Date: February 14, 2009
To: Faculty Senate and University Community
From: David P. Rainville, Faculty Senate Chair
Subject: Agenda for Faculty Senate Meeting February 18, 2009

The 2008-2009 Faculty Senate will meet on Wednesday, February 18, 2009 at 3:30 P.M. in the Willow River Room (334 UC) of the University Center. 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 of December 10, 2008
Approval of Minutes of February 4, 2009

Reports:
Chairs Report

Vice Chairs Report (Faculty Senate Elections)

Other Reports:

Unfinished Business:

New Business Consent Agenda:

1. Approval of Program Changes (from AP&P - Cecilia Bustamante, Chair):
   a. TESOL Education - Minor Content Change
   b. English Broad Education - Minor Content Change

   both are included in your packet

New Business:

1. The first reading from the Diversity Committee (Kristin Underwood, Chair)
changing its name from the Diversity Committee to the **Diversity and Inclusivity Committee**.

This represents a change in the bylaws (Chapter 3 of the Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook) and requires two readings. This change in name will take effect immediately upon adoption.

2. A motion from AP&P to approve the **Guidelines for Reviewers of Academic Program Self-Studies**. This document contains the guidelines that reviewers are to follow when reviewing Academic Programs pursuant to UWRF Faculty Senate Motion 2008-09/47 which approved the Academic Self-Study Tool.

The document is as follows:

---

**University of Wisconsin – River Falls**

**Guidelines for Reviewers of Academic Program Self-Studies**

The operating paradigm of the UWRF Strategic Plan requires the institution to assess programs and set budget priorities. A self-study of academic programs is one step in this process and will produce a deeper understanding of the quality of and resources devoted to our undergraduate and graduate programs. To ensure that the thoughtful work of faculty can be translated into strategic choices in meeting the University’s mission and vision, program reviewers must analyze the program self-study documentation and offer recommendations regarding our future program array. Important judgments must be made to guide the allocation of our resources.

**Academic Program Self-Study Tool**  [Faculty Senate Motion 2008-09/47]

The Self-Study will utilize six criteria to help obtain information for use in program evaluation:

--1) Mission and Strategic Plan: How is the program critical to the University’s Mission, Vision, and Values and to the “Living the Promise” Strategic Plan?

--2) External and Internal Demand: What is the job outlook for graduates of this program? How many majors, minors, and transfers are there? What is the contribution to General Education and other university program requirements?

--3) Program Quality, Inputs, and Outcomes: Is the curriculum innovative and forward-focused? What is there evidence of teaching effectiveness? What are the professional, scholarly, and creative activities of the faculty in the program?

--4) Productivity, Costs, and Efficiency: What are the cost efficiencies of this program? What are the SCH, FTE, budget, and space utilized or produced by the program?

--5) Benchmarking with Peers: How does the academic program compare with others at peer institutions?

--6) Other Critical Information: What distinctive characteristics or other information are critical to the evaluation of this program?
Academic Program Ratings

As outlined in the Academic Program Ratings document [Faculty Senate Motion 2008-2009/48], a rating score ranging from 1-5 will be assigned to each of these six criteria. The score for the criterion will be multiplied by its appropriate weight factor and the products added for a program total score. Scores for each program as determined by individual members of the Deans Council will be averaged to generate an overall mean for each program.

Following are the general guidelines for scoring. Please note that a score of 5, 4, 3, 2, or 1 might be assigned for a given criterion. While only scores of 5, 3, or 1 are described below, scores of 4 or 2 would naturally fall in between as appropriate based on the data and other information provided for that criterion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Rating Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Mission and Strategic Plan</td>
<td>Strong alignment with and support for the UWRF Mission, Vision, and Values, and Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) External and Internal Demand</td>
<td>Strong job market for graduates; high internal demand of program (number of majors, minors, and transfers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Program Quality, Inputs, and Outcomes</td>
<td>Curriculum is clearly innovative; teaching is highly effective; faculty are very productive in scholarly and creative activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Productivity, Costs, and Efficiency</td>
<td>High productivity of program (SCH/FTE, etc.); extremely efficient use of resources (budget/SCH, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Benchmarking with Peers</td>
<td>Program compares very favorably with peers in terms of cost and productivity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6) Other Critical Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information provided</th>
<th>Information provided</th>
<th>Information provided</th>
<th>Information provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>is highly significant.</td>
<td>demonstrates some</td>
<td>is not significant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>additional value of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Programs whose overall mean scores are in the middle 60% of all program scores will be considered for maintenance at current resource levels or maintenance with monitoring.

Programs whose overall mean scores are in the upper 20% of all program mean scores will be considered for enhancement (e.g. increases in FTE and/or S&E, enrollment growth, etc.). Inclusion in this group does not automatically mean programs will be enhanced but rather that they will be considered as priorities for enhancement.

Similarly, programs whose overall mean scores are in the lowest 20% of all programs will be considered for reduction or elimination. Inclusion in this group does not automatically mean programs will be reduced or eliminated but rather that they will be considered as potential candidates for reduction or elimination.

Final decisions on enhancement or reduction/elimination will need to include considerations of university mission and balance of programs, strategic enrollment planning, budget restrictions and obligations, current students and completion of academic plans, implications for accreditations, and other factors.

Resource reallocation resulting from enhancement or reduction/elimination within specific programs will begin immediately but may require longer term adjustment due to the factors mentioned above.

3. A Motion from the Executive Committee to adopt the following meeting schedule for the UWRF Faculty Senate for the 2009-2010 Academic Year. This schedule is being proposed as it is necessary to reserve room space in advance.

**Faculty Senate Schedule**

**Fall 2009-2010**

All meetings are scheduled to begin at 3:30 P.M. and conclude when business is complete, (hopefully by 5:00 P.M.)

All meetings except the September 9, 2009 meeting are in the Willow River Room (334 UC) of the University Center

Wednesday, September 9, 2009 - Apple River Room (333 UC)
Wednesday, September 23, 2009 - Willow River Room (334 UC)
Wednesday, October 7, 2009 - Willow River Room (334 UC)
Wednesday, October 21, 2009 - Willow River Room (334 UC)
Wednesday, November 4, 2009 - Willow River Room (334 UC)
Faculty Senate Schedule
Spring 2009-2010

All meetings are scheduled to begin at 3:30 P.M. and conclude when business is complete, (hopefully by 5:00 P.M.)

All meetings are in the Willow River Room (334 UC) of the University Center

Wednesday, February 3, 2010 - Willow River Room (334 UC)
Wednesday, February 17, 2010 - Willow River Room (334 UC)
Wednesday, March 3, 2010 - Willow River Room (334 UC)
Wednesday, March 24, 2010 - Willow River Room (334 UC)
Wednesday, April 7, 2010 - Willow River Room (334 UC)
Wednesday, April 21, 2010 - Willow River Room (334 UC)
Wednesday, May 5, 2010 - Willow River Room (334 UC)

4. A Resolution from the Executive Committee to support the University of Wisconsin System's 2009 Report entitled: "An Analysis of Domestic Partner Benefits for University of Wisconsin System Employees." This report reviews domestic partner benefits available at peer institutions, expected enrollment rates and costs if UW System offered domestic partner health insurance benefits and the effect that a lack of domestic partner health insurance is having on total employee compensation, recruitment efforts and employee retention. The report was requested by the Board of Regents of the UWS.

Whereas the University of Wisconsin-River Falls has always strived for fairness and equity to all of its employees:

Be it Resolved that the Faculty Senate of the University of Wisconsin-River Falls supports the Findings and Recommendations in the University of Wisconsin System's Report, "An Analysis of Domestic Partner Benefits for University of Wisconsin System Employees."

Miscellaneous New Business:

Adjournment