414 employees and amounted to $1.272 million. In addition, 705 classified staff received lump-sum awards amounting to $1.32 million. For breakdown by employee category, dollar amounts, and percentage of eligible employees, please see Tables 1-2.

2. Classified staff: The collective campus effort was outstanding. A total of 1,227 persons received awards (base adjustments or lump-sums) amounting to $4.1 million. Permanent base adjustments reached 28.7% of eligible employees, close to the 30% cap.

3. Academic staff: The CCF tool reached 1,270 employees who were awarded $5.73 million. In addition, the CCF empowered some units to make an exceptionally strong effort to respond to long delayed critical needs, in part by tapping off central campus allocations with additional internal reallocations. Units that topped off more than 15% included Dean of Students (24.8%), L & S (20.9%), Nelson Institute (18.2%), and SOE (21.8%), University Health Services (39.7%), and University Housing (111.5%).

4. Faculty: The CCF enabled schools/colleges to address critical salary needs through awards to 485 faculty whose adjustments amounted to $3.84 million. (Note: Faculty members are also eligible for other pay-related tools in our portfolio. Notwithstanding difficulties with achieving non-GPR targets for base adjustments, most schools either achieved 85-99% of their total dollar allocation targets (CALS, SOE, COE, Law, L & S, Nursing, Veterinary Medicine), or exceeded targets through additional internal reallocation (Business, Graduate School, Nelson Institute, Pharmacy, Continuing Studies).
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Concerns:

1. Uneven results by employee categories: Academic staff base adjustments relative to target numbers lagged behind those in other employee categories, and academic staff allocation targets were also more dependent on non-GPR allocations. If SMPH is set aside as an arena with highly distinctive budgetary and staffing logics, however, the uneven results disappear. See Tables 1-2.

2. Uneven results by funding source: Comparison of GPR and non-GPR funded results in Tables 1-2 suggests that there was considerably more difficulty meeting the non-GPR dollar targets. For example, CALS made a strong good-faith effort, but the adjustment results varied: 98.3% of GPR target versus 82.5% of non-GPR target. Such gaps were not uncommon.

3. Reconciling global and local logics: The budgetary premises and time lines of the CCF model did not harmonize with the budgetary decision-making logics and needs of some units. Among academic units of large size, SMPH experienced the most difficulty harmonizing its budget model and decision process with the assumptions of the CCF process. See Table 2, note 5.

4. In retrospect, some aspects of the first-time implementation process may have compounded the difficulties or areas of concern.

   (a) This was a first-time exercise conducted largely in summer months on short notice, within highly decentralized decision-making and implementation process.

   (b) We did not organize an educational preparation process with workshops for chairs and directors, and other key personnel including PIs.

   (c) There was no central campus requirement (although there was a stated expectation) that units had to meet dollar targets or a high threshold (e.g., 90%) of targets.

   (d) There was not a deferred implementation option in cases of hardship where grant budgets did not align with CCF rules of implementation in the short run.

   The good news is that we can learn from the first-time process to improve practices and education for CCF-like or other pay related exercises in the future, and we can share best-practice examples from units that engaged CCF in highly effective ways.

5. Employee morale and good will: Considerable good will among employees accrued from statements by university leaders that we expect to do a future CCF-like exercise (unless a state pay plan and a campus supplemental pay plan eliminate the need) that will make it possible, over time, to consider those employees who could not be considered in the first-time CCF, given the 30% cap on adjustments. Clarity and follow-up about the timing of the next CCF-like exercise, if a meaningful state pay plan is not forthcoming, is important.

[For summary numbers, please see Tables 1-2 on next pages.]

(continued)
### CCF Summary Table 1

**Campus-Wide Results Excluding SMPH, 31 January 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Headcounts</th>
<th>All Employees</th>
<th>Academic St</th>
<th>Limited</th>
<th>Classified (broadbanded)</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2043 (see note 3)</td>
<td>1043</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>472 (see note 3)</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of employees</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dollar Amounts Awarded Compared to Dollar Amounts Targeted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ amount Awarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ amount Targeted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of $ target</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GPR Compared to Non-GPR Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GPR/Non-GPR:</th>
<th>Non-GPR: $ (millions)</th>
<th>GPR: $ (millions)</th>
<th>% of target awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Awarded</td>
<td>Targeted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPR/Non-GPR:</td>
<td>6.73 GPR/4.01 Non-</td>
<td>2.10 GPR/2.60 Non-</td>
<td>102.9% GPR/91.4% Non-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.10 GPR/2.60 Non-</td>
<td>0.63 GPR/0.20 Non-</td>
<td>103.3% GPR/97.8% Non-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.63 GPR/0.20 Non-</td>
<td>1.19 GPR/0.80 Non-</td>
<td>131.7% GPR/62.7% Non-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.19 GPR/0.80 Non-</td>
<td>2.81 GPR/0.47 Non-</td>
<td>102.0% GPR/88.0% Non-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical notes:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Head-count data per APIR; $ data per Budget Office; funding sources per 10/12 payroll.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. GPR = 101 + 402 funds; non-GPR = all others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Classified headcounts in table includes broad-banded category and permanent base adjustments only. <strong>In addition, there were 642 classified lump-sum adjustments amounting to $1.73 million</strong>, or 116.5% of $ allocation target and 26.8% of eligible employees (FTE basis).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. For preliminary campus-wide results including SMPH, please see Table 2 including note 5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### CCF Summary Table 2

**Campus-Wide Preliminary Results Including SMFH, 31 January 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Employees</th>
<th>Academic St.</th>
<th>Limited</th>
<th>Classified (broadbanded)</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Headcounts</strong></td>
<td>2414 (see note 3)</td>
<td>1270</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>522 (see note 3)</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent of employees</strong></td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **$ amount Awarded**         | 12.72 million (see note 3) | 5.73 million | 0.98 million | 2.18 million (see note 3) | 3.84 million |
| **$ amount Targeted**        | 15.23 million          | 7.67 million | 0.93 million | 2.27                      | 4.37 million |
| **Percent of target**        | 83.5%                   | 74.7%        | 105.1%      | 95.9%                     | 87.9%      |

### GPR Compared to Non-GPR Results

| GPR/Non-GPR: $ (millions) Awarded | 7.20 GPR/5.52 Non- | 2.23 GPR/3.50 Non- | 0.69 GPR/0.29 Non- | 1.27 GPR/0.91 Non- | 3.02 GPR/0.82 Non- |
| GPR/Non-GPR: $ (millions) Targeted | 7.46 GPR/7.77 Non- | 2.42 GPR/5.25 Non- | 0.54 GPR/0.39 Non- | 1.26 GPR/1.01 Non- | 3.25 GPR/1.11 Non- |
| GPR/Non-GPR: % of target awarded | 98.6% GPR/71.0% Non- | 92.3% GPR/66.6% Non- | 128.1% GPR/75.6% Non- | 100.8% GPR/89.8% Non- | 92.9% GPR/73.8% Non- |

**Technical notes:**
1. Head-count data per APIR; $ data per Budget Office; funding sources per 10/12 payroll.
2. GPR = 101 + 402 funds; non-GPR = all others.
3. Classified headcounts in table includes broad-band category and permanent base adjustments only. In addition, there were 705 classified lump-sum adjustments amounting to $1.92 million, or 103.3% of $ allocation target and 24.6% of eligible employees (FTE basis).
4. The current preliminary estimate of unspent GPR allocations (excluding top-off effects when some units exceeded GPR allocations based on their own additional internal reallocations) is as follows: 898K, divided as follows: 329K academic staff, 57K limited, 96K classified, 416K faculty. Note that this estimate will change as a function of updated information; see note 5.
5. Among the academic schools/colleges whose scale of operation is large enough to affect campus-wide figures significantly, the SMFH relies on a distinctive budgetary model and logic, with major reliance on clinical revenues in combination with non-GPR grant revenues and GPR revenues. In addition, central campus data is not fully up to date on all SMFH adjustments and funding splits; final data on number of awards and dollars may go up, but not down. It is therefore important to consider also the campus-wide pattern of results with the SMFH factor removed. These are given in Table 1.
Appendix 5

DISTRIBUTION OF FACULTY CRITICAL COMPENSATION FUND (CCF) SALARY ADJUSTMENTS BY CAMPUS UNIT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Total faculty</th>
<th>Faculty with CCF</th>
<th>% of faculty with CCF</th>
<th>Total annual CCF amount</th>
<th>Mean CCF amount</th>
<th>Minimum amount</th>
<th>Maximum amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CALS</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>476,042</td>
<td>6,521</td>
<td>3,244</td>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>196,903</td>
<td>6,352</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>18,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>377,809</td>
<td>7,408</td>
<td>4,250</td>
<td>20,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOHE</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>48,477</td>
<td>12,119</td>
<td>8,015</td>
<td>15,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Env St</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>13,198</td>
<td>6,599</td>
<td>4,486</td>
<td>8,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>84,532</td>
<td>8,453</td>
<td>5,050</td>
<td>15,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L&amp;S</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>1,500,244</td>
<td>7,896</td>
<td>2,825</td>
<td>25,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSLH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5,412</td>
<td>5,412</td>
<td>5,412</td>
<td>5,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMFH</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>591,405</td>
<td>8,101</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>20,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>46,191</td>
<td>6,599</td>
<td>3,450</td>
<td>17,786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>62,730</td>
<td>7,841</td>
<td>4,316</td>
<td>14,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vet Med</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>110,209</td>
<td>7,872</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>11,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cont St</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>13,584</td>
<td>4,528</td>
<td>4,496</td>
<td>4,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2,094</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>3,936,338</td>
<td>8,116</td>
<td>2,825</td>
<td>33,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: HRS EPM data views as of March 20, 2013
NOTES: Total faculty includes all individuals with a paid UW-Madison faculty position as of July 1, 2012.
Many faculty have more than one tenure home and multiple funding departments. For this table, faculty are assigned
to one department only, based on their primary department in HRS. CCF dollar amounts shown are calculated as full-
time annualized salary adjustments. Grand Total adjusted for FTE shows the dollar amounts adjusting for those
faculty who hold less than full time faculty positions. Prepared by Office of Academic Planning and Institutional
Research 3/26/2013

DISTRIBUTION OF FACULTY CRITICAL COMPENSATION FUND (CCF) SALARY ADJUSTMENTS BY ACADEMIC RANK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Total faculty</th>
<th>Faculty with CCF</th>
<th>% of faculty with CCF</th>
<th>Total annual CCF amount</th>
<th>Mean CCF amount</th>
<th>Minimum amount</th>
<th>Maximum amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>537,469</td>
<td>6,476</td>
<td>2,825</td>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>754,361</td>
<td>6,796</td>
<td>2,984</td>
<td>21,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>1265</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>2,444,506</td>
<td>9,088</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>33,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2,094</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>3,936,338</td>
<td>8,116</td>
<td>2,825</td>
<td>33,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
### Appendix 6 (continued)

#### Distribution of Faculty Critical Commissions Fund (CCF) Salary Adjustments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Minority</th>
<th>Total Faculty</th>
<th>Total CCF</th>
<th>Total Faculty CCF</th>
<th>% of Faculty CCF</th>
<th>% of CCF</th>
<th>% of Faculty * % of CCF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Majority</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Majority</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Ethnic</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Ethnic</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Pay by Gender and Minority Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Total Faculty</th>
<th>Total CCF</th>
<th>Total Faculty CCF</th>
<th>% of Faculty CCF</th>
<th>% of CCF</th>
<th>% of Faculty * % of CCF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>33.750</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>132.9</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>24.89</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>33.750</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Notes

- The table above summarizes the distribution of faculty critical commissions fund (CCF) salary adjustments by gender and minority status.
- The data is presented for each gender and minority group, showing the total faculty, total CCF, total faculty CCF, and the respective percentages of each.
### Appendix 6, cont'd.

The table below shows the breakdown of full-time faculty members by race and gender as of July 1, 2012.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Title</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>33,750</td>
<td>9,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES: Total faculty includes all individuals with a paid UW-Madison faculty position as of July 1, 2012.

SOURCE: HRIS ERM data views as of March 20, 2013.
Military education at the University of Wisconsin-Madison dates from 1866 when the university became a land-grant institution under the Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862. The act required the teaching of “military science;” however, for many years it involved little more than a required drilling exercise for all male students. The National Defense Act of 1916 established the Reserve Officer Training Corp (ROTC), and a formal program of instruction augmented practice on the field. In 1923, military training became optional at the university.

During World War II, the University of Wisconsin continued its commitment to providing well-trained servicemen and women for the America’s Armed Forces. In 1942, Regent President A. J. Glover, in his annual message to the university alumni, bragged that twelve hundred sailors were enrolled in the radio code and communications school; 480 “Women Accepted for Volunteer Emergency Service” (WAVES) were being trained as radio operators. An institute of correspondence education for Army and Navy personnel was in operation, and 2,600 students were enrolled in ROTC. Although for many decades the aging Old Red Gym had served as the campus training facility, during the war the Army and Navy were assured that they would soon have a new permanent headquarters.

Since that time, the University of Wisconsin-Madison has continued to meet its land-grant obligation. Indeed, this one of a few universities that offers students the opportunity to earn a commission in any of the three armed services. We host three departments: Military Science; Naval Science, which includes the Marines; and Aerospace Studies. The regents’ contracts with the services provide that each program has full departmental status and enjoys privileges comparable to those of other academic departments on campus. Faculty status is granted to the commanding officers in the programs [Faculty Policies and Procedures (FPP) 1.02.-1.03.].

The Officer Education Committee (FPP 6.47.) consists of the following members: the provost; eight faculty members, one of whom serves as the director of the Officer Education Program (OEP); and the commandants of each of the ROTC units, who are ex officio and nonvoting.

Its primary charge is to recommend policy relating to the Officer Education Program. The academic components of the Officer Education Program operate under the supervision of the Officer Education Committee (OEC). Members of the committee are chosen from a wide range of departments and disciplines. The Committee on Committees is delegated to make the faculty appointments to the OEC. In addition to their other functions, the OEC examines, for approval, the qualifications of all commanding officers nominated for service on campus. The committee personally interviews and recommends action on nominations of persons to serve as unit commanders, each of whom holds the title professor of military science (FPP 1.03.B.1.). Two former professors of military science are currently on university staff. Kris Ackerbauer is the assistant director of the Physical Plant, and John Bechtol is the assistant dean of students for veterans affairs. Both serve as advisors to the OEC and the ROTC programs.

The combined programs receive more than $3.3 million each year in federal funds, which are used for student scholarships, salaries of officers, enlisted personnel and civilian support staff, and for supplies. The University of Wisconsin’s 2012-2013 budget (101) contribution of $203,886 includes funding for secretarial support for each of the services and for the Officer Education Program (directed by Professor James Johannes, School of Business), miscellaneous support, and for use of an off-campus rifle range.
All classes offered in the three departments conform to university and campus rules, including the laws, policies, and regulations for equity and diversity. Courses offered by the ROTC programs are open to all UW-Madison students. A number of non-ROTC students interested in courses such as navigation or military history, or who are considering the possibility of seeking a commission, take courses in the three programs. Some ultimately enroll in the commissioning program, while others do not.

The military services have established standards for commissioning, and all students who choose to pursue commissions sign contracts before entering the final two years of the program. They receive monthly stipends, the amount depending on their year in college. Subsequent to graduation, commissioned officer graduates are obligated to serve various periods of time on active duty or in the reserves.

**Navy-Marine Corps:** The Department of Naval Science (NROTC) operates under the command of Captain Russell Haas and is located at 1610 University Avenue. The UW NROTC Unit continues to focus its students and resources on technical programs but is pursuing emerging opportunities for advanced language and cultural/regional diversity degree programs as well. The unit consists of five active duty naval officers, one senior non-commissioned officer, two federal civilian employees, and one University of Wisconsin classified employee.

- The Badger Battalion began the 2012-2013 academic year with 63 students, including 17 new students in its freshman class. In May 2013, it expects to commission nine new ensigns in the U.S. Navy and four new second lieutenants in the U.S. Marine Corps. At present, 15% of NROTC students are women and 5% are minorities.
- Midshipmen remain active in the UW community, participating in efforts such as the Million Pound Challenge, campus blood-drives, and intramural athletics. During the fall 2012 term, the midshipmen inaugurated a semi-annual tri-service blood donation challenge, helping the American Red Cross collect over 150 units of whole blood.
- During the previous academic year, the battalion maintained a 3.16 GPA and commissioned 17 new officers in the Navy and Marine Corps. Scholarships and tuition support payments to the university for NROTC students exceeded $900,000.
- The NROTC staff continued to pursue innovative ways to integrate better naval science courses into mainstream university academic majors. Specifically:
  - The Naval Engineering course will soon be accepted by the College of Engineering as meeting their requirement for an entry-level basic engineering course thus, resulting in a three-credit reduction in course load for a typical midshipman in an engineering program.
  - The history department has agreed to add specific naval history topics to its two-semester military history series. NROTC midshipmen will now complete this series in lieu of the Naval Science Sea Power and Maritime Affairs curriculum. Although this will not result in a reduction in course load, it will broaden the scope of military history taught to our students.
- In cooperation with the other ROTC units and a university facilities planning team, the NROTC staff is actively engaged in developing the next proposal for a combined ROTC facility.

**Army:** The Department of Military Science (AROTC) operates under the supervision of LTC W. Allen Henderson, professor of military science. Their headquarters is located at 1910 Linden Drive. The Badger Battalion is the largest of the three ROTC entities, with current staffing set at two officers, three noncommissioned officers, three Department of Army civilians, four contractors, and one university secretary. It receives supplementary support from the Wisconsin National Guard with an additional officer and three noncommissioned officers.

(continued)
On the UW-Madison campus, 160 students are enrolled in AROTC classes (AROTC 100- and 200-level courses); 67 are UW student athletes (football, basketball, men’s and women’s hockey, rowing, etc.) and 73 are either contracted, non-contracted, or participating in AROTC program classes. AROTC includes students from other nearby colleges: 3 cadets from Edgewood College; 43 cadets from UW-Whitewater; and 30 cadets from Maranatha Baptist Bible College in Watertown. In total from all campuses, 78 cadets are actively pursuing a commission and are currently contracted with the program. The remaining students are “participating students” who complete the military science classes as an academic student but are not formally enlisted or pursuing entrance to the program. AROTC expects to commission 21 cadets this academic year. Currently, 18% of AROTC students are women, and minorities make up 10% of AROTC’s contracted population.

Scholarships (29 students) and tuition assistance (22 students) for UW-Madison students amounts to $355,522; resident tuition assistance is at $207,691, and non-resident tuition assistance is $53,268. For the 201202-13 academic year, the total for scholarships and tuition assistance is $616,481.

UW-Madison AROTC cadets have been recognized throughout the previous academic year for exceeding the Cadet Command Leadership Development and Assessment Camp national averages for both physical fitness and RECONDO (a highly specialized infantry training in reconnaissance and commando) or receiving an overall “Excellent” rating and “Top 5” in a 50-person platoon. One cadet assigned to UW-Madison AROTC was assessed as being the top pre-commissionee for all universities in the State of Wisconsin for the entire 2013 class. Additionally, in the coming months, four cadets will complete summer internships abroad for the Cultural and Understanding Language Program in India, Vietnam, Thailand, and Togo. Finally, cadets participated in the German Armed Forces Proficiency Badge competition, resulting in ten gold medals.

The program has made great strides to extend the sphere of influence of the AROTC unit on campus and within the community, improving upon mutually beneficial relationships with both the university athletic and academic departments. Some of the more notable contributions and involvements include the following: establishing a new Badger ROTC website with wisc.edu as the domain to connect ROTC programs with UW search engine criteria; integration and assistance from the OEC for accreditation of military science credits with the College of Letters and Science; assisting in and now having a representative on the Project GO committee with university language academics to incorporate the Department of Defense program on campus to improve academic relations and generate language interest among cadets; assisting in the development and implementation of a U.S. Army Cadet Command Pilot Program for a distance-learning military history course that is coordinated with the Wisconsin Army National Guard State Aviation Officer; and facilitating efforts with university administration for the on-campus landing of two UH-60 Blackhawk helicopters in support of the Spring Combined Field Training Exercise.

**Air Force:** The Department of Aerospace Studies (AFROTC) – Detachment 925 operates under the supervision of LTC Todd Berge. Its headquarters is located at 1433 Monroe Street across from Camp Randall Sports Center. The Air Force unit consists of three officers, two non-commissioned officers (NCO), and one civilian (secretary).

LTC Berge, UW-Madison ‘93, assumed command of the unit in summer 2010. He will be completing his term this spring. The OEC interviewed and selected LTC Gregory Goar as LTC Berge’s replacement as commander of the AFROTC program. His projected arrival will be sometime in early July. LTC Goar is an alumnus of the University of Wisconsin.

As of fall 2012, the total cadet enrollment was 98 students, including eight from Maranatha Baptist Bible College, twelve from UW-Whitewater, two from Edgewood College, and one from MATC, all of whom commute to participate in the UW-Madison program. This was the highest enrollment in 25 years for AFROTC.

(continued)
• The graduation class projected for academic year 2012-2013 is nine cadets. Funding, including scholarships and stipends, is currently being provided to 35 cadets and totals about $460,000 annually.
• The highlight of the past year was undoubtedly the distinction of being number one in the nation out of 145 AFROTC detachments in the physical fitness assessment average. This is the first time Detachment 925 has won this award. LTC Berge has put an emphasis on the physical training program. We have also been lauded for being one of only three detachments in the Northwest region to be in the top ten of 36 regional detachments for both physical fitness scores and GPA.
• The unit achieved a recruiting record of 50 new students this year. A continued emphasis on recruiting should help the unit reach the Air Force’s expected graduation rate of 15 cadets per year despite budget pressures limiting the number of AFROTC scholarship awards. Currently, over 25% of Air cadets are female. While the command places a high emphasis on recruiting for diversity, our unit continues to reflect the demographic makeup of Wisconsin’s communities. Every effort is being made to improve recruitment among minority groups.
• Congressional budget uncertainties and sequestration make it impossible to project what next year’s federal budgetary component will be. Currently all funds are awaiting headquarters AFROTC approval.

Concerns and Recommendations: The primary concern for the ROTC detachments at UW-Madison is physical space. Short-term space and facilities issues have been addressed for the Army and Air Force programs. However, the Naval program will soon need to relocate as construction of the new Wisconsin Energy Institute building continues. There are also longer-term concerns for the other services as current facilities age and the programs grow. A dedicated new building would enhance the competitiveness of the UW-Madison ROTC program and provide more efficient use of space that could be shared by the three units. A plan for a new joint ROTC facility on Lot 16 is in the concept stage, and next year the OEC and the director of OEP intend to present formally the plan to the Campus Planning Committee for consideration in the 2015-2017 campus biennial budget.

Officer Education Committee Membership

Provost Paul DeLuca
Professor Mark Etzel, Food Science
Assistant Professor John Hall, History
Professor James Johannes (director of Officer Education Program), Business
Associate Professor Helen Kinsella, Political Science
Professor James LaGro, Urban and Regional Planning
Professor Linda Oakley, Nursing
Professor Mark Rickenbach, Forest and Wildlife Ecology
Professor John Sharpless (chair), History

Ex officio
LTC Todd Berge, Air Force
CAPT Russell Haas, Navy
LTC W. Allen Henderson, Army

Consultants
Kris Ackerbauer, U.S. Navy Ret
John Bechtol, U.S. Army Ret

UW-Madison Fac Doc 2426 - 6 May 2013
RECREATIONAL SPORTS BOARD
ANNUAL REPORT FOR 2012-2013

I. STATEMENT OF COMMITTEE FUNCTIONS

Pursuant to *Faculty Policies and Procedures* 6.48.B., the functions of the Recreational Sports Board are as follows:

1. Advises the administration concerning the development, programming, staffing, maintenance, and financing of recreational sports facilities for faculty, staff, and students.
2. Initiates actions in matters of budget and personnel for the chancellor.
3. When issues related to academic matters develop, decisions shall be restricted to a subcommittee consisting of the faculty members of the committee. Disputes about identifying issues as academic shall be resolved by the University Committee.

II. CURRENT OR PAST YEAR’S ACTIVITIES

Highlights from the five Recreational Sports Board meetings conducted in 2012-2013 include:

- Implemented IM Leagues Software for Intramural Sports Operations. In addition, purchased 16 iPads through a We Conserve grant to eliminate virtually all paper from our Intramural Program operations. Reduced paper output by over 50,000 copies on an annual basis.

- Continued technology expansion to offer online registration for all programs. Membership and locker online services scheduled to be fully complete in summer 2013.

- Implemented several new membership options for users, including perpetual memberships, expanded payroll deduction, and more temporary membership services.

- Replaced all strength and conditioning equipment at the Natatorium.

- In line with vice chancellor for administration strategic initiatives, Recreational Sports has created an “Engagement, Inclusion and Diversity Plan” as a result of the EID survey conducted in 2010-2011. Recreational Sports has also created a “Key Performance Indicator Dashboard” to measure program success.

- Converted the vast majority of marketing materials into digital form.

- Added indoor futsal (soccer) at the Southeast Recreation Facility. Through this renovation, the Intramural Sports Program was also able to offer a new sport that attracted almost 100 teams.

- Recreational Sports continues to expand special events in order to generate new revenue. At this point, we feel that we have not impacted use by students with this expansion.

- The Student Services Finance Committee proposed and approved funding to request that the Division of Recreational Sports re-open the master plan and consider a broader scope for purposes of a 2014 referendum for new and expanded indoor and outdoor recreational facilities.

- The Near East Playfield has been closed for a number of years to accommodate a staging area for numerous construction projects. The completion of the Dejope Residence Hall allowed the division to level the field with topsoil and plant new seed. That playfield space is expected to open in fall 2013 for use by the division.

(continued)
• Several club sports within the division remain nationally competitive and have won numerous national club tournaments.

• Indoor recreational use is on pace once again to surpass 1.6 million users in 2012-2013. The numbers for 2011-2012 are below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Recreation Facility</td>
<td>735,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natatorium</td>
<td>413,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Randall Sports Center</td>
<td>273,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nielsen Tennis Stadium</td>
<td>93,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lathrop Hall</td>
<td>11,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Spaces (includes only scheduled programs)</td>
<td>139,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,527,861</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. CURRENT ISSUES OR CONCERNS

Many facilities within the unit are aging and have significant major repair projects to keep the facilities up to code. Without the approval of a master plan, significant funds will be needed to repair the facilities in coming years.

IV. FUTURE ISSUES

State mandated reductions and the 50/50 split on all major repair projects in facilities have severely impacted the Recreational Sports budget. In response to these issues, Recreational Sports worked closely with student leaders to expand segregated fees for 2013-2014. The Student Services Finance Committee supported and approved this budget expansion to prepare the division better for these current expenses. Expected projects included in the FY 2014 budget include roof repairs at the Southeast Recreation Facility and Nielsen Tennis Stadium, and HVAC and plumbing repair at the Camp Randall Sports Center. Facilities conditions assessments are continuing, and we expect the expenses to increase in foreseeable future.

The division expects to move forward with a master plan to present to the campus in a referendum in April 2014.

V. SUMMARY/RECOMMENDATIONS

The Recreational Sports Board passed a motion requesting that the Division of Recreational Sports work closely with students and the campus community to develop a master plan for the purpose of going to referendum in FY 2014.

The Recreational Sports Board will continue to work closely with Division of Recreational Sports staff and campus administration to consider long-range recreational services to benefit the campus community.

VI. COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heidi Kaeppler, co-chair</td>
<td>Peter Crump</td>
<td>Christian Blatner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Reindl</td>
<td>Jesse Markow, co-chair</td>
<td>Nathan Ebben</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen Radar</td>
<td>Ian Malmstadt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex officio</td>
<td></td>
<td>Emily Wolfenden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Horn</td>
<td>Classified Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Schmidt</td>
<td>Cathryn Pierce-Mosher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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I. Functions

This committee was established by the Faculty Senate and the Academic Staff Assembly to:

a. review and make recommendations on university services relating to retirees; and
b. review and make recommendations on services relating to retirement planning.

II. Past Year’s Activities

The Retirement Issues Committee (RIC) met three times during the 2012-2013 academic year.

Joyce Tikalsky, the committee’s webmaster, continued development on our webpage. Although we do not plan to publicize the page broadly until this summer or next fall, it is now publicly accessible at retirement.wisc.edu. The primary focus of the page is pre-planning for retirement, although it includes content for retirees and new employees as well. Links are organized according to timeframe, making it easier for people five years from retirement, one year from retirement, currently retired, etc., to find information relevant to their particular situations.

The Division of Continuing Studies moved the temporary office space for retirees to 21 North Park Street, Room 7229. The room has been used primarily for small group meetings and served as a workspace for planning the “Make the Most of Your Retirement” workshop that was sponsored by the University of Wisconsin Retirement Association in January.

Steve Lund and Catharine DeRubeis came to our January meeting to discuss policies pertaining to rehired annuitants since this has been a significant topic of discussion among university employees this year.

Richard Straub has agreed to continue as faculty co-chair for 2013-2014 if no one else expresses interest. Patricia Iaccarino is at the end of her term and will be leaving the committee; therefore, we will have a new academic staff co-chair for the upcoming year.

III. Summary/Recommendations

RIC was successful in meeting its goals for the year, in improving the committee’s effectiveness, and in expanding opportunities for university retirees.

Goals and topics that we plan to focus on next year include: engaging social media, working with various units to educate the campus community on retirement planning, and continuing discussion on the future of the Wisconsin Retirement System.

Since most of the topics we discuss pertain to human resources, we are requesting that someone from OHR, preferably someone involved in retirement counseling, be appointed as an ex officio member of the committee. In addition, we are recommending that once the governance body for the future “university staff” category of employees has been created, that our committee be expanded to include representatives from that body.

(continued)
### IV. Committee Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Darrell Barth</th>
<th>Dennis Miller</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Bertics</td>
<td>Stephen Pearson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Burke</td>
<td>Kathleen Poi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Combs</td>
<td>Jeffrey Russell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith Craig</td>
<td>William Steffenhagen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Daluge</td>
<td>Richard Straug, co-chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Dye</td>
<td>Millard Susman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Iaccarino, co-chair</td>
<td>Joyce Tikalsky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Kunde</td>
<td>Ann Wallace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Limbach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESOLUTION FROM ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR BRUCE BARRETT (DISTRICT 103) REGARDING CLIMATE CHANGE AND FOSSIL FUELS DIVESTMENT

WHEREAS scientific experts and organizations representing scientific disciplines overwhelmingly agree with the 2007 report of the International Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) stating that global warming is real, is primarily caused by human activities, and poses substantive risks; and

WHEREAS in 2009, the national academies of science in the United States, China, Russia, India, Brazil, England, Italy, Germany, Canada, Mexico, France, and Japan issued a joint statement saying that it is extremely important that world leaders agree on emission reductions because climate change is occurring even faster than the IPCC had estimated; and

WHEREAS in 2009, 167 countries endorsed the non-binding Copenhagen Accord which, as drafted by the United States, China, India and Brazil, said that to avoid dangerous warming the increase in global temperature should be less than 2.0 degrees Celsius (3.6°F) above pre-industrial levels; and

WHEREAS average global temperature increases of only 0.8°C from pre-industrial levels have already had serious adverse impacts, and the risks of further future warming include:
- Acidification of oceans, fresh-water bodies and soils that threaten global food supplies;
- Rising seas that threaten numerous coastal populations;
- Disappearing glaciers that, in summer, release melt water needed for drinking and agriculture;
- Deadly extreme weather—for hurricane-force winds to record droughts and precipitation—causing infrastructure and property damage worth hundreds of billions of dollars annually;
- Premature death and health impacts from heat, vector-borne diseases, and toxic pollutants, all of which disproportionately impact the oldest, youngest, and poorest people on the planet;
- Deforestation from wildfires, and from expanded lifecycles and ranges for invasive pest species;
- Melting permafrost and disappearing Arctic ice disrupting indigenous cultures and threatening extinction of large-animal species; and

WHEREAS to have a reasonable chance of staying below 2°C warming, scientists estimate that from 2010 to 2050 humans can safely emit only 565 gigatons of additional CO₂ into the atmosphere; and

WHEREAS if all the currently known reserves of coal, oil, and gas were burned, they would emit 2,795 gigatons of CO₂, or roughly five times the amount we can safely release to maintain a 2°C limit of planetary warming; and

WHEREAS recent studies by groups as diverse as MIT, the World Bank, the International Energy Agency, and PricewaterhouseCoopers predict that if we continue to increase fossil-fuel emissions at current rates from now to 2050, then we risk catastrophic warming of 4-7°C—putting civilization as we know it at serious risk; and

WHEREAS those who have contributed the least to this problem—the poorest and youngest of the world’s people—are most likely to suffer the first and worst effects from this intergenerational problem; and

WHEREAS if governments around the world agree to limit fossil-fuel emissions to what the vast majority of climate scientists tell us are safe levels, then current fossil-fuel assets are seriously over-valued, and as investment experts point out, it’s not just imprudent to bet on the long-term financial viability of the fossil-fuel industry, it may be a breach of fiduciary responsibility; and

(continued)
WHEREAS financial experts have concluded that it is possible to divest from fossil fuels and still earn strong returns, with one industry study by Aperio Investment Management finding that the theoretical risk to return from fossil fuel divestment is 0.0044%;

WHEREAS according to our mission statement, “The primary purpose of the University of Wisconsin-Madison is to provide a learning environment in which faculty, staff and students can discover, examine critically, preserve and transmit the knowledge, wisdom and values that will help ensure the survival of this and future generations and improve the quality of life for all;” and

WHEREAS for the reasons outlined above, we find an intolerable contradiction between the university’s stated mission and its current investments in fossil-fuel companies—a contradiction that not only threatens the future for today’s students and those who will follow us, but which truly risks grave environmental and economic disruptions with terrible public health consequences;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that until the 200 companies that, in 2010, had known coal, oil or natural gas reserves capable of emitting at least 0.15 gigatons of atmospheric CO₂ agree to leave 80% of their reserves in the ground and agree not to acquire additional reserves,

Then, the University of Wisconsin System will immediately stop making new investments of endowment funds in those companies, and within five years, will divest its current holdings in all such companies, and

With input from the Faculty Senate, scientific experts and others, the UW System will set intermediate targets for divesting and make annual reports on its progress toward reaching those targets that are fully transparent and public.

---


iv http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Scientific_opinion_on_climate_change

v http://unfccc.int/meetings/copenhagen_dec_2009/meeting/6295.php

vi http://data.giss.nasa.gov/gistemp/2005/


viii http://www.carbontracker.org/carbonbubble

ix Id. See also: http://www.carbonvisuals.com/proposals/do-the-math

x http://journals.ametsoc.org/doi/pdf/10.1175/2009JCLI2863.1, (or, see: M.I.T. doubles its 2095 warming projection to 10°F – with 866 ppm and Arctic warming of 20°F)


xii http://www.iea.org/publications freepublications/publication/CO2emissionfromfuelcombustion HIGHLIGHTS.pdf (or, see: http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2012/01/04/379694/iea-world-11-degree-warming-school-children-catastrophic/)

xiii http://www.pwc.com/gx/en/sustainability/publications/low-carbon-economy-index/index.jhtml (or, see: http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2012/11/06/1144431/study-were-headed-to-11f-warming-and-even-7f requires-nearly-quadrupling-the-current-rate-of-decarbonisation/)
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http://wwwp.dailyclimate.org/tdc-newsroom/2013/02/energy-reserve-economics,