



Minutes of the UWRF Faculty Senate for March 3, 2010 Vol. 34 No. 13

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

* Chancellor's Designee

** Absent

() Substitute

Call to Order: 3:35 p.m.

1. Seating of Substitutes: Ashley Olson for Kristie Feist, James Madsen for Todd Savage.

2. Approval of Minutes of February 17, 2010.

Barbara Stinson moved to approve, David Furniss seconded.

Corrections: Remove "John" from before Michelle Parkison's name, pg 6.

Minutes were approved unanimously.

Reports:

Chairs Report

On Friday, February 19, 2010 I attended a meeting of the UWS faculty representatives in Madison. We had a lengthy agenda starting with a discussion of the Bachelor's Degree in Applied Arts & Sciences being proposed by the UW Colleges. They have received

approval of a proposal of entitlement to plan. The proposal is extremely limited in its scope and does not impact UWRP directly. It is primarily designed to accommodate non traditional students who may have credit at other institutions and are deserving of credit for other learning which has occurred outside of the college classroom. The faculty representatives indicated that they had concerns about "mission creep" and reallocation of resources. The question was raised as to whether faculty at the colleges would be able to handle the increased load and responsibilities of advanced courses. The argument was also proposed as to the necessity of the proposal given the availability of so many on line courses.

We also discussed the UWS growth agenda and "Educational Attainment." Reps voiced their concerns about projected growth without resources. A graph was produced by a rep that was an internal UWS document that showed substantial UWS growth without any increased GPR revenue for the System. We were told later that the graph which did show growth with and without GPR dollars was an internal document that was not distributed and was erroneous. Most reps concluded that the grow agenda was competitive and they voiced their concerns about pitting one UW campus against another. Later Kevin Reilly indicated that this proposal was the only way that new GPR dollars could be obtained from the legislature. he indicated that Wisconsin is lagging behind the nation with respect to bachelor's and associate degrees. The problem is even worse when compared to Minnesota which is 7% ahead of Wisconsin in terms of degrees awarded. There is a direct correlation to average income across the country with Wisconsin being behind Minnesota by an average of four thousand dollars in per capita annual income.

Major concern was voiced about the method being used to project growth. No details were requested on the template requested by UWS on February 17, 2010. This was a planning template that could be altered later. It would however be used to make preliminary estimate that were possible. It would be presented at the April BOR meeting and ultimately be used to prepare the biennial budget proposal for UWS. There are several open forums on our campus to discuss the initiative. I would recommend that each of you go to at least one of the sessions. I am also on a working group which is preparing the proposals from UWRP.

The topic of a "Portal" for all UWS online courses was discussed. This is being proposed as a vehicle by which all UWS courses could be readily accessed by students wishing to take online courses. There is a model plan called E-Campus. Representatives voiced their concerns about policing of required prerequisites and fees that would be appropriated by UW-Extension which would oversee the process.

Differential tuition was discussed with the bulk of the discussion centering on the differing abilities of some campuses to charge based on family incomes of students. There is growing concern that the BOR is too willing to go this route which could put some UWS campuses at a disadvantage. The need for reallocation of GPR dollars to campuses who did not have the ability to charge differential tuition was proposed by some of the representatives. We were told while possible; it was not being immediately discussed. We were also told that the BOR is reluctant to approve any more DT

proposals and the one recently approved for Eau Claire was hotly debated in committee by the BOR.

The topic of remuneration of department chairs was discussed by the reps. It appears that it is all over the board with respect to various campuses.

We also discussed policies with respect to faculty being compensated with respect to development of courses packets and lab manuals. This was something that will be looked at next time with concrete answers hopefully being offered.

The question of loads at the various campuses was discussed. While most of the comprehensives are at 12 and 12, some are at 9 and q2 with one being at 9 and 9. The reasons for the disparities are historical, but we were told that there are no UWS mandates as to the loads on campuses.

A discussion about faculty senate procedures initiated which made some very cursory comparisons of the differing structures across the UWS. There was also an in-depth discussion about electronic voting/balloting. We were told, that it is legal to conduct elections through on line balloting but it is illegal to vote on faculty senate proposals on line.

Finally we discussed the "Making Textbooks Affordable Policy" approved some time ago by the BOR. There will be a revised policy presented at the April BOR meeting. We were told that there would be ample time to get our comments to UWS. I am still waiting for the document.

Other Reports: None

Unfinished Business:

None

New Business Consent Agenda:

1. Appointment of the following to the Chancellor's Awards Committee:

Tonya Amen (CAFES)
Megan Learman (CAS)
John Walker (CBE)
Donald Stovall (COEPS)
Paul Shepherd (Fourth Division)

2. Appointment of the following to the *ad hoc* Faculty Senate Committee on Constitutional Reform:

Kris Hiney (CAFES)

Betty Bergland (CAS)
 Marilyn Duerst (IAS CAS)
 Rich Wallace (CAS)
 Charlie Corcoran (CBE)
 Ogden Rogers (COEPS)
 Gretchen Link (Fourth Division)
 Michele McKnelly (Fourth Division)

John Heppen moved to forward John Heppen, seconded by Karl Peterson.

Unanimous

Consent agenda approved

New Business:

1. A motion from the Academic Policy and Program (Jim Zimmerman-Chair).

The following motion was passed by AP&P on February 24, 2010:

AP&P approves the prioritized list of graduate and undergraduate programs as submitted by the Dean's Council. It is a best effort attempt to comply with the goals and approved procedures of the program prioritization initiative. AP&P would encourage Faculty Senate to be expedient in their deliberations, with the goal that the list could be forwarded to administration to be used as a tool for future strategic planning. Motion Passed (7 /1 vote).

The following is the same motion with Faculty Senate substituted for AP&P:

Faculty Senate approves the prioritized list of graduate and undergraduate programs as submitted by the Dean's Council. It is a best effort attempt to comply with the goals and approved procedures of the program prioritization initiative. AP&P would encourage Faculty Senate to be expedient in their deliberations, with the goal that the list could be forwarded to administration to be used as a tool for future strategic planning.

- Discussion: Jim Zimmerman reported the two tasks AP&P undertook: 1. Examining the process and 2. Examining the results of program prioritization. The list of undergraduate programs came from Dean's Council in later spring of 2009. AP&P requested Dean's council to make single list to include graduate as well as undergraduate programs. They then received a complete list in November of 2009. They acknowledge that this a snapshot in time of programs one year ago, and that data may be inconsistent or inaccurate.

- Lists were shared with Stakeholders and they were invited to submit additional materials is desired. This included new information, the data used or other mitigating circumstances. No input on the process was considered. Representatives were invited to speak to questions that AP&P had. The complete recommendations are now here at Senate.
- This is to serve as an advisory tool for the strategic plan.
- Some are concerned with how the information might be used. Will this be used for multiple budget cycles or will program prioritization be a regular occurrence? Still contemplating timeline of how often it should be done, perhaps linked with program reviews. Every 2-3 years, every biennium?
- There is a need to get better numerical indicators.
- Programs can only be suspended, not truly eliminated without the involvement of System.
- There was a desire for program prioritization during Strategic Planning. Need to be able to make tough decisions on campus.
- New data and reorganization would be considered at Dean's Council (which consists of the Dean's of CBE, CAFES, COEPS and CAS, as well as Doug Johnson, Katrina Larson, Fernando Delgado and Nan Jordahl). The individual scoring by the deans was not reported.
- AP&P did allow the option of providing narratives and new data and then that returned back to AP&P, therefore new data was considered. AP&P was to be the objective second body. Stakeholder comments were considered (they were voluntary) and were received from mid-December to January 25, 2010. Individuals were invited to AP&P if there were specific questions. They tried to use the narratives rather than emotion to obtain the clearest picture.

Motion was approved 22:0:0

2. A motion from the Academic Policy and Program (Jim Zimmerman-Chair) regarding the program prioritization process.

The following motion was passed by AP&P on February 24, 2010:

AP&P accepts the current program prioritization process as an appropriate and useful exercise that should be seen through to conclusion. AP&P feels that flaws exist in the current process. However, the flaws are not sufficient to invalidate the results. AP&P

recommends that program prioritization, upon revision, be incorporated into an ongoing University initiative. Motion Passed (5/2 with 1 abstention)

- Discussion: Is this process finite. Faculty Senate has to either ratify or deny and pass along to Senior Leadership.
- Possible creation of steering committee to redefine the process. Figure out if the process is beneficial and making sure everyone is on the same page when discussing prioritization.

The following is the same motion with Faculty Senate substituted for AP&P:

Faculty Senate accepts the current program prioritization process as an appropriate and useful exercise that should be seen through to conclusion. AP&P feels that flaws exist in the current process. However, the flaws are not sufficient to invalidate the results. AP&P recommends that program prioritization, upon revision, be incorporated into an ongoing University initiative.

Karl Peterson moved to bring forward and was seconded by Hossein Najafi.

What does conclusion mean? The process ended with the list being ratified (which just happened). Perhaps a steering committee should be formed to continue to work on the process. Who will undertake that initiative? How often will it be performed? With reaccreditation processes and assessment, we may be able to use those tools. The process needs to be revised. Institutional research is much better now.

Wes Chapin moved to amend the motion and was seconded by John Heppen to include the following:

The Executive Committee will be charged with ensuring that the task of refining the process included appropriate faculty governance and that a plan is implemented to define the process. The Executive Committee will report back to the Senate no later than November 1, 2010.

Amendment passed 21:0:1

It was mentioned that the dissenting votes in AP&P felt that the flaws in the process were significant enough to invalidate the process.

Michelle Parkinson moved to amend the motion by striking AP&P and substituting Faculty Senate throughout.

The amendment passed 22:0:0

Pat Berg moved to amend “incorporated into” to become

The amendment passed 22:0:0.

The complete motion as amended is as follows:

Faculty Senate accepts the current program prioritization process as an appropriate and useful exercise that should be seen through to conclusion. Faculty Senate feels that flaws exist in the current process. However, the flaws are not sufficient to invalidate the results. Faculty Senate recommends that program prioritization, upon revision, become an ongoing University initiative. The Executive Committee will be charged with ensuring that the task of refining the process included appropriate faculty governance and that a plan is implemented to define the process. The Executive Committee will report back to the Senate no later than November 1, 2010.

Motion passed 22:0:0.

Miscellaneous New Business:

John Heppen moved to appoint Ogden Rogers as Chair to the ad hoc committee on constitutional reform and was seconded by Karl Peterson. 22:0:0 unanimous

Dennis Cooper moved to adjourn and was seconded by Fernando Delgado.

Adjournment: 4:40 p.m.