

MINUTES-FACULTY SENATE  
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-SUPERIOR  
Tuesday, April 20 2010  
YU 203, 2:30 p.m.

**CALL TO ORDER**

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

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

Guest: Griffith, S.

Excused: Simpson

**I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

*Motion (Engstrom/Lynch) to approve minutes dated March 23, 2010. Motion carried.*

**Receive Executive Minutes**

*Motion (Einerson/Jacobs) to receive Executive (unapproved) minutes April 6, 2010. Motion carried.*

**REPORT OF THE CHANCELLOR**

The Chancellor provided a copy of an article in the winter edition of Liberal Education; The Public Liberal Arts Sector by Bill Spellman.

Brief report of the process of the upcoming search for the next chancellor. This will be an 8 – 10 month effort, could be up a year before the announcement is made, the new chancellor should be in place by July 1, 2011.

**REPORT OF THE PROVOST**

HLC report. Thank you and congratulations to all those who helped prepare for the successful visit. A verbal report has been given, written report to follow. Our academic plan is strong, the liberal arts initiative developed by faculty is strong and many other areas are on target. There are five opportunities for improvement; three have to do with assessment. The Commission felt a sense of faculty ownership of the liberal arts mission. Fifty six per cent of the faculty, teaching and academic staff turned out for the luncheon/meeting which is the highest turn out ever for one of their visits. There is a sense of embeddedness of the Liberal Arts agenda in the program.

Congratulations to all!

Hand out-support for Emeritus status for Chancellor Erlenbach.

*Motion (Einerson/Sloboda) to adopt the resolution to request Chancellor Emeritus Status for Dr. Julius E. Erlenbach. Motion carried.*

**REPORTS**

**Chair** Written report provided.

CIPT meeting tomorrow, the goal is to endorse a campus model for educational attainment to be submitted to system. Retention is an item to be emphasized.

**Secretary**

Results of nominations:

**Senate Chair** – one – Rosenberg

The following was read by senator Einerson-

Unfortunately, there is only one name on the ballot for Faculty Senate Chair. Sound and practical politics has greater potential with choices in representation and leadership.

Over the next two years our campus will see dramatic changes in its administrative leadership. For this

and other reasons, the Faculty Senate Chair will undoubtedly benefit from experience and historical service on Faculty Senate. The individual listed on the ballot has never served on Faculty Senate.

I believe that more effort was put into keeping names off this year's ballot, than was put into getting names on the ballot. Petty, interpersonal politics kept an experienced, senior faculty name from appearing on our ballot.

For this reason, I will write-in Professor Nick Sloboda, for Chair of Faculty Senate. He has served on Senate for over 10 years, and has consistently and effectively represented UW-Superior faculty as Faculty Representative, and a member of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

Informational FS Chair Forum scheduled for Thursday, April 22, 1-1:30 p.m. YU. Announcement has been made to faculty via email.

**Personnel Council** – two – Simpson, Augsburg

**Planning and Budgetary** – two – Griffith, Hembd

Academic Program Review – No nominations – Discussion of options, 1) ballot for write in only, 2) extend the nomination period, 3) issue new call for nominations. *Motion (Cleary/Kronzer) to issue a new call for nominations for Academic Program Review.* Motion carried.

Suggestion -Starratt – could the call for nominations be made in the fall, it is the near the end of the semester, HLC, etc. Discussion. Committee assignments are made by exec senate during the summer, changes would have to be made to assignments if committee members were elected to a council, that process would be difficult.

#### **Faculty Representative -**

Sloboda, BOR meeting on April 8 and 9<sup>th</sup>. The Growth Agenda was formally presented. The Board is enthusiastic. Reps are concerned with the unfunded mandate.

**Academic Program Review Council** No report

**Planning and Budgetary Council** No report

**Personnel Council**

Kronzer-working diligently to complete.

**Undergraduate Academic Affairs Council**

Three action items.

SMGT Credit Certificate – *Motion (Hembd/Einerson) to approve the SMGT Credit Certificate.* Question, what is an 'at large student'? Same as 'special'? (Not admitted into a program). No answer. Motion carried.

First Year Seminar Implementation Proposal – *Motion (Kronzer/Einerson) to approve the FYS Implementation Proposal.* Discussion. Department of Natural Science has specific requirements for the first semester, FYS added, the credit load would be unrealistic. The department requests this to be implemented during 2<sup>nd</sup> semester. Griffith, it is to be taken the first semester, whether, fall or spring. The point of the seminar is to facilitate their conceptualization of the classroom, to study, prepare and discuss. Discussion ensued. Noted that adopting the proposal does not mean it will go in the catalog at this point. A concrete proposal will be coming soon. Motion carried with 1 opposed.

Clarification of the Advisement Model- *Motion (Einerson/Jacobs) to support the Clarifications of the Advisement Model.* Clarification; non teaching academic staff are not to advise unless under contract.

**Graduate Council** – Christensen – graduate tea being held this afternoon.

**Student Senate** No Report

**Academic Staff Senate** No report

## OLD BUSINESS

### **I. Academic Staff Workload (attachment)**

*Motion (Einerson/Staratt) to approve.* Discussion. Schmude - the handbook is not completely clear. Is there a system policy? Can a department lower the teaching load for valid reasons? Human resources should act on this and this should not be changed or acted on by a resolution by the faculty senate. There is no system policy. What about teaching excellence, asking people to teach 5 credits will lower that excellence. Einerson-it is the purview of the senate to discuss this. Motion carried.

### **II. Promotions Committee**

*Motion (Cleary/Faerber) to remove Promotions Committee from the table.* Motion carried. One opposed. The three options are:

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.

Discussion. *Motion (Kronzer/ Cleary) to recommend the abolition of the Promotions Committee and to recommend that administration explore reinstating the position of Dean of Faculty/Graduate Dean.*

Discussion. Faerber- the overall sense of the music department is to keep the committee because it provides balance with administration and suggest reduce the number of the committee to 3 and 3. Starratt-the Social Inquiry Department would like to see one merged committee with both associate and full professors and the merged committee would supervise all promotions. Starratt is in favor of voting on having dean position being reinstated but does not like the way it is tied to the abolition of the promotions committee, would having a dean remove the necessity of having a promotions committee, some administration positions are two years only, more continuity is needed. Einerson- Agrees with Starratt about the dean position. Einerson states that she thinks there is an ethical problem with Kronzer making the motion as Kronzer has been publicly announced Associate Dean of Graduate Studies and that she is advocating for a position for herself. Clarification by Kronzer-she is recommending that the position be abolished and a national search. Lynch-tying the two motions (the dean issue) together may not be the thing to do and recommends that we revisit the motion and separate the two.

Wright-department is in favor of abolishing the committee. Sloboda-his department is strongly in favor of abolishing the committee given its current charge, (to make certain department rules have been followed) a lot of people aren't aware of what the committee actually does. Lynch-department is in favor of abolishing. A smaller committee would continue as is.

How do we get there if it is abolished? Instead of immediately abolishing it there should be transition period and phased out gracefully.

Cleary-department in favor of abolishing the committee. Markwood-if the promotions committee is abolished then the promotion decisions rest solely with administration, what happened to peer review? Peer review is important. Einerson-understands the frustration of senate exec committee in finding the numbers of people for committees, but peer review is very important. The Personnel Council has not completed its charge, an important piece of that is what will their recommendations be for personnel policy. Kronzer-peer review happens at the department level, that is the evaluation. The promotion committee at this point in time reviews whether or not department rules (interpretation problems may happen) are followed. Her proposal would have a middle between the department and the chancellor and provost. The personnel committee reviewed its' charge and is concerned that senate thinks that new criteria is being formed, the personnel committee was charged to develop procedures and a template to follow those procedures, not developing criteria. Lynch-in favor of peer review, this is more of a philosophical issue, Jacobs-WRLS preferred the second option of reducing. It has the element of peer review and support. The WRLS is writing their personnel rules now and would appreciate the committee seeing if the department

missed something in their own review. A possibility of conflict in a department is there and the committee would help clarify things. Einerson-clarification -department peer is internal and that would not change but how we evaluate scholarly work and excellence in teaching also requires external peer review. Other organizations would concur. Cleary-have you ever been concerned with who is on the committee at the time of your promotion? This is a small university, not just peers but individual relationships. Wright-the personnel committee should be retained but only if it follows campus wide criteria. *Motion (Einerson/Sloboda/Hembd) to table this issue.* Motion carried. OLD BUSINESS

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **I. Completion of the Multi-Year Pay Plan**

Matter of record, the multi-year pay plan is now in the realm of administration. *Motion (Cleary/Sloboda) (thanking Shaun Lynch in bringing this governance issue to a successful completion* Provost Markwood noted that Chancellor Erlenbach signed today. Sipress-Shaun went above and beyond the call of duty in support of the governance process.

### **II. Retention and Enrollment Committee (attachment)**

Set of recommendations to administration. Change in the composition and the charge. *Motion (Einerson/Lynch) to approve.* Motion carried.

### **III. Chancellor Search and Screen Committee**

*Motion (Clear/Lynch) to endorse the list of eighteen names on the list and forward to President Reilly.* Noted by Sipress that all but two departments are represented, 16 distinct areas, and four junior faculty. Motion carried.

### **IV. Other**

No other business, meeting adjourned 4:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted on this 23<sup>rd</sup> day of April 2010 by Linda Sharp, Faculty Senate Clerical Assistant.