

MINUTES-FACULTY SENATE
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-SUPERIOR
Tuesday, March 23 2010
YU 203, 2:30 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Pro Tem Lynch called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

Present: Sipress, Cleary, Lynch, Sloboda, Einerson, Engstrom, Hembd, Fank, Schmude, Christensen, J., Jacobs, Aldridge, Starratt, Kronzer, Wright, G., Erlenbach, Markwood, Sharp
Excused: Simpson

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion (Kronzer/Einerson) to approve minutes February 16, 2010. Motion carried.

Receive Executive Minutes

Motion (Einerson/Cleary) to receive Executive (approved) minutes dated February 2, 2010. Motion carried.
Executive minutes dated March 2, 2010 received as informational only.

REPORT OF THE CHANCELLOR

Reminders, HLC will be here next week. (Be on your best behavior!) The completion of a successful Campaign Superior will be celebrated on April 16, YU. Update of the current system chancellor searches. The visit to Korea and the Global Village was a positive experience. Students are having a wonderful time. The experience has been positive and educational. Expanding the relationship is a goal, faculty exchange is the next step.

REPORT OF THE PROVOST

A tentative schedule of the HLC visit was handed out. The faculty are invited (and encouraged) to participate in any and all meetings. HLC has asked for an expanded time to spend with the General Education committee. Four faculty search positions have been secured. Several candidates are on campus this week.

REPORTS

Chair Written report provided. Chair Sipress reminded senators that the HLC will be on campus next week and urges all to attend the noon seminar on Monday.

Secretary Results of the ratification for the Multi-Year Pay Plan are: Total of 50 ballots. Approve 42 and disapprove 8.

Secretary Cleary notified department chairs whose senators at the end of their term. Departments are to hold elections for senators during the first two weeks of April. New or returning senators will be seated at the final meeting in May.

Call for nominations going out soon for: Academic Program Review, 2 positions. Planning and Budgetary, 2 positions. Personnel Council, 1 position and Senate Chair. Chair Sipress will not be running for re election.

Faculty Representative

Representative Sloboda highlighted items of the report. Lots of ground was covered. President Reilly was there.

Academic Program Review Council No report
Planning and Budgetary Council No report
Personnel Council No report

Undergraduate Academic Affairs Council (attachments-Report to Senate, Minutes January 26 and February 23, Gogebic General Eds, Final Exam Policy).

Two action items.

Gogebic General Education Articulation Agreement - *Motion (Einerson/Schmude) to approve the Gogebic General Education Articulation Agreement.* Motion carried.

Final Exam Policy - *Motion (Einerson/Aldridge) to approve the final exam policy as approved by UAAC on February 24, 2010.* Discussion. Chair Sipress- Faculty are expected to meet for 'final exams' but the final exam does not have to be a traditional exam. Motion carried. (Note: document has typo to be corrected, than instead of that, first paragraph.)

Graduate Council Christensen-grad council met this morning. Two items, graduate council did approve the course content review policy from Continuing Ed, (previously approved by UAAC.) Took action and approved and are now taking to the Provost Leadership Team a graduate fees proposal. The council is asking for 75 per cent of the fees that are charged to graduate students be returned to the graduate studies office to fund graduate initiatives. Question, what are graduate initiatives? Grad research symposium, grad assistants, to fund other initiative strategy plans like marketing.

Student Senate No Report

Academic Staff Senate No report

OLD BUSINESS

No old business

NEW BUSINESS

I. Distance Learning Course Review Policy (attachment)

Motion (Einerson/Jacobs) to approve the Distance Learning Review Policy.

Motion carried.

II. Promotion Committee Review (attachment)

Review- At the request of Faculty Senate Executive Committee, the Provost has asked Faculty Senate to review the composition Promotions Committee. Executive Committee was particularly concerned with the size of the committee and the difficulty filling committee positions. Members of the committee also raised the issue of whether a Promotions Committee is necessary.

At its February meeting, Faculty Senate asked Faculty Senate Executive Committee to develop a number of options regarding the structure of the Promotions Committee. Executive Committee offers the following three alternatives:

- Retain the Current Composition—10 members divided into two subcommittees: 1) 5 full professors to evaluate promotion to full professor; 2) 5 associate professors to evaluate promotion to associate professor. Retain the current charge of the committee, which is to evaluate requests for promotion and make recommendations to the provost on the basis of departmental criteria. Re-evaluate the effectiveness of the committee following the completion of the current revision of campus and departmental personnel rules. (The ambiguity of departmental criteria has posed problems for the committee charge. The current review of campus and departmental rules is intended, in part, to put an end to this ambiguity.)
- Reduce the Committee to Five Members—the committee would be composed of 3 full professors and 2 associate professors drawn from the distinct disciplinary areas of campus. The full committee would review and make recommendations to the provost for all promotions to both associate and full professor. (If Senate endorses this option, a more specific proposal would be written specifying the particular disciplinary areas to insure academic diversity and roughly equal representation.) Retain the current charge of the committee, which is to evaluate requests for promotion and make recommendations to the provost on the basis of departmental criteria. Re-evaluate the effectiveness of the committee following the completion of the current revision of campus and departmental personnel rules. (The ambiguity of departmental criteria has posed

problems for the committee charge. The current review of campus and departmental rules is intended, in part, to put an end to this ambiguity.)

- Eliminate the Promotions Committee—Recommendations for promotion would go directly to the Provost/Dean of Faculties who would review each recommendation to insure that departmental criteria had been properly applied.

Motion (Sipress/Fank) to postpone this agenda item until the next meeting to give departments time to discuss the item. Discussion. Some issues included that some promotion committee members have different interpretations of department rules. It should be up to the departments to recommend promotion or not. The Personnel Committee rules should be complete before the decision is made in regard to the Promotions Committee. Is this discussion too premature? Should the handbook be complete first? The template will allow departments to follow basic criteria, a set of guidelines but each department will develop their own personnel rules following the criteria. Discussion ensued. Should Associate Professors be voting on promotion of faculty to full professor? Should the committee be full professors only? A non tenured faculty does not vote on the department level for tenure and promotion. Should the committee be limited to tenured faculty only?

Departments are to begin discussing the issue in general terms to get a sense of direction. Note: other alternative options are welcomed. Motion carried.

OLD BUSINESS APRIL

III. CIPT REVIEW (attachment)

Review by Chair Sipress. The committee structure is large and it is difficult to focus on the mission. Chair Sipress contacted Student Senate President but had no response. Academic Staff Senate Chair T. Fennessey is okay with the proposal.

Motion (Kronzer/Hembd) to endorse the recommendations from the faculty members of the CIPT committee and bring forth to administration. Motion carried.

IV. Educational Attainment (handouts, Provost Markwood)

This is a serious issue .System is expecting an increase in the number of degrees granted. We need to take a look at how and what we are doing to provide service to our community and students. Some of the discussion items included four credit courses vs three credit courses, why are students completing 60 hours and not returning when an AA degree could have been attained. Enrollment vs retention. Increased enrollment means more faculty, buildings, etc. We are committed to retention of our students. What matters is the day to day experience, in and out of the classroom. What is it we can do differently to create an environment that is more conducive to retention. Discussion continued.

OTHER

I. UWS Teaching Load Policy (hand out)

Brief discussion. Senators are asked to discuss this item with their departments. APRIL agenda item.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned, 4:15 p.m. by Chair Pro Tem Lynch.

Respectfully submitted on this 25th day of March by Linda Sharp, Faculty Senate clerical assistant.