

**Memorandum to Faculty Senate Executive Committee**  
**Prepared by Interim Provost Maria Cuzzo and Dean of Academic Affairs & Graduate Studies Nick Danz with approval of Chancellor Renee Wachter**

**9/9/19**  
**FINAL**

In the interests of practicing effective and ongoing shared governance according to the duly approved Faculty Shared Governance Policy at UW-Superior, I am inviting Faculty Senate and its Councils to engage in various advising and consulting engagements.

For reference purposes, the Faculty Share Governance Policy approved in May 2018 by the Chancellor, Interim Provost and Chair of Faculty Senate defined and clarified practices of UW-Superior faculty shared governance, following the revision to Wisconsin Chapter 36 (2015). The policy reaffirms the longstanding tradition of faculty shared governance at UW-Superior. This policy addressed the following shared governance needs:

- defined a common understanding between administration and faculty of Chapter 36 roles and responsibilities as it relates to all current and pending decisions as of April 10, 2018 forward;
- clarified what faculty shared governance is and how it operates at UW-Superior; and
- supported critical needs in managing and planning strategic operations and budgeting realities in a changing higher education environment while ensuring advising and consultation roles for faculty.

Key definitions included:

**Consultation** is the formal method by which faculty input or action is sought or received via a request and review process that would result in a recommendation, action, or vote in due time to inform the administration as it addresses a specific issue or considers a particular solution. Minimally, consultation refers to seeking input or action via the current faculty organizational structure, which is assumed to be faculty senate and its councils or designees on topics relevant to the primary responsibilities of faculty, as outlined in Chapter 36. While consultation must include the faculty organizational structure, broader input or research and ideas may be additionally sought from other groups, such as department chairs, ad hoc task forces, or other committees.

**Advising** implies a longer-term relationship and arrangement, whereby faculty and its faculty organizational structure are asked to address specific issues. Faculty may also initiate action, carry out reviews of requested topics relevant to primary faculty responsibilities related to Chapter 36, and make recommendations in advance of decisions. The faculty organizational structure may also proactively identify problems or issues so related.

**Academic and educational activities:** This term addresses all academic and educational activities related to curriculum, pedagogy, teaching, and instruction.

**Shared governance:** The practice of shared governance assumes that administration will initiate the advising and consulting process by formally presenting a request to the faculty organizational structure, which subsequently will provide a response that constitutes advising or consulting. The expectation is that shared governance will involve activities such as data sharing, dialogue, continual input, and problem-solving between administration and faculty. The information obtained and outcomes generated from these participative activities will be considered in the decision-making process by the chancellor. The execution of primary responsibility rests with Faculty Senate and its councils or designees.

The policy also included the following key language on how the process would operate:

## **6. Policy Statement**

A. Shared governance as defined in this policy is the UW- Superior version of institutional governance. Shared governance is a longstanding practice at UW- Superior, grounded in the understanding that administration and faculty share a commitment to educational quality and results and to the vitality of the institution. True shared governance attempts to balance maximum participation in decision-making with clear accountability.

Fundamentally, it involves advising and consultation between administration (especially the chancellor) and faculty about the primary responsibilities of the faculty as outlined in Wisconsin Chapter 36. While Faculty Senate and its councils provide consultation, the Chancellor has the authority under Chapter 36 to make final decisions. All parties commit to redefining and clarifying shared governance on an ongoing basis to ensure that processes and expectations are clear. The chancellor and Faculty Senate are expected to inform each other in writing if the policy of shared governance has been neglected or violated. Both parties have the right to provide this notice.

B. On issues related to the primary responsibilities of faculty as outlined in Chapter 36, advising and consulting will occur before decisions are made by administration except in emergency situations. Emergency situations are assumed to be infrequent and will require administrative explanation of the nature of the circumstances and their relation to the faculty organizational structure. If the faculty organizational structure does not provide advising or consulting as requested and in a timely manner, the administration would be under no obligation to seek further input from the faculty organizational structure for decision-making purposes on that particular issue.

The chancellor (or designee) and Faculty Senate will be responsible for continuously defining specific situations and topics that comprise the primary responsibilities of the faculty as outlined in Chapter 36. There is mutual recognition that not every

administrative decision is consequential to faculty shared governance. Shared governance protocols and processes shall prevail when administrative decisions impact the scope, array, and delivery of academic and educational activities.

C. Clear administrative policies will operationalize the intent of this policy. These policies include those contained within the Unclassified Staff Handbook, select administrative policies, and other documents that govern the faculty organizational structure and practices.

Based on this approved policy, the following specific requests for consultation between administration (in this case the Interim Provost and Dean of Academic Affairs & Graduate Studies) and the Faculty Senate and its appropriate Councils in September 2019:

1. The Interim Provost and Dean of Academic Affairs & Graduate Studies requests Faculty Senate to charge the APRC to collaborate directly with the PBC and the Dean/Interim Provost to revise the APR template, shorten the window of APR review cycles from six years to three years, revise or perhaps eliminate the use of triennial reports based on these revisions, integrate PBC quantitative dashboard into APR template plus administrative criteria to be negotiated and such other reasonable modifications that would significantly integrate and refine the APR process. All recommendations should be completed, reviewed and approved through Faculty Senate no later than the December 2019 meeting.

**Rationale:** The APRC and PBC leadership met with the Interim Provost, Dean of Academic Affairs & Graduate Studies and Chancellor on 9/6/19 to discuss the possibility of revising the APR template and process to ensure a more focused, streamlined, shorter and more relevant process of meaningful review of academic programs linked to the process of budgeting and planning. This dialogue explored the possibility that the administrative representatives and the members of the two Faculty Senate Councils would directly collaborate over the next two months on these proposals for review by Faculty Senate. The benefits to completing this process would be:

- to ensure focused and targeted review (assessment of past performance and projections of future needs);
- to shorten the cycles of review from six years to three years using more focused criteria;
- to find a way to eliminate the need for triennial reports by shifting focus to more frequent APR's;
- to link academic program review intentionally with planning and budgeting reviews of academic departments;
- to intentionally link the APR process with the IPBP process of budget and planning;
- to increase flexibility and nimbleness of program offerings and institutional resources;

- to coordinate the APR process with department chair election cycles so Chairs are later in their service cycle and not at the beginning
2. The Interim Provost and Dean of Academic Affairs & Graduate Studies requests Faculty Senate to charge PBC to work in collaboration with administration to develop and provide qualitative criteria to complement and supplement the quantitative criteria that were approved in 2018-2019. These qualitative criteria along with the quantitative criteria would be used in APR and by administration for program review purposes. These proposed qualitative criteria should be proposed, reviewed and approved by Faculty Senate no later than the December 2019 meeting.

**Rationale:** The PBC developed and obtained successful approval and implementation of the quantitative dashboard in 2018-2019. The first quantitative dashboard report cards were generated in Spring 2019 with the first consultations due in Fall 2019. During those dialogues, PBC identified that there likely were a complementary set of qualitative criteria that would be useful to specific to allow programs under review to provide evidence to demonstrate quantitative and qualitative performance when being reviewed. Some programs have the capacity to meet quantitative indicators (such as number of majors or SCH) and other programs may provide other types of value to the university that are better evaluated through qualitative criteria (such as community service projects/hours, outreach events to the community, pre-college enrollment management initiatives or other examples). If the Faculty Senate were to identify and pass the qualitative criteria, each academic program would have multiple ways to demonstrate value and contribution to the university. PBC already began the dialogue about these qualitative criteria.

3. The Interim Provost and Dean of Academic Affairs & Graduate Studies requests Faculty Senate to charge UAAC, PBC and APRC to work with the Dean/Provost to develop criteria that will cover all new program curricular requests (entitled majors which must comply with UW System protocols), non-entitled majors such as concentrations, tracks or other subsets, minors, certificates and any other category of new curriculum. In addition, these Councils should examine the current AP 1117 to ensure that Provost review and authorization to proceed is obtained at the front end of curricular proposals and not the back end. All existing policies related to these topics should be reviewed and appropriate changes to integrated and streamline these processes proposed. The review of existing policy and proposal for conforming policy or, where necessary creating policy, should be with proposed, reviewed and approved by Faculty Senate no later than the January 2020 meeting.

**Rationale:** While there is a clear UW System policy path for developing new entitled majors, there is no clear integrated pathway for the development of non-entitled majors such as concentrations, tracks or other subsets, minors and certificates other than AP 1117. While there were significant revisions to the AP 1117 process in 2018-2019, it is not clear that there should be consultation and approval to plan provided by the

Provost/Dean prior to proceeding with design work in entitled and non-entitled majors and other types of curricular proposals. In addition, then Provost Molly Smith proposed a set of “guidelines” that may not have been approved through Faculty Senate. This charge would examine all current pathways to new curricular design and approval processes to hopefully streamline and clarify the role of the Provost on the front end of review and approval. To save time and energy by academic departments, such pre-consultation and approval to plan should be obtained.

4. The Interim Provost and the Dean of Academic Affairs & Graduate Studies requests Faculty Senate to charge Personnel Council to consult with the Provost/Dean about the sabbatical criteria and the ranking process of Personnel Council review prior to next round of sabbatical calls. This dialogue, criteria setting and ranking process must be done by end of September 2019 to allow the 2019-2020 cycle of sabbatical review to proceed in a timely fashion.

**Rationale:** During the 2018-2019 sabbatical process, there was lack of clarity about the role and process of Personnel Council review and prioritizing of the sabbatical proposal process. The role of Personnel Council is to do a meaningful review of all sabbatical proposals to rank order them in meeting the criteria to award a sabbatical. Given the limited number of sabbaticals that can be awarded each year, it is important for consultation for Personnel Council to engage in a meaningful review or the Provost has the duty to resolve sabbatical awards on their own. The 2019-2020 cycle will begin the first week in October when UW System provides the call with a submission deadline by the third week of October and Personnel Council review during the final week of October to meet the first week of November System deadline for submission of granted sabbaticals

5. The Interim Provost and Dean of Academic Affairs & Graduate Studies requests Faculty Senate to charge PBC to collaborate with the Dean/Provost/Vice Chancellor of Administration & Finance and the Human Resource Director to analyze the practice and content of stipend, overload, release, re-assignment and adjunct spending patterns and prepare recommendations for how to address this unstructured deficit.

**Rationale:** UW-Superior has been carrying an unstructured deficit to cover adjuncts, overloads and stipend payments for multiple years. It is time to review a year’s worth of contracts to diagnose what is occurring and identify opportunities to potentially set targets to reduce this unstructured deficit pattern within Academic Affairs. This analysis of 2018-2019 contracts along with any recommendations should be reviewed and received by Faculty Senate no later than January 2020 meeting with administration potentially identifying potential reduction areas by February 1, 2020 or later based on the results of the analysis. It is important that faculty be involved in this review to ensure there is clear understanding of the patterns of adjunct, overload and stipend payments to identify the options (if any) to deal with this longstanding issue.

#### Information on Administrative Actions:

1. Advisory committee guidelines---not rules but best practice suggestions; working with SBE in pilot to revise these and provide to support and assist programs/departments in developing quality advisory groups; can expect these to be shared with Faculty Senate Executive and Faculty Senate at the October 2019 meeting;
2. Administration confirms the longstanding university support for Study Away and Study Abroad commitments BUT designers and program leaders must follow the established protocols regarding safety of students and traveling faculty (handouts);
3. With the transition away from D2L, a different system will be implemented for faculty and staff ePortfolios. There is an input team finalizing the template and training supports to ensure all faculty members will be able to use the tool to submit e-portfolios for review. Although details are still under finalization, it is likely there will be required submission of ePortfolios in 2019-2020 using Sharepoint for all new faculty and optionally for others. This is necessary to ensure that there is consistency in the materials and protocols used for review. No paper materials will be accepted in the 2019-2020 cycle. The submission method for materials is an administrative matter that does not alter or affect the personnel rules or process. Instructions will be sent soon.
4. Recognize that the Unclassified Handbook may need updates related complaints and grievances as well as other areas. How might the process of revision proceed in the best way for Personnel Council and Faculty Senate?
5. Call for the Associate Dean position will likely be posted by end of this week with anticipated start date January 2020. Please watch for the call.
6. Faculty Development Grant Calls are coming out by end of week. Dean consulted with Personnel Council about the criteria and the process.