Date: November 17, 2008
To: Faculty Senate and University Community
From: David P. Rainville, Faculty Senate Chair
Subject: Agenda for Faculty Senate Meeting November 19, 2008

The 2008-2009 Faculty Senate will meet on Wednesday, November 19, 2008 at 3:30 P.M. in the Willow River Room (334 UC) of the University Center. As you can see from the agenda, we have a light meeting for a change. Faculty Senators who cannot attend should arrange for a substitute and notify Kristina Hiney at Kristina.hiney@uwrf.edu.

Call to Order:
- Seating of Substitutes
- Approval of Minutes November 5, 2008

Reports:
- Chairs Report
- Vice Chairs Report
- Report from the General Education and University Requirements Committee
  Rich Wallace
- Other Reports

Unfinished Business:

1. Faculty Senate Luncheons with Chancellor Finalists

New Business Consent Agenda:

1. Program Change - credits change in Communicative Disorders Major
2. Program Change - substantial change in Graduate Program in Communicative Disorders
3. Approval of a New Transmittal Form for Undergraduate Programs

New Business:

1. A motion from the Executive Committee to endorse a request from the Faculty Senate of the University of Wisconsin - Oshkosh to ask the Legislative Fiscal Bureau to commission a white paper on the issue of faculty salaries, along the lines of what it did on tuition in January 2007 (Informational Paper #37). This informational paper should compile information and statistic relevant to university funding issues, and specifically faculty salaries.
It has been suggested that this paper present *yearly data from 1995-2008 for the following variables*:

**Personnel and Budgeted Salaries**
- total full time tenured and tenure track employees for every 4-year institution
- total full time equivalent positions filled by non-tenured employees by institution
- total compensation per full time equivalent position
- total state contribution to the UW system in dollars and percent of total budget

**Retention and Raises**
- losses of tenured and tenure track employees by school
- faculty given counteroffers; percent of counteroffers accepted (broken down by school)
- base salary raises; Wisconsin inflation/cost of living data

**Economic Impact and Operating Capital**
- endowment/permanent operating capital for every 4-year school
- estimates on positive economic impact to state of UW system for each institution

**Benefits**
- health and dental care coverage and premiums
- pension contributions

**Comparative Data**
- percentage of the state budget appropriated to major sectors (e.g. corrections, university, K-12 instruction, technical colleges, etc.)
- average compensation for full time, permanent technical college employees
- average compensation for professors at universities in comparable state systems (e.g. Michigan, Illinois, and Minnesota).

The following letter was sent by the Faculty Advocacy Committee of the University of Wisconsin - Oshkosh's Faculty Senate to Representative Hinz.

Dear Representative Hintz,

October 10, 2008

As you know, the state university system has not fared well in recent biennia. We have borne the brunt of disproportionate cuts. We, the Faculty Advocacy Committee, a duly constituted committee of the University of Wisconsin - Oshkosh’s Faculty Senate, hope to work with you to reverse this disturbing trend.

The budgetary hits the university system have been forced to absorb induce larger class sizes, greater use of adjunct faculty (many of whom are not as highly trained as
permanent staff), a decline in faculty morale due to poor raises and salary inversion, and a diminished ability to hire and retain quality faculty. When we hire replacements we typically cannot replicate their quality. Thus the caliber of our university system is at stake. We are animated by the belief that the higher the quality of our university system, the better it is for the state of Wisconsin, economically and otherwise. Continuing to drain the university of state support undermines our tradition of educational excellence and it squanders an opportunity to investment in the future.

We urge you to ask the Legislative Fiscal Bureau to commission a white paper on the issue of faculty salaries, along the lines of what it did on tuition in January 2007 (Informational Paper #37). This informational paper should compile information and statistics relevant to university funding issues, and specifically faculty salaries.

We suggest that this paper present **yearly data from 1995-2008 for the following variables:**

Personnel and Budgeted Salaries
- total full time tenured and tenure track employees for every 4-year institution
- total full time equivalent positions filled by non-tenured employees by institution
- total compensation per full time equivalent position
- total state contribution to the UW system in dollars and percent of total budget

Retention and Raises
- losses of tenured and tenure track employees by school
- faculty given counteroffers; percent of counteroffers accepted (broken down by school)
- base salary raises; Wisconsin inflation/cost of living data

Economic Impact and Operating Capital
- endowment/permanent operating capital for every 4-year school
- estimates on positive economic impact to state of UW system for each institution

Benefits
- health and dental care coverage and premiums
- pension contributions

Comparative Data
- percentage of the state budget appropriated to major sectors (e.g. corrections, university,
  K-12 instruction, technical colleges, etc.)
- average compensation for full time, permanent technical college employees
- average compensation for professors at universities in comparable state systems (e.g.

The summary statistics provided in an informational paper will be helpful, but we also hope to have access to the raw data used to compile the paper. Our intention is to
assemble a thorough assessment of faculty salaries and benefits, so that we may participate in budgetary discussions from an informed position. We have asked the UW-Oshkosh Faculty Senate to contact the other Faculty Senates to invite them to join our effort.

Sincerely,

David Siemers, chair
Merlaine Angwall, Theatre
James Chaudoir, Music
Ryan Haley, Economics
Alan Lareau, Foreign Languages and Literatures
George Philip, Management Information Systems
Ken Price, Mathematics

The following was sent to Bill Wacholtz, Faculty Senate President of the University of Wisconsin - Oshkosh from the Faculty Advocacy Committee requesting the attention of Faculty Senates in the University of Wisconsin System. The pertinent portion is number 4.

To: Bill Wacholtz, Faculty Senate President
From: Faculty Advocacy Committee
Re: Suggestions for the Faculty Senate

Dear Faculty Senate,

The Faculty Advocacy Committee would like to propose the following to the Faculty Senate as items to be taken up for discussion and action as the Senate sees fit:

1. FAC responsibilities

The Faculty Advocacy Committee suggests that its charge be clarified. The current mission of the FAC is focused on public relations. While we see this as an important part of our mission, it unnecessarily limits our options for promoting the interests of the faculty. We would like to strengthen the committee’s definition and propose the following change of the “responsibilities.”

Current Charge: The Faculty Advocacy Committee studies and makes recommendations regarding the at large development of harmonious campus-community relationships. The committee also seeks “methods for improving communication between all groups within and outside the University and effective methods of advocacy.”

Proposed Charge: The Faculty Advocacy Committee works to increase understanding of the work and value of University faculty in the community, among businesses, and with the media and government. The committee addresses issues of representation and
perception of the faculty and advocates on different levels for the needs and concerns of the faculty, in support of and in collaboration with the Faculty Senate.

2. We ask that you add M. Ryan Haley, Economics (COBA) to the committee.

3. Speaker’s Bureau

The FAC is concerned that for the last two years the Speaker’s Bureau has been non-functional. The Speaker’s Bureau is an institution which would help the faculty liaison in a positive way with the local, regional, and state community. Its webpage is out of date and nobody has been promoting or maintaining this service. Some time ago, it moved from University Relations to Lifelong Learning and Community Engagement on a temporary basis, but meanwhile it has lost its staff support.

We have begun the process of promoting the revival of this service. We suggest that the Faculty Senate take up the cause and turn to higher offices to see whether and how the Speakers Bureau can be turned into a successful venture for the University. Possibilities to be considered include relocating the service to the News Bureau, the Provost’s office, or the Chancellor’s office. This service should also be more widely publicized.

4. Faculty Salaries

Faculty salaries and their diminution through paltry raises that don’t meet cost of living increases are major concerns among the faculty. Our committee has requested that State Representative Gordon Hintz ask the Legislative Fiscal Bureau to compile an Informational Paper about this matter, along the lines of what it wrote about tuition in January 2007. This “white paper” will put us, the faculty, in a stronger position in making our case to the state legislature. We have attached the letter that we have written to Representative Hintz. It is our hope that we can be sufficiently well informed to make a compelling case for the reversal of the trends of the last several biennia.

We cannot count on the state legislature, nor the University Administration to fight hard for adequate faculty salaries. We have to rely first on ourselves. The data that we can get from the Legislative Fiscal Bureau will help. It would also help to have Senate committees at each of the other 12 four year institutions have a committee that we can share information with, and who are responsible for putting our best foot forward to state decision-makers on this issue.

In that endeavor we hope that the Faculty Senate or the Senate president will write to the other faculty Senates. This letter will acquaint their Senate with our feeling that the quality of the University system is at risk, that we wish to do what we can to prevent the further erosion of quality to our system, and that we hope that they will join in this endeavor. The letter will inquire if any Senate committee is looking into the issue and if not, ask that one be put in charge of it, so that we can share information, and defend ourselves against unreasonable cuts.
2. A motion from the Advising Committee:

To accept the clarification and update selection of UWRF Academic Advisor of the Year award (Motion 98-99/39) as proposed by the Advising committee.

1. Purpose and Eligibility
The purpose of the UWRF Academic Advisor of the Year award is to recognize excellence in the academic advising of undergraduate students. Eligible for the award are full-time, tenure-track faculty and professional staff with a minimum of four years of academic advising at UWRF.

2. Nomination Procedure
Eligible nominators include all current students and alumni of UWRF. An on-line nomination form will be made available through the University web site, and advertised electronically to current students and alumni. Seniors, three, and five year alumni will receive solicitations via postcard along with their Distinguished Teacher Award nominating materials.

3. Selection Procedure
The Advising Committee will collect the nominations. The committee’s selection will not solely be based on the number of nominations received but will also take into account students’ and alumni comments in order to address disparity in advising loads in different departments.

4. Recommendation to the Chancellor
The committee’s annual recommendation to the chancellor will consist of a single academic advisor’s name.

5. Award Presentation
Of the nominations, the only name to be announced will be the advisor selected for the award. The award presentation will be made at the Chancellor’s Award Reception. It is recommended that a monetary prize accompany the award. An advisor may receive the award only once.

6. Improvement of Academic Advising
The Advising Committee will evaluate the nominations to gain insight on what students and alumni consider to be criteria for outstanding academic advising. These insights will inform development of faculty and student outcomes of advising, tools for their assessment, and plans for their achievement.
NOMINATION FORM

Academic Advisor’s full name:
Academic Advisor’s department or program:

Nominated by:
Nominator’s university status: alumni, senior, junior, sophomore, freshman.
Nominator’s major:

For each statement please indicate whether you;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My Academic Advisor…</th>
<th>Strongly Agree=5, are neutral=3, or Strongly Disagree=1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>is/was a source of accurate information regarding academic requirements within my academic program.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is/was knowledgeable of institutional regulations, policies and procedures.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is/was aware of and makes/made appropriate referrals to career, health, academic success, or other services when I needed them.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is/was available and accessible and communicated in a timely manner</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>keeps/kept track of my progress toward academic and career goals.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>represents/represented the core values of UWRF.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has/had a helpful, caring attitude toward students</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please briefly explain why you feel this advisor should be recognized with this award.

1. How has this advisor met your academic advising needs?

2. Describe three qualities that make this advisor uniquely suited for award.

To complete your nomination, click on the SUBMIT NOMINATION button below.
Miscellaneous New Business:

1. A **discussion** about committees that do not properly fit into either the Faculty Senate Committee (Chapter 3) or Administrative Committee (Chapter 4) categories. These committees are probably best classified as "University Committees" in that they are hybrids with some duties and responsibilities that require shared governance and other duties and responsibilities that do not. Specifically, it has been suggested that sustainability and instructional technology may best be served by committees of this type. This would require a new chapter be introduced into the Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook.

Adjournment