



**Minutes of the UWRF Faculty Senate for May 5, 2010 Vol. 34 No. 16**

<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** (Brad Mogen)	
<b>COEPS</b>		Hilary Pollack	Todd Savage
<b>CBE</b>			Hossein Najafi**
<b>4th Division</b>	Kristie Feist	Valerie Malzacher	Barbara Stinson** (Steve Reed)
	Kristen Hendrickson		
<b>At Large</b>		Kathleen Hunzer	Robyne Tiedeman
	Michelle Parkison** (Rellen Hardtke)	Dennis Cooper	Marshall Toman
	David Furniss		Dawn Hukai
	Fernando Delgado* ** (Doug Johnson)		

\* Chancellor's Designee

\*\* Absent

() Substitute

Agenda: March 24, 2010

**Call to Order:3:36**

**1. Seating of Substitutes**

Doug Johnson for Fernando Delgado

Rellen Hardtke for Michelle Parkinson

Steve Reed for Barbara Stinson

Brad Mogen for Jennifer Willis-Rivera

**2. Approval of Minutes of April 21, 2010**

Moved by Kristie Feist

Seconded by David Furniss

20-0-0 approved

**Reports:**

## Chairs Report:

David will attend faculty representatives meeting tomorrow. Educational attainment and collective bargaining are on the agenda. Friday attending Faculty reps meeting, will prepare report to present. Executive Committee and Senior Leadership met last week. They discussed Recruitment and Retention and the disbursement of the funds. A plan for distribution was required by System by May of 2009. Some colleges followed these procedures while some did not. Executive Committee had some concerns of where the funds went as the awardees names weren't released. David has list of names and there were a disproportionate amount given to the colleges, in particular CBE was provided with more funding. Dean's council is aware that policies weren't followed but have indicated that they will try to follow procedures in the future.

Vice Chairs report: Election results were announced.

## Other Reports:

**1. none****Unfinished Business:**

None

**New Business Consent Agenda:****1. Approval of Program Changes from AP&P (James Zimmerman - Chair):**

- Moved by Kathleen Hunzer
- Seconded by Laine Vignona
- 21-0-0 unanimous
- a.** MSE-Fine Arts (ART), minor change in curriculum;
- b.** Master of Science in Education (Communicative Disorders), substantial change in curriculum;
- c.** Master of Science - Communicative Disorders, substantial change in curriculum
- d.** Secondary Graduate Initial Certification

**NOTE:** The following Certificate Programs were approved by AP&P. They do not require Faculty Senate Approval:

- a.** Sustainable Management Certificate (no Faculty Senate action required)

**New Business:**

- 1. A Report** from the Vice Chair on the reorganization of IT Services which occurred last summer. This may or may not require further Faculty Senate Action.
1. Faculty and other stakeholders may not have been consulted properly about a major change in administrative support services that are used by faculty and students in and out of the classroom. This would be a violation of Chapter 36 of the Wisconsin State Statutes, and would add to a continuing pattern of unilateral,

disruptive decisions by the administration, particularly, those units reporting the Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance (VCAF). The proper functioning of shared governance needs to be restored on this campus.

2. In particular, the long-time director of the Educational Technology Center (ETC), Karen Ryan, decided to leave the university prematurely because of this reorganization, the way it was done, and the climate she experienced during that process. Losing a university employee for these reasons should be a matter of concern to all responsible parties at UWRf; it certainly is to the Faculty Senate (FS).

3. Any internal deficiencies in the functioning of the FS and its committees that may have contributed to this problem must be identified and corrected.

1. **Recommendations; That the Faculty Senate pass a motion declaring the restructuring of ITS and the administrative relocation of the ETC are postponed until the following has been completed.**
  - a. **The changes in ETC are to be reviewed and approved by the academic departments in COEPS. Their recommendations are to be submitted to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee for action by the Faculty Senate.**
  - b. **The restructuring of ITS is to be submitted to the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate for action by the Faculty Senate.**
2. If necessary, the Faculty Senate should review the performance of its committees in contributing to governance failures and make appropriate corrections.

**John Heppen moved to follow the recommendations made in 1a and 1b and was seconded by Pat Berg.**

#### Discussion:

It is important for administration to realize that decisions have to go through governance and not just find one individual who agrees with them.

The restructuring has already taken place. The name change went through the Chancellor's cabinet following a review that took place 3 years ago. The ETC has been transitioned, but no change in service has occurred.

Faculty members present did not agree that no change in service had happened. There is great concern in COEPS over this matter and future changes in technological services. Executive Committee was unaware of reconstruction.

Is it feasible to go back to ITS from DoTS? Would cost money and time to change name. ETC is done. Hasn't been a change in service so why does there need to be a change.

Change took place over the summer, has happened before with CBE restructuring.

A motion from 4 years ago states that faculty must be consulted on academic matters.

The petition concerning the elimination of Macs is a non-issue as it addresses rumors and uncertainty.

No honest appraisal of changes have been made or what will happen.

This has not been decided at Tech Council.

Faculty came back over the summer to discover the transition, and service was not the same. Now only one person over in WEB to help.

A committee member brought the Mac issue to their colleagues due to the fear a similar transition would take place without faculty consult.

Nothing about Macs has been decided yet.

Service was not different in the fall, they bridged the gap to the final change in the spring.

Faculty were given a survey to fill out to comment on change.

No work has been done to change platforms in the classroom other than maintenance.

Committees made the decision to skip Senate because it takes too long and they might be turned down.

The restructure of ILTC didn't come through senate, can't make decisions without senate.

Financially can't sustain the current tech support, so they sent forth a proposal to Tech Council. Mary Alice has already held focus groups about this conversion.

The 2007 motion gives Faculty senate the right to meddle.

This should have gone through Senate.

This discussion is about the process, focus on the issue.

Dennis reported on the timeline of the process. He requested a report from Lisa, received last fall. Asked for statement from people, taking a long time to respond. Tech council wouldn't give details and asked for as much time as they could have. He met with the chair of the Council but was not provided with further information.

Can try to fix the process by running through as a proposal in the college of Ed.

Need to have some sort of a response to address this issue.

ETC/TLC was not just a COEPS service, it was a university wide service. They were just housed near it.

Survey was submitted to faculty but not included in the report.

Want to see the survey.

The survey was given afterward, instead of before the action took place.

If it is a university wide service, there definitely should have been governance oversight.

If this motion passes, how will it change business as usually?

What is the motion going to do if passed? That it should be froze and done the right way.

Would like to start over so proper governance can be in place and go through the proper colleges.

Operationally, what will change? We can't impact service, can't go back.

The issue was brought to Dennis has a matter of procedure.

The motion reasserts the need to keep procedure in mind.

Wes Chapin moved to call the question, and was seconded by John Heppen. Motion to call question passed 18:0:2.

A roll call vote was requested.

Kris Hiney – yes

Wes Chapin – yes

Karl Peterson – yes

Kristie Feist – yes

David Furniss – yes

Doug Johnson – no

Laine Vignona – yes  
 Pat Berg – yes  
 John Heppen – yes  
 Brad Mogen – no  
 Hilary Pollack – yes  
 Valerie Malzacher – no  
 Kathleen Hunzer – no  
 Dennis Cooper – yes  
 Todd Savage – yes  
 Rellen Hardtke – yes  
 Stephen Reed – yes  
 Robyne Tiedeman – yes  
 Marshall Toman – yes  
 Dawn Hukai – yes

16 for, 4 against; motion passed.

**2. A discussion** about the petition received from some faculty in the College of Education and Professional Studies concerning the actions of the Tech council. 20 names are currently on the petition and names have been both added and taken off. No decisions have yet been made as it is still in an exploratory phase. Any changes proposed must be brought to senate.

**2. A motion** from the Faculty Compensation Committee (Stephen Olsen, Chair) and Faculty Welfare and Personnel Policies Committee (Brad Mogen, Chair) to approve a Self-Funding, Uniform Campus Compensation Policy for Summer Session, Winter Session (J-Term), Fully on-line, Hybrid, Internship and Independent Study, Research and Reading Courses.

Request to withdraw from agenda

**3. A motion from the Executive Committee to approve the following policy concerning Fulbright Fellowships** (This motion/policy was prepared by Marshall Toman, UWRF Fulbright Coordinator):

- Moved by John Heppen
- Seconded by Laine Vignona
- 13-0-0 unanimous

## **UWRF Policy Regarding Fulbright Grants to Teach or Research Abroad**

### **Background**

To encourage UWRF faculty to apply for and accept Fulbright grants, we ought to know what can and will be done. Faculty give up money and often additional household income if a partner accompanies them or visits for extended periods; these faculty come back ready to enrich the campus climate and extend the curriculum. These faculty

deserve to know what will happen on this campus if they are selected for this prestigious grant ahead of their actually receiving one.

In the past, a faculty member who was offered a Fulbright tripped a switch that set off a scrambling to cobble together some ad hoc agreement that would enable a faculty member to accept the grant. An example occurred in 1997 when the CAS dean enabled a faculty member to continue his UWS health coverage and even pension credit. When the same question was asked in 2008, no one knew what could be done (some System guidelines were suspected of having changed and people were not sure of a work-around); that grant was ultimately declined in part because of this lack of a policy. Now, again, in 2010 a faculty member is faced with deciding whether to accept a Fulbright Senior Lecturing Position in combination with a sabbatical grant, and an ad hoc decision was needed and arrived at through a specific request.

**We need a policy.**

### **Procedure**

To that end Brent Greene and/or I have visited with the knowledgeable staff on campus: Kristen Hendrickson (Budget Director) on March 11, Deb Koehler (Human Resources) on March 12, and Connie Smith (Risk Management) on March 18. All believed that the following proposal was workable from their perspectives.

### **Proposed Policy**

Faculty who wish to accept a Fulbright grant will be continued in their present salary and benefits by UWRF through the mechanism of turning over to UWRF the cost of replacing their teaching services for the duration of the Fulbright.

### **Details**

(1) It is assumed that the faculty member on such a “Fulbright Reassignment” (a “leave of absence” mischaracterizes the reassignment and may create difficulties in maintaining the faculty member on health and pension plans) continues to work for UWRF in developing contacts abroad.

(2) It is further assumed that the faculty member will return to UWRF at the conclusion of the reassignment to enrich the campus with the experience. To that end, and following a similar stipulation in UWRF’s sabbatical guidelines, a faculty member must remain in the employment of UWRF for two semesters for every semester in which full salary was maintained or pay back to UWRF the difference between the teaching costs covered and the remainder of the salary paid by UWRF.

(3) This policy is intended as an incentive for faculty to apply for and accept a grant for up to one year. The policy does not apply necessarily if a Fulbright grantee were offered a consecutive continuation of the abroad experience, either through the Fulbright Commission or through the foreign home university. Such cases would be subject to negotiation between UWRF administration and the faculty member. However, the Fulbright Commission allows two life-time grants, and a second grant separated by a minimum of three years from the first, would be subject to this policy.

(4) The current (2010) teaching replacement cost is figured at approximately \$1,560 per credit to cover instruction (figured at \$1,300 per credit) and benefits (multiply by 20%) for a replacement instructor. Thus, the teaching costs expected to be covered by

the Fulbright grantee would be capped at and normally be \$18,720 (12 x \$1,560) per semester. However, in a given department, the faculty member's teaching assignment in a given year might not need to be fully covered (not 100%, not the full 12 credits per semester). In such a case, the teaching replacement cost would be less.

(5) Full salary paid by UWRF will ensure continued health coverage. Fulbright grantees receive health coverage adequate to treat a broken leg in country. But if anything major is detected while the grantee is abroad, continuing health coverage is important.

(6) Full salary paid by UWRF will ensure continued life insurance, income continuation, and other coverage.

(7) Full salary paid by UWRF will ensure continued pension credit. Since in fact faculty will be working to enrich Wisconsin and the UWS, this continuation is appropriate.

### **Institutional Benefits**

1. An additionally internationalized campus.
2. Re-energized, re-tooled, and pedagogically reoriented faculty to better serve our students.
3. Compliance with UWRF goal, in its strategic plan, "to expand global literacy and engagement."
4. Additional conformity to UWS goal "to consider incentives to encourage ...faculty and academic staff to participate in programs abroad."
5. Administrative transparency.
6. Recognized leadership in a local, System, and national priority.

### **Fulbright Grants and Sabbaticals**

There are circumstances where faculty apply for sabbaticals with the hope of receiving a Fulbright grant that will help them carry out the sabbatical. In such cases, the following provision (#4) in the sabbatical guidelines will apply: "A faculty member may seek additional grants specifically for travel or unusual living expenses incidental to the Sabbatical Program without restriction by the full compensation maximum."

(<http://www.uwrf.edu/facdev/Sabbatical.php>) Those who receive both the sabbatical and the Fulbright grant thus maintain their sabbatical status, which guarantees the faculty member's continuation of benefits, and such grantees may retain the entire amount of the Fulbright grant even if the combination of sabbatical grant and Fulbright grant exceeds 100% of salary. Furthermore, the stipulation that the faculty member return for one year to UWRF following a sabbatical will apply in such cases, not a longer term.

### **Fulbright Grants and Tenure**

Similar to sabbatical grants, which currently acknowledge continued service to the UWRF in the evaluation of the application, Fulbright grants are perhaps best pursued by professors above the rank of assistant professor. Nonetheless, the intent of the policy is to create incentives for internationalizing UWRF. To that end, departments are encouraged to work with any junior faculty who may become Fulbright grantees in

regard to the tenure process. Such accommodation may include, for example, by mutual agreement, the stopping of the tenure clock, subject to UWS guidelines, and should include at minimum a frank and documented conversation regarding the effects of the grantee's accepting such a grant on the department's view of the tenure-track candidate's tenure-ability.

**Miscellaneous New Business:**

1. none

**Adjournment: 5:10**

- Motioned by John Heppen, seconded by Kristie Feist.