

AGENDA

UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 9

Wednesday, April 30, 2014

Alumni Rooms, University Union, 3:00 p.m.

Presiding Officer: Greg Davis, Speaker

Parliamentarian: Clifford Abbott

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 8

April 9, 2014 [page 2; corrected minutes for Meeting No.7 begin on page 7]

3. CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

4. OLD BUSINESS

- a. Essential Job Functions (second reading) [page 11]
Presented by Bryan Vescio
- b. Requirements for Minors (second reading) [page 12]
Presented by Cliff Abbott
- c. Code Change for Graduate Faculty (second reading) [page 13]
Presented by Matt Dornbush
- d. Policy Change on Promotion to Full Professor (second reading) [page 14]
Presented by Jeff Entwistle
- e. Administrative Evaluation Process [page 15]
Presented by Bryan Vescio

5. NEW BUSINESS

- a. Academic Advising Report
Presented by Darrel Renier
- b. Election of Speaker of the Senate for 2014-15
- c. Resolution from Committee on Workload and Compensation [page 17]
Presented by Chris Martin
- d. Request for future business

6. PROVOST'S REPORT

7. OTHER REPORTS

- a. Academic Affairs Council [page 18]
- b. University Committee Report - Presented by Bryan Vescio
- d. Academic Staff Report
- e. Student Government Report - Presented by Heba Mohammad

8. ADJOURNMENT

[draft]

MINUTES 2013-2014
UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 8
Wednesday, April 9, 2014
1965 Room, University Union

Presiding Officer: Greg Davis, Speaker of the Senate
Parliamentarian: Clifford Abbott

PRESENT: Francis Akakpo (SOWORK), Andrew Austin (DJS), Forrest Baulieu (ICS), Greg Davis (NAS-UC), Michael Draney (NAS), Heidi Fencl (NAS), Hernan Fernandez-Mearidi (HUS), Adolfo Garcia (ICS), Jenell Holstead (HUD), Ray Hutchison (URS), Ghadir Ishqaidef (BUA), Mimi Kubsch (NUR-UC), Arthur Lacey (EDU), William Lepley (BUA), J. Vincent Lowery (HUS), Kaoime Malloy/Jeff Entwistle (Theatre and Dance), Christopher Martin (HUS alternate), Ryan Martin (HUD-UC), Michelle McQuade-Dewhirst (MUS), Steve Meyer (NAS-UC), Cristina Ortiz (HUS-UC), Debra Pearson (HUB), Uwe Pott (HUB), Chuck Rybak (HUS), Linda Tabers-Kwak (EDU), Patricia Terry (NAS), Christine Vandenhouten (NUR), Bryan Vescio (HUS-UC), Dean VonDras (HUD), Elizabeth Wheat (PEA alternate).

NOT PRESENT: Thomas Harden (Chancellor, *ex officio*), Alison Stehlik (AND), Julia Wallace (Provost, *ex officio*).

REPRESENTATIVES: Anne Buttke, Academic Staff; Heba Mohammad, Student Government

GUESTS: Andrew Kersten, Scott Furlong, Sue Mattison, John Katers, David Coury, Sheryl Van Gruensven, Matt Dornbush, Meir Russ, Paula Ganyard, and several students.

1. CALL TO ORDER. At 3:01 p.m. Speaker Davis with his signature “Let’s do this thing” called the Senate meeting to order and plunged into what the University Committee had prepared as a master class in how to stuff an agenda.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES for Faculty Senate Meeting No. 7, March 12, 2014. Speaker Davis asked for approval of the minutes. **Senator Meyer (Senator Martin second) moved approval of the minutes. Senator Hutchison offered some corrections and with no objection the motion passed (23-0-3).**

3. CHANCELLOR’S REPORT. The Chancellor was not in attendance, but Associate Provost Andrew Kersten shared one item in his stead. UW-System has informed us that our select mission is “out of concert” with state requirements, particularly with respect to specifying program responsibilities and types of degrees granted. A keen observer might have noticed some eyes roll or some jaws drop but the Senate kept a civil tongue. The issue will be dealt with.

4. OLD BUSINESS

a. Policy on Assigning Self-authored Texts

UC Chair Vescio presented this item, now tabled and in a rather different form from the UC's original language. He suspected that the consensus achieved by the UC might not be possible for the Senate and he made a plea to dispatch the issue with some efficiency. **Senator Christopher Martin then moved (Senator Draney second) to remove the item from the table.** Senator Austin made an impassioned argument against removing the motion from the table, claiming, in part, that despite the particular language of the proposed policy, the Senate would be forced to take a position that amounted to an assault on faculty autonomy. As other senators started to respond, the Speaker recognized the discussion could easily drift into arguments about the policy rather than the issue of removing it from the table and he called for a vote. **The motion to remove the item from the table failed (7-21-1).**

b. Essential Job Functions.

This item had been read at the previous meeting, but since there was no opportunity for discussion then, it was here re-presented by David Coury and Sheryl Van Gruensven. Prof. Coury explained that the reason for the joint presentation was to dispel the idea that the proposal comes just from a single academic program or from the office of Human Resources, but is instead an attempt to remedy an institutional problem. That problem is the need to have a basis for making judgments about employees' ability to do their jobs so the institution can either make reasonable accommodations or grant permanent disability status.

About a third of the senators contributed to a spirited discussion. There were many statements of support for the intention of the policy, although at least one senator took issue with that, but on the whole senators voiced objections, raised concerns, and to a lesser extent offered alternatives. Some of the concerns: might there be unintended consequences if a policy designed for making decisions about disabilities were used for other judgments such as promotion and merit; are the job functions stated in ways that are measurable; who is qualified to make the judgments or to act in the name of the institution; can units opt to use the policy or not; do the job functions presume a standardization that is not possible or desirable; how does the policy dovetail with federal ADA law; can the same policy be used both for granting accommodations and permanent disability status; what are models in use at other institutions. One suggestion was to state job functions very broadly (to do teaching, scholarship, and service) and then specify the physical and mental capacities needed as the basis for judgments about disabilities. The discussion ended with an invitation from UC Chair Vescio to send him suggestions for revision. The matter will return at the next Senate meeting.

5. NEW BUSINESS

a. Resolution on Granting Degrees.

Senator Vescio moved (Senator Ortiz second) adoption of this standard and joyous resolution. The Senate voted its unanimous approval (30-0-0).

b. Designation of Engineering Technology programs as Professional.

Dean Furlong presented this item by reporting that the three Engineering Technology programs have been approved by the Regents and the Higher Learning Commission and accreditation by ABET is anticipated. Last year the Senate designated the Environmental ET program as interdisciplinary and the proposal now is to designate the other two ET programs (mechanical and electrical) as professional with the implication that that gives them the status of interdisciplinary programs in meeting the university's requirement that all students have an interdisciplinary program.

Senator Terry moved (Senator Meyer second) adoption. This is an issue of labels and the discussion was largely a matter of trying to sort out the implications of various labels. The following claims were offered as part of that effort. All engineering programs are considered professional by their fields. Environmental ET is a unique program that is interdisciplinary in its nature and in its courses. Mechanical and Electrical ET are not interdisciplinary in their nature, at least by some definitions of interdisciplinary. All three ET programs are liberal arts programs (one dean). All programs in both colleges are liberal arts programs (the other dean). All professional programs at UW-Green Bay are considered interdisciplinary for purposes of meeting the requirement that students have an interdisciplinary program. Thus it follows that students majoring in ET programs that are labelled either interdisciplinary or professional will not be required to take an additional program to graduate. With that clarification, **the Senate approved the motion (27-2-1).**

c. Requirements for Minors.

Cliff Abbott presented this proposal to remove the requirement that all minors must have at least 12 credits of upper level courses but to leave in place the requirement that all minor must have at least 18 credits. This is essentially a proposal for more flexibility in program design that accommodates the differences in how programs set up prerequisite structures, decide whether courses are upper or lower level, and coordinate with transfer courses from other schools. The approval process (units, deans, AAC, Provost) remains the same. Questions were raised about the protections on quality (the same approval process as we have now); equity across programs (easier vs harder programs); is this a solution to a specific problem (not currently but exceptions have been granted in the past). This issue returns at the next Senate meeting.

d. Code Change for Graduate Faculty.

Matt Dornbush presented this proposal to allow members of the graduate faculty to vote in more than a single graduate program. Participation in graduate programs is more akin to participation in disciplinary and other programs than it is to having a single home in an interdisciplinary unit. The current restriction is a barrier to the effective governance of existing graduate programs and a threat to their development. A question was raised about the rationale for the current rule. There was a flurry of activity as the older people in the room made a stab at searching institutional memory but it largely amounted to just blaming people who were no longer around. There was also a concern about giving undue power to individuals in multiple programs. The response was that that was a potential problem even with current disciplinary programs (a faculty member can belong to and vote in multiple disciplinary/other programs) but in practice it was minimal and shouldn't outweigh the gains of more effective management of the graduate programs. One senator suggested adding the word 'graduate' before 'program' in the last sentence would clarify the intent. There was an attempt to **suspend the rules to move this first**

reading to action by Senator Terry (Senator Meyer second) but the Senate did not provide the necessary two-thirds approval (16-10-1). The issue will return for a second reading and action at the next Senate meeting.

e. Policy Change on Promotion to Full Professor.

Jeff Entwistle presented this proposal to clarify the role of applied scholarship in promotion deliberations, because this might have been seen as barrier, particularly for faculty in professional programs and the arts. There was very little discussion on the substance of this change, but the Senate, ever conscious that language matters, flew into high wordsmithing mode. Questions were raised about: the order of the paragraphs, whether the ‘and’ in the first sentence of the second paragraph should be ‘or’; whether ‘supplementary’ had the wrong connotation; whether ‘additional’ would be better than ‘supplementary’; whether ‘but’ in the next to last sentence was appropriate; whether ‘outstanding’ was the best choice; and whether ‘creative’ could be added to ‘scholarly’. Perhaps we can get classified as a writing emphasis senate. This issue returns for second reading at the next Senate meeting.

f. Administrative Evaluation Process.

Bryan Vescio presented some of the history of faculty (and sometimes staff) reviews of the performance of administrators. Attempts in the past to set up an ongoing process have often been thwarted by either the turnover rate among administrators or the lack of diligence by the faculty. The University Committee reviewed the last attempt (2008) and generally found the process satisfactory and wishes to re-implement it with just a few changes, one being to include academic staff. The discussion by the Senate focused on two issues: periodicity and transparency. Some argued for more frequent reviews. There was support for more regularity since ad hoc reviews give the impression that they are in response to a specific problem. The transparency challenge is to balance the availability of raw survey data with more nuanced discussion in a face-to-face interaction between representatives of the faculty/staff with the administrators. During this discussion the approach of the automatic adjournment time (5 p.m.) forced the Speaker to be nimble. He asked for a motion to extend the meeting for 15 minutes and in his let’s-do-this-thing style he got it. **Senator Austin moved (Senator Draney second) to extend the meeting for 15 minutes. The diminishing Senate approved (15-6-0).** UC Chair Vescio invited additional suggestions on administrator evaluation be sent to him for the next meeting.

g. Request for future business. Really, you want more on the agenda?

6. PROVOST’S REPORT

There was no report since the Provost was off welcoming spring at the Board of Regents meeting in scenic River Falls.

7. OTHER REPORTS

a. Academic Affairs Council. This was attached in written form on the agenda. Just after the Senate adjourned, the Chair of the AAC noted a correction - the renaming of the Spanish major should have applied as well to the minor.

b. Faculty Rep Report.

Rep Meyer reviewed how administrator evaluations happen at other campuses. UW-Stout's University Committee evaluates administrators every two years. UW-Madison has a committee evaluate the deans every five years but there is apparently no process to evaluate the chancellor and provost. UW-Oshkosh presents a public evaluation every three years. UW-Whitewater does a confidential evaluation every two years. UW-Milwaukee does a committee review on a five year cycle for each administrator. He also reported on the legislative requests for data on teaching loads for faculty. Expect some politics.

c. University Committee Report.

UC Chair Vescio reminded all about the conference on shared governance on April 11th, announced Steve Meyer as the newly elected UC chair for next year (applause!), and reported that the UC will be dealing the much of today's Senate agenda as well as the policy on creating centers.

d. Academic Staff Report.

Anne Buttke, celebrated earlier in the day as she prepares to leave for a new position and then required to sit through an extended Senate meeting, reported success as the long-term work on identifying barriers to promotion and career progression was presented to the administration and appears to be moving toward implementation. She also reported the Academic Staff Assembly is planned for May 19.

e. Student Government Report.

Heba Mohammad reported on a student government conference to be held at UW-L, the soon-to-be-concluded elections for next year's leaders, the referendum on a childcare center, and a recently held successful American Multicultural Leadership conference.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Almost in a single breath the Speaker noted time had elapsed, called for adjournment, thanked the Senate, and ended the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Clifford Abbott, Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

[approved as amended]

MINUTES 2013-2014
UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 7

Wednesday, March 12, 2014
Alumni Room AB, University Union

Presiding Officer: Greg Davis, Speaker of the Senate

Parliamentarian: Clifford Abbott

PRESENT: Francis Akakpo (SOWORK), Gregory Aldrete (HUS), Andrew Austin (DJS), Greg Davis (NAS-UC), Michael Draney (NAS), Heidi Fencl (NAS), Hernan Fernandez-Meardi (HUS), Adolfo Garcia (ICS), Jenell Holstead (HUD), Ray Hutchison (URS), Ghadir Ishqaidef (BUA), Mimi Kubsch (NUR-UC), Arthur Lacey (EDU), J. Vincent Lowery (HUS), Kaoime Malloy (Theatre and Dance), Ryan Martin (HUD-UC), Michelle McQuade-Dewhirst (MUS), Steve Meyer (NAS-UC), Cristina Ortiz (HUS-UC), Debra Pearson (HUB), Uwe Pott (HUB), Chuck Rybak (HUS), Alison Stehlik (AND), Linda Tabers-Kwak (EDU), Patricia Terry (NAS), Christine Vandenhouten (NUR), Dean VonDras (HUSD), Elizabeth Wheat (PEA alternate).

NOT PRESENT: Forrest Baulieu (ICS), Thomas Harden (Chancellor, *ex officio*), William Lepley (BUA), Bryan Vescio (HUS-UC), Julia Wallace (Provost, *ex officio*).

REPRESENTATIVES: Heba Mohammad, Student Government

GUESTS: Andrew Kersten, Yunsun Huh, Regan Gurung, Scott Furlong, Sue Mattison, Morgan Mason.

1. CALL TO ORDER. Speaker Davis called the Senate meeting to order as soon as a quorum was present at 3:02 p.m.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES for Faculty Senate Meeting No. 6, February 19, 2014. Speaker Davis asked for approval of the minutes. **Senator Meyer (Senator Martin second) moved approval of the minutes and with no discussion the motion passed (22-0-0).**

3. CHANCELLOR'S REPORT. Since the Chancellor was not in attendance, his report was dispensed with.

4. OLD BUSINESS

a. Policy on Assigning Self-authored Texts. The second reading of this proposal was presented by Ryan Martin with the final sentence of this agenda's version slightly altered from the first reading. The Senate's handling of the proposal was somewhat akin to Odysseus' return from the Trojan War although individual senators will no doubt disagree on who was practicing the sorcery of Circe and who had the limited vision of the Cyclops. The formal route proceeded as follows.

Senator Meyer (Senator Ortiz second) moved the proposal as it appeared in the agenda. The discussion led to a **motion by Senator Hutchison (Senator Pott second) to amend the motion by deleting the last two sentences.** The amended motion (handed out by Senator Hutchison) read as follows:

*Because faculty members are scholars contributing to their academic fields as well as teachers, as part of its commitment to academic freedom UW-Green Bay affirms the right of faculty to assign works they themselves have authored in courses they teach. **This motion failed (6-18-4).***

Senator Rybak suggested deleting the second sentence and since the original mover and seconder agreed, the Senate then debated the motion in this form:

Because faculty members are scholars contributing to their academic fields as well as teachers, as part of its commitment to academic freedom UW-Green Bay affirms the right of faculty to assign works they themselves have authored in courses they teach. To prevent conflicts of interest, faculty members at UW-Green Bay may not profit from the assignment of materials to students without the approval of the Executive Committee of their budgetary unit and the Committee on Rights and Responsibilities for each semester in which those materials are assigned.

After some discussion **Senator Austin (Senator Pott second) moved a substitute motion in the following form**, based on a policy at UW-Madison:

Whereas UW-Green Bay is committed to academic freedom and affirms the right of faculty to determine the content of the courses they teach,

Whereas the standards of academic freedom hold that choice of textbooks is the prerogative of the instructor or the budgetary unit or some delegation therein,

Whereas it is not in the best interest of students to prohibit instructors from assigning textbooks they have written, given that such materials may be the most appropriate materials available,

Whereas the faculty recognizes that an apparent conflict of interest may be perceived when education materials produced by an instructor are required for a class that instructor teaches,

The instructor and the budgetary unit to which that instructor is assigned may therefore consider at their discretion any of the following:

Accommodate students who choose not to purchase the materials by placing copies on reserve in the library or by making the materials electronically available for the duration of the semester.

Confer with the department or department chair to establish that these materials are, indeed, the most appropriate materials to students.

Donate royalties derived from those texts assigned to students in the instructor's course to a cause or entity of the instructor's choice.

The act of replacing the original motion with the substitute was accepted by the Senate (16-12-0). This motion now before the Senate was altered by the process commonly called “friendly amendment” [this is not a formal parliamentary procedure but a collaborative effort to get the wording right as long as the mover and seconder agree]. The motion at this point had the following form:

Whereas UW-Green Bay is committed to academic freedom and affirms the right of faculty to determine the content of the courses they teach,

Whereas the standards of academic freedom hold that choice of course materials is the prerogative of the instructor or the budgetary unit or some delegation therein,

Whereas it is not in the best interest of students to prohibit instructors from assigning course materials they have written, given that such materials may be the most appropriate materials available,

Whereas the faculty recognizes that an apparent conflict of interest may be perceived when education materials produced by an instructor are required for a class that instructor teaches, The instructor and the budgetary unit to which that instructor is assigned will therefore implement one or more of the following:

Accommodate students who choose not to purchase the materials by placing copies on reserve in the library or by making the materials electronically available for the duration of the semester.

Confer with the department or department chair to establish that these materials are, indeed, the most appropriate materials to students.

Senator Hutchison (Senator Lowery second) moved to table the proposal and the Senate approved (19-7-2). Senator Hutchison added his intention that the University Committee consider possible revisions based the discussion. This all took about an hour and a half which only felt like the decade Odysseus took getting home from the war.

There was, of course, considerable discussion along this journey. Among the issues raised were the following:

Several people urged a separation of the issue of freedom to assign texts from the issue of how to deal with income from texts but others argued they were interdependent. Some of the amending was seen as an attempt to remove apparent contradictions within the resolution.

Some saw the role of the Committee on Rights and Responsibilities as problematic if it were to serve both as an ethics committee and as a group to hear appeals on ethics. It was also questioned whether the CRR as an external body should be involved in any decision about the appropriateness of a text to field. The role of a dean in that decision was both questioned and supported.

There was a disagreement over whether assigning a self-authored text should automatically be presumed a conflict of interest and thus establish a burden of proof or should a conflict of interest be a basis for individual-initiated complaint.

A parallel was drawn between how an individual might profit from a self-authored text and how the university might profit from bookstore sales. This raised the question of degrees of profitability and ultimate costs to students.

A number of questions arose concerning legalities - copyright restrictions, taxes on income from self-authored texts, due process in removing property rights of faculty, and whether a faculty resolution was the appropriate level for policy.

If there is to be a route for exceptions, what should be the grounds for that exception and what should be the period of review - every semester or less frequently?

There were disagreements on whether there might be a solution in providing alternatives to an assigned self-authored text for students.

b. Academic Actions Committee. Yuhsun Huh, chair of the Academic Actions Committee, presented the second reading of a proposal to modify the structure of that committee. Senator Garcia, chair of the Committee on Committees and Nominations, weighed in that the version in the agenda was not the version preferred by the CCN. Their preferred version had one student

(rather than two) and two staff members (rather than one). **It was that revised version that Senator Kubsch (Senator Meyer second) moved** (along with the appropriate grammatical number agreements in the second paragraph). There was some discussion, questioning of the student government position, and reviewing of experience from other campuses before the Senate completed this journey home and **voted its approval (24-2-2)**.

5. NEW BUSINESS

a. Essential Job Functions (first reading). Human Resources Director Sheryl Van Gruensven presented the historical context for this proposal. In the past a list of essential job functions has been needed to help a medical review of individuals coping with illness and disabilities to determine their ability to perform their job. An ad hoc list of such essential job functions has been used in the past. The list presented in this proposal is a slightly modified version offered for faculty approval. Before any discussion, since the time was nearing the Senate's automatic cut off hour of 5:00, **Senator Garcia (Senator Pott second) moved to table this proposal and the Senate voted its unanimous support.**

b. Requirements for Minors (first reading). In the interests of time the Speaker postponed this issue until the next meeting.

c. Call for future business. Like Jello there is always room for this item. The call received no response.

6. PROVOST'S REPORT The Provost being absent, the Speaker skipped over this item.

7. OTHER REPORTS

a. Academic Affairs Council Report. The report was attached to the agenda and the AAC's chair, Senator VonDras, offered that the AAC had been busy, particularly with inactivating courses no longer being taught. He also noted the end of the Anthropology minor.

b. University Committee Report. UC member Ryan Martin stood in for the absent chair to announce a conference being planned for April 11th on shared governance - 11-4:30 with lunch included. Details are to follow.

c. Academic Staff Report. The Speaker skipped this report since no representative from the Academic Staff was able to make this meeting.

d. Student Government Report. Heba Mohammad mentioned a fruitful discussion with a consultant on childcare, the upcoming SGA elections in early April, and an initiative for a self-operated dining system being negotiated.

8. ADJOURNMENT The Speaker adjourned the meeting within seconds of the clock doing it for him.

Respectfully submitted,
Clifford Abbott, Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

Proposal to Define Essential Job Functions of Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty

1. Designs and teaches, in a classroom setting and environment, required courses assigned by the Dean or Department Chair.
2. Prepares, reviews, orders teaching materials, and updates course outlines and syllabi.
3. Meets all scheduled classes, and uses scheduled classroom time appropriately.
4. Demonstrates commitment to the institutional mission, goals and objectives.
5. Adheres to University policies and procedures that reflect updated Federal, state and local legislation that governs the educational process.
6. Maintains accurate student records for grading and attendance purposes; submits grade reports within college deadlines.
7. Schedules and maintains office hours as assigned.
8. Attends departmental and other meetings as designated by the Department Chair or administrative official.
9. Assists in the development, implementation, and evaluation of divisional and departmental program goals.
10. Serves on university committees to which elected or appointed.
11. Supervises, monitors, and evaluates student teachers performance when assigned to do so.
12. Establishes a scholarly research focus and engages in research and other scholarly projects, resulting in peer-reviewed publications or other scholarly output appropriate to the faculty member's budgetary unit.
13. Performs academic and professional service to advance the university, college and community.
14. Participates in faculty governance.
15. Demonstrates a professional attitude, philosophy, and commitment that promote student growth and learning.
16. Uses instructional technology and is familiar with appropriate software and hardware.
17. Has the ability to stand or sit for extended periods of time.
18. Transports oneself independently to various on and off campus locations when required.
19. Communicates effectively with students, colleagues, staff and the public.

Faculty Senate Old Business 4a 4/30/2014

Proposal to Change University Requirements for Minors

The current requirement:

Minors will consist of a minimum of 18 credits with at least 12 credits at the upper level. The three exceptions are Music, Art, and Theatre.

The proposed requirement:

Minors will consist of a minimum of 18 credits.

Faculty Senate Old Business 4b 4/30/2014

Code Change for Graduate Faculty

The proposal is to delete the struck-through parts and add the boldface parts to the existing Code:

53.12 Graduate Program

A. Graduate Degree Programs: Membership, Responsibilities, Appointment Process.

*1. Membership. The faculty of a graduate program shall consist of those UW-Green Bay faculty members holding professorial rank and Lecturers with faculty status who have been appointed to that program by the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs on the recommendation of the appropriate dean and the graduate program executive committee. ~~A faculty member may have a split appointment or assignment with another graduate program but may vote in only one program.~~ **A faculty member may have a split assignment with another program and may vote in more than one.***

Faculty Senate Old Business 4c 4/30/2014

Proposal to Change Policy on Promotion to Full Professor

Current policy on Criteria and Procedure for Promotion to Full Professor (page 100 of the current Faculty Handbook) includes the following two paragraphs:

Scholarly Activity

This is attested to by articles in refereed scholarly journals, an outstanding scholarly book, publication of book reviews in refereed scholarly journals, oral presentations at national, area, and sectional meetings of various professional associations and societies, appointment as referee and/or reader for scholarly publications. For faculty whose creative scholarly work is not usually manifested in this manner--e.g. faculty in the visual arts and the performing arts such as drama, music, and dance--exhibitions and performances provide the evidence of scholarly and creative activity.

Candidates should be judged on their own merits and should have exhibited substantial and/or continuous advance and progress beyond those scholarly activities which warranted promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. Historically, one or two significant scholarly works have been sufficient to assure promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. For promotion to the rank of Professor the level of performance should appreciably exceed this.

The proposal is to substitute the following:

Scholarly Activity

Candidates should be judged on their own merits and should have exhibited substantial scholarly activity, which should appreciably exceed the scholarly expectations that warranted promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.

Substantial scholarly activities are exemplified by articles in refereed academic journals; a scholarly book; juried or invited exhibitions and public performances; or consequential applications of academic ideas to solving social or technical problems. Additional scholarly activities including publication of book reviews; oral presentations at national, area, and sectional meetings of professional associations and societies; and appointment as referee, editor, or reader for scholarly publications may strengthen the record but are not by themselves sufficient for promotion. In cases where traditional mechanisms of scholarly review are not applicable, strong validation by external sources is required.

Faculty Senate Old Business 4d 4/30/2014

UW-GREEN BAY
ADMINSTRATOR REVIEW PROCESS
April 2014

Purpose

UWGB seeks to assure that all the members of its community have accurate information as to performance expectations and assessments of that performance. Members of the faculty and the administrative staff have annual processes for the development and communication of information about goals, accomplishments, and assessments. The Regents and the President have policies for the annual review of chancellors and those annual reviews include evaluations involving all direct reports to the UWGB Chancellor and the leaders of the UWGB governance organizations.

UWGB seeks to complement these annual review procedures with reviews which more formally and systematically incorporate broader input from faculty and other members of the university community, including student leaders, as appropriate, to the scope of responsibilities associated with the position. The procedure that follows applies to the UWGB Chancellor, Provost, and Deans.

Policy

UWGB's policy is as follows:

- I. All administrators to whom this policy applies participate in annual evaluations, as already established. These annual evaluations provide an important means by which the employee and her or his supervisor share information about appropriate goals for the coming year and about the degree of achievement of goals for the preceding year. This process will supplement, not replace, those annual evaluations by soliciting feedback from the larger campus community in an attempt to improve the health and the strength of the institution.
- II. Prior to the completion of the third year and every three years thereafter, the performance of the academic or administrative leader will be evaluated through a participatory process. Completion of this review will be the responsibility of the Administrative Evaluation Committee (AEC) appointed by the University Committee and the Academic Staff Committee. The function of the committee will be the coordination/administration of the administrator evaluation process.
- III. The AEC, in coordination with the Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff, will be responsible for the development and distribution of the applicable questionnaire to all personnel in all units reporting to the administrator under evaluation. A selected list of other constituents

may be included as appropriate for the purpose of soliciting feedback about the performance of the administrator (e.g., student leadership in the review of a Dean of Students). The position description for the position being reviewed will accompany the questionnaire. The AEC will have the authority to develop a timeline and a questionnaire as appropriate to the responsibilities and challenges of a particular position.

IV. Members of the AEC, with the help of the Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff, will use the completed evaluations materials to compile a comprehensive report of the results of the submitted evaluations. The report will include the number and percentage of faculty reporting. The summary of questionnaire responses will be prepared so as to assure the confidentiality of respondents. The comprehensive report will only be distributed to the administrator(s) being evaluated. The AEC will meet with the administrator being evaluated to review and discuss the comprehensive report.

V. The comprehensive report should be considered a confidential personnel document and should only be shared with those individuals who have a legitimate need to see the report. Consistent with sound practices for effective personnel development, results of the review are shared only with the employee under review, the supervisor, and, as these are key line administrative positions, with the Chancellor. Other access to the results of the review process would be governed by applicable statutes, relevant case law, and the policies of the University of Wisconsin.

VI. The AEC will prepare a final summary report for distribution to the administrator, his/her supervisor and the appropriate governance groups. Once the process is complete, the questionnaires upon which the summary is based will be destroyed.

VII. The Administrator will be asked to respond to the University Community, in writing, to both the comprehensive and final summary reports as well as the evaluative process.

VIII. The Office of the Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff will maintain records regarding the year of the most recent review of each administrator. If an administrator is due for a review in a given year, the SOFAS Office will alert both the administrator and the AEC by the fourth week of fall semester.

Committee on Workload and Compensation Resolution to Faculty Senate

Whereas a majority of the Faculty completed the HERI survey and a comparable survey is currently being solicited to Staff, and

Whereas the UW-Green Bay Compensation Philosophy identifies “transparency” and “easily understandable” as two adjectives defining our Compensation Program, and

Whereas the UW-Green Bay Compensation Philosophy specifies our aim of meeting at least the median of the competitive market salaries and many Faculty and Staff are still significantly below the median salary for their positions, and

Whereas recent market adjustments do little to address Salary Compression relative to other members of the UW-Green Bay Faculty and Staff community

Therefore be it resolved, that the UW-Green Bay Faculty Senate, Academic Staff Committee, the Classified Staff Advisory Council, and the Compensation and Workload Committee support the CWC’s use of data from the HERI surveys to formulate and propose Workload proposals, and

Therefore be it further resolved, that the UW-Green Bay Faculty Senate, Academic Staff Committee, the Classified Staff Advisory Council, and the Compensation and Workload Committee support greater transparency and explanation on behalf of the Administration in the rationale for and limitations on further market adjustments, and

Therefore be it further resolved, that the UW-Green Bay Faculty Senate, Academic Staff Committee, the Classified Staff Advisory Council, and the Compensation and Workload Committee support the Administration seeking in earnest internal and external revenue dollars to best address our internal salary compression inequities.

Faculty Senate New Business 5c 4/30/2014

Academic Affairs Council Report to the Senate

April 30, 2014

The Academic Affairs Council has recently approved the following:

- Approved the renaming of the “Corporate Communication Emphasis”, to the “Applied Communication” area in the Interdisciplinary Studies Program, as well as other course modifications for this area of emphasis.
- Approved the renaming of the “Interdisciplinary Studies” major, to the “Integrative Leadership Studies” major, offered as a Bachelor of Arts degree and as a Bachelor of Applied Studies degree.
- Approved the removal of Science and Religion: Spirit of Inquiry (HUM BIO 331) from the list of upper-level electives in General Human Biology.
- Approved replacement of Area Studies in Democracy and Justice (DJS 333), with Topics in Democracy and Justice (DJS 363) in Category III of the History major curriculum.
- Approved re-designating Introduction to Human Biology (HUM BIOL 102) to the supporting courses area of the Social Work major curriculum, as well as the addition of Anatomy and Physiology (HUM BIOL 204) as a possible course choice for this area of the curriculum.

Respectfully submitted,
Dean D. VonDras
AAC Chair