



Faculty Senate • http://www.uwrf.edu/faculty_senate/welcome.html

Senators: Chair – Wes Chapin , Vice Chair – Ogden Rogers, Secretary – John Heppen, Executive Committee – Glenn Potts, Brenda Boetel

Date: November 1, 2006
To: Faculty Senate and University Community
From: Wes Chapin, Faculty Senate Chair
Subject: Tentative Agenda for Faculty Senate Meeting November 1, 2006

The 2006-2007 Faculty Senate will meet on Wednesday November 1, 2006 at 3:40pm in the Regents Room of the Student Center. Faculty Senators who cannot attend should arrange for a substitute and notify John Heppen at john.heppen@uwrf.edu
http://www.uwrf.edu/faculty_senate/

Agenda November 1, 2006

Call to Order

Seating of Substitutes
Recognition of Invited Guests
Approval of Minutes from October 18 2006

Reports:

Unfinished Business:

New Business:

Proposal 1: A motion from the Assessment Committee to approve the Assessment Plan Elements document and the rubric for Evaluating Assessment Plans.

Proposal 2: A motion for the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to accept the resignation of Kim Mogen from the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) and approve Scott Ballantyne as her replacement.

Proposal 3: Motion from the Academic Policy and Program Committee to approve the Interdisciplinary Minor in the College of Education and Professional Studies.

Proposal 4: Motion from the Faculty Salary Committee to approve guidelines for the Exemplary Performance Awards.

New Business Miscellaneous:

Minutes of the UWRF Faculty Senate for October 18, 2006 Vol. 31 No. 8

Members:

Representation	Term Expires 2007	Term Expires 2008	Term Expires 2009
CAFES	Bob Baker	Laine Vignona	
CAS	Wes Chapin	Patricia Berg	Peter Johansson
	Larry Harred	John Heppen	
	Barbara Werner		
COEPS		Ogden Rogers	Michael Miller
CBE			Glenn Potts
4th Division	Cara Rubis	Gregg Heinselman	Sarah Egerstrom
At Large		Brenda Boetel (Jr) (David Trechter)	Melissa Wilson (Jr)
	Karl Peterson (Jr)	Dawn Hukai (Sr)	David Rainville (Sr)
	Nan Jordahl (Sr)		Terry Ferriss (Sr) (Mike Middleton)
	Charlie Hurt		

* Chancellor's Designee

** Absent

() Substitute

Call to Order: W. Chapin called the meeting to order at 3:40 p.m in the Alumni Room of South Hall.

Seating of Substitutes: Mike Middleton for Terry Ferris and David Trechter for Brenda Boetel.

Guests: Brad Mogen

Approval of Minutes: The Minutes for October 4, 2006 and October 11, 2006 were approved as corrected by general consent.

Chair's Report:

- Wes Chapin reported that there may be a Faculty Senate meeting on Wednesday October 25, 2006 for a first reading of the revised UWS-7.
- The Strategic Planning Working Groups (SPWG) will submit their tasks to the Strategic Planning Steering Committee (SPSC) shortly for the purpose of creating posters of initiatives and tasks for presentation to the campus community on October 26, 2005. UW System President Reilly will on campus during that time.

- Bob Baker and Wes Chapin reminded everyone that there will be an online method for providing feedback to SPWG chairs.

Vice Chair's Report:

- Ogden Rogers reported that David Rainville was elected to the Faculty Senate replacing John Walker.

Parliamentarian's Report:

- Karl Peterson reported that Wes Chapin's comments on October 4, 2006 regarding his communication with the Administration about the potential consequences of passing the motion to amend something previously adopted were in order, but the Chair's further comments could be 1) reasonably interpreted as addressing the merits of the pending motion and 2) reasonably interpreted as being intended to influence the vote on the motion. These additional comments were out of order and the Parliamentarian requested that the Chair relinquish the gavel in the future.

Unfinished Business: None

New Business:

Proposal 1: A motion to adopt a resolution regarding Final Exam Week from the Faculty Welfare Policy and Procedure Committee was made by John Heppen and seconded by Karl Peterson. Brad Mogen spoke to the issue. Questions were asked if the resolution forbade any meetings and it was noted that the resolution requested that committees not meet. The motion passed by a vote of 19 in favor and 1 opposed.

Proposal 2: A motion to adopt a resolution regarding President Reilly's Growth Agenda for the University of Wisconsin System from the Recruitment and Retention Committee was made by John Heppen and seconded by Barbara Werner. David Trechter spoke to the issue. The motion passed unanimously.

Proposal 3: A motion from the Senate Executive Committee to appoint Vicki Hajewski as Back-up Chair of the Multi-cultural Advisory Strategic Planning Working Group was made by David Trechter and seconded by Karl Peterson. Secretary John Heppen explained that this was needed because a back-up chair was not assigned when the working groups first affirmed on September 20, 2006. The motion was carried by general consent.

Proposal 4: A motion from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to set three-year terms of appointment for the UW-RF Faculty Representatives to the West Central Wisconsin Consortium Commission and to establish May 31, 2007 as the expiration date for the current representative's term was made by John Heppen and seconded by David Trechter. The motion was carried by general consent.

Proposal 5: A motion from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to appoint George Hansen and Nate Splett to the Campus Planning Strategic Planning Working Group and to appoint Glenn Potts, Faye Perkins, and Miriam Huffman to the Sustainable Strategic Planning Working Group was made by David Rainville and seconded by Bob Baker. Bob Baker thanked the Executive Committee for their work on this matter. The motion was carried by general consent.

New Business Miscellaneous: none

Adjournment: Barbara Werner moved and Ogden Rogers seconded a motion to adjourn at 4:00pm.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM ASSESSMENT PLAN ELEMENTS

The following are seven elements that are to be included and updated in an academic program's assessment plan. These are the elements that will be evaluated by the Faculty Senate Assessment Committee when reviewing an academic program's plan. For organization of the plan, or element specific questions, please contact Tricia Davis, Assessment Coordinator, in NH 104 at x0650 or e-mail tricia.m.davis@uwrf.edu. She would be glad to assist in your assessment efforts.

I. Student Learning Objectives/Outcomes

- Outcomes are focused on student learning such as “When students complete the *program/major*, they will be able to....”
- Make sure to differentiate and identify measurable objectives/outcomes for each of the different options in a major, if applicable.

II. Identification of where Objectives/Outcomes are Being Achieved

- Indicate in which course/activity the objective/outcome is being achieved.
- If there are different options in the program/major, make sure to clearly indicate which courses are in each option.

III. Assessment Tools used to Measure Objectives/Outcomes

- Multiple direct and indirect measures are used to assess the learning outcomes (a single direct *and* a single indirect assessment measure, if appropriate, can be used for all outcomes).
- Make sure to identify which assessment tool links with each of the learning objectives/outcomes.

IV. Timetable Indicating the Cycle of Assessment and Continuous Improvement

- Specify the cycle for which each objective/outcome will be measured, analyzed, and discussed.
- Identify the time frame for continuous improvement of assessment efforts.

V. Data Presentation and Discussion Process

- Describe the process for the interpretation, presentation, and discussion of the data (i.e.: Who will be involved? How will the data be handled? Etc.)

VI. Implementation of Revisions Based on Assessment Results

- Specify the plan for how improvements in the department/program will take place due to the results received in the assessment discussion.

VII. Results Availability

Indicate how the results will be made available for students and others.

EVALUATING ACADEMIC PROGRAM ASSESSMENT PLANS

Assessment Plan Elements	Well Developed	Developing	Undeveloped
I. Student Learning Objectives/Outcomes	• There are clearly stated objectives • Objectives are measurable and focused on student learning	• Stated but with lack of clarity. • Word like ‘should’ is not measurable; Replace with action verb, like “will”.	• The objectives don’t relate to student learning. • Are stated in an unacceptable format.
II. Identification of where Objectives/Outcomes are being Achieved	• Course(s) and/or activities are clearly identified for <u>every</u> objective.	• Courses/activities identified for some of the objectives (need to rethink those objectives where not identified).	• Specific courses/activities <u>not identified for each</u> objective.
III. Assessment Tools used to Measure Objectives/Outcomes	• Assessment measures (direct and indirect) are identified for each outcome.	• Assessment measures (direct and/or indirect) are identified for some outcomes.	• Assessment measures are not identified or inadequately described.
IV. Timetable Indicating the Cycle of Assessment and Continuous Improvement	• There is a clear plan for assessment implementation and indication for continuous improvement.	• Some parameters have been established but a clear timeline is not evident.	• There is not a stated implementation plan.
V. Data Presentation and Discussion Process	• The process for the interpretation, presentation, and discussion of the data is clearly described, including who will be involved and timing.	• The process is addressed but is unclear or incomplete in some aspects (ie: interpretation, presentation, discussion).	• There is no stated plan.

VI. Implementation of Revisions Based on Assessment Results	• The process for implementing revisions based on assessment results is clearly described. • There are clearly indicated plans for how improvements will take place due to results.	• The process is addressed but is unclear or incomplete in some aspects.	• There is no stated plan as to how the assessment results will be used for program changes.
VII. Results Availability	• The process for making results available for students and others is clearly described.	• The process is addressed but is unclear or incomplete in some aspects.	• There is no stated plan as to how the results will be made available to students and others.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REPORT* ELEMENTS

In order to examine the efforts of an academic program's assessment of student learning, an assessment report will need to be generated as part of the annual report process. The following are five elements that are to be included in the assessment report. For organization of the report, or element specific questions, please contact Tricia Davis, Assessment Coordinator, in NH 104 at x0650 or e-mail tricia.m.davis@uwrf.edu. She would be glad to assist in your assessment efforts.

I. Profile

- Academic program's mission statement.
- Academic program's factors that affect assessment and learning (for example, the program is growing or shrinking rapidly, job market changing for graduates, field changing rapidly, large percentage of faculty retiring in next three years).

II. Assessment Review

- Indicate where the academic program is at in the assessment process since the last report.
- List the learning objectives/outcomes that the program focused upon over the time-period.

III. Assessment Results and Action Plan

- Describe the results found for the assessment that was conducted.
- Identify the actions that were/are being made to improve student learning based on the assessment results.
- Indicate where these results have made available for the students and others.

IV. Recommendation for Improving Assessment Processes

- Specify the changes that are being taken to improve the *assessment* of student learning in the academic program.
- Identify the academic program's next step in its assessment process.

V. Data from Institutional Research

- Number of majors (in each emphases, if applicable)
- Number of faculty (full-time and part-time)

*As recommended by the Deans and Provost, Academic Program Assessment Reports will be used as part of the university planning and budgeting process.

Interdisciplinary Minor Proposal in the College of Education and Professional Studies

The interdisciplinary minor is intended to meet the needs of students who wish to center their minor studies around an interdepartmental grouping of courses reflecting a specific career or learning focus. The minor must include a minimum of 22 credits with an appropriate mix of lower and upper division courses. None of the courses can be double counted in general education, major, and professional education requirements. The minor is designed in consultation with the student's advisor. The student must prepare an explanation justifying the purpose of the proposed program in relation to his or her needs. The advisor must write a letter validating the program. The program must be approved by the Dean of the College. This minor is not approved by the department of Public Instruction for elementary education students. It can be selected by students seeking Early Adolescence/Adolescence certification in areas that do not have a Broad Field/ Comprehensive major. Students with non-certifiable majors can select this minor if the advisor considers it appropriate.

This minor is needed to meet the needs of students who want to tailor a minor to an interest that is not already represented as an available minor. Examples could include but are not limited to: and interest in special education; the requirements for a student planning to go on for a master's degree in Physical Therapy or other professional fields; a student interested in pursuing athletic training in addition to the major area; a student with cross-disciplinary interests in the fine arts; a student interested in blending early childhood courses with business courses to prepare for a career in early childhood management. Currently a minor of this type is available in the Colleges of Arts and Sciences and of Business and Economics, but is not accessible to students in the College of Education and Professional Studies.

Guidelines for Exemplary Performance Awards. Approved by the Faculty Senate Salary Committee on October 20, 2006.

Exemplary Performance Awards

1. Awards will go to the faculty member's salary line.
2. 2005-06 winners will have a permanent salary adjustment in the amount of their award.
3. Awards shall be in the amount of \$3,000.
4. Deans will distribute these awards as merit, paralleling the process currently used for distributing "regular dean's merit" and following those existing guidelines within each college.
5. Both tenured and tenure track faculty will be eligible for the award.
6. Funds will be proportionally allocated to colleges based on FTE faculty.
7. Funds will not be carried over to a subsequent year unless there is not enough money to make a \$3,000 award. In that case, the amount under \$3,000 will be carried over to the next year and put into the Meritorious Faculty Award pool.