

AGENDA

UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 5

Wednesday, January 26, 2011

Alumni Rooms AB, 3:00 p.m.

Presiding Officer: Michael Draney, Speaker

Parliamentarian: Clifford F. Abbott

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 4 December 8, 2010 [page 2]

3. CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

4. NEW BUSINESS

- a. Policy on College Student Bereavement
presented by Illene Noppe [page 4]
- b. Resolution on Creating a Partner-Friendly University for Faculty
presented by Illene Noppe [page 7]
- c. Requests for future business

5. PROVOST'S REPORT

6. OTHER REPORTS

- a. Faculty Rep's report - presented by Brian Sutton
- b. University Committee Report - presented by Illene Noppe

7. ADJOURNMENT

MINUTES 2010-2011
UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 4

Wednesday, December 8, 2010

Phoenix C, University Union

Presiding Officer: Michael Draney, Speaker of the Senate

Parliamentarian: Clifford Abbott, Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

PRESENT: Lucy Arendt (BUA), Scott Ashmann (EDU), Andrew Austin (SCD), Kimberly Baker (HUB), Caroline Boswell (HUS), Susan Cooper (EDU), Toni Damkoehler (AVD), David Dolan (NAS-UC), Michael Draney (NAS-UC), Adam Gaines (AVD), Adolfo Garcia (ICS), Thomas Harden (Chancellor, *ex officio*), Doreen Higgins (SOCW), Derek Jeffreys (HUS-UC), Tim Kaufman (EDU-UC), James Loebel (BUA), Kaoime Malloy (AVD), Christopher Martin (HUS), Michael McIntire (NAS), Amanda Nelson (HUB), Thomas Nesselin (URS), Illene Noppe (HUD-UC), Mimi Kubsch (NUR), Christine Smith (HUD), John Stoll (PEA), Brian Sutton (HUS-UC), Patricia Terry (NAS), Julia Wallace (Provost, *ex officio*), Amy Wolf (NAS), Jennifer Zapf (HUD)

REPRESENTATIVES: Linda Parins (academic staff); Derek Bergman (student government)

NOT PRESENT: Viki Goff (ICS), Heidi Sherman (HUS)

GUESTS: Tim Sewall, Scott Furlong, Derryl Block, Susan Gallagher-Lepak, Heba Mohammad

1. Call to Order. Speaker Draney called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes of UW-Green Bay Faculty Senate Meeting No. 3, November 17, 2010. Speaker Draney asked for corrections or objections. He heard none and declared the minutes approved.

3. Chancellor's Report. The Chancellor warned that rumors and speculation are abundant but solid news on the budget is hard to come by. We will have to wait until the new governor takes office and calls the legislature into session. Things may move quickly at that point. We are making every effort to have a positive influence on the legislative budget decisions and we have supportive friends.

4. Continuing Business

a. Master of Science in Nursing. Dean Block introduced the second reading of this proposal for a new degree and summarized its main features. **Senator Arendt (Senator Kaufman second) moved adoption of the proposal.** The only discussion was praise for the Nursing faculty for putting together a fine proposal. **The motion passed unanimously (25-0-0).**

5. New business

a. Code Change for Graduate Faculty Board of Advisors - first reading. Dean Block introduced this proposal, sought by the Graduate Faculty Board of Advisors, to add the LAS Dean to the Board in an *ex officio* non-voting position. The LAS Dean has been meeting informally with the Board and has some budgetary responsibility for graduate programs so the proposal makes sense. The proposal also corrects an obsolete reference in the current Code. **Senator Terry (Senator Arendt second) moved to suspend the rules to move the proposed change to an action item. With little discussion the Senate agreed (24-0-2). Senator Stoll (Senator Terry second) then**

moved to approve the Code change and with no discussion the Senate agreed (25-0-1).

b. Win-Win Program. University Committee Chair Noppe introduced this resolution to protect the faculty's rights to determine degree requirements in the face of an administration proposal (the Win-Win Program) to grant retroactive associate of arts degrees (A.A.S) to students who had already met the requirements but had left the university without asking for the degree. One of the degree requirements is completion of a 12-credit area of emphasis approved by a faculty member. The other requirements can be mechanically determined but in cases where an area of emphasis is not obvious, faculty advice is needed. Most of the questions were directed at the Provost to explain the Win-Win Program itself. The program is meant to encourage employability and perhaps additional education, but is not expected to generate much revenue. There is some modest grant money to do the degree audits to identify eligible people, then find them, ask them if they want the associate degree, and then award the degrees retroactively. Whether the work required to do this is worth it is unknown, so some limits have been placed on which former students will be targeted. If numbers warrant it, the program could be expanded. Satisfied that it understood the program and the resolution, the Senate acted on a **Senator Sutton (Senator Kubsch second) motion to approve and it passed unanimously (26-0-0).**

c. Request for future business. Speaker Draney asked that any such requests be sent to UC Chair.

6. Provost's Report The Provost, perhaps mesmerized by the Senate's efficiency at this meeting, could only report that the semester had gone by remarkably quickly. She invited questions but there were none.

7. Other Reports

a. AAC's Report. The Speaker noted that this required report was attached to the agenda.

b. Faculty Rep's Report. Faculty Rep Sutton mentioned issues under discussion at the most recent Faculty Reps meeting. He led off with UW-System's disingenuous position in the continuing saga of the sharp increases in extra-mural fringe benefit costs. The campuses are now clearly at odds with System Administration on the issue of depooling those costs. The reps are also asking questions about how System can brag to the public and legislature about enrollment increases without increased funding and not admit that this amounts to the faculty doing more work for less pay. President Reilly's response apparently was that that will be clarified when we know more about the next budget. Other news from the campuses: three schools now have Partner Hire Policies; new classroom construction is typically now including technology for lecture-capturing; many campuses have faculty committees to monitor budget preparation but almost none are satisfied with the effectiveness of such committees; and tenure and promotional material is now being handled on most campuses in digital formats.

c. University Committee Report. UC Chair Noppe listed the issues the UC has been discussing: a partner-friendly policy; a student bereavement policy; retention issues; joint governance committees; concerns of First Year Seminars; and the Interdisciplinarity Task Force.

8. Adjournment. The agenda completed, the Speaker **adjourned the meeting at 4:10 p.m.**

Policy on College Student Bereavement

I. Introduction and Rationale

The UW-Green Bay University Committee proposes that a university-wide policy regarding student bereavement be created for implementation as of Fall 2011.

Please note that bereavement policies for faculty and staff already exist. Current policy may be found at <http://www.uwsa.edu/hr/upgs/upg10.pdf>.

In a white paper proposing the need for a summit on college student bereavement, Dr. Heather-Servaty-Seib (published researcher in this area) of Purdue University writes:

"Rationale for Policies to Support Bereaved Students

At any one point in time, 38-45% college students are grieving the death of a loved one who died in the previous 2 year period.

- *As most other employers, colleges and universities include bereavement leave policies as standard course for employees.*
- *However, few colleges and universities have bereavement leave for students.*
- *Faculty members make individual decisions regarding the students' ability to "make-up" work missed as a result of bereavement-related situations.*

Perception of Institution as Responsive to Students Needs

- *Having a policy communicates that the institution is aware of most recent scholarly literature and aligned with empirical evidence.*
- *Communicates respect of students as adults who have lives outside of the institution and experience difficult events that affect their academic functioning*
- *Communicates sense of compassion with regard to difficult life events experienced by students*

Quality of Student Life

- *Bereaved students exhibit significantly lower GPAs (in the semester of death loss) when compared those who are not bereaved (Servaty-Seib & Hamilton, 2007).*
- *Bereavement students report challenges in their interpersonal relationships with peers and faculty (Balk, 1997; Silverman, 1987).*
- *A policy would allow students structure for navigating academic challenges at a time when they are likely debilitated by their grief.*
 - *Although students generally have an option to speak with their professors individually or seek assistance from staff members (Dean of Students for example or similar office), lack of a policy requires excessive effort on student's part; effort at a time when emotional resources are low.*

Resource/Economic

- *Students who are bereaved appear to be at risk for higher attrition than their non-bereaved peers (Servaty-Seib & Hamilton, 2007).*
 - *Tinto in his model of attrition and retention includes clear foci on academic and interpersonal integration.*
 - *Bereaved students are at risk in both the academic and interpersonal domains.*

- *A policy would provide faculty and staff structure for navigating issues related to student bereavement.*
 - *Faculty would include the policy on their syllabi.*
 - *Faculty would not need to spend effort on generating an individual approach for their classes.*
 - *Faculty could refer students to policy and consistent procedures would be followed.*
 - *Reduction in clock hours spent by staff members (Dean of Students or similar office) that now handles each case individually.*
 - *Most cases would fall under policy and could be handled with little staff contact*
 - *More complex cases could be allotted more appropriate amount of time and consideration*

- *Students who feel positive about their institution and who perceive that they have been respected and supported will be more likely to stay connected as alums and be more likely to contribute to the institution."*

Quoted with permission from Dr. Heather-Servaty-Seib, December 2010.

II. Student Bereavement Policy

1. Students who experience the death of a loved one must contact the Dean of Students (DOS) Office if the student wishes to implement either the Standard Bereavement Procedure or the Leave of Absence Bereavement Procedure (#3 & #7 below). The DOS has the right to request a document that verifies the death (e.g., a funeral program or death notice).
2. Typically this death involves that of a family member, in parallel to the bereavement policy for faculty and staff. However, it is up to the discretion of the DOS to determine if a death outside of the immediate family warrants implementation of the of the student bereavement policy.
3. Standard Bereavement Procedure:

Upon approval from the DOS, the student is allowed one week of excused absence. Should the student feel that he/she needs additional days, these should be discussed with individual course instructors and/or the DOS.
4. The DOS will contact the student's advisor, and faculty and academic staff of the student's courses.
5. Faculty and academic staff will be advised that extensions must be granted to the student for the period of one week of excused absence.

6. Further extensions may be negotiated with the student when he or she returns to campus. Students are encouraged to discuss options with their instructors.
7. Leave of Absence Bereavement Procedure:

Students may be allowed to withdraw from the semester in which the death occurs, without any academic repercussions to their record. This withdrawal will be noted as a "Bereavement Leave of Absence." Any monetary reimbursements will be in accord with current university policy.
8. The Bereavement Leave of Absence is for one semester only.
9. Students who have opted to take the "Bereavement Leave of Absence" will be allowed to re-enter the following semester without having to reapply to the university.
10. Reference to the Student Bereavement Policies will be noted on course syllabi.

Creating a “Partner-Friendly” University for Faculty

Introduction

For several years, periodic requests have been made to the University Committee to create a policy for professional accommodation of spouses and domestic partners when conducting a faculty search. Although the evidence is anecdotal, a number of members of faculty search committees have experience such requests from potential candidates who are married (or in a committed relationship) to another academic. There is concern that UW-Green Bay may be losing highly qualified candidates to other institutions that have such policies. In order to address this problem, and to promote a campus climate responsive to family/work issues for incoming faculty, the University Committee proposes the following “Partner Friendly” policy:

Restrictions

Any of the personnel decisions **must** adhere to the UW-Green Bay Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity and Conflict of Interest Policies. In addition, any department or program that is receiving the partner has the ultimate authority to stop the process if such an inclusion is in conflict with its goals, mission, and curriculum. For the purposes of the Partner Friendly policy, a domestic partner will follow the qualifications that were established by UW-System for the eligibility of coverage of employee benefits:

“ Qualifications of a Domestic Partnership

Effective January 1, 2010, the same-sex or opposite-sex domestic partner and the partner’s eligible dependent children will be eligible for coverage under all employee benefits offered to UW System employees that provide dependent coverage.

The partnership must meet all of the criteria outlined in Chapter 40 of Wisconsin State Statute in order to be considered a domestic partnership for benefit purposes:

- Each individual is at least 18 years old and competent to enter into a contract;
- Neither individual is married to, or in a domestic partnership with another person;
- Their partnership must not violate Wis. Stats. 765.03, which bars marriage between certain persons based on kinship and divorce;
- They must consider themselves to be members of each other’s immediate family;
- They must agree to be responsible for each other’s basic living expenses;
- They share a common residence - any of the following conditions may apply:
 - o Only one partner has legal ownership of the residence (if ownership is applicable).
 - o One or both partners have additional residences not shared with the other partner.
 - o One partner leaves the common residence with the intent to return. “

UW-Green Bay Policy for (Academic) Partners of Candidates for Faculty Positions:

1. Professional accommodations for partners must be recommended by the relevant "home unit" to the Chancellor.
2. The Chancellor must approve the professional accommodation.
3. Partners must have a terminal degree in his/her field.
4. Partners must submit a vita, cover letter, and statement of proposed activities while a member of the UW-Green Bay campus.
5. Partners must agree to have his/her status on campus reviewed and renewed after one year. The request for renewal must be reviewed and approved by the Chancellor or his/her designate.
6. Partners will receive:
 - The title of affiliation of Honorary Associate Fellow*
 - Access to an on-campus office
 - On-campus address
 - Campus e-mail account
 - Internet access
 - Access to library resources.
7. This professional accommodation will be for a maximum period of three contiguous years.

*The title of Honorary Associate Fellow is a UW System title. See p.83 of UPG#1 Attachment 1 Unclassified Title Definition Book at <http://www.uwsa.edu/hr/upgs/upg.htm>:

"Honorary Associate/Fellow

Appointment Status: Other

Compensation Category: D

Salary Range: None

Title Code: Z90NN

This title designates the holder of a fellowship (usually postdoctoral) administered outside the university or a courtesy appointment for a visiting scholar. This temporary appointment is used to provide an official university affiliation and identification without pay."