

MINUTES-FACULTY SENATE
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-SUPERIOR
Tuesday, December 15, 2009
RSC 111, 2:30 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER

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

Present: Sipress, Cleary, Lynch, Sloboda, Einerson, Simpson, Hembd, Fank, Schmude, Christensen, J., Jacobs, Aldridge, Starratt, Kronzer

Excused: Markwood, Wright, G.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion (Hembd/Cleary) to approve minutes dated November 17, 2009. Motion carried.

Receive Executive Minutes

Motion (Jacobs/Aldridge) to receive Executive minutes dated December 1, 2009. Motion carried

REPORT OF THE CHANCELLOR

All three differential (Natural Science credit surcharge, Inclusive Advocacy, Technology Services) proposals were defeated.

Education Attainment update. (Two documents provided). The Chancellor has concerns with the numbers that they are proposing. The bottom line for UWS is that we are being asked to begin to increase the number of students gradually, focusing primarily on the Baccalaureate and Associate level, by 21 students in 2012 and increasing from there, adding an additional 21 each year to the base. The Chancellor is concerned that we can sustain given our current staffing and faculty size. Our buildings cannot handle the large increase. It's not a question about degree holders, it's a question about education for those people. We do not want to lose our personal touch with the students.

REPORT OF THE PROVOST

No report

REPORTS

Chair (Note incorrect written report provided, (online report corrected 12.18.09)

Chair Sipress provided his report to the senate at this time.

Faculty Personnel Rules

We have clarified that the faculty personnel rules contained in Appendix One of the Unclassified Staff Handbook are the legally binding personnel rules of the UW System with local UW-Superior specifications. If there are any inconsistencies between the main body of the handbook and the rules contained in Appendix A, the rules contained in Appendix A take precedence. Any changes to our local specifications require approval of Faculty Senate, the Chancellor, and the Regents. We have clarified that the charge to Personnel Council from Senate to review our faculty personnel rules was a charge to review the local specifications found in Appendix One of the handbook and to bring forward proposed revisions. Any proposed revisions brought forward by the Personnel Council and endorsed by Faculty Senate would need to be forwarded to the Chancellor and Regents for approval. Once revisions to the faculty personnel rules are approved, the main body of the handbook will need to be updated to be made consistent with these revisions.

Attendance Policy

As requested by Senate, Executive Committee is working on a proposal on the issue of student absence due to illness. The proposal we are working on would ask departments to review

course policies to insure that all instructors allow reasonable accommodations for students who are absent due to illness. It is our intent to bring forward a proposal at the January Senate meeting.

Individually Designed Major and Minor Policy

Senate has asked Executive Committee to develop a proposal regarding policy changes for the Individually Designed Major and Minor for submission for UAAC review. Due to crush of pressing business, Executive Committee has tabled this item until next semester.

Secretary No report

Faculty Representative (attachment)

Sloboda highlighted several items of his report.

Educational Attainment goals were discussed at the joint representative meeting, President Reilly was in attendance. The concerns raised by UWS are shared by many of the faculty reps across the system, which include the pace of the initiative, the numbers that each campus is being asked to attain and resources. Sloboda is asking senate members keep this on their radar for and provide input. President Reilly will be on campus Thursday, December 17.

Limited Appointments: role in governance: System's view is that it is a campus level decision to determine faculty status for limited appointees with concurrent .5 faculty appointment (but would not be part of collective bargaining unit). System will research this matter further and will provide further clarification.

UW-Online Programs: One Portal for all UW Programs:

There were questions about this "portal" proposal. Concerns were raised about such a 'centralized' structure. There was a varied discussion on the impact of increasing number of online courses and programs in terms of on-campus curriculum offerings

Academic Program Review Council No report

Planning and Budgetary Council No report

Personnel Council

Kronzer – Updates to the handbook are complete and are ready for the Provost and HR to review, then to senate for final approval.

Undergraduate Academic Affairs Council (attachment)

One item for action. Interactive Media Track. *Motion (Einerson/Starratt) to approve the Interactive Media Track.* Motion approved.

Graduate Council No Report

Student Senate No Report

Academic Staff Senate No report

OLD BUSINESS

I. Global Awareness Education Committee (Attachment)

The committee noticed that the current/official list of members is inaccurate because of the reorganization of the Office of International Programs and the creation of the position of Associate Dean for International Education and Programs. The committee has asked faculty senate to revise the membership list and to replace the two bolded members (see document) from the OIP with one representative from the OIP and the Associate Dean for International Education and Programs with the Associate Dean to serve ex officio. Executive senate recommends the proposal. *Motion (Einerson/Cleary) to approve the changes to the GAEC membership.* Clarification by Sipress – The proposal is the Associate Dean would be Ex Officio but the proposal is that the representative from the OIP would be a full voting member of the committee. No further discussion. Motion carried.

II. Senior Experience Funds (attachment)

The proposed alternative is to move from a model that is based on an equal allocation per department to one that is based entirely on numbers of students completing the Senior Experience in each department. *Motion (Starratt/Hembd) to approve the Senior Experience fund proposal.* Discussion of the rationale ensued. More students equal more invitations and refreshment. There appears to be a lack of clarity of how the departments are using the \$\$ for SYE. Not all departments are doing the same thing, should a model be created as if departments were all approaching it the same way. Discussion continued. It was suggested that the Senior Experience Committee could examine the budgets of all departments involved to

see what extent they are reflective of numbers and to what extent a set fee is required. Discussion continued. Hembd suggested that a similar model of the S & E budget process may be an alternative way to determine the allocation. Lab fees for variable costs was suggested. Starratt/Hembd withdrew original motion. *Motion (Cleary/Lynch) to ask the Senior Experience Committee to report back to Senate with a recommendation for Senior Experience funding formula that addresses both fixed and variable costs.* Motion carried.

III. Definition of Peer faculty

Sipress- The second 'whereas' includes the current definition of peer faculty that is contained in appendix A of the handbook that contains the faculty personnel rules. One problem is that the version of the handbook that is online does not include any of the footnotes and this definition is found in a footnote. It exists only in the hard copy, not the electronic copy. If not action is taken this is the definition that will remain in place. The council has recommended that that definition be replaced by the definition contained under the resolve and that the definition be removed from the footnotes and be placed in the main text of the rules under definitions. The personnel council is recommending replacement of the existing definition and move its location to definitions. This change cannot go into effect without going to the Chancellor and the Regents. The council would like direction from the senate but will not forward beyond the senate level until the full package comes forward. *Motion (Starratt/Lynch) to remove from table.* Motion carried. Discussion of the criteria. Einerson-proposes that a line be added that departments could opt out of this definition if they have a faculty member who doesn't fit the administrative profile that is being addressed. Hembd- read his handout- 'A faculty peer shall be defined as a rand member (professor, associate professor, assistant professor, or instructor, as defined in UW-Sup 7.4.4) with at least a half time teaching, research and/or outreach appointment in the department. Departmental faculty with more that half-time administrative reassignment shall not be considered peer faculty for the duration of the reassignment. Limited term academic staff members with back up appointments in an academic department shall not be considered peer faculty. The department chair shall be considered peer faculty as long as he or she meets the peer faculty definition.' Discussion. Clarification of outreach provided by Hembd. Discussion of faculty interim appointments. *Motion (Einerson/Schmude) to amend the original proposal (personnel council definition) with Jerry Hembd's definition of faculty peer.* Discussion. Motion carried. Discussion/clarification of interim chair. *Motion (Kronzer/Einerson) to replace the line Limited term academic staff members with back up appointments in an academic department shall not be considered peer faculty* with the sentence that reads *Academic staff members designated as having faculty status and academic staff with back-up appointments are not faculty peers* . Motion carried. This definition will now go back to the council to and will be included in the package to be voted on by senate.

IV. Experience Premium

Motion (Einerson/Cleary) to reconsider the approval of the fixed rate experience premium. Einerson-it would be possible for people to receive negative adjustments with option 1. Motion carried. Lynch provided a handout (with pictures!) for clarification of the options. If you put in an experience premium that is too low it will mean that people close to retirement will not get any money, and those who were just promoted would look very underpaid. An experience premium that is too high those who were just promoted expected salary is lower than your actual salary. Generally speaking, disciplines with low starting salaries tend to have larger annual increases on average and disciplines with high starting salaries tend to have small annual increases. If we adopt the standard experience premium for all disciplines it does not reflect the reality of the national data. Einerson asked for clarification of the options. Lynch- option 2 is an accurate representation within the discipline and across the board. It works for both. No further discussion. Separate votes for each option called. Option 1- Select a value for the experience premium and apply it uniformly across all disciplines. Hand vote: 0 in favor. Option 2 – Calculate the experience premium for each discipline using an algorithm that uses empirical salary data. Hand vote: all in favor. Option 2 is carried unanimously. Senate thanked Shaun Lynch for his work.

NEW BUSINESS

No new business.

OTHER

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned, 4:00 p.m. by Chair Sipress.

Respectfully submitted on this 19th day of December by Linda Sharp, Faculty Senate Clerical Assistant.