



**Minutes of the UWRF Faculty Senate for February 17, 2010 Vol. 34 No. 12.**

<b>Representation</b>	<b>Term Expires 2010</b>	<b>Term Expires 2011</b>	<b>Term Expires 2012</b>
<b>CAFES</b>	Kris Hiney	Laine Vignona	
<b>CAS</b>	Wes Chapin	Patricia Berg	David Rainville
	Karl Peterson	John Heppen	
		Jennifer Willis-Rivera	
<b>COEPS</b>		Hilary Pollack	Todd Savage
<b>CBE</b>			Hosseini Najafi
<b>4th Division</b>	Kristie Feist	Valerie Malzacher	Barbara Stinson
	Kristen Hendrickson		
<b>At Large</b>		Kathleen Hunzer	Robyne Tiedeman
	Michelle Parkison	Dennis Cooper	Marshall Toman
	David Furniss		Dawn Hukai
	Fernando Delgado*		

\* Chancellor's Designee

\*\* Absent

() Substitute

**Call to Order:** David Rainville called the meeting to order at 3:40 p.m.

**Seating of Substitutes:**

**Recognition of Invited Guests:**

**Approval of Minutes:**

February 3, 2010. Dennis Cooper moved to approve and was seconded by David Furniss.

Corrections – In the chair's report "meet" should be met.

Minutes were approved 21:0:0.

**Chair's Report:**

On February 4-5, 2010, I attended a meeting of the UWS Board of Regents in Madison. I went there primarily to observe deliberations concerning the Differential Tuition Proposal that was being put forward by UW-Eau Claire. After closer examination of the agenda, I

decided that my time would be better spent attending the Education Committee's session which took up the matter of baccalaureate degrees in applied arts and applied sciences being granted by the UW-Colleges.

(At this time David expressed some concern over the ability of two year colleges allowed to grant 4 year degrees.)

Ultimately, the BOR took no action on the proposal beyond listening to the proposal and allowing UWS to explore the matter further and to report back at some later time (probably one to two years). All of the faculty representative that attended the meeting went to the Education Committee and later voiced their strong concerns about the nature of the proposal and implications that it held for the comprehensive and doctoral institutions within the UWS.

This Friday when I attend a meeting of the UWS faculty representatives in Madison, we will be bringing the matter up. It is my understanding that last Friday it was less than enthusiastically received in a meeting of the Chief academic Officers in the UWS. I will report back to this body on March 2, 2010 when we meet in two weeks.

I can report back that at the BOR meeting, the regents did approve the differential tuition request from UWEC. This will be graduated in four years ending up with a \$1200 increase in tuition for UWEC.

I have been working within a working group including Kristin Hendricksen, Fernando Delgado, and chaired by Chancellor Van Galen, to construct a spread sheet which will outline UWRF's plans for increasing its number of degrees granted over the next 15 years. This is all part of what has been termed "Educational Attainment" as presented by Chancellor Van Galen at our last Faculty Senate meeting. The plan calls for a 1% increase in the number of degrees which we predict to confer starting in two years. This would translate to 46 more degrees being granted each year. It is my plan that someone from the working group will report back to faculty senate in the future with some further details after the final documents go to UWS. As it stands now, the spread sheet going to UWS is preliminary in order to give System some idea as to what may be possible. There will be ample time to change anything proposed to UWS.

This completes my report.

Discussion: Some concerns were expressed over the 1% increase in degrees conferred and how that might be actually calculated. I.e. If 46 additional degrees were conferred the first year, would that mean 92 the next year etc? It was indicated that no one is exactly sure how this is being calculated.

**Vice Chair's Report:**

**Other Reports:**

**Unfinished Business:** None

**New Business Consent Agenda:**

Program Changes from Academic Policy and Program Committee (James Zimmerman, Chair)

1. Elimination of the Secondary Education in Communication Studies Major and Minor.

2. Suspension of the Business Administration-MIS Option

Michelle Parkinson moved to accept the consent agenda and Jennifer Willis-Rivera seconded.

It was approved 21:0:0.

**New Business:**

1. A **motion** from the Executive Committee requesting a 0.50 release for both semesters for the 2010-2011 Faculty Senate Chair.

Todd Savage moved to bring the motion forward and was seconded by Hossein Najafi.

Additional information was provided that the previous chair, Wes Chapin, had received .25 release time, and the current chair, David Rainvilled, receives 0.4 release time. This is due to the nature of the classes which he teaches that carry a laboratory component. Chairs at other universities range between 0.25 and 0.5 release time.

Jennifer Willis Rivera moved to amend the motion to change both semesters to each semester. David Furniss seconded. The amendment passes 20:0:1.

Additional discussion centered on the idea for a permanent change, rather than a one year solution. Dennis Cooper moved to amend the motion to eliminate 2010-2011 and was seconded by Pat Berg. The amendment passes 15:3:3.

Additional discussion:

Should this amendment be referred to the soon to be constituted committee on governance and the constitution? The timeliness of the issue needs to be addressed. Perhaps there should be more “floating” releases to see where the need really lies. Where is the data that would prove that the chair needs 0.5 release time?

The position really is a 0.5 position (David was an exception at 0.4) and this motion would clarify that need.

Three years ago it was agreed by the administration to be a 0.5 position, then this offer was retracted, to finally reach an agreement of 0.4.

The discussion should remain centered on the chair’s position, and not on the needs of other committee chairs.

Was a release for the chair ever made through a motion by Senate? No, it was always just an agreement with administration.

It is reasonable to support faculty chair in this position and provide the release.

Why is there not more data to support the need for a 0.5 release?

It makes sense to support this motion even without the presence of data.

It would be helpful to provide the history of how the chair is provided a release and what previous motions might have stated.

Passing this motion could institutionalize the 0.5 agreement, rather than constant negotiations.

Information on previous motions and discussions is difficult, as there is no way to retrieve other than reading through all the minutes from the years past.

Barabara Stinson moved to call the question and was seconded by David Furniss. Calling the question was approved 22:0:0.

The entire motion as amended passed 19:0:3.

**2. A motion** from the Executive Committee requesting the following releases for Faculty Senate Committee Chairs:

- a. Academic Policy and Program** - 0.25 for one semester;
- b. Assessment Committee** - 0.25 for one semester
- c. Faculty Welfare and Personnel Policies Committee** - 0.25 for one semester;
- d. General Education and University Requirements Committee** - 0.25 for one semester;
- e. Information and Instructional Technology Council** - 0.25 for one semester;
- f. University Curriculum Committee** - 0.25 for two semesters;

Todd Savage moved to bring forward and was seconded by Hossein Najafi.

Jennifer Willis-Rivera moved to amend the motion to change the Gen Ed and UCC release to 2 semesters rather than 1. Todd Savage seconded.

The amendment passed 22:0:0.

Discussion:

There is need to get release times approved earlier as it allows chairs of departments to plan schedules accordingly.

The releases have been individually approved every year after the chairs were named.

Do we revisit this every year? That is how the current motion is phrased.

Sometimes the workload for individual committees changes from year to year.

Occasionally other committees have a heavy workload.

Do we lose flexibility by passing this motion? For example, we currently have no assessment coordinator. Perhaps if we did the workload on the chair of assessment would be less.

It makes sense to have semi-permanent reassignment to account for the budgets in fall (allows more planning).

This is a reasonable request, the workload exists for these committees.

There is a need for more information on the agenda

Isn't serving on committees part of service? Why should faculty be compensated?

Chairing these committees goes above and beyond service.

There is no way to evaluate the performance of the chairs, so why should they be compensated if underperforming?

Motion as amended was approved 19:0:2.

**Miscellaneous New Business:**

1. Program prioritization will soon be here. Plan accordingly.

2. Three candidates have been identified for VCAF.

3. The ad hoc committee on constitutional reform will mirror the composition of Faculty Senate, but reduced in number by half. There will be three members from CAS (one will be IAS), one from CAFES, one from CBE, one from COEPS, and two from the 4<sup>th</sup> division. A chair has not yet been identified. The committee should report back to Senate in mid-April.

Dennis Cooper moved for adjournment, and was seconded by Michelle Parkinson. There was no dissention.

**Adjournment at 4:45 p.m.**