

AGENDA-FACULTY SENATE
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-SUPERIOR
Tuesday, October 20, 2009
RSC 111, 2:30 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Sipress called the meeting to order, 2:30 p.m.

Present: Sipress, Cleary, Sloboda, Einerson, Jones (for Aldridge), Schmude, Wright, G., Starratt, Lynch, Markwood, Erlenbach, Kronzer, Jacobs,

Guests: Hudelson, Schoeler, Hensrud, Beal, Vainio, **Birkholtz,**

Excused: Aldridge, Fank

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion (Einerson/Cleary) to approve minutes dated September 22, 2009. Discussion. Einerson requested addition, page 3, #IV. H1N1 Impact on Teaching and Learning Attendance Policy motion to include hand vote, 7 for, 6 against. Minutes to be revised. Motion carried as amended.

Receive Executive Minutes

Motion (Cleary/Einerson) to receive Executive Minutes dated October 6, 2009. Motion carried.

REPORT OF THE CHANCELLOR

REPORT OF THE PROVOST

REPORTS

Chair

Written report provided. Chair Sipress thanked the Provost for asking faculty senate to take leadership on the development of the Academic Plan and the members of the Academic Planning Committee, Terri Kronzer, Laura Jacobs, Shaun Lynch, Sue Holm, Faith Hensrud, David Carroll (served spring 2009), Rhoda Robinson. The written document was a collective effort and shows what can be accomplished and Chair Sipress appreciated working with such a great group of people. Special thanks to Brent Notbohm and Jacob Swanson for turning a bureaucratic document into a lively video (and on short notice). Thanks, too, for Laura Jacobs for pinch hitting for Sipress at the BOR meeting.

Key policy- the procedure was not as difficult as was expected. The building by building key replacement process will begin again, no need to wait until winter intercession. Some buildings, such as Holden, may have special needs/requests and those issues should be worked out in advance.

Secretary No report

Faculty Representative

Written report provided by Sloboda. The Superior Academic Plan was a stellar performance. Many regents, publicly and privately, congratulated Sloboda and team members. Word via email, was just received that President Reilly is putting together a system wide compensation committee. Sloboda co-chairs the faculty reps and will be on a conference call on Friday. He will keep the senate informed.

Academic Program Review Council No Report

Planning and Budgetary Council No Report

Personnel Council No Report Agenda item

Undergraduate Academic Affairs Council

Action items:

1. Proposal as Amended to clarify what languages satisfy the BA Language Requirement

Some controversy has arisen over the years as to which languages actually fulfill the BA language requirement, Ojibwe is an example. Another issue pertains to international students, English is not their first language, how do those students fulfill the BA requirement. The proposal states that any language studied formally, not a language that you grew up speaking counts, placing all languages on an equal footing. *Motion (Einerson/Kronzer) to approve the clarification of the BA language requirement.* Motion carried.

2. Proposal to Adopt a Policy for the In Progress Grade. *Motion to approve (Einerson/Jacobs) the Proposal to Adopt a Policy for the In Progress Grade.* Discussion. There has/is confusion as to what is the difference between 'in progress' and 'incomplete', this would be to clarify when the IP would be appropriate, under what conditions an IP grade should be given and the length of time an IP grade can be in place. At this time nothing currently exists in the catalog. Einerson asked for verification if the policy is only for undergraduates only and asks the chair of grad council if this is under consideration for graduate grades.

Christensen- her understanding is that in the absence of any policy for grad council that the undergrad catalog stands. It is not under consideration, should it be. The question of grad students and the need for a longer period for grad students to complete work was raised at the UAAC meeting. The understanding at UAAC is that this applies only to undergraduates. Kronzer-if the grad council language is silent then the undergrad language is used for issues like this. Question-the policy says 'if the student does not fulfill the requirements of the course within one semester the grade will remain and IP and cannot be changed'. Does that mean forever? At this time faculty can change grades by submitting a change of grade form.

Discussion. The policy of changing incompletes and IP's by submitting a petition to the credits committee has not been enforced, other issues problems include faculty teaching on campus, how can grades be given in those cases. Sipress-two issues have been raised, 1) with regard to the IP and incomplete, do we want to maintain the one semester restriction on the changing of the grade and 2) this has not been reviewed by graduate council and if adopted today it will apply to graduate students. Question, why is the language for incomplete and IP the same. The emphasis of the proposal was on the faculty's lack of clarity of the difference between the two. The idea is that an in progress is to be used only when it is known that the work would not be completed in the specific term and would extend to the next. The incomplete could trail off in time through petitions to the committee but the IP should be used for the more narrow circumscribed circumstances. The IP grade is intended for courses that are intended to take more than one semester. The incomplete is designed for those courses which are completed in one semester but were not completed within that semester, students must have completed two thirds of the course to receive an incomplete. Discussion. *Motion (Einerson/Simpson) to table until November, pending review by the graduate council and departmental discussion.* Motion carried to table. Agenda item NOVEMBER.

3. Individually Designed Majors and Minors – UAAC was asked by exec senate to conduct a review of ID Majors and ID Minors, should there be policy added regarding those majors and minors. UAAC has bounced back to senate asking senate exec committee to draft a proposal for them to look at. (What is the issue). Question-why did this issue come up. Sipress-the provost asked exec committee to look at this and in part because exec committee agreed with the provost because when exec committee acts on petitions in summer in lieu of the credits committee there have been concerns about the lack of policy guidance as to what constitutes an appropriate ID Major and Minor. Example, there is no policy that the ID major and minor cannot have most of its credits from the same discipline. Discussion. The distinction or the differences between criteria for Distance Learning IDM's and on campus IDM's should be examined. *Motion (Starratt/Jacobs) to request the faculty senate exec committee draft a proposal regarding policy for ID majors and minors for future consideration by UAAC.* Motion carried.

4. Proposal for adding to the requirements of the BS degree. BA degree was defined by the substantial language requirement and the BS degree was defined the absence of the language requirement. Provost Markwood proposed that all BS degrees have 6 hours of math, science, computer science in addition to the gen ed requirements to distinguish it from the BA degree. UAAC has asked for a committee to be appointed look into this and develop a proposal and this be an open committee not a sub committee of UAAC. *Motion (Cleary/Simpson) to have the faculty senate appoint a committee of five to six members balanced with respect to disciplines to look into BA and BS requirements and develop a proposal regarding*

each for further consideration by UAAC and the campus as a whole. Motion carried. A call for volunteers will be issued.

5. Reduction of the Requirements of the BA degree. UAAC has approved a proposal to reduce the language requirement from 12 credits to 6. Background provided by Sloboda. *Motion (Cleary/Starratt) to approve the Reduction of Requirements of the BA degree.* Discussion, many different opinions in regard to this issue. ***Motion (Einerson) to table the motion until the November meeting with the request that the Department of WLLC bring forth exact catalog policy language on this question for consideration.*** Motion carried. NOVEMBER OLD BUSINESS.

6. Approve Recommendation HLC Academy of Assessment

Provost Markwood- Our campus does not have an assessment committee or someone in charge of overseeing assessment. Some significant efforts are underway, but nothing is consistent. The HLC sponsors an academy for those institutions that could use help in developing a comprehensive assessment plan. The Provost is proposing that we petition of join the Higher Learning Commission Academy for Assessment of Student Learning Goals.

This would be a four year sequence of pulling together and fully developing our assessment functions. It will serve to help us focus and move in a methodical and progressive way in regard to our assessment, focusing on institution goals, department goals, program goals and individual unit goals. In the evaluation enrollment in the Academy you earn a 'pass' that shows primary evidence of the seriousness about assessment and are making progress. The cost is significant, approximately \$15,000 per year which includes travel costs (travel costs will be the majority of the cost). The team would be made up of 5 – 7 members. Discussion. Knowing that assessment is an initiative that must be tackled, one way or the other, participation in the academy or going in another direction approximately \$12, 000.00 was built into the CETL. Total budgeted figures are about \$48,000. Question, if we don't do this what are our options? Provost Markwood- we would need to identify some assistance to move forward, we would need coordination of leadership and facilitation. The benefit of participating in this academy is it is sponsored by the accreditation agency that approves, accredits us. It is designed to help us meet their expectations. Discussion included concerns that if an organization accredits us says if you use this organization it will help guarantee your successful accreditation. Question, have discussions with administration and the leadership team what else can be done via administration leadership to help assessment process along. Must we outsource this? Provost Markwood- as we begin to put the price tag on individual programs, facilitators and other types of approaches it could extend beyond the \$60 000 and we still have the infrastructure that needs to be put together for the campus. *Motion (Kronzer/Sloboda) to recommend that we apply to participate in the HLC Academy of Assessment.* Discussion. Kronzer-had reservations about the HLC but has done research and it appears this is a proven method. Motion carried with two abstentions, Cleary and Einerson.

Graduate Council

Christensen- Have begun the discussion of the difference between a Masters of Arts Degree and Masters of Science.

Student Senate No report

Academic Staff Senate No report

OLD BUSINESS

I. Salary Decompression

Informational discussion only. Composite and Market Based model handouts provided, these are the alternative documents that are needed for final discussion and vote in November. Discussion ensued. Lynch will develop a third document that is purely based on campus averages. ***Lynch and Sipress will meet and NOVEMBER***

II. Reconsideration of Student Attendance Policy

NEW BUSINESS

I. Definition of Peer Faculty (Attachment)

II. Summer Session Salary Model

III. Student Retention Strategic Plan

IV. Voluntary Coordinated Furlough Day

OTHER

ADJOURNMENT