



Minutes of the UWRF Faculty Senate for April 4, 2007,

Vol. 31 No. 21.

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

* Chancellor's Designee

** Absent

() Substitute

Call to Order: Wes Chapin called the meeting to order at 3:42pm.

Seating of Substitutes: Alan Tuchtenhagen for Charlie Hurt

Guests: Brian Shultz, Tim Buttles

Approval of Minutes: The minutes of March 21, 2007 were approved as corrected.

Chair's Report:

- Wes Chapin thanked Ogden Rogers for serving as chair last meeting while he was at Madison.
- Wes Chapin asked the Faculty Senate what is Faculty Governance? Glenn Potts said that faculty governance must be broadly defined in regards to participation and approval since faculty has the primary responsibility. Bob Baker concurred. Nan Jordahl and David Rainville also addressed the question with the belief that faculty must have participation. Peter Johansson and Ogden Rogers also addressed the issue in a similar manner.

- Wes Chapin passed out a letter from the FWPP committee addressing concerns over strategic planning. Wes Chapin also passed out a progress report on tasks from the Office of the Provost. Wes Chapin distributed the membership of the University Planning Group as received from the Office of the Provost. The 13 member UPG is the successor organization to the Strategic Planning Steering Committee and Wes Chapin noted that there is one member that is appointed from the Faculty Senate and one member by the Student Senate and the rest were appointed. Wes Chapin reported that he was told that there was no algorithm used to determine membership and that the UPG represents the University. Questions were asked from the Senate on the method used to appoint members to the UPG. Sarah Egerstrom reported that she was appointed as the representative of Academic Staff Council. Laine Vignona suggested that we examine what was done in the past in similar situations. Nan Jordahl suggested that we look at the progress report and spend time looking at it. Terry Ferriss stated that there are two types of committees: senate and administrative and that we should examine past protocols for the level of senate involvement. Laine Vignona stated that it seems inconsistent to have a lower level of faculty involvement compared to the participation for the initiatives and tasks. Glenn Potts stated that we did not approve the Strategic Planning Steering Committee and that the administration has some rights for administrative committees. Bob Baker gave some historical perspective on the formation of the Strategic Planning Steering Committee last Spring.
- Wes Chapin reported on the progress of the Chair Compensation Proposals and questions about the 12 month contracts and what issues are negotiable and that there has been a delay in meeting with the Provost.
- Wes Chapin reported that Motions 49 and 50 were not signed by the Chancellor and accepted as recommendations and that according to our constitutions motions have to be approved or disapproved and that the faculty salary committee has proposed new motions removing the word recommend.

Memorandum

To: Wes Chapin, Chair, Faculty Senate`
 From: Brad Mogen, Chair, Faculty Welfare and Personnel Policies Committee
 Cc: John Heppen
 Date: March 30th, 2007

Re: An open letter from FWPP to Senate regarding the Strategic Planning process and timeline.

Wes,

One of the duties relegated to the FWPP committee is to monitor and relay to the faculty at large issues that have a direct bearing on their working conditions. We believe that the lack of any significant progress regarding the implementation of the Strategic Plan since December of 2006 is precisely one of these issues. Our FWPP-SPWG committee alone committed tremendous numbers of hours and an entire semester to the strategic planning process: virtually all other issues that might have otherwise been addressed were postponed. The campus has devoted large amounts of time and energy to this effort with the promise that results would be forthcoming. Where are they?

Faculty, staff, and students returned from Christmas break energized and justifiably proud by all they had accomplished. We had completed the planning process with extraordinary commitment and unity, while accommodating an unusually aggressive timeline established by Senate that consumed much of the entire fall semester – all with the tacit promise that priorities would be assigned to the Goals so the campus could *rapidly* move forward. It was particularly exciting to see the DRAFT Strategic Planning Priority Timeline, dated November 28, 2006, as this appeared to consolidate the Strategic Planning Process and turn it into a reality with achievable goals and deadlines. As of today, March 30th, 2007, we are not aware of a single official Task that has moved forward and we have long passed the proposed February and March 1st initiation dates indicated on the draft. The simple reality is that with only five weeks of class left and no Tasks officially assigned to their appropriate committees, nothing of significance will get accomplished during the entire Spring semester – essential momentum has stagnated.

Faculty, staff, and students need to see and believe that the work they have done during the planning process in 06/07 was not in vain. One way Administration might demonstrate "good faith" is to move forward on one or two of the most critical strategic planning goals yet this semester. We ask that those steps be taken immediately and communication be made to the entire campus community regarding which goal/s will move forward this semester, including an updated and realistic implementation timeline for the entire plan.

Vice-Chair's Report:

Ogden Rogers reported that David Furniss and Dennis Cooper have accepted nominations for senior faculty at-large and will announce the candidates for junior at-large and termination committee.

Other Reports:

Brian Schultz from the Advising Committee reported that the size and structure of the committee is good. They are losing one member of the committee and the member may run again for the committee, and the committee is working on keeping communication open with advising groups and finding appropriate inputs from students and faculty on the advising process and will look at proposing an assessment tool in the future.

Unfinished Business: none

New Business:

Proposal 1: A motion from FWPP to recommend that Senate forward the nomination of Dr. Gary Rohde to be appointed to the State Group Insurance Board. Nan Jordahl and Bob Baker first and seconded the motion respectively. The motion passed by general consent.

Proposal 2: A motion from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to rewrite Chapter III Organization of the Faculty and Staff 3.2 Constitution of the UW-River Falls Faculty Article VI The Faculty Senate Section C Election Procedures for the Faculty Senate. John Heppen and Larry Harred first and seconded the motion respectively. Ogden Rogers stated that this was a way to simplify the election process and that the present system is a de facto primary election. David Rainville asked about the number of signatures needed for at-large senator. It was replied that currently you need 15 signatures to be added to the ballot and that ten signatures was used to simplify the process. Wes Chapin stated that this motion must go to the faculty for a vote and then be sent to the Chancellor. Alan Tuchtenhagen made two points about the need for electronic voting in the future and does this process preclude an electronic petition process. The motion passed with 15 yes votes 1 no vote and 3 abstentions.

Proposal 3: A motion from Faculty Salary Committee that the 2007-09 pay plan be submitted with 2/3 of any increase going to solid performance and 1/3 for merit/market was made by David Rainville and seconded by David Furniss. The motion passed with 17 yes votes, 1 no vote, and 1 abstention.

Proposal 4: A motion from Faculty Salary Committee that the Chancellor follow the example of the majority of other UW-System chancellors and abstain from taking the 10% discretionary fund was first and seconded by David Rainville and John Heppen respectively. The motion passed with 16 yes votes, 1 no vote, and 2 abstentions.

Proposal 5: First reading of a motion for the Executive Committee to change the description of the Calendar Committee.

Proposal 6: Second reading of a motion from the Assessment Committee to change its duties. John Heppen and Peter Johansson first and seconded the motion respectively. Tim Buttles spoke to the issue. The motion passed with 18 yes votes, 0 no votes, and 1 abstention.

Proposal 7: Motion from FWPP to amend the Faculty Handbook. The Faculty Welfare and Personnel Policies Committee (FWPP) requests that Senate consider the attached recommended changes to the Faculty Handbook to help clarify some vague language. Sarah Egerstrom and Glenn Potts first and seconded the motion respectively. Glenn Potts spoke to the issue. Glenn Potts stated that issued regarding confusion in the current wording over the minority reports, summary statements from the Chair and a clarification over work days are important. The motion passed by general consent.

Proposal 8: A first reading of a motion from FWPP to transfer committee duties and to rename the Faculty Salary Committee.

New Business Miscellaneous:

Proposal 9: David Rainville moved that the Faculty Senate recommend that the Administration delay meeting of the University Planning Group until the Faculty Senate is able to consider the selection of the membership and its compliance with the policies of shared governance. Larry Harred seconded the motion. Nan Jordahl recommended that the Faculty Senate meet next week. Michael Miller asked Glenn Potts and Terry Ferriss how they were appointed to the UPG. They both stated that they were asked by the Provost and they accepted. Nan Jordahl stated why not ask how they choose people. Michael Miller asked that we obtain information prior to meeting. David Rainville stated that they should not go forward without Faculty Senate input. Alan Tuchtenhagen asked how would obtaining information impact what is going on now. Wes Chapin stated that all three bodies (Academic Staff Council, Student Senate, Faculty Senate) were asked to submit one name. Nan Jordahl and Laine Vignona asked if this was fair representation and that representation is the issue. Wes Chapin asked the Senate if one faculty senate representative out of 15 is adequate. Ogden Rogers asked what was the understanding of how the UPG was to be chosen. Wes Chapin replied that it was his understanding it was supposed to be the result of discussion between the Faculty Senate and the Administration. David Rainville stated that he made the motion for the ability to go back and check the process. John Heppen stated that it was important to have a formal motion/statement if the senate has questions. Peter Johansson stated that it's a matter of perception and the UPG does not represent faculty. The motion passed with 9 yes votes, 1 no vote and 9 abstentions.

Wes Chapin reported on the status of faculty senate chair compensation and release time for next year in comparison to other UW institutions. Peter Johansson spoke about the Redbook being taken offline by the UW-System. Ogden Rogers stated that the Redbook is online within the System but in a less user-friendly format.

Adjournment: The Faculty Senate adjourned at 5:25pm by general consent.