FACULTY SENATE MOTIONS 1992-1993

MOTION  DESCRIPTION

92-93/1  Approval of Faculty Senate Committee Memberships.

92-93/2  Approval of UW-RF Scientific Misconduct Statement.

92-93/3  Approval of students who are close to the honors.

92-93/4  Change Faculty Committees (on 9/2/92)

92-93/5  Approval of the 16th Edition of the Faculty Handbook.

92-93/6-7  Approval of the Scientific Misconduct Statement.

92-93/6-7  Amendment of motion 92-93/6

92-93/8-9  Approval to repeal UWS 17.06(2), the portion of the UWS Student Code dealing with "hate speech".

92-93/8-9  Amendment of motion 92-93/8

92-93/10  Approval of faculty personnel rules-chapter 3: renewal and nonrenewal of probationary appointments.

92-93/11  Approval of changes to restrict membership on the Faculty Hearing, Grievance, and Appeals Committee.

92-93/12  Approval to modify the description of duties for the Instructional Improvement Committee.

92-93/13  Approval to accept the Visiting Professor Committee as a standing committee of the Faculty Senate.

92-93/14  Approval of the Faculty Welfare and Personnel Policies Committee proposal to amend Faculty Personnel Rule 3.12.

92-93/15  Approval of the Faculty Welfare and Personnel Policies Committee proposal to amend Faculty Personnel Rule 3.33.

92-93/16  Approval of the Academic Program & Policies motion to accept the Marketing Communication major.

92-93/17  Approval of the Academic Program & Policies motion to add Environmental Engineering Technology Option to the Agriculture Engineering Technology Major.

92-93/18  Approval of Revision of RF 5: Post Tenure Review.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>92-93/19</td>
<td>Approval of the Academic Program &amp; Policies motion to create a Criminal Justice Minor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92-93/20</td>
<td>Approval of the Affirmative Action Committee proposal to create a Mentoring Advisory Task Force.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92-93/21</td>
<td>Approval of Sabbatical Committee's revision of the Guidelines for Sabbatical Leave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92-93/22</td>
<td>Approval by Faculty Senate of motion to accept the resolution of Faculty Salary. Motion not approved by Chancellor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92-93/23</td>
<td>Approval of the formation of a Mentoring Advisory Task Force.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92-93/24</td>
<td>Approval of motion to change the name of Minority Affairs Advisory Committee to Multicultural Advisory Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92-93/25</td>
<td>Approval of motion to include some English Department diversity courses in the General Education Humanities B.3 other category.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92-93/26</td>
<td>Approval of the Legislative Advisory Committee's resolution regarding Pell Grant Awards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92-93/27</td>
<td>Approval of Academic Program &amp; Policies motion to add Environmental Engineering Technology option to the Agriculture Engineering Technology major.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92-93/28</td>
<td>Approval of Faculty Salary Committee resolution regarding compensation for non-instructional academic staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92-93/29</td>
<td>Approval of Student Senate resolution regarding Unity in the Community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92-93/30</td>
<td>Approval of the 1994-95 Academic Year Calendar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92-93/31</td>
<td>Approval of the Computer Guidance Committee policy statement regarding University Wide-Area Network Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92-93/32-33</td>
<td>Approval of the Faculty Welfare and Personnel Committee proposal for Use of Augmented Departments for Personnel Decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92-93/34</td>
<td>Approval to establish a Pre-Major Advising program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92-93/35</td>
<td>Approval of resolution opposing passage of pending Wisconsin Legislation that will require Wisconsin public schools to begin classes after labor day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92-93/36</td>
<td>Approval by the Faculty Senate of a motion to limit the number of evaluations that would be processed each semester. Motion not approved by Chancellor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92-93/37</td>
<td>Approval of Compensation Distribution Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92-93/38</td>
<td>Approval of the Academic Standards Committee motion to include transfer credit grades in the calculation of the student's major GPA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FACULTY SENATE MOTIONS FOR 1992-93

Motion 92-93/5  16th Edition of the Faculty Handbook
Motion 92-93/6  Scientific Misconduct Statement
Motion 92-93/8  Campus Climate-UWS 17.06
Motion 92-93/9
Motion 92-93/10
Motion 92-93/11  Changes to Faculty Hearing, Grievance, and Appeals Committee
Motion 92-93/12  Changes to Instructional Improvement Committee
Motion 92-93/13  Proposal to Create Visiting Professor Standing Committee
Motion 92-93/14  Revision to Faculty Personnel Rule 3.12
Motion 92-93/15  Revision to Faculty Personnel Rule 3.33
Motion 92-93/16  Marketing Communication Major
Motion 92-93/17  Environmental Engineering Technology Option in Agriculture Engineering Technology Major
Motion 92-93/18  Revision of RF 5: Post Tenure Review
Motion 92-93/19  Criminal Justice Minor
Motion 92-93/20  Mentoring Advisory Task Force
Motion 92-93/21  Revisions to the Guidelines for Sabbatical Leave
Motion 92-93/22  Faculty Senate Resolution for 1993-94 Pay Plan
Motion 92-93/23  Mentoring Task Force
Motion 92-93/24  Minority Affairs Advisory Committee
Motion 92-93/25  Diversity Courses
Motion 92-93/26  Pell Grants
Motion 92-93/27  Changes to Personnel Rules to Comply with 1991 Wisconsin Act 118(Notestein)
Motion 92-93/28  Compensation for Non-Instructional Academic Staff
Motion 92-93/29  Unity in the Community
Motion 92-93/30  1994-95 Academic Year Calendar
Motion 92-93/31  University Wide Area Network
Motion 92-93/32 (amended #33)  Augmented Departments
Motion 92-93/33  
Motion 92-93/34  Pre-Major Proposal
Motion 92-93/35  
Motion 92-93/36  Faculty Evaluations (not approved)
Motion 92-93/37  Compensation Distribution Plan
Motion 92-93/38 (amended #33)  Transfer Grades in Major GPA
Motion 93-94/2  Faculty Senate Motions for 1993-94
             Acceptence of appointment of Faculty Senate Committee chairs and members.
15 May 1993

To:     Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor
        University of Wisconsin-River Falls

From:   Sally Standford, Chair
        Faculty Senate

Re:     Transfer Grades in Major GPA

The Faculty Senate approved the following motion of the Academic Standards
Committee:

    The Office of the Registrar has recommended the inclusion of transfer
    credit grades in the calculation of the student's major GPA.

We hope that you will concur with our action.

Motion passed by Faculty Senate: 92-93/#38

X  Approved

Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor  5/1993

____ Not Approved
15 May 1993

To: Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor
University of Wisconsin-River Falls

From: Sally Standiford, Chair
Faculty Senate

Re: Compensation Distribution Plan

The Faculty Senate approved the following Compensation Distribution Plan:

The 1993-94 compensation adjustments for UW-RF faculty and academic staff shall be distributed as follows: one third of the total compensation plan shall be distributed on the basis of merit/market and two-thirds of the total compensation plan shall be distributed on the basis of solid performance.

We hope that you will concur with our action.

Motion passed by Faculty Senate: 92-93/#37

☐ Approved

Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor 01/1/93

☐ Not Approved
15 May 1993

To: Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor
   University of Wisconsin-River Falls

From: Sally Standiford, Chair
       Faculty Senate

Re: Faculty Evaluations

In a 8-6 vote, the Faculty Senate approved the attached motion to limit the number of evaluations that would be processed each semester. The frequency with which each faculty member would be evaluated is congruent with current personnel rules and decision points.

Moved that student evaluations be administered each semester for probationary faculty and instructional academic staff only and that evaluations be administered each semester for one third (1/3) of tenured faculty. Tenured faculty to be evaluated will be selected alphabetically every third evaluation period. Faculty would have the option to have evaluations done more frequently.

We recognize concerns expressed by students and we will facilitate a thorough community discussion of the entire evaluation procedure and purpose during 1993-94 academic year. Such a discussion will include, but not be limited to: frequency of evaluations, the "when" and "how" administered issues; validity and reliability of evaluation instrument, and modifications/individualization of instrument.

I recognize that this Senate action looks at but one aspect of evaluation and not at the larger picture. I ask, however, that you support this Senate action since it is congruent with current rules and that we will consider the issue as a whole next semester.

Motion passed by Faculty Senate: 92-93/#36

   Approved

   Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor

   Date

   Not Approved
June 7, 1993

TO: Sally Standiford  
Chair  
Faculty Senate

FROM: Gary A. Thibodeau  
Chancellor

RE: Student Evaluation of Faculty Resolution 92-93/#36

Given the fact that you are planning to review all facets of the student evaluation of faculty process (questions, reliability, etc.), I would prefer to consider the administration schedule as a part of the revised package rather than as a separate issue. Consequently, I am not ready to support the resolution as written.

Please let me know if you need further clarification.

GAT/sam
30 April 1993

To:      Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor
         University of Wisconsin-River Falls

From:    Sally Standiford, Chair
         Faculty Senate

Re:      Wisconsin Legislative Action: AB-217

The Faculty Senate unanimously passed the attached resolution opposing passage of
pending Wisconsin Legislation that will require Wisconsin public schools to begin
classes after Labor Day. Although not stated in this resolution, we strongly favor an
academic calendar that would permit us to start classes prior to September 1 (the current
law). In short, we favor scheduling classes on an academic calendar rather than a
legislative calendar.

We hope you will approve this Faculty Senate action.

Motion passed by Faculty Senate: 92-93/#35

☑️ Approved

Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor 5/3/93

☐ Not Approved
RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the University Wisconsin System is currently required to begin after September 1; and

WHEREAS, current legislation AB217 calls for all public schools to start after Labor Day (includes UW-System); and

WHEREAS, the current academic calendar is already constrained in the amount of weeks in the Fall and Spring semesters;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate hereby stand in opposition of the passage of AB217.
15 May 1993

To: Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor
   University of Wisconsin-River Falls

From: Sally Standiford, Chair
       Faculty Senate

Re: Pre-Major Proposal

The Faculty Senate unanimously approved the Academic Programming and Policy Committee proposal to establish a Pre-Major Advising program. The general discussion with Vice Chancellor Taylor and Assistant to the Vice Chancellor Larry Harred indicated that 1993-1994 would be considered as a pilot program and evaluated as such.

We hope you will approve this Faculty Senate action.

Motion passed by Faculty Senate: 92-93/#34

☑ Approved

Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor
4/1/93

☐ Not Approved
15 May 1993

To: Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor
University of Wisconsin-River Falls

From: Sally Standiford, Chair
Faculty Senate

Re: Augmented Departments

The Faculty Senate approved the Faculty Welfare and Personnel Policies Committee proposal for Use of Augmented Departments for Personnel Decisions (attached). We are anticipating UWS requests for changes to department size as a result of Lateral Review. We think our proposal will address the major concerns of UWS without requiring changes in department structure.

We hope you will approve this Faculty Senate action.

Motion passed by Faculty Senate: 92-93/#32 (amended #33)

[Signature]
Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor

Approved by the Board of Regents October 8, 1993.
The motion below is a revised version of the one passed unanimously by Faculty Welfare and Personnel Policies Committee on April 6, 1993 and currently tabled by Faculty Senate. Revisions have been made after consultation with System Legal Counsel and others.

Use of Augmented Departments for Personnel Decisions

For the purposes of this personnel rule, any department with fewer than three tenured members shall be augmented with additional members who shall participate in personnel decisions. In other cases departments may be augmented if, in the judgment of the appropriate academic dean, it is in the best interests of the department and the University to do so.

Specific personnel actions covered by this rule include, but are not limited to, search and screen, appointment, and reviewing for retention, promotion, and tenure. The number of faculty needed to augment the department shall be determined on a case by case basis. Each case shall be reviewed by the Dean and the department. Their deliberations should include such factors as the number of tenure lines and other positions to be filled, department history, and any other relevant programmatic and personnel factors.

Faculty selected to augment the department shall be tenured faculty in other UW-RF departments. They shall be selected by the dean of the college in which the department is located. The criteria for selection shall be 1) preparation in a cognate field or interdisciplinary training in the discipline of the department; and/or 2) expertise in personnel processes. The department to be augmented shall nominate up to two candidates for each position to be filled. The dean shall consider these nominees in making his final selection, but is not obligated to include departmental nominees among faculty selected to augment the department. The dean’s recommendations shall be reviewed and approved by the Chancellor and the Vice Chancellor.

Whenever possible, the augmented department shall function from the beginning of the personnel process for a given position until the faculty member it hires for that position is non-retained, resigns, or is tenured, whichever occurs first. Applicants who are interviewed for a position shall be notified that the department has been augmented for personnel purposes. They shall also be apprised of the qualifications of the members who are augmenting the department and of the rules by which the augmented department operates.

Revised April 23, 1993
October 12, 1993

Chancellor Gary Thibodeau  
University of Wisconsin-River Falls  
River Falls, WI 54022

Dear Chancellor Thibodeau:

At its meeting on Friday, October 8, 1993, the Board of Regents adopted the following resolution:

That, upon recommendation of the Chancellor of the University of Wisconsin-River Falls and the President of the University of Wisconsin System, the revisions RF 1.1 and UWRF 5, UW-River Falls Faculty Policies and Procedures, be approved.

Sincerely,

Judith A. Temby
Secretary

cc: Senior Vice President Portch
RF 1.1 Academic Unit

The academic unit may be the department in which the faculty member serves, a college or division within a college, or an administratively designated unit which does not have departmental status. The designation of the academic unit should be made at the time of an individual’s appointment and should not be changed to handle particular cases pending.

Any department with fewer than three tenured members shall be augmented with additional members who shall participate in personnel decisions.

Specific personnel actions covered by this rule include, but are not limited to, search and screen, appointment, and reviewing for retention, promotion, and tenure. The number of faculty needed to augment the department shall be determined on a case by case basis. Each case shall be reviewed by the Dean and the department. Their deliberations should include such factors as the number of tenure lines and other positions to be filled, department history, and any other relevant programmatic and personnel factors.

Faculty selected to augment the department shall be tenured faculty in other UWRF departments. They shall be selected by the dean of the college in which the department is located. The criteria for selection shall be 1) preparation in a cognate field or interdisciplinary training in the discipline of the department; and/or 2) expertise in personnel processes. The department to be augmented shall nominate up to two candidates for each position to be filled. The dean shall consider these nominees in making the final decision, but is not obligated to include departmental nominees among faculty selected to augment the department. The dean's recommendations shall be reviewed and approved by the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor.

Applicants who are interviewed for a position shall be notified that the department has been augmented for personnel purposes. They shall also be apprised of the qualifications of the members who are augmenting the department and of the rules by which the augmented department operates. Whenever possible, the augmented department shall function from the beginning of the personnel process for a given position until the faculty member it hires for that position is nonretained, resigns, or is tenured.

In other cases, departments may be augmented if, in the best judgment of the appropriate academic dean, it is in the best interests of the department and the University to do so.
UWRF 5 - PERIODIC REVIEW

RF 5.1 An annual review of the professional activities of the faculty shall be conducted at least once every five years the professional activities of tenured faculty will be reviewed to inform the faculty member of his/her performance. The review may be conducted simultaneously with merit review or with promotion review.

For the purposes of this The criteria for the review the criteria used are those found in the Faculty Handbook under RF 3.21c and the appropriate department’s statement applying these criteria to the department mission, such statement to be on file in the Vice Chancellor’s office shall consist of:

RF 5.2 The review shall be conducted by the head of The academic unit will determine whether a committee of its tenured faculty or the chair will conduct the review with this exception: deans shall review the academic unit heads. In conducting the review, the reviewer(s) shall:

a. review the teaching portfolio and other pertinent data submitted by the faculty member. The faculty member has primary responsibility for assembling the data for review. The faculty member will include an inventory of the data submitted, and the chair will verify the inventory contents. The faculty member is responsible for promptly submitting the information for his/her review. The reviewer(s) will prepare compile a summary report of their findings data-listed under RF 5.1 and include his or her evaluation of the quality of the individual’s performance.

b. discuss perceived strengths and weaknesses in with the faculty member’s his/her professional performance with him or her in continuing to meet the criteria under RF 3.21c. Following this discussion the reviewer(s) will prepare a final summary of findings and recommendations which will be signed by the chair and any other reviewers, and by the faculty member reviewed to acknowledge that the review was completed.

c. enter into the faculty member's departmental professional file, the documents inventory, the final summary report, and any other pertinent information used in compiling the summary report, along with the summary report, review in the faculty member’s departmental professional record. The faculty member reviewed will be given a copy of the final summary report.

If the faculty member’s performance is deemed outstanding, a copy of the report shall be entered into the peer merit file as evidence to support a high merit ranking, and the chair shall consider the faculty member in the recommendations to the dean for special merit awards.

If the faculty member’s review reveals a need for significant improvement in performance, the chair will report such to the academic dean. The dean and the chair in consultation with the faculty member will recommend a retraining or redevelopment program to the Vice Chancellor who shall assist the dean to find resources to fund such a program. This program may include, but is not limited to, additional coursework, referral to the Employee Assistance Program, participation in professional meetings in the discipline, and/or appointment of a peer mentor.

RF 5.3 A The faculty member has the right to may challenge the contents of the periodic review before summary report before the reviewer(s) and/or before the tenured faculty of his/her department. Subsequently, the faculty member may take the matter to the University Faculty Hearing, Grievance, and Appeals Committee.
15 May 1993

To: Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor
   University of Wisconsin-River Falls

From: Sally Standiford, Chair
       Faculty Senate

Re: University Wide Area Network

The Faculty Senate approved the Computer Guidance Committee policy statement regarding University Wide-Area Network Resources (attached)

We hope you will approve this Faculty Senate action.

Motion passed by Faculty Senate: 92-93/#31

[Signature]
   Approved

[Signature]
   Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor

[Signature]
   Date

[Signature]
   Not Approved
University of Wisconsin - Rivers Falls  
Policy  
Access to University Wide Area Network Resources

Background

The question of who can have access to University instructional computing labs, multi-user systems and network resources has existed for some time and policies were developed to deal with them. However, the availability of WiscNet and the Internet has created strong demand for access to them, and to shared campus computing resources which support them, including local hosts such as the Rivers VAX cluster, the Sun Enterprise cluster and potentially for direct connection to the backbone computer network.

Principles

The Academic Computing Center develops and maintains facilities at UW-RF for the support of University instruction and research. The resources are for those purposes only, and for University public service efforts that are compatible with those objectives. Toward that end Academic Computing strives to ensure that adequate resources are available to support the primary mission of teaching and the related mission of research, subject to financial, ethical, legal and other constraints.

Use Directly Related to the Academic Mission

This includes access to facilities for University course work and research. Policies and practices regarding this type of access have been developed and are in place. For purposes of brevity they will not be documented here.

Use Indirectly Related or Unrelated to the Academic Mission

Most of the issues of access relate to personal use, or quasi-academic use. Some of the type of requests are described below, grouped by the typical means of connection, *host account access* and *direct connection*. See Appendix A, Considerations Regarding WiscNet/Internet Access, for a discussion of these terms. Direct connection for individuals represents a new issue for this campus, which will present a significant management challenge.

Host Account Access

This consists of an account with an allocation of time and disk space on a campus host computer system. In this mode, users typically access a multi-user computer system by terminal emulation.

1. Personal access for students. Students often request personal accounts on UW-RF's multi-users systems, sometimes for access to special software packages, more often to obtain Internet access. In most cases, the objective is personal use. Such use is exclusive of class use; students are given their own accounts for course work.
2. Graduates. Some have asked to maintain host accounts to obtain (continued) access to the Internet or have requested a SLIP connection to the University’s network or to a faculty member’s machine.

3. Local Schools. Persons in local schools have requested access as part of University sponsored programs; we’ve honored these as they are in direct support of University mission. Others have requested access to support other academic endeavors or personal research. Still others have become interested in the Internet and want a courtesy account.

4. Community. Persons in the community have requested access to the Internet. Often it is for the purpose of communicating with a family member or getting communication with a distant school while home on vacation.

Policies

The following policies will apply for access to WiscNet and the Internet as regards host account access.

1. All use of WiscNet and the Internet will comply with the WiscNet Acceptable Use Policy. UW-RF agreed to this as a condition of WiscNet membership. It should be noted that it discourages use for personal purposes.

2. University faculty, staff and student access for purposes of instruction and research use will follow past practices and, subject to available resources, will be granted automatically. This shall include student access that is part of a class requirement, including topics courses, for which the student is registered and a grade is expected.

   Students may also have access for study of various topics for which they are not registered for a class without charge, provided the activity is faculty sponsored and verified by completion of a proposal of approximately one page signed by the sponsoring faculty member.

3. Faculty and staff use that is not related to one’s University work is discouraged. State statutes prohibit use of state equipment for personal purposes. Use by other persons, unless they are engaged in a bona-fide collaborative effort with the faculty or staff member is also discouraged.

4. University students may request access for personal use not related to their University course work, but will have to pay a fixed application fee. This is for the purpose of processing applications, managing the program including providing minimal training, and will be a fixed fee per school year. It will provides access to a standard allocation of resources; if the student has needs for additional resources such as disk space and CPU time, there may be a charge for these. The proposed amount of the fee for 1993-94 is $25.00.
5. Use by off-campus parties is limited to educational purposes that support the goals and programs of the University and fostering development of the Internet. Free access may be granted as an introductory arrangement for a specific time period, otherwise parties off-campus will be charged for access to the resources. Persons or organizations meeting the above requirements may be granted courtesy accounts upon completion of a proposal of approximately one page, to be submitted to the Computing Center, describing their project and objectives.

Extensive use by outside parties that has no particular educational or research purpose should best be met by alternative means, such as commercial access to the Internet.

6. All agreements with students or off-campus parties will be limited to a maximum duration of one year, renewal by agreement of both parties on or about August 25 each year.

Direct Connection (Ethernet IP Node)

The University's policies and practices regarding connection to the campus backbone have not yet been developed. The principles set forth here will apply until such time as more extensive policies are developed.

Policies

1. University Academic Departments desiring an Ethernet or SLIP (Serial Line Internet Protocol) connection will make written request to Academic Computing; Administrative Departments will forward requests to Administrative Computing. Subject to available funding to purchase the necessary equipment and services, access will be provided. Academic and Administrative Computing, in consultation with other departments charged with managing the University's computer and communication resources, are solely responsible for the choice of devices to effect the connection, and with the operation and management of network devices such as hubs, bridges and routers. Departments connecting must be willing to meet published standards which now exist in draft form and are expected to be revised as the network develops.

2. Individual machines within a department, purchased with University funds, or purchased with a faculty or staff member's funds may be connected in the same manner as provided for in 1, but request will be made through the department with the signature of the department chair.

3. Standards for the use of directly connected machines shall parallel those for host account access. Specific exceptions or additions shall be addressed in this document or in future policies.
4. At this time there is no provision for the direct connection of student machines to the campus backbone. In the event it becomes a desired practice, it will be under a model that provides full cost recovery.

5. Outside agencies or persons can only connect to the campus backbone and the Internet via a SLIP, ethernet or higher speed connection on a full cost recovery basis. This practice whereby additional organizations connect to an existing WiscNet member’s backbone is called a "back door connection"; back door connections are charged access fees by WiscNet and resource utilization fees determined by the member institution providing access.

6. A SLIP or other connection to a computer operated by a University department or an individual affiliated with it, providing service to persons not affiliated with the University will be subject to the same cost recovery standards as a centrally connected "back door" connection. Such activities will be monitored and its impact on the network will determine whether it merits full charges. To meet the user authentication requirements of the Internet, persons operating such systems will issue unique IDs and passwords to the users of the machine, such that any persons using the network via that machine at any particular time can be identified.

Internet Newsgroups and the Question of Censorship

Background

A related topic is access to Internet Newsgroups. Newsgroups are free flowing electronic discussion groups which computer users can sign up for. Some of the technical information offered has already proven to be of immense value to the University. However, the subject of other groups range widely and may contain material offensive to some individuals, or, if not offensive, appear to be a waste of time. Examples include discussion groups on anti-Semitism, pornographic films, sex, "The Simpsons", politics, or much more. Such material may offend the sensibilities of faculty, staff, other students or the entities that control our funding such as the regents and the legislature.

It is not the desire of the University, nor Academic Computing to censor material or limit freedom of expression.

However, we believe it is reasonable to emulate society at large, which does not permit the free and unlimited propagation of potentially offensive materials, be they deemed racist, sexist, pornographic or whatever. In general, materials may be distributed freely, but they cannot be put on open display in public areas and can be disseminated only to those who want them. For example, the US Postal Service will deliver material which may be considered pornographic by some definitions, but it must be mailed in a non-obtrusive package and can be mailed only to persons who have requested it. Similarly, magazines deemed pornographic by some are sold in supermarkets, but they are put in plastic bags with opaque covers.
Another important distinction is that the cost of the above materials and their distribution is paid for essentially by the purchaser. Access to wide area computer networks is provided largely through state funds.

Policies

1. Access to controversial newsgroups shall not be forbidden or censored, but shall not be openly distributed to the user community at large.

2. Requests for access to controversial newsgroups shall be made and access provided on an individual basis. Access will be for that person's use and not for other individuals and must be sponsored by a faculty member.

3. Requests for access to controversial newsgroups for use by a class shall be handled in similar manner; the request for such shall come from the instructor and access will be limited to that specific class.

4. If computing resources are not available to permit offering controversial materials or if effective means are not available to restrict access to the requesting parties, then access to them shall remain unavailable until such resources are adequate.
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Appendix A
Considerations Regarding WiscNet/Internet Access

The following comments are provided here to provide additional clarification, and to permit shortening of the main document.

A non-commercialism policy is traditional in the UW System. We are strongly discouraged from selling goods or services in competition with the private sector.

Use of State / University facilities or equipment by individuals for personal use or profit is prohibited by statute.

Digital Equipment Corporation prohibits commercial use of their software for which we were granted virtually free use for educational purpose. In other words we can't sell access to the VAX to third parties.

Policing users activity for compliance is most difficult, and time is not available. For example, determining whether use is "educational" or "personal" may be extremely difficult. Also Unix Systems place no restrictions on access to external networks; if someone knows how to do it it is nearly impossible to stop them.

Types of WiscNet / Internet Access

With the massive changes of the last several years, and with most of the campus community barely aware of them, some explanation of the type of access is necessary. There are at least three major types of Internet connections from the perspective of campus users, host account, IP Node and SLIP.

Host Account

Much of the discussion of above was probably perceived largely in the context of the typical type a means of accessing the wide area networks, namely a host connection. With this arrangement the user has an ID and account on one of the campus multi-user systems such as the VAX Cluster or the Sun Enterprise server and an allocation of disk space and time (usually unlimited). Users sign on with a terminal or a personal computer emulating one. Once logged into the host, they may use such services as e-mail and transfer files from archive servers via file transfer protocol (FTP) utilities on the system. Personal files, of whatever origin, reside in their directories on the multi-user system. To transfer them to and from a personal computer, one uses an available communication protocol such as KERMIT or Z-Modem.
Ethernet IP Node

This may take many different forms, but it is essentially a direct connection to the Internet. Whereas with a host account, the user accesses the Internet through the host system which resides on the Internet, a computer configured as an ethernet IP Node is itself on the Internet. It can still establish sessions on multi-user hosts through the terminal emulation protocol known as Telnet, but file transfers via FTP can be made directly this machine, rather than being sent to a host system first and then downloaded.

Many different kinds of systems can be so attached including Macintoshes, MS DOS Systems and Unix Workstations. To do so, requires an ethernet adapter and appropriate software. With such, the machine can provide much more extensive network functionality and potentially be much more resource intensive. Unix workstations are especially significant, since many of them are very fast and possess a multi-user operating system. Hence, they can act as a host as well as a personal workstation.

At present the only workstations directly attached to the network are the computers in the Sun workstation lab, Khan which is operated by Marlys Nelson and doubles as the campus mail server, a personal workstation owned by a faculty member and located in his office and some Administrative Data Network Computers which can access the campus backbone through a bridge. This issue will become progressively more significant when the fiber optic backbone and extensions to the campus ethernet network will make it easier to establish direct connections.

SLIP Connections

SLIP (Serial Line Internet Protocol) connections are similar to ethernet nodes, except that the network traffic is routed through slower serial communication lines. This is done, typically, to reduce communication costs and often to permit dial-up access, which avoids purchasing expensive fixed communications lines which may only receive very limited use. Aside from limited speed, SLIP connection can enjoy most of the same functionality as an ethernet node.

Resource Consumption

Resource consumption is a factor in the availability of any service, whether controversial or not, and in the end may prove to be an overriding factor.

For example, if one controversial newsgroup could not be added without bringing in a much larger group of them, thus making a heavy demand on available storage, then resource consumption is an overriding demand. Also if access to graphic images of any kind are desired, massive storage requirements are likely to be generated.

If the items in question were to achieve high popularity, demand could impact availability for research or instruction.
There is also a question of management of resources; it is possible that the programs for accessing the information do not allow system management to selectively specify that newsgroups that individuals can have access to. At present, though, it appears that access to controversial newsgroups can be restricted to the persons requesting them.
Appendix B

Resolutions Approved by the Computer Policy Committee
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
February 21, 1992

Recommendation from the Computer Policy Committee
on Access to Network News Systems

Background

Users of the UWM central computer facility (faculty, staff, students) have access to the network news system, a set of newsgroups concerned with a wide variety of topics. Members of these groups engage in exchanges of information on matters of common interest, such as computing, scientific issues, social and cultural topics, the environment, politics, hobbies, recreational pursuits, and so forth. This system is the product of a loosely organized and largely unregulated network which now includes sites throughout the world. If a site is linked to the network, users can transmit and receive messages to and from other sites. There is no central repository for these articles—they are passed automatically from site to site so that a news article generated at a particular locale will eventually replicate itself to network-connected news systems at distant locations.

Although the news network has become a valuable resource for university communities all over the world, objections are raised from time to time about the content of the messages and articles. These objections range from complaints that some of the material is frivolous and unrelated to serious academic pursuits to complaints that certain sexually-oriented material is obscene or pornographic. Moreover, there have been instances in which administrators at other Universities have responded to such complaints by terminating or restricting access to the news network. Unfortunately, such actions usually have been taken unilaterally, that is, without consultation with appropriate faculty and student groups.

Censorship of the news network is not presently an issue here at UWM nor do we wish to imply that the administration would act in an arbitrary manner should the issue arise. Nevertheless, the Computer Policy Committee believes that it would be useful to have a policy in place which would govern access to and participation in the news network. The four resolutions below are intended to express such a policy.

RESOLUTION #1

Resolved: That full recognition and support be given to the valuable resource provided by the network news system.
Rationale: Electronic transmission of information is playing an increasingly vital role in higher education. This new technology provides a unique vehicle for the participation of the university community in the world-wide exchange of ideas.

RESOLUTION #2

Resolved: That any action by the UWM administration that might restrict access to the news network should be contemplated only after consultation with the Computer Policy Committee and other appropriate faculty bodies.

Rationale: Such consultation is required by the principle of faculty governance at UWM.

RESOLUTION #3

Resolved: That the same standards and principles of intellectual and academic freedom developed for university libraries be applied to material received from the news network.

Rationale: Academic institutions exist for the transmission of knowledge and the pursuit of truth, and it has come to be widely accepted that censorship of library material on partisan or doctrinal grounds is contrary to these goals. The many similarities of the print and electronic media require similar standards concerning access to messages and articles received from the news network.

RESOLUTION #4

Resolved: That the same standards of intellectual and academic freedom developed for faculty and student publication in traditional media be applied to publication in computer media.

Rationale. Messages and articles posted to a newsgroup have many of the features of a publication. They constitute a means of formulating and conveying knowledge, including statements of belief and opinion, to the university community and to the world at large. Communications to the network that originate on this campus should be free of any form of censorship or prior restraint.
April 15, 1993

To: Gary Thibodeau
    Chancellor, UW-RF

From: Sally Standiford
    Chair, Faculty Senate

Re: 1994-95 Academic Year Calendar

At its April 14th meeting, the Faculty Senate approved the 1994-95 Academic Year Calendar (attached).

Although we approved an amended version of the Calendar Committee’s proposed calendar, Senators expressed concerns about the uneven length of semesters, the long winter break, and effects of starting fall semester classes the earliest possible day or waiting until after Labor Day.

Faculty Senate Motion: 92-93/#30.

[Signature]

X Approved

Gary Thibodeau

4/15/93

Date

[Signature]

Not Approved
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registration advising dates</td>
<td>Date classes begin</td>
<td>Examinations and study</td>
<td>Date of commencement</td>
<td>Date semester ends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty contract year ends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interterm (must total 170 days minimum)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interterm (must total 170 days minimum)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holidays and Recesses</td>
<td>Specify exact dates for your campus</td>
<td>Sat./Sun./Holidays/Make-up days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Day</td>
<td>9/5/94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thanksgiving</td>
<td>11/24-25, 1994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other fall break</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christmas break</td>
<td>12/22 - 1/8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter break</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easter</td>
<td>4/14, 15, 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Luther King Holiday</td>
<td>1/16/95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Break</td>
<td>3/11 - 3/19, 1995</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please note: Half days must be reported and so counted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 April 1993

To: Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor  
   University of Wisconsin-River Falls

From: Sally Standiford, Chair  
       Faculty Senate

Re: Unity in the Community

We are pleased to support the efforts of students to improve the campus climate. To that end, the Faculty Senate unanimously approved the attached Student Senate resolution regarding Unity in the Community.

We look forward to your endorsement of our support of this important student initiative.

Motion passed by Faculty Senate: 92-93/#29

Approved

Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor

Not Approved
RESOLUTION

Whereas; The faculty of the University of Wisconsin – River Falls are committed to the educational development and academic success of students, as well as the enhancement of the quality of student life and learning, and

Whereas; It has been the goal of the University of Wisconsin – River Falls to prepare students for lives in a society characterized by racial and ethnic diversity, and

Whereas; The faculty recognize the need for a strong and effective diversity program.

Therefore Be It Resolved; That we, the Faculty Senate of the University of Wisconsin – River Falls supports the efforts of the "Unity in the Community" committee.

The benefits that we want to achieve for this campus through "Unity in the Community" are as follows:

1) Students will be exposed to various aspects of numerous cultures in a non-structured educational setting.
2) By incorporating diversity into an event organized by students we will avoid the perception of "required" learning.
3) This will take the burden of a diversity program "off the back of faculty, staff, and administrators, and place it with interested students.
4) By involving the local community we will further strengthen our ties between the University and the River Falls Community.
5) This will facilitate cooperation between students and faculty to strive to make the University of Wisconsin – River Falls the most sensitive to diversity needs in the UW System.

As a result of the current campus image concerning diversity issues, this committee hopes that you will allow us to improve the campus climate by supporting our efforts.
4 April 1993

To:    Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor
       University of Wisconsin-River Falls

From:  Sally Standiford, Chair
       Faculty Senate

Re:    Compensation for Non-instructional Academic Staff

We think it very important that the university community supports efforts to compensate non-instructional staff the same as faculty and instructional staff. To that end, the Faculty Senate unanimously approved the attached Faculty Salary Committee resolution regarding compensation for non-instructional academic staff.

We hope that you will support our vote of solidarity by approving our action.

Motion passed by Faculty Senate: 92-93/#28

_____ Approved

Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor  4/7/93

_____ Not Approved
Whereas UWS 1.05 states that

By action of the appropriate faculty body and chancellor of an institution, members of the academic staff may be designated as having "faculty status,"

and UW-River Falls Academic Staff were granted "faculty status" by action of the UW-River Falls Faculty Senate and Chancellor in 1975;

Whereas all of UW-River Falls professional staff share the same aims: to provide high-quality education, to advance the frontiers of knowledge, and to serve the citizens of Wisconsin;

Whereas Academic Staff are our professional colleagues and peers, and perform functions at UW-River Falls which are crucial to our joint aims;

Whereas all faculty and academic staff are professionally qualified with appropriate academic degrees and expertise;

Whereas differential treatment of non-instructional academic staff will have a deleterious effect on UW-River Falls professional staff and a negative impact on the services we can provide our students;

Whereas Wisconsin students deserve a strong, unified, professional university; and

Whereas the governor's budget has proposed a one percent salary increase for faculty and instructional academic staff which is not accorded to non-instructional academic staff;

Resolved, that the 1993-95 budget should treat non-instructional academic staff the same as faculty and instructional academic staff; and

Resolved, the legislature should appropriate the additional funds required to include non-instructional academic staff in the one percent increase.
7 June 1993

To: Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor
    University of Wisconsin-River Falls

From: Sally Standiford, Chair
       Faculty Senate

Re: Changes to Personnel Rules to Comply with 1991 Wisconsin Act 118 (Notestein)

The Faculty Senate approved the proposed changes to personnel rules necessary to bring UW-RF into compliance with 1991 Wisconsin Act 118, known as the Notestein Bill. I have attached changes to RF 1 (1.5) and 4 (4.2 and 4.3).

We hope you will approve these changes.

Motion passed by Faculty Senate: 92-93/#27

Approved

Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor  6/16/93

Not Approved

APPROVED BY BOARD OF REGENTS  7/16/93
CHANGES IN PERSONNEL RULES NECESSARY TO BRING UW-RF INTO COMPLIANCE
WITH 1991 WISCONSIN ACT 118 (NOTESTEIN BILL)

RF 1.5 Tenure Appointment
A tenure appointment is an appointment for an unlimited period granted to a ranked faculty member by the Board. Ordinarily, such appointments are made upon the affirmative recommendation of the appropriate academic unit and the Chancellor of the University via the President of the System. If the academic unit denies tenure and a review reveals that the denial was based on impermissible factors, a tenure appointment may be made on the affirmative recommendations of a properly constituted tenure review committee and of the Chancellor.

Granting Tenure

RF 4.2 Procedure
(e) As noted in RF 1.5, a tenure appointment is granted by the Board upon the affirmative recommendation of the appropriate academic unit and the Chancellor or the University via the President of the System, unless a denial of tenure is found to be based on impermissible factors, in which case the provisions of RF 4.3 will apply.

RF 4.3 Procedures for the Review and Rectification of Denial of Tenure on Basis of Impermissible Factors
(a) Recommendations for Tenure shall be based on the criteria established in RF 3.21 and on such extension of those criteria as are enacted by each academic unit and filed with the Vice Chancellor. Tenure shall not be denied on the basis of impermissible factors as defined in RF 6.4 of the Faculty Handbook (Sixteenth Edition). Faculty who appeal their denial of tenure on the basis of impermissible factors may follow the process and procedure of the appeal process described below. No member of the academic unit in which the appeal originated shall serve on any bodies involved in the appeal.

1. The faculty member denied tenure may appeal to the Faculty Hearing, Grievance and Appeals Committee to determine if impermissible factors were used in denying tenure. This committee will review the tenure documents and supporting materials, and hold interviews and hearings as needed to establish the basis on which the decision was made. Academic Staff members of the Hearing, Grievance and Appeals Committee shall not participate in appeals of denial of tenure for impermissible factors.

2. Should the Hearing, Grievance and Appeals Committee find that the decision was not based on impermissible factors, the denial shall stand pending further appeal as delineated in Chapters 6, 9, and 10 of the Faculty Handbook (Sixteenth Edition).

3. Should the Hearing, Grievance and Appeals Committee find that the decision was based on impermissible factors, an Ad Hoc Committee shall be established to conduct an independent review of the grievant's credentials in relation to established criteria (RF 3.21).

4. The Faculty Senate shall be responsible for establishing the Ad Hoc Committee.
   a. The Chair of the Faculty Senate in consultation with the tenured members of the Executive Committee shall draft a list of potential Ad Hoc Committee members to be approved by the entire Faculty Senate. The Faculty Senate Chair shall be responsible for contacting nominees to the Ad Hoc Committee and obtaining their consent to serve.
b. This Ad Hoc Committee shall be composed of five members who teach in the same academic field as the individual under review or in a substantially similar academic field and a non-voting chair selected from the tenured members of the Executive Committee of the River Falls Faculty Senate.

c. Members of the Ad Hoc Committee may be UW-RF faculty or faculty from other campuses, but they must be tenured at an accredited four-year institution of higher learning. In selecting off-campus members of the Ad Hoc Committee, the Faculty Senate shall try to choose faculty from institutions whose philosophy and mission are similar to those on this campus. Members of this Ad Hoc Committee are expected to give a fair and impartial review and to be free of conflicts of interests which might bias them in favor of one of the parties to the appeal.

5. The Ad Hoc Committee will function as follows:
   a. The administration shall provide a recording secretary who, in the event of an open meeting, will prepare a verbatim report;
   b. review documents on which the decision was based including, but not limited to, the grievant’s personnel file, minutes of meetings at which the grievant’s tenure was discussed, the chair’s recommendation regarding tenure, and other supporting documents;
   c. hold a meeting to conduct an independent review of the grievant’s credentials in relation to established criteria (RF 3.21). In accordance with s. 19.85 (1)(b) Wisconsin Statutes and other statutory provisions, appropriate notice shall be given of this meeting and the grievant shall have the option to request that it be open;
   d. after due discussion and deliberation, vote by signed ballot to recommend granting or denying tenure; and
   e. convey to the Chancellor their conclusions providing a report stating the rationale for their decision and indicating any substantive minority views which may have been expressed.

6. The Chancellor shall review the recommendation of the Ad Hoc Committee and make a recommendation following the criteria in RF 3.21 and any such extension of those criteria established by the academic unit and filed with the Vice Chancellor.

7. The following time limits shall govern this procedure:
   a. Within 15 days after being notified in writing of the departmental vote denying tenure, the faculty member must forward an appeal to the Hearing, Grievance and Appeals Committee.
   b. The Hearing, Grievance and Appeals Committee shall operate under the provisions of RF 10 except that in the event impermissible factors are found to operate, the Hearing, Grievance and Appeals Committee chair shall immediately notify the faculty member and the Chair of the Faculty Senate.
   c. Faculty Senate action on establishing the Ad Hoc Committee shall proceed in a timely fashion, but no more than one month shall elapse between notification and the approval of the Ad Hoc Committee.
   d. The Ad Hoc Committee shall have one month in which to conduct its review and to notify the Chancellor of its decision.
   e. The Chancellor will act on the report within two weeks after its receipt and will immediately give written notice of the final decision to all parties involved.
August 11, 1993

TO: Administrative Council

FROM: Gary A. Thibodeau
Chancellor

RE: Faculty Personnel Rules

At its July, 1993 meeting, the Board of Regents approved several changes to the Faculty Personnel Rules. The following were approved:

RF 1.5, RF 4.2, RF 4.3 - Changes to personnel rules necessary to bring UW-River Falls into compliance with 1991 Wisconsin Act 118 (Nottstein Bill). (Faculty Senate Motion 92-93/27 with some editorial changes.)

RF 3.12 - Changes to personnel rule regarding who votes on renewal of probationary faculty appointments. (Faculty Senate Motion 92-93/14 with some editorial changes.)

RF 3.33 - Changes to personnel rule describing the information/data to be considered in renewal of probationary faculty. (Faculty Senate Motion 92-93/15 with some editorial changes.)

Copies of the Board motion as well as the approved changes are attached. Dr. Standiford will be sending these revisions to all faculty for inclusion in the Faculty Handbook.
July 19, 1993

Chancellor Gary A. Thibodeau  
University of Wisconsin-River Falls  
River Falls, WI 54022

Dear Chancellor Thibodeau:

At its meeting on Friday, July 16, 1993, the Board of Regents adopted the following resolution:

That, upon recommendation of the Chancellor of the University of Wisconsin-River Falls and the President of the University of Wisconsin System, revisions to sections RF 1.5 and RF 4.2, creation of section RF 4.3 and revisions to sections RF 3.12 and 3.33 of UW-River Falls Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures be approved.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Judith A. Temby  
Secretary

cc: Senior Vice President Portch

RECEIVED  
JUL 22 1993  
CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE  
UW-RIVER FALLS
CHANGES IN PERSONNEL RULES NECESSARY TO BRING UW-RF INTO COMPLIANCE WITH 1991 WISCONSIN ACT 118 (NOTESTEIN BILL)

RF 1.5 Tenure Appointment
A tenure appointment is an appointment for an unlimited period granted to a ranked faculty member by the Board. Ordinary, such appointments are made upon the affirmative recommendation of the appropriate academic unit and the Chancellor of the University via the President of the System. If the academic unit denies tenure and a review reveals that the denial was based on impermissible factors, a tenure appointment may be made on the affirmative recommendations of a properly constituted tenure review committee and of the Chancellor.

Granting Tenure

RF 4.2 Procedure

(e) As noted in RF 1.5, a tenure appointment is granted by the Board upon the affirmative recommendation of the appropriate academic unit and the Chancellor or the University via the President of the System, unless a denial of tenure is found to be based on impermissible factors, in which case the provisions of RF 4.3 will apply.

RF 4.3 Procedures for the Review and Rectification of Denial of Tenure on Basis of Impermissible Factors

(a) Recommendations for Tenure shall be based on the criteria established in RF 3.21 and on such extension of those criteria as are enacted by each academic unit and filed with the Vice Chancellor. Tenure shall not be denied on the basis of impermissible factors as defined in RF 6.4 of the Faculty Handbook (Sixteenth Edition). Faculty who appeal their denial of tenure on the basis of impermissible factors may follow the process and procedure of the appeal process described below. No member of the academic unit in which the appeal originated shall serve on any bodies involved in the appeal.

(1) The faculty member denied tenure may appeal to the Faculty Hearing, Grievance and Appeals Committee to determine if impermissible factors were used in denying tenure. This committee will review the tenure documents and supporting materials and hold interviews and hearings as needed to establish the basis on which the decision was made. Academic Staff members of the Hearing, Grievance and Appeals Committee shall not participate in appeals of denial of tenure for impermissible factors.

(2) Should the Hearing, Grievance and Appeals Committee find that the decision was not based on impermissible factors, the denial shall stand pending further appeal as delineated in Chapters 6, 9, and 10 of the Faculty Handbook (Sixteenth Edition).

(3) Should the Hearing, Grievance and Appeals Committee find that decision was based on impermissible factors, an Ad Hoc Committee shall be established to conduct an independent review of the grievant's credentials in relation to established criteria (RF 3.21).

(4) The Faculty Senate shall be responsible for establishing the Ad Hoc Committee

a. The Chair of the Faculty Senate in consultation with the tenured members of the Executive Committee shall draft a list of potential Ad Hoc Committee members to be approved by the entire Faculty Senate. The Faculty Senate Chair shall be responsible for contacting nominees to the Ad Hoc Committee and obtaining their consent to serve.
b. This Ad Hoc Committee shall be composed of five members who teach in the same academic field as the individual under review or in a substantially similar academic field and a non-voting chair selected from the tenured members of the Executive Committee of the River Falls Faculty Senate.

c. Members of the Ad Hoc Committee may be UW-RF faculty or faculty from other campuses, but they must be tenured at an accredited four-year institution of higher learning. In selecting off-campus members of the Ad Hoc Committee, the Faculty Senate shall try to choose faculty from institutions whose philosophy and mission are similar to those on this campus. Members of this Ad Hoc Committee are expected to give a fair and impartial review and to be free of conflicts of interests which might bias them in favor of one of the parties to the appeal.

5) The Ad Hoc Committee will function as follows:
   a. The administration shall provide a recording secretary who, in the event of an open meeting, will prepare a verbatim report;
   b. review documents on which the decision was based including, but not limited to, the grievant's personnel file, minutes of meetings at which the grievant's tenure was discussed, the chair's recommendation regarding tenure, and other supporting documents;
   c. hold a meeting to conduct an independent review of the grievant's credentials in relation to established criteria (RF 3.21). In accordance with s. 19.85 (1)(b) Wisconsin Statutes and other statutory provisions appropriate notice shall be given of this meeting and the grievant shall have the option to request that it be open;
   d. after due discussion and deliberation, vote by signed ballot to recommend granting or denying tenure; and
   e. convey to the Chancellor their conclusions providing a report stating the rationale for their decision and indicating any substantive minority views which may have been expressed.

6) The Chancellor shall review the recommendation of the Ad Hoc Committee and make a recommendation following the criteria in RF 3.21 and any such extension of those criteria established by the academic unit and filed with the Vice Chancellor.

7) The following time limits shall govern this procedure:
   a. Within 15 days after being notified in writing of the departmental vote denying tenure, the faculty member must forward an appeal to the Hearing, Grievance and Appeals Committee.
   b. The Hearing, Grievance and Appeals Committee shall operate under the provisions of RF 10 except that in the event impermissible factors are found to operate, the Hearing, Grievance and Appeals Committee chair shall immediately notify the faculty member and the Chair of the Faculty Senate.
   c. Faculty Senate action on establishing the Ad Hoc Committee shall proceed in a timely fashion, but no more than one month shall elapse between notification and the approval of the Ad Hoc Committee.
   d. The Ad Hoc Committee shall have one month in which to conduct its review and to notify the Chancellor of its decision.
   e. The Chancellor will act on the report within two weeks after its receipt and will immediately give written notice of the final decision to all parties involved.
3.12 Only tenured faculty members in the academic unit or its functional equivalent shall be eligible to vote on renewal and nonrenewal of probationary appointments except for those who have received nonrenewal notices or resigned for reasons other than retirement shall not vote on the reappointment question. Otherwise, every faculty member, including the head, having completed four consecutive semesters of service in that academic unit (exclusive of summer sessions) shall be eligible to vote. However, a faculty member shall not be eligible to vote on a decision concerning his/her own appointment and those excluded by other UWS regulations, e.g., s. UWS 8.03(3), the rule governing nepotism.

3.33 Before a vote is taken, the recommendation in question shall be discussed at a meeting of the faculty members eligible to vote thereon. The meeting shall be called under the provisions of s. 19.85 Wisconsin Statutes, the Open Meeting Law, and RF 3.12. The meeting shall be called and conducted by the head chair so as to afford reasonable opportunities to ask questions, to offer additional information, and to discuss the recommendation in question. This discussion shall be based on documents in the probationary faculty member's personnel file. This file should contain and the chair shall introduce for discussion: official recommendations from departmental personnel committees where such exist; and non-binding advisory reports from other sources who are engaged in a working relationship with the faculty under review.
12 March 1993

To: Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor
    University of Wisconsin-River Falls

From: Sally Standiford, Chair
    UW-RF Faculty Senate

Re: Diversity Courses

The Faculty Senate approved the Academic Policy and Program Committee
recommendation to include the following English Department diversity courses in the
General Education Humanities B.3 other category:
    English/Women’s Studies 300/500: Women and Film
    English 206: Ethnic Film and Literature
    English 207: Asian American Literature
    English 235: Autobiography

We hope you will approve these additions to the General Education Humanities offerings.

Motion passed by Faculty Senate: 92-93/#25

☑ Approved

Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor
8/3/93

☐ Not Approved
12 March 1993

To: Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor
University of Wisconsin-River Falls

From: Sally Standiford, Chair
UW-RF Faculty Senate

Re: Pell Grants

The Faculty Senate approved the Legislative Advisory Committee’s resolution regarding Pell Grant Awards:
Be it resolved, the Faculty Senate of the University of Wisconsin-River Falls support the resolution to urge President Clinton and the United States Congress to provide full funding for the Federal Pell Grant Program, and to amend income level and living expense criteria to include all students who were previously eligible.

We hope you will add your endorsement to this resolution.

Motion passed by Faculty Senate: 92-93/#26

☐ Approved
Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor 3/1/93

☐ Not Approved
12 March 1993

To: Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor  
University of Wisconsin-River Falls

From: Sally Standiford, Chair  
UW-RF Faculty Senate

Re: Minority Affairs Advisory Committee

The Faculty Senate approved the Minority Affairs Advisory Committee proposal to change its name to the Multicultural Advisory Committee.

This changes is consistent with the change of name for the Multicultural Services Office (formerly the Minority Services Office) and reflects concern that the term “minority” is now generally unacceptable to most people of color.

We hope that you will approve this action.

Motion passed by Faculty Senate: 92-93/#24

Approved

[Signature]
Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor

Not Approved

[Signature]
Date 8/31/93
12 March 1993

To:    Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor
       University of Wisconsin-River Falls

From: Sally Standiford, Chair
       UW-RF Faculty Senate

Re: Mentoring Task Force

The Faculty Senate passed, and you approved, the formation of a Mentoring Advisory Task Force [FS 92-93/#20]. After your approval, I sent all faculty an invitation to apply for membership. Several faculty expressed concern that we were limiting a mentoring program to women and minority faculty/staff. Although that phrase was used in the original Senate motion, I encouraged the committee to consider a broader context as a mentoring program for UW-RF faculty and staff.

This Faculty Senate motion endorses my letter (attached) sent to committee appointees.

I hope that you too will endorse the spirit of my letter.

Motion passed by Faculty Senate: 92-93/#23

Approved

Date

Not Approved
March 1, 1993

To: Roger Ballou  
    Chris Baum  
    Ila June Brown-Pratt  
    Judith Caflisch  
    Sheue Keenan  
    Mary Lundeberg  
    Jim Madsen  
    Marilyn Naylor  
    Pascal Ngoboka  
    Ken Olson  
    Faye Perkins  
    Sheila Schils  
    Rhonda Scott-Ennis  
    Brenda Shearer  
    Tom Weiss

From: Sally Standiford

Re: Mentoring Advisory Task Force

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee is pleased to appoint each of you to the Mentoring Advisory Task Force and thanks you for volunteering to serve. Mary Lundeberg and Faye Perkins will convene the first meeting of the committee and, in that capacity, will call to set up a meeting during 3/8-2/12. Please read the enclosed grant before that first meeting.

While the original call for membership specified a mentoring program for women and minority faculty/staff, it is our hope that the Mentoring Advisory Task Force will explore the need for and design of a mentoring program for all UW-RF faculty and staff. Considered within this broader context, a carefully designed mentoring program will address the needs of women and minority faculty/staff.

Thank you for your interest in and willingness to address this important issue.
April 8, 1993

TO: Dr. Sally Standiford, Chair
    UW-RF Faculty Senate

FROM: Gary A. Thibodeau
      Chancellor

SUBJECT: Faculty Senate Resolution for 1993-94 Pay Plan (92-93/#22)

REFERENCE: Memo and Attachment Standiford-Thibodeau 3/12/93

I am returning Senate Resolution 92-93/#22 marked "not approved." I do understand the intent of the resolution and Vice Chancellor Taylor has shared with me his observations of the Senate discussion related to this issue.

My action in this matter is predicated on the fact that authority to specify distribution of pay plan resources approved by the legislature rests with the Board of Regents.

A resolution that requests maximum distribution of available dollars as a cost of living increment within parameters established by the Board of Regents for that category might address, in part, the intent of the Senate.

If you have questions, please feel free to contact me.

GAT/sam

attachment
12 March 1993

To: Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor
    University of Wisconsin-River Falls

From: Sally Standiford, Chair
       UW-RF Faculty Senate

Re: Faculty Senate Resolution for 1993-94 Pay Plan

The Faculty Senate passed the following resolution:

   Be it resolved, that a cost of living award shall be granted to all faculty performing
   satisfactorily or better, and

   Be it further resolved, that additional merit categories will be considered only if
   there is sufficient money in the pay package in access of the cost of living.

This resolution appears in keeping with System guidelines that require adjustments in pay
be based on merit since this resolution recommends an award for all faculty with
satisfactory performance. It is not an across-the-board pay increase recommendation.

We hope you will support our recommendation that satisfactory performance should be
recognized, at the very least, with a cost of living adjustment. We feel that anything less
than cost of living, for solid, satisfactory performance is indefensible.

Motion passed by Faculty Senate: 92-93/#22

[Signature]

[Signature]

Approved

Not Approved
12 March 1993

To:    Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor
        University of Wisconsin-River Falls

From:  Sally Standiford, Chair
        UW-RF Faculty Senate

Re:Revisions to *The Guidelines for Sabbatical Leave*

The Faculty Senate approved the Sabbatical Committee’s revision to the Guidelines for Sabbatical Leave as amended. The final version is in accord with System Guidelines including reference to the “privilege [of Sabbatical leave] should be granted to faculty members on the merit of their past academic contributions and the merit of their proposal.”

The complete text is attached.

We hope that you will approve these revised guidelines.

Motion passed by Faculty Senate: 92-93/#21

[Signature]
Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor

[Signature]
Date

[Signature]
Not Approved
GUIDELINES: SABBATICAL LEAVE

I. **Purpose:** The purpose of the sabbatical leave for instructional faculty is to recognize and enhance teaching efforts and/or research through a program of travel, intensive study, or other reallocation of the faculty member's time and professional abilities. The purpose of the faculty Sabbatical Program is to enable recipients to be engaged in intensive study in order to become more effective teachers and scholars and to enhance their services to the university.

II. **Types:** Two types of sabbatical leaves are available to faculty members:
A. A faculty member may take a sabbatical leave for an academic year and receive, from the institutional, financial support at any level up to sixty-five percent of his/her full compensation for that period, in accordance with institutional policies.

B. A faculty member may take a sabbatical leave for one semester of the academic year and receive, from the institution, financial support at any level up to a maximum of his/her full compensation for that period.

III. **Eligibility:** To be eligible, a faculty member must meet the following minimum criteria:
A. Prior to taking the sabbatical, he/she must have completed six or more years of full-time instructional service in the UW System, or its equivalent, and must not have taken a sabbatical within the UW System during the previous six years of full-time service or its equivalent.

B. Leaves if absence, regardless of source of funding (including personal resources), will be excluded in determining a faculty member's years of full-time service.

C. Preference shall be given to those making significant contributions to teaching and who have not had a leave of absence, regardless of source of funding (including personal resources), in the previous four years.

D. *The privilege should be granted to faculty members on the merit of their past academic contributions and the merit of their proposal.*

DE. A sabbatical will not be awarded to:

(a) A faculty member who is not to return to a permanent position in the year following the sabbatical leave.

(b) A faculty member whose plan is to retire within two years.

(c) A faculty member whose plan or proposal might more properly be considered for a retraining or renewal grant.

(d) A faculty member who has previously been awarded the sabbatical but has failed to file the final sabbatical report (See Part V.H.).

IV. **Requirements:** Each applicant shall prepare a proposal describing the sabbatical program in complete, clear, and specific terms, including each of the following items.
A. A cover sheet signed by the Department Chair and the Dean acknowledging their support of the sabbatical proposal and the effects it would have on the department.

B. *An abstract of fifty words or less summarizing the objectives of the proposal.*
The nature and objectives of the proposed sabbatical program, which include a detailed account of proposes sabbatical activities. If the proposal involves interaction with other than a traditional institution, documentation should be provided establishing the credibility of that institution as a proper setting for a sabbatical.

The relationship of the proposed sabbatical program should be related to the faculty applicant's field of expertise. This can be demonstrated through the applicant's vita or any other supporting evidence. The relationship of the proposed Sabbatical Program to the faculty applicant's field of expertise is to be demonstrated, and as appropriate, supported by references to the Vita and other documentation.

The anticipated contribution of the proposed sabbatical program to the enhancement of teaching and/or course and curriculum development at UW-River Falls or the relationship of the sabbatical program to the research interests of the applicant.

The proposed period and/or schedule of sabbatical study.

The reason(s) the proposed program could not be completed as part of the normal faculty assignment for instruction and other professional duties during the academic year.

A copy of the personal vita should be attached to the proposal.

V. Conditions: The following conditions govern the faculty sabbatical program:

A. In the administration of faculty sabbaticals, creditable service for retirement purposes will vary depending on the length of the sabbatical and the level of compensation. A faculty member considering a sabbatical leave request should consult with the institutional fringe benefits coordinator prior to submitting a formal request.

B. A faculty member may receive supplementary grants or other awards while on sabbatical leave, but such compensation, shall not exceed the full compensation normally received from his/her institution for that period.

C. Such additional grants or awards may be received by a faculty member only if the conditions for accepting the additional resources do not interfere with the stated purposes of a faculty member's sabbatical program.

D. A faculty member may seek additional support specifically for travel or unusual living expenses incident to the sabbatical program without restriction by the full compensation maximum (see condition B above).

E. A faculty member may not use the sabbatical leave to accept other paid employment during the period of the leave, unless as stipulated as a condition of the leave. If so stipulated, condition B is operative.

F. A faculty member must specify all grants or other awards applied for or to be received during the leave in his/her application for the sabbatical program.

G. A faculty member must agree to return to UW-River Falls for at least one academic year of service after the termination of the sabbatical or repay any compensation (salary plus the University's share of fringe benefits) received from his/her institution during the sabbatical.
VI. Selection:

A. Call: The Vice Chancellor shall notify the faculty of the availability of sabbatical leave each March and shall call for applications for the leave period beginning 18 months hence.

B. Following this notification, applicants should submit application in accordance with the requirements set forth in Section IV of this document. Proposals are due no later than October 1 of the year preceding the proposed sabbatical period. One copy of the proposal and supporting documents should be submitted to the applicant's Department Chair, one copy to the applicant's academic Dean, and eight (8) copies to the Vice Chancellor's office. A transmittal form must be signed by the appropriate Department Chair and Dean and be submitted with the copies sent to the Vice Chancellor's office. Transmittal forms are available from the Vice Chancellor's office.

C. The Faculty Senate shall appoint an ad hoc committee of six (6) faculty members, appointed for three (3) year terms, to review the sabbatical program and to recommend to the Vice Chancellor recipients for the announced sabbatical period. The Vice Chancellor or representative shall serve as an ex officio voting member of the committee. One faculty member shall be chosen to represent each of the colleges within the University, and three (3) shall be chosen at large. These representatives should be chosen on the basis of their fairness, impartiality, and ability to appreciate the efforts of their colleagues, even though these colleagues may work outside the faculty representative's discipline or college. The Senate shall make every effort to ensure that at least one, and possibly two, of its appointees have been previously awarded a sabbatical.

D. The committee shall be convened by the Vice Chancellor or his/her representative who will hold an election for committee chairperson and secretary.

E. The chairperson will then assume direction of the committee in reviewing reports from the previous year's recipient(s) of sabbatical leave, in considering any timely revisions in the sabbatical program or guidelines, in a preliminary discussion of the proposals, and in arranging a subsequent meeting for the final discussion and ranking of the proposals. Following the initial discussion, the committee may ask the applicant to review or clarify his/her proposal for final consideration. The Vice Chancellor's office will invite the appropriate Department Chair and Dean to comment to the Sabbatical Committee on the applicant's proposal.

F. At its final meeting, the committee shall discuss the proposals and then rank them on a written ballot. The chairperson shall communicate the committee's rankings of the proposals to the Vice Chancellor or representative and may include in his/her report such information as may be helpful to unsuccessful applicant(s) who may wish to apply at a later time.

G. During the first two weeks of November, the Vice Chancellor, in consultation with the Deans and the Chancellor will review the recommendations of the Sabbatical Committee, shall make the final selection, and shall notify the applicant(s) of the status of their application(s). The Vice Chancellor will implement the granting of awards based on the committee's recommendations and within budget limitations. The rationale for any changes from the Sabbatical Committee would be sent to the chair of the committee by the Vice Chancellor.

H. The Chancellor shall communicate his selections, in writing, to System Administration by November 15th for formal announcement at the December meeting of the Board of Regents.
27 January 1993

To: Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor
    University of Wisconsin-River Falls

From: Sally Standiford, Chair
      Faculty Senate

Re: Mentoring Advisory Task Force

The Faculty Senate approved the Affirmative Action Committee proposal to create a Mentoring Advisory Task Force—see attachment #1.

If you approve this motion, we will send out to all faculty and staff an invitation to apply for membership—see attachment #2.

Motion passed by Faculty Senate: 92-93/#20

☑ Approved

Signed

Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor

Date

☐ Not Approved
Mentoring Advisory Task Force

Recommendation. The Faculty Senate Affirmative Action Committee recommends that the Faculty Senate create a Mentoring Advisory Task Force to explore the need for (and, if needed, to create the design of) a mentoring program for women and minority faculty/staff.

Rationale. Retention data included in the UW System report "Retaining and Promoting Women and Minority Faculty Members: Problems and Possibilities" (Swoboda, 1990) emphasized that a supportive environment is critical to retaining women and minority faculty. Our UW-RF institutional data show that both academic staff and faculty women and minorities are not being retained in the same numbers proportionally as are men (Lessard, 1992). Moreover, UW-RF has very few women or minorities in positions of leadership on campus. Furthermore, a group of ad hoc faculty and staff women have been meeting regularly this Fall to discuss the need for programs to improve the campus climate for women and to promote the retention of women faculty/staff. Thus, data suggests that we should explore avenues to retain the women and minorities we have been hiring. Some universities, such as the University of Hawaii, have experienced success with structured, planned mentoring programs for junior faculty women (Wunsch & Johnsrud, 1992).

Charge to the committee. The purpose of this committee would be to conduct a needs assessment of all women and minorities, use the results to structure appropriate program activities, and suggest an appropriate place/person to facilitate these activities and evaluate the program.

Committee composition. Between 1-4 faculty/staff women/minorities from each of the four divisions should be on this committee. The committee should contain both tenured and probationary faculty. This committee should be inclusive, but limited to a workable number of people. Moreover, the committee should tap appropriate expertise on campus. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee will solicit applications from all UW-RF faculty and academic staff and, in consultation with the Chair of the Faculty Senate Affirmative Action Committee and the Chair of the Women's Network II Committee, create the Task Force.

Timeline
We recommend that the committee complete the needs assessment by summer 1993 with the goal of piloting some phases of appropriate activities in Fall 1993-94.
January 26, 1993

TO: All Faculty and Academic Staff

FROM: Sally Standiford, Chair, Faculty Senate
       Mary Lundeberg, Chair, Faculty Senate Affirmative Action Committee

RE: Membership on Mentoring Advisory Task Force

We are soliciting applications for membership on a Mentoring Advisory Task Force. Below is some background information about the task force, including the committee’s charge. If you are interested in being a member of this Task Force, please complete the information at the bottom and return this form to Sally Standiford by **Friday, 2/5**. If you have questions, feel free to contact either one of us. Thanks.

**Information about the Mentoring Advisory Task Force**

The Faculty Senate approved the recommendation of the Faculty Senate Affirmative Action Committee to create a Mentoring Advisory Task Force to explore the need for (and, if needed, to create the design of) a mentoring program for women and minority faculty/staff.

**Rationale.** Retention data included in the UW System report "Retaining and Promoting Women and Minority Faculty Members: Problems and Possibilities" (Swoboda, 1990) emphasized that a supportive environment is critical to retaining women and minority faculty. UW-RF institutional data show that both academic staff and faculty women and minorities are not being retained in the same numbers proportionally as are men (Lessard, 1992). We should explore avenues to retain women and minorities we have been hiring. Some universities, such as the University of Hawaii, have experienced success with structured, planned mentoring programs for junior faculty women (Wunsch & Johnsrud, 1992).

**Charge to the committee.** The purpose of this committee would be to conduct a needs assessment of all women and minorities, use the results to structure appropriate program activities, and suggest an appropriate place/person to facilitate these activities and evaluate the program.

**Committee composition.** Between 1-4 faculty/staff women/minorities from each of the four divisions should be on this committee. The committee should contain both tenured and probationary faculty, be inclusive and tap appropriate expertise on campus.

**Timeline.** We recommend that the committee complete the needs assessment by summer 1993 with the goal of piloting some phases of appropriate activities in Fall 1993-94.

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
If you are interested in serving on this Task Force, complete and mail to Sally Standiford, A12 Ames by Friday, February 5, 1993:

Name ___________________________ Department ___________________________ Phone _____

Comments/special qualifications for serving on this Task Force (optional):
27 January 1993

To: Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor
   University of Wisconsin-River Falls

From: Sally Standiford, Chair
   Faculty Senate

Re: Criminal Justice Minor

The Faculty Senate approved the Academic Program & Policies motion to create a Criminal Justice Minor.

Motion passed by Faculty Senate: 92-93/#19

☐ Approved

☐ Not Approved

[Signature] 1/28/93
Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor  Date
A letter of transmittal must accompany each format of academic program submission with the following form completed as an integral part of that letter.

I. Information

A. Exact Program Designation: Eliminate criminal justice major/create criminal justice minor
B. Department: Sociology & Social Work
C. College: Arts & Sciences
D. Institution: University of Wisconsin-River Falls
E. Degree Title: BS
F. Program Classification: I II. X
G. Funding Source: New GPR Extramural Base Reallocation
   Redeployment NONE NEEDED

II. Unit Approvals

A. Department Head/Functional Equivalent
B. Dean of College
C. Dean of Graduate School
D. Chair, Academic Planning Council or Equivalent
E. Chair, Faculty Senate
F. Vice Chancellor
G. Chancellor

III. System Administration Approvals/Disapprovals

A. Vice President for Academic Affairs
B. President, UW System

IV. Board of Regents Approvals/Disapprovals

A. Chair, Education Committee
B. President, Board of Regents

*Category I: A program with significant implications for System resource requirements, or for interinstitutional planning.
Category II: A program with minimal implications for System resource requirements, or for interinstitutional planning.

**Signature
***Only for Graduate Programs
TO: Sally Standiford, Chair Faculty Senate
FROM: Jim Mulvey, Chair AP & P
DATE: November 24, 1992

At its November 23 meeting AP & P unanimously approved implementation of the Criminal Justice Minor in the sociology department. I am forwarding you the Proposal and the check off sheet.
PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH OR SUBSTANTIALLY MODIFY
A SUBMAJOR OR A CERTIFICATION PROGRAM

I. Exact Description of Request

Eliminate a criminal justice emphasis from the Sociology
major and create a criminal justice minor.

II. Title of Program

Criminal Justice Minor

III. Relationship to Mission of Institution

The University Mission Statement reflects the need to
discover knowledge, disseminate knowledge effectively, meet
the needs of the region, and the need to address a student's
intellectual development, cultural sensitivity and sense of
value and purpose. By creating a criminal justice minor the
department will be better able to do this. Students from a
variety of disciplines with an interest in the criminal
justice field will be able to take a core group of courses
which will enhance their intellectual development and
knowledge base in the area of criminal justice. They will be
able to begin a career in criminal justice with the kind of
cultural sensitivity and sense of value and purpose so
important in this area. Finally, the minor will better enable
the institution to meet regional needs within the criminal
justice work force by enabling more than just sociology majors
to prepare for a career in criminal justice.
IV. List of Courses

**Criminal Justice Minor:** 24 Credits*

**Required Courses**
Soc 218: Deviant Behavior 3
Soc 320: Juvenile Delinquency 3
Soc 322: Criminal Justice & Criminology 3
Soc 430: Contemporary Corrections 3

12 cr.

**Directed Electives**
Select six credits from the following:
Soc 379: Internship in Sociology 6**
Soc/Anth 205: Culture & Personality 3
Soc 445: Power & Inequality 3

6 cr.

Select two of the following:
Soc 208: Sociology of Diversity 3
Psy 325: Abnormal Psychology 3
PolSci 416: Constitutional Law I 3
PolSci 417: Constitutional Law II 3

6 cr.

24 cr.

* Courses taken for a Sociology major may not be counted toward a criminal justice minor.

** Students who take additional internship credits (7-12) may not apply them to the major. They must be applied toward general electives.

Note: None of the above are new courses created for the minor.
V. **Cost Implications**
Since all courses exist and are currently being taught there is no additional cost involved.

VI. **Rationale for establishing a new submajor or certification program or for modifying an existing one**

In the past "Criminal Justice" has been an "emphasis" within the Sociology major. This created two problems for students. First, a student interested in a criminal justice related career but not interested in majoring in Sociology was excluded from academic preparation in criminal justice. Second, the student who decided to major in Sociology with a Criminal Justice Emphasis completed a major with nearly half of their credits being prescribed criminal justice credits. Their preparation in the sociology area (non-criminal justice) of the major was weak. By changing to a minor and dropping the emphasis, both of these problems can be addressed. Students interested in criminal justice can now take the criminal justice core courses as part of a Criminal Justice minor. Students interested in a Sociology major will be much better prepared as sociologists having received a more comprehensive and systematic grounding in the discipline. Students interested in other majors can pursue academic preparation in those majors (psychology, political science, physical education, etc.) and still receive academic preparation in criminal justice through the minor. Thus, by dropping the Criminal Justice Emphasis and creating a Criminal Justice minor, the department believes it can meet the needs
of students from all majors without the need to create a new major in Criminal Justice.
27 January 1993

To: Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor
    University of Wisconsin-River Falls

From: Sally Standiford, Chair
      Faculty Senate

Re: Revision of RF 5: Post Tenure Review

The Faculty Senate approved the Faculty Welfare and Personnel Policies Committee revision of RF 5: Post Tenure Review. (See attached copy.)

The revisions were proposed in response to UWS requirements that each institution develop guidelines for post-tenure review of faculty.

Motion passed by Faculty Senate: 92-93/#18

Approved

Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor

Not Approved

Approved by the Board of Regents October 8, 1993.
October 12, 1993

Chancellor Gary Thibodeau
University of Wisconsin-River Falls
River Falls, WI 54022

Dear Chancellor Thibodeau:

At its meeting on Friday, October 8, 1993, the Board of Regents adopted the following resolution:

That, upon recommendation of the Chancellor of the University of Wisconsin-River Falls and the President of the University of Wisconsin System, the revisions RF 1.1 and UWRP 5, UW-River Falls Faculty Policies and Procedures, be approved.

Sincerely,

Judith A. Temby
Secretary

cc: Senior Vice President Portch
RF 5.1 An annual review of the professional activities of the faculty shall be conducted at least once every five years. The professional activities of each faculty member will be reviewed to inform the faculty member of his/her performance. The review may be conducted simultaneously with merit review or with promotion review.

For the purposes of this review, the criteria used are those found in the Faculty Handbook under RF 3.21c and the appropriate department's statement applying these criteria to the department mission, such statement to be on file in the Vice Chancellor's office shall consist of:

RF 5.2 The review shall be conducted by the head of the academic unit. The academic unit will determine whether a committee of its tenured faculty or the chair will conduct the review with this exception: deans shall review the academic unit heads. In conducting the review, the reviewer(s) shall:

a. review the teaching portfolio and other pertinent data submitted by the faculty member. The faculty member has primary responsibility for assembling the data for review. The faculty member will include an inventory of the data submitted, and the chair will verify the inventory contents. The faculty member is responsible for promptly submitting the information for his/her review. The reviewer(s) will prepare a summary report of their findings data listed under RF 5.1 and include his or her evaluation of the quality of the individual's performance.

b. discuss perceived strengths and weaknesses in with the faculty member's his/her professional performance with him or her in continuing to meet the criteria under RF 3.21c. Following this discussion the reviewer(s) will prepare a final summary of findings and recommendations which will be signed by the chair and any other reviewers, and by the faculty member reviewed to acknowledge that the review was completed.

c. enter into the faculty member's departmental professional file, the documents inventory, the final summary report, and any other pertinent information used in compiling the summary report, along with the summary report, review in the faculty member's departmental professional record. The faculty member reviewed will be given a copy of the final summary report.

If the faculty member's performance is deemed outstanding, a copy of the report shall be entered into the peer merit file as evidence to support a high merit ranking, and the chair shall consider the faculty member in the recommendations to the dean for special merit awards.

If the faculty member's review reveals a need for significant improvement in performance, the chair will report such to the academic dean. The dean and the chair in consultation with the faculty member will recommend a retraining or redevelopment program to the Vice Chancellor who shall assist the dean to find resources to fund such a program. This program may include, but is not limited to, additional coursework, referral to the Employee Assistance Program, participation in professional meetings in the discipline, and/or appointment of a peer mentor.

RF 5.3 The faculty member has the right to may challenge the contents of the periodic review before summary report before the reviewer(s) and/or before the tenured faculty of his/her department. Subsequently, the faculty member may take the matter to the University Faculty Hearing, Grievance, and Appeals Committee.
RF 5.1 An annual review of the professional activities of the faculty shall be conducted at least once every five years the professional activities of tenured faculty will be reviewed to inform the faculty member of his/her performance. The review may be conducted simultaneously with merit review or with promotion review.

The criteria for the review are contained in RF 3.21c as revised in October, 1992, shall consist of:

RF 5.2 The review shall be conducted by the head of the academic unit will determine whether a committee of its tenured faculty or the chair will conduct the review with this exception: deans shall review the academic unit heads. In conducting the review, The reviewer(s) shall:

a. review the teaching portfolio and other pertinent data submitted by the faculty member. The faculty member will include and inventory of the data submitted, and the chair will verify the inventory contents. The faculty member is responsible for promptly submitting the information for his/her review. The reviewer(s) will prepare compile a summary report of their findings data listed under RF 5.1 and include his or her evaluation of the quality of the individual's performance.

b. discuss perceived strengths and weaknesses in with the faculty member's his/her professional performance with him or her in continuing to meet the criteria. Following this discussion the reviewer(s) will prepare a final summary of findings and recommendations which will be signed by the chair and any other reviewers, and by the faculty member reviewed to acknowledge that the review was completed.

c. enter the documents inventory, the final summary report, and any other pertinent information used in compiling the summary report, along with the summary report; review into the faculty member's departmental professional record file. The faculty member reviewed will be given a copy of the final summary report.

If the faculty member's review reveals a need for significant improvement in performance, the chair will report such to the academic dean. The dean and the chair in consultation with the faculty member will recommend a retraining or redevelopment program and shall assist the faculty to find resources to fund such a program. This program may include, but is not limited to, additional coursework, referral to the Employee Assistance Program, participation in professional meetings in the discipline, and/or appointment of a peer mentor.

RF 5.3 A The faculty member has the right to may challenge the contents of the periodic review before summary report before the reviewer(s) and/or before the tenured faculty of his/her department. Subsequently, the faculty member may take the matter to the University Faculty Hearing, Grievance, and Appeals Committee.
25 January 1993

To: Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor
    University of Wisconsin-River Falls

From: Sally Standiford, Chair
       Faculty Senate

Re: Environmental Engineering Technology Option in
    Agriculture Engineering Technology Major

The Faculty Senate approved the Academic Program & Policies motion to add
Environmental Engineering Technology Option to the Agriculture Engineering
Technology Major.

Motion passed by Faculty Senate: 92-93/#17

☐ Approved

Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor 1/25/93

☐ Not Approved
LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

I. Program Information

A. Title of Program: Environmental Engineering Technology Option in the Agricultural Engineering Technology Major

B. Department: Agricultural Engineering Technology

C. College: Agriculture

D. University: UW-River Falls

E. Description of Request: The department of Agricultural Engineering Technology requests permission to add an option in Environmental Engineering Technology to the Agricultural Engineering Technology major.

II. Unit Approvals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Approval</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Department Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. College Curriculum Committee Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Dean of College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Academic Program and Policy Committee Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Faculty Senate Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Vice Chancellor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Chancellor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. System Administration Approval

| A. Vice President for Academic Affairs |                 |
| B. President, UW System              |                 |

IV. Academic Program Guidelines call for information only to Board of Regents
PROPOSAL TO ADD ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY OPTION TO THE AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY MAJOR

1. **Exact Description of Request:** The department of Agricultural Engineering Technology requests permission to add an option in Environmental Engineering Technology to the Agricultural Engineering Technology major. The Environmental Engineering Technology option is proposed to be included in the 1993-95 UW River Falls undergraduate catalog.

2. **Title of Program:** Environmental Engineering Technology option in the Agricultural Engineering Technology major will be listed under the Department of Agricultural Engineering Technology.

3. **Relationship to Mission of the Institution:** The Environmental Engineering Technology option is directly related to the select mission of the University of Wisconsin - River Falls. Statement B of the select mission states "The University offers liberal arts programs and degrees to meet regional needs in the arts, humanities, mathematics, natural and physical sciences, and social and behavioral sciences." Statement D of the select mission states "The University offers programs and degrees in the agricultural sciences, agribusiness, and agricultural teacher education. Graduates from this option will provide the agricultural industry with professionals that can develop and apply technology to protect soil and water resources, and develop and manage food production and processing systems that are environmentally sound and efficient.

4. **Proposed Option:** See attached.

5. **Cost Implications:** The implementation of the Environmental Engineering Technology option will not require addition of new faculty or staff. If this proposal is approved, a portion of the department's capital budget will be used to begin to equip an environmental engineering laboratory.

6. **Rationale for Adding the Environmental Engineering Technology Option:** The enrollment in the University of Wisconsin-River Falls Agricultural Engineering Technology major declined along with enrollment in other agricultural majors at River Falls and across the United States in the mid 1980's. Enrollment in the major has stabilized at about 60 students. The department has the physical facilities and faculty resources to serve additional students. The placement record for graduates from the major indicates that additional graduates can be placed in jobs directly related to Agricultural Engineering Technology. The faculty of the department have a national basis. It was found that UW-River Falls is the only Agricultural Engineering Department supported by a single major. It was also found that the present course offerings in the department and faculty training and professional experience lend themselves to supporting a broader program in Agricultural Engineering Technology.

The Agricultural Engineering Technology major was recently reviewed by the UW-
River Falls Audit and Program Review Committee. The Committee recommended the continuation of the program and suggested that the department study the possibility of a name change and of developing new major tracks. This proposal requests that the department be allowed to develop an option in Environmental Engineering Technology within the Agricultural Engineering Technology major.

The objective of the major: To prepare students to solve problems and manage systems that involve the interaction of mechanical and biological systems will remain unchanged. Graduates will be prepared to be members of the engineering and technical staffs of businesses and government agencies working in Agricultural Production; Food Processing; Soil and Water Resources; Structural Design, Construction and Operation; and Electronics and Electrical Systems. Because of the broad scope of training required for the Agricultural Engineering profession, only slight modification of the existing course offerings will be necessary to support an option in Environmental Engineering Technology.

Engineering professionals with degrees in engineering technology and in environmental engineering are ranked 19th and 20th respectively in Peterson’s 1991 Annual Job Opportunity Survey. Of the 923 responding employers, 19% indicated a need for employees with engineering technology degrees and 17% for employees with environmental engineering degrees. A reader profile survey conducted for Agricultural Engineering indicates that 36% of the readers are employed in jobs related to management of soil and water resources.

Agricultural engineers have traditionally had an important role in solving environmental engineering problems. Agricultural engineers design systems for: pollution control and mitigation from runoff from agricultural land and construction sites, and systems for management and utilization of animal and food processing wastes. They are also involved in designing food production and processing systems with reduced environmental impact. The environmental engineering technology option will extend the use of available faculty resources and courses and provide a specific program for students with an interest in engineering science and environmental issues.

Students with an interest in Environmental Engineering in the present Agricultural Engineering Technology major have been limited in their ability to select courses that provide the required background in life science and chemistry to support courses related to Environmental Engineering Technology. The proposed option reduces the number of required Agricultural Engineering Technology courses to allow students to take these courses. Courses in Applied Hydrology and Water Quality and Resource Economics will be included in the option, also a senior level course in Environmental Engineering Technology will be developed. Dr. Robert Butler will take a lead role in developing and teaching courses for this option. Dr. Butler has had academic and professional experience in environmental engineering.

The Environmental Engineering Technology option will provide students with additional course work in life science, chemistry and resource management along with a foundation in engineering, mathematics, and physical science. Students
selecting this option will be prepared for a career analyzing problems and implementing technology to protect and improve the quality of air, soil and water resources.

The following definitions of the Engineering Enterprise, Engineering and Engineering Technology have been proposed by the Engineering Technology Council of the American Society of Engineering Education. These definitions will be used as guidelines in establishing the emphasis of courses in the Agricultural Engineering Technology major.

**Engineering Enterprise**

The engineering enterprise of the United States includes professional and paraprofessionals in engineering, engineering technology, and related fields. Entry to professional positions in engineering requires at least a baccalaureate degree in engineering, engineering technology, or a related field. Entry to para-professional positions requires a two year associate degree in engineering, engineering technology, or a related field.

**THE WORK AND EDUCATION REQUIRED OF PROFESSIONALS:**

"Engineering" is the profession in which a knowledge of advanced mathematical and natural sciences gained by higher education, experience, and practice is devoted to the creation of new technology for the benefit of humanity. Engineering education for the professional focuses primarily on the conceptual and theoretical aspects of science and engineering aimed at preparing graduates for the practice of engineering closest to the research, development, and conceptual design functions.

"Engineering Technology" is the profession in which a knowledge of the applied mathematical and natural sciences gained by higher education, experience, and practice is devoted to application of engineering principles and the implementation of technological advances for the benefit of humanity. Engineering Technology education for the professional focuses primarily on analyzing, applying, implementing and improving existing technologies and is aimed at preparing graduates for the practice of engineering closest to the product improvement, manufacturing, and engineering operation functions.
PRESENT MAJOR IN AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY
1990-1992 (Semester Credits)

revised 11/7/90

A. GENERAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS.........(41-43 cr. hrs.)

Communications....................(9 cr. hrs.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English 111</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 112</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech 101</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Humanities & Fine Arts............(8-9 cr. hrs.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Select one:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art 100,211,212</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mus 100,200,234,235</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCTX 105,337 or 338</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Select one:
- English 203, 212, 214, 222, 234, 443
- Modern Language-any 2nd semester course or higher
- Ph 151, 222, 223, 224, 230, 235, 240, 245, 265 or
  Senior Inter-disc study

in Humanities (2 cr) 2-3

Social & Behavioral Sciences.....(8-9 cr. hrs.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Select one course from 3 groups:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Resource Mgt 105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Psychology 101,230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. History 102,103,104, 140,145,160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Political Science 113,260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Soc 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Geography 120,140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Senior Inter-Disc study in Social Sc 2 cr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sciences.......................(10-12 cr. hrs.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry 111 &amp; 116</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics 151 (or 161)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Biology 100 or Geology 101 or
  Senior Inter Disc Study In Science | 2-3   |

Mathematics....................(3 cr. hrs.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics 146 or higher algebra-calculus course</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Physical Education...............(2 cr. hrs.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STUDENTS MUST TAKE ONE BUT NO MORE THAN TWO
OF THE 2 CREDIT SENIOR INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDY COURSES.

B. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS IN AG............(15 cr. hrs.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ag Econ 230</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag Eng 150</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag Sci 111</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Sci 161</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soils 210</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. MAJOR CONCENTRATION....................(48 cr. hrs.)

Ag Engineering Technology........(20 cr. hrs.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structures 240</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrnl Combstn Engs 320</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Electrcty 350</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food &amp; Proc Eng 352</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation &amp; Drainage 355</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Machinery 360</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr &amp; Electronics 451</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Engineering..............(11 cr. hrs.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Drawing 121</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveying 235</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials Design 245</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Graphics 265</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Departmental Electives...........(17 cr. hrs.)
(from Ag Eng Tech or Gen Eng)

Must include:
8 cr. in 400 level courses.
7 cr. in 300 level courses.
2 cr. in 200 level courses.

D. OTHER REQUIRED COURSES AND ELECTIVES .......(22-24 cr. hrs.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math 147 or 156 or 166</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics 152,156,157</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Sci 101,105 or 211</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Electives.....................9-13

Total..................128 cr. hrs.
A. GENERAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS ..........(41-43 cr. hrs.)

Communications ..........................(9 cr. hrs.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English 111</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 112</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech 101</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Humanities & Fine Arts ..........(8-9 cr. hrs.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Select one:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 241,242,243</td>
<td>244 or 245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select one:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art 100, 211,212</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mus 100,200,234,235</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCTA 105,337 or 338</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Select one:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English 203,212,214,222,224,227,231,232,233,234,243</td>
<td>Modern Language-any 2nd semester course or higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil 151,221,222,223,224,230,235,240,243,265 or Senior Inter-Disc study in Humanities (2 cr)</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social & Behavioral Sciences ..........(8-9 cr. hrs.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Select one course from 3 groups:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Resource Mgt 105***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Psychology 101,230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. History 102,103,104,140,145,160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Political Science 113,260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Soc 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Geography 120,140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Senior Inter-Disc Study in Social Sci (2 cr.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sciences ..........(10-12 cr. hrs.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry 111 &amp; 116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics 151 (or 161)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology 100*** or Geology 101 or Senior Inter Disc Study in Science</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mathematics ..........(3 cr. hrs.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics 146 or higher Algebra-Calculus course</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Physical Education ..........(2 cr. hrs.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE 108</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two .5 cr activity courses</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STUDENTS MUST TAKE ONE BUT NO MORE THAN TWO OF THE 2 CREDIT SENIOR INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDY COURSES.

C. MAJOR CONCENTRATION ..........(49-52 cr. hrs.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Engineering</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen Eng 121</td>
<td>2 Eng Drawing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen Eng 235</td>
<td>3 Surveying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen Eng 245</td>
<td>3 Materials Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen Eng 265</td>
<td>3 Eng Graphics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen Eng 450*</td>
<td>3 Eng Project Mgmt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agricultural Engineering Technology ..........(18 cr. hrs.)

| Ag Eng Tech 240 | 3 Structures |
| Ag Eng Tech 360* | 4 Mech and Fluid Pwr |
| Ag Eng Tech 350 | 3 Applied Electricity |
| Ag Eng Tech 352 | 3 Food & Proc Eng |
| Ag Eng Tech 355* | 3 Water Resources |
| Ag Eng Tech 451 | 2 Instr & Electronics |

Options in Agricultural Engineering Technology Select one:

1. Agricultural Engineering Technology Option ..........(17 cr. hrs)

| Internal Comb Engrs 320 | 3 |
| Electives Ag Eng Tech or Gen Eng (14 cr. hrs.) |       |
| 5-6 cr. in 400 level courses |       |
| 6-7 cr. in 300 level courses |       |
| 2-3 cr. in 200 level courses |       |

2. Environmental Engineering Technology Option ..........(20 cr. hrs.)

| Chem 230 | 3 Organic Chemistry |
| Biol 324 | 4 Bacteriology |
| Ag Eng Tech 365 | 3 Waste Management |
| Ag Eng Tech 450* | 4 Environmental Eng |
| Select two: | 6 |
| Ag Eng Tech 325 | 3 Alternate Energy |
| Geology 445 | 3 Hydrogeology |
| Ag Econ 450 | 3 Natural Res. Econ. |
| Res Mgmt 360 | 4 App Hydrology & Water Qty |

D. OTHER REQUIRED COURSES AND ELECTIVES ..........(18-23 cr. hrs.)

| Math 147 or 156 or 166 | 3-4 |
| Physics 156 | 1 |
| Physics 152, 157 or Chem 112,117*** | 5 |
| Computer Sci 101,105 or 211 |       |
| Electives | 7-12 |

Total ..........128 cr. hrs.

*NEW COURSES
**REVISED COURSE
***REQUIRED FOR ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING OPTION

E. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS IN AG ............(15 cr. hrs.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ag Econ 230</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag Eng 150</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solls 210</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Sci 111</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Sci 161</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUMMARY OF COURSE CHANGES TO SUPPORT THE REVISED PROGRAM

Revised Courses:

Ag Eng 355  (3 cr) Water Resources Engineering Technology

The irrigation and drainage course will be revised to include design and selection of soil management and water control structures.

Ag Eng 360 Farm Machinery and Power Mechanics (3 cr) and Ag Eng 465 Fluid Power Systems (2 cr) will be combined in a revised Ag Eng 360 Machinery and Fluid Power (4 cr).

The present Ag Eng 360 course includes an introduction to fluid power systems. This portion of the course will be expanded.

New Courses:

Gen Eng 450 (3 cr) Engineering Project Management

The department plans to add this course to the Agricultural Engineering Technology program to introduce students to methods used to evaluate and manage engineering projects. Topics include: Engineering Economy, Operations Research, Estimating, Procurement and Purchasing, and Contracts.

Gen Eng 465 (4 cr) Environmental Engineering

The course will provide a senior level course in Environmental Engineering Technology. Engineering models for the quantitative analysis of treatment systems will be developed. Topics include: Water Treatment Systems, Wastewater Treatment Systems, Air Pollution Control Systems, Indoor Air Quality and Solid Waste Management Systems.
LETTERS OF SUPPORT
November 20, 1992

To Whom It May concern:

RE: Support for Agricultural Engineering Technology Program Revisions

I want to indicate my strong support for the proposal to establish an Environmental Engineering Technology option under our current Agricultural Engineering Technology major.

The Department and College have completed a self-study of academic programs and offerings and have concluded that an environmental engineering technology option is needed in our program. This is based on a thorough review of engineering technology programs on a national basis, an audit of the Agricultural Engineering Technology major, and extensive discussion with faculty in the Department.

An external review team appointed by UW System to examine our self-study of academic programs indicated a review of ag mechanization and engineering technology programs is warranted based on low student numbers and national trends. Further, they recommended the College continue to build its academic credibility in the environmental area by expanding offerings in environmental education and to add faculty strength in environmentally related areas. This proposal is a partial response to the team’s findings and recommendations.

This overall proposal will require the development of two new courses that current faculty have the expertise to develop. This option will result in additional students being served that have an interest in combining engineering technology with agricultural and environmental applications. We project that additional students will be attracted to the program and that excellent employment opportunities will be available to graduates of this program.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Gary E. Rohde, Dean
College of Agriculture
June 16, 1992

TO: Bob Butler  
Ag. Engineering Technology

FROM: Curt Larson  
Chairperson  
Department of Physics

Re: Proposed curricular changes in the department of Ag. Engineering Technology

We discussed your proposal at a departmental meeting. The changes you have proposed seem reasonable when viewed in the context of your curriculum. It would appear that these changes would make your program more appealing to a broader base of students. There is an important question that must be addressed, however. We agree that there would be no additional faculty or staff needed to field the changes; however, if laboratory modernization funds are needed to support this new area, funding may be limited because of the unmet needs of existing programs.

We are concerned that students may be mislead about the nature of a degree in Engineering Technology. To avoid potential confusion, the differences between an Engineering Technology degree and the Engineering degree must be carefully explained to prospective students.
January 14, 1992

TO: Bob Butler, Chair
    Department of Agricultural Engineering Technology

FROM: Michael Keenan, Chair
      Department of Chemistry

RE: Proposed Name Change and New Options in Agriculture Engineering Technology

The name change and options that you propose appear appropriate for your department and should better meet the needs of students interested in engineering.
September 17, 1991

TO: Robert Butler  
Agriculture Engineering Technology

FROM: Robert Baker  
Plant & Earth Sciences Department

SUBJECT: Engineering Technology Proposal

We support your petition to change the name of your major from Agricultural Engineering Technology to Engineering Technology. We would like to suggest, however, that you consider including the following courses in your Environmental Technology Option:

Geology 269 - Environmental Geology  
Geology 445 - Hydrogeology

Approximately 3/4 of the Geology 269 course deals with environmental/geologic hazards including engineering remedies. The hydrogeology class, along with the Resource Management 360 class already on your list, is becoming mandatory for all students seeking employment with environmental consulting firms. Reading lists for these classes are attached. Perhaps it would be possible to give students a choice from among Biology 324, Geology 269, and Geology 445?

Thank you.

cc. G. Rohde

jdd
SUMMARY OF COURSE CHANGES TO SUPPORT THE REVISED PROGRAM

Revised Courses:

Ag Eng 355 (3 cr) Water Resources Engineering Technology

The irrigation and drainage course will be revised to include design and selection of soil management and water control structures.

Ag Eng 360 Farm Machinery and Power Mechanics (3 cr) and Ag Eng 465 Fluid Power Systems (2 cr) will be combined in a revised Ag Eng 360 Machinery and Fluid Power (4 cr).

The present Ag Eng 360 course includes an introduction to fluid power systems. This portion of the course will be expanded.

New Courses:

Gen Eng 450 (3 cr) Engineering Project Management

The department plans to add this course to the Agricultural Engineering Technology program to introduce students to methods used to evaluate and manage engineering projects. Topics include: Engineering Economy, Operations Research, Estimating, Procurement and Purchasing, and Contracts.

Gen Eng 465 (4 cr) Environmental Engineering

The course will provide a senior level course in Environmental Engineering Technology. Engineering models for the quantitative analysis of treatment systems will be developed. Topics include: Water Treatment Systems, Wastewater Treatment Systems, Air Pollution Control Systems, Indoor Air Quality and Solid Waste Management Systems.
25 January 1993

To: Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor
University of Wisconsin-River Falls

From: Sally Standiford, Chair
Faculty Senate

Re: Marketing Communication Major

The Faculty Senate approved the Academic Program & Policies motion to accept the Marketing Communication major.

Motion passed by Faculty Senate: 92-93/#16

☑ Approved

Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor       1/29/93

☐ Not Approved
New Program Planning and Approval

Format A: Authorization

The following form should be completed and accompany a request for Preliminary Entitlement to Plan a Proposal for a New Academic Program (Format A).

Approvals:

Richard Bickham
Chair, Art
Date 10/12/92

Chair, Business Administration
Date 10/12/92

Richard Bickham
Chair, English
Date

Chair, Journalism
Date

Chair, Speech Comm & Theater Arts
Date 10/12/92

Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
Date

Jim Mulvey
Chair, Academic Planning Council
Date 12/8/92

Vice Chancellor
Date

Chancellor
Date
25 January 1993

To:       Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor
          University of Wisconsin-River Falls

From:    Sally Standiford, Chair
          Faculty Senate

Re:    Revision to Faculty Personnel Rule 3.33

The Faculty Senate approved the Faculty Welfare and Personnel Policies Committee proposal to amend Faculty Personnel Rule 3.33. (See attached text.)

This rule change is to carefully describe the information/data to be considered in considering renewal/non-renewal of probationary faculty. Revisions to RF3.33 are designed to permit inclusion of non-binding advisory information from other sources who are not eligible to vote (recent revisions to Faculty Personnel Rules 3.12 (Faculty Senate 92-93/#14) permits only tenured faculty to vote on renewal/non-renewal of probationary faculty).

We hope that you are able to support these changes.

Motion passed by Faculty Senate: 92-93/#15

[Signature]
Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor

[Signature]
Date

[Signature]
Not Approved

APPROVED BY BOARD OF REGENTS 7/16/93
3.33 Before a vote is taken, the recommendation in question shall be discussed at a meeting of the faculty members eligible to vote thereon. The meeting shall be called under the provisions of WS 1985, the Open Meeting Law, and RF 3.12. The meeting shall be called and conducted by the head chair so as to afford reasonable opportunities to ask questions, to offer additional information, and to discuss the recommendation in question. This discussion shall be based on documents in the probationary faculty member’s personnel file. This file should contain and the chair shall introduce for discussion: official recommendations from departmental personnel committees where such exist; and non-binding advisory reports from other sources who are engaged in a working relationship with the faculty under review.
August 11, 1993

TO: Administrative Council
FROM: Gary A. Thibodeau
       Chancellor
RE: Faculty Personnel Rules

At its July, 1993 meeting, the Board of Regents approved several changes to the Faculty Personnel Rules. The following were approved:

RF 1.5, RF 4.2, RF 4.3 - Changes to personnel rules necessary to bring UW-River Falls into compliance with 1991 Wisconsin Act 118 (Notestein Bill). (Faculty Senate Motion 92-93/27 with some editorial changes.)

RF 3.12 - Changes to personnel rule regarding who votes on renewal of probationary faculty appointments. (Faculty Senate Motion 92-93/14 with some editorial changes.)

RF 3.33 - Changes to personnel rule describing the information/data to be considered in renewal of probationary faculty. (Faculty Senate Motion 92-93/15 with some editorial changes.)

Copies of the Board motion as well as the approved changes are attached. Dr. Standiford will be sending these revisions to all faculty for inclusion in the Faculty Handbook.
July 19, 1993

Chancellor Gary A. Thibodeau
University of Wisconsin-River Falls
River Falls, WI  54022

Dear Chancellor Thibodeau:

At its meeting on Friday, July 16, 1993, the Board of Regents adopted the following resolution:

That, upon recommendation of the Chancellor of the University of Wisconsin-River Falls and the President of the University of Wisconsin System, revisions to sections RF 1.5 and RF 4.2, creation of section RF 4.3 and revisions to sections RF 3.12 and 3.33 of UW-River Falls Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures be approved.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Judith A. Temby
Secretary

cc:  Senior Vice President Portch
CHANGES IN PERSONNEL RULES NECESSARY TO BRING UW-RF INTO COMPLIANCE WITH 1991 WISCONSIN ACT 118 (NOTESTEIN BILL)

RF 1.5 Tenure Appointment
A tenure appointment is an appointment for an unlimited period granted to a ranked faculty member by the Board. Ordinarily, such appointments are made upon the affirmative recommendation of the appropriate academic unit and the Chancellor of the University via the President of the System. If the academic unit denies tenure and a review reveals that the denial was based on impermissible factors, a tenure appointment may be made on the affirmative recommendations of a properly constituted tenure review committee and of the Chancellor.

Granting Tenure

RF 4.2 Procedure

(e) As noted in RF 1.5, a tenure appointment is granted by the Board upon the affirmative recommendation of the appropriate academic unit and the Chancellor or the University via the President of the System, unless a denial of tenure is found to be based on impermissible factors, in which case the provisions of RF 4.3 will apply.

RF 4.3 Procedures for the Review and Rectification of Denial of Tenure on Basis of Impermissible Factors

(a) Recommendations for Tenure shall be based on the criteria established in RF 3.21 and on such extension of those criteria as are enacted by each academic unit and filed with the Vice Chancellor. Tenure shall not be denied on the basis of impermissible factors as defined in RF 6.4 of the Faculty Handbook (Sixteenth Edition). Faculty who appeal their denial of tenure on the basis of impermissible factors may follow the process and procedure of the appeal process described below. No member of the academic unit in which the appeal originated shall serve on any bodies involved in the appeal.

1. The faculty member denied tenure may appeal to the Faculty Hearing, Grievance and Appeals Committee to determine if impermissible factors were used in denying tenure.
   This committee will review the tenure documents and supporting materials, and hold interviews and hearings as needed to establish the basis on which the decision was made. Academic Staff members of the Hearing, Grievance and Appeals Committee shall not participate in appeals of denial of tenure for impermissible factors.

2. Should the Hearing, Grievance and Appeals Committee find that the decision was not based on impermissible factors, the denial shall stand pending further appeal as delineated in Chapters 6, 9, and 10 of the Faculty Handbook (Sixteenth Edition).

3. Should the Hearing, Grievance and Appeals Committee find that decision was based on impermissible factors, an Ad Hoc Committee shall be established to conduct an independent review of the grievant's credentials in relation to established criteria (RF 3.21).

4. The Faculty Senate shall be responsible for establishing the Ad Hoc Committee
   a. The Chair of the Faculty Senate in consultation with the tenured members of the Executive Committee shall draft a list of potential Ad Hoc Committee members to be approved by the entire Faculty Senate. The Faculty Senate Chair shall be responsible for contacting nominees to the Ad Hoc Committee and obtaining their consent to serve.
b. This Ad Hoc Committee shall be composed of five members who teach in the same academic field as the individual under review or in a substantially similar academic field and a non-voting chair selected from the tenured members of the Executive Committee of the River Falls Faculty Senate.

c. Members of the Ad Hoc Committee may be UW-RF faculty or faculty from other campuses, but they must be tenured at an accredited four-year institution of higher learning. In selecting off-campus members of the Ad Hoc Committee, the Faculty Senate shall try to choose faculty from institutions whose philosophy and mission are similar to those on this campus. Members of this Ad Hoc Committee are expected to give a fair and impartial review and to be free of conflicts of interests which might bias them in favor of one of the parties to the appeal.

(5) The Ad Hoc Committee will function as follows:

a. The administration shall provide a recording secretary who, in the event of an open meeting, will prepare a verbatim report;

b. review documents on which the decision was based including, but not limited to, the grievant's personnel file, minutes of meetings at which the grievant's tenure was discussed, the chair's recommendation regarding tenure, and other supporting documents;

c. hold a meeting to conduct an independent review of the grievant's credentials in relation to established criteria (RF 3.21). In accordance with s. 19.85 (1)(b) Wisconsin Statutes and other statutory provisions appropriate notice shall be given of this meeting and the grievant shall have the option to request that it be open;

d. after due discussion and deliberation, vote by signed ballot to recommend granting or denying tenure; and

e. convey to the Chancellor their conclusions providing a report stating the rationale for their decision and indicating any substantive minority views which may have been expressed.

(6) The Chancellor shall review the recommendation of the Ad Hoc Committee and make a recommendation following the criteria in RF 3.21 and any such extension of those criteria established by the academic unit and filed with the Vice Chancellor.

(7) The following time limits shall govern this procedure:

a. Within 15 days after being notified in writing of the departmental vote denying tenure, the faculty member must forward an appeal to the Hearing, Grievance and Appeals Committee.

b. The Hearing, Grievance and Appeals Committee shall operate under the provisions of RF 10 except that in the event impermissible factors are found to operate, the Hearing, Grievance and Appeals Committee chair shall immediately notify the faculty member and the Chair of the Faculty Senate.

c. Faculty Senate action on establishing the Ad Hoc Committee shall proceed in a timely fashion, but no more than one month shall elapse between notification and the approval of the Ad Hoc Committee.

d. The Ad Hoc Committee shall have one month in which to conduct its review and to notify the Chancellor of its decision.

e. The Chancellor will act on the report within two weeks after its receipt and will immediately give written notice of the final decision to all parties involved.
3.12 Only tenured faculty members in the academic unit or its functional equivalent shall be eligible to vote on renewal and nonrenewal of probationary appointments except for those who have received non-renewal notices or resigned for reasons other than retirement shall not vote on the reappointment question. Otherwise, every faculty member, including the head, having completed four consecutive semesters of service in that academic unit (exclusive of summer sessions) shall be eligible to vote. However, a faculty member shall not be eligible to vote on a decision concerning his/her own appointment, and those excluded by other UWS regulations, e.g., s. UWS 8.03(3), the rule governing nepotism.

3.33 Before a vote is taken, the recommendation in question shall be discussed at a meeting of the faculty members eligible to vote thereon. The meeting shall be called under the provisions of s. 19.85 Wisconsin Statutes, the Open Meeting Law, and RF 3.12. The meeting shall be called and conducted by the head chair so as to afford reasonable opportunities to ask questions, to offer additional information, and to discuss the recommendation in question. This discussion shall be based on documents in the probationary faculty member’s personnel file. This file should contain and the chair shall introduce for discussion: official recommendations from departmental personnel committees where such exist; and non-binding advisory reports from other sources who are engaged in a working relationship with the faculty under review.
25 January 1993

To: Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor
    University of Wisconsin-River Falls

From: Sally Standiford, Chair
      Faculty Senate

Re: Revision to Faculty Personnel Rule 3.12

The Faculty Senate approved the Faculty Welfare and Personnel Policies Committee proposal to amend Faculty Personnel Rule 3.12.

3.12 Only tenured faculty members in the academic unit or its functional equivalent shall be eligible to vote on renewal and nonrenewal of probationary appointments except for: Those who have received nonrenewal notices or resigned for reasons other than retirement shall not vote on the reappointment question. Otherwise, every faculty member, including the head, having completed four consecutive semesters of service in that academic unit (exclusive of summer sessions) shall be eligible to vote. However, a faculty member shall not be eligible to vote on a decision concerning his/her own appointment and those excluded by other UWS regulations such as the nepotism rule.

We hope that you are able to support these changes.

Motion passed by Faculty Senate: 92-93/#14

Approved

Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor

Not Approved

APPROVED BY BOARD OF REGENTS 7/16/93
TO:        Administrative Council
FROM:     Gary A. Thibodeau
          Chancellor
RE:       Faculty Personnel Rules

August 11, 1993

At its July, 1993 meeting, the Board of Regents approved several changes to the Faculty Personnel Rules. The following were approved:

RF 1.5, RF 4.2, RF 4.3 - Changes to personnel rules necessary to bring UW-River Falls into compliance with 1991 Wisconsin Act 118 (Notestein Bill). (Faculty Senate Motion 92-93/27 with some editorial changes.)

RF 3.12 - Changes to personnel rule regarding who votes on renewal of probationary faculty appointments. (Faculty Senate Motion 92-93/14 with some editorial changes.)

RF 3.33 - Changes to personnel rule describing the information/data to be considered in renewal of probationary faculty. (Faculty Senate Motion 92-93/15 with some editorial changes.)

Copies of the Board motion as well as the approved changes are attached. Dr. Standiford will be sending these revisions to all faculty for inclusion in the Faculty Handbook.
July 19, 1993

Chancellor Gary A. Thibodeau
University of Wisconsin-River Falls
River Falls, WI 54022

Dear Chancellor Thibodeau:

At its meeting on Friday, July 16, 1993, the Board of Regents adopted the following resolution:

That, upon recommendation of the Chancellor of the University of Wisconsin-River Falls and the President of the University of Wisconsin System, revisions to sections RF 1.5 and RF 4.2, creation of section RF 4.3 and revisions to sections RF 3.12 and 3.33 of UW-River Falls Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures be approved.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Judith A. Temby
Secretary

cc: Senior Vice President Portch

RECEIVED
JUL 22 1993
CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE
UW-RIVER FALLS
CHANGES IN PERSONNEL RULES NECESSARY TO BRING UW-RF INTO COMPLIANCE WITH 1991 WISCONSIN ACT 118 (NOTESTEIN BILL)

RF 1.5 Tenure Appointment
A tenure appointment is an appointment for an unlimited period granted to a ranked faculty member by the Board. Ordinarily, such appointments are made upon the affirmative recommendation of the appropriate academic unit and the Chancellor of the University via the President of the System. If the academic unit denies tenure and a review reveals that the denial was based on impermissible factors, a tenure appointment may be made on the affirmative recommendations of a properly constituted tenure review committee and of the Chancellor.

Granting Tenure

RF 4.2 Procedure
(e) As noted in RF 1.5, a tenure appointment is granted by the Board upon the affirmative recommendation of the appropriate academic unit and the Chancellor or the University via the President of the System, unless a denial of tenure is found to be based on impermissible factors, in which case the provisions of RF 4.3 will apply.

RF 4.3 Procedures for the Review and Rectification of Denial of Tenure on Basis of Impermissible Factors
(a) Recommendations for Tenure shall be based on the criteria established in RF 3.21 and on such extension of those criteria as are enacted by each academic unit and filed with the Vice Chancellor. Tenure shall not be denied on the basis of impermissible factors as defined in RF 6.4 of the Faculty Handbook (Sixteenth Edition). Faculty who appeal their denial of tenure on the basis of impermissible factors may follow the process and procedure of the appeal process described below. No member of the academic unit in which the appeal originated shall serve on any bodies involved in the appeal.

1. The faculty member denied tenure may appeal to the Faculty Hearing, Grievance and Appeals Committee to determine if impermissible factors were used in denying tenure. This committee will review the tenure documents and supporting materials, and hold interviews and hearings as needed to establish the basis on which the decision was made. Academic Staff members of the Hearing, Grievance and Appeals Committee shall not participate in appeals of denial of tenure for impermissible factors.

2. Should the Hearing, Grievance and Appeals Committee find that the decision was not based on impermissible factors, the denial shall stand pending further appeal as delineated in Chapters 6, 9, and 10 of the Faculty Handbook (Sixteenth Edition).

3. Should the Hearing, Grievance and Appeals Committee find that decision was based on impermissible factors, an Ad Hoc Committee shall be established to conduct an independent review of the grievant's credentials in relation to established criteria (RF 3.21).

4. The Faculty Senate shall be responsible for establishing the Ad Hoc Committee.

a. The Chair of the Faculty Senate in consultation with the tenured members of the Executive Committee shall draft a list of potential Ad Hoc Committee members to be approved by the entire Faculty Senate. The Faculty Senate Chair shall be responsible for contacting nominees to the Ad Hoc Committee and obtaining their consent to serve.
b. This Ad Hoc Committee shall be composed of five members who teach in the same academic field as the individual under review or in a substantially similar academic field and a non-voting chair selected from the tenured members of the Executive Committee of the River Falls Faculty Senate.

c. Members of the Ad Hoc Committee may be UW-RF faculty or faculty from other campuses, but they must be tenured at an accredited four-year institution of higher learning. In selecting off-campus members of the Ad Hoc Committee, the Faculty Senate shall try to choose faculty from institutions whose philosophy and mission are similar to those on this campus. Members of this Ad Hoc Committee are expected to give a fair and impartial review and to be free of conflicts of interests which might bias them in favor of one of the parties to the appeal.

(5) The Ad Hoc Committee will function as follows:

a. The administration shall provide a recording secretary who, in the event of an open meeting, will prepare a verbatim report;

b. review documents on which the decision was based including, but not limited to, the grievant's personnel file, minutes of meetings at which the grievant's tenure was discussed, the chair's recommendation regarding tenure, and other supporting documents;

c. hold a meeting to conduct an independent review of the grievant's credentials in relation to established criteria (RF 3.21). In accordance with s. 19.85 (1)(b) Wisconsin Statutes and other statutory provisions appropriate notice shall be given of this meeting and the grievant shall have the option to request that it be open;

d. after due discussion and deliberation, vote by signed ballot to recommend granting or denying tenure; and

e. convey to the Chancellor their conclusions providing a report stating the rationale for their decision and indicating any substantive minority views which may have been expressed.

(6) The Chancellor shall review the recommendation of the Ad Hoc Committee and make a recommendation following the criteria in RF 3.21 and any such extension of those criteria established by the academic unit and filed with the Vice Chancellor.

(7) The following time limits shall govern this procedure:

a. Within 15 days after being notified in writing of the departmental vote denying tenure, the faculty member must forward an appeal to the Hearing, Grievance and Appeals Committee.

b. The Hearing, Grievance and Appeals Committee shall operate under the provisions of RF 10 except that in the event impermissible factors are found to operate, the Hearing, Grievance and Appeals Committee chair shall immediately notify the faculty member and the Chair of the Faculty Senate.

c. Faculty Senate action on establishing the Ad Hoc Committee shall proceed in a timely fashion, but no more than one month shall elapse between notification and the approval of the Ad Hoc Committee.

d. The Ad Hoc Committee shall have one month in which to conduct its review and to notify the Chancellor of its decision.

e. The Chancellor will act on the report within two weeks after its receipt and will immediately give written notice of the final decision to all parties involved.
3.12 Only tenured faculty members in the academic unit or its functional equivalent shall be eligible to vote on renewal and nonrenewal of probationary appointments except for those who have received non-renewal notices or resigned for reasons other than retirement shall not vote on the reappointment question. Otherwise, every faculty member, including the head, having completed four consecutive semesters of service in that academic unit (exclusive of summer sessions) shall be eligible to vote. However, a faculty member shall not be eligible to vote on a decision concerning his/her own appointment; and those excluded by other UWS regulations, e.g., s. UWS 8.03(3), the rule governing nepotism.

3.33 Before a vote is taken, the recommendation in question shall be discussed at a meeting of the faculty members eligible to vote thereon. The meeting shall be called under the provisions of s. 19.85 Wisconsin Statutes, the Open Meeting Law, and RF 3.12. The meeting shall be called and conducted by the head chair so as to afford reasonable opportunities to ask questions, to offer additional information, and to discuss the recommendation in question. This discussion shall be based on documents in the probationary faculty member’s personnel file. This file should contain and the chair shall introduce for discussion: official recommendations from departmental personnel committees where such exist; and non-binding advisory reports from other sources who are engaged in a working relationship with the faculty under review.
Date: 18 December 1992

To: Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor
University of Wisconsin-River Falls

From: Sally Standiford, Chair
Faculty Senate

Re: Proposal to Create Visiting Professor Standing Committee

The Faculty Senate unanimously approved the establishment of the Visiting Professor Committee as a standing committee of the Faculty Senate. Although the duties of the committee have not changed in essence from the time the committee functioned as an Administrative Committee, we have described the process of selecting a Visiting Professor more explicitly.

I have attached the description of the committee reflecting the changes.

Motion passed by Faculty Senate: 92-93/#13

[Signature]

Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor

[Signature]

Date
Administrative Committee

The Visiting Professor Committee is appointed by and is responsible to the Chancellor. It includes representatives from the four divisions for the purpose of administering a grant from the University of Wisconsin-River Falls Foundation. It is the function of the committee:

1. To select the person to be brought to the campus as a Visiting Professor for a minimum of three days.
2. To arrange a schedule designed to give students maximum opportunity for informal conversation and discussion with the Visiting Professor.
3. To schedule public lectures and other events in connection with the Visiting Professor's appearance.

Section X: Visiting Professor Committee

1. Membership: Two faculty from the College of Arts and Sciences, one from the College of Agriculture, one from the College of Education and a designee of the Director of the UWRF Foundation.

2. Term of Office: Four years, with one quarter of the membership being appointed each year.

3. Duties: The duties of this committee are directed toward the administering of a Visiting Professor grant from the University of Wisconsin-River Falls Foundation.

   a. Initially, the committee selects the person to be brought to campus as a Visiting Professor, ideally for a minimum of three days. To begin the selection process, the committee will solicit nominations from all of the academic departments of the University. Departments will submit their nominations with some background information. The committee will attempt to select a candidate who has outstanding academic credentials and whose presentations may have appeal to a reasonable portion of the University community. The committee may request that the sponsoring department make the initial contact with the candidate to obtain a curriculum vitae and to determine the feasibility of the candidate's visit. The committee will then submit a proposal to the UWRF Foundation requesting the funds needed for travel, lodging, meals, honorarium, etc. The committee may modify this procedure as may be appropriate to facilitate the search and to assure fairness of the selection process.

   b. Once the Visiting Professor has been selected, the academic departments most relevant to this person's discipline should take over the arranging of events and schedules for the visit. The Visiting Professor Committee should work with these departments to help to schedule public lectures and other events in connection with the Visiting Professor's appearance. Together the committee and the departments should try to arrange a schedule designed to give students and faculty opportunity for informal conversation and discussion with the Visiting Professor.

   c. The committee should strive to ensure that the discipline areas represented by the Visiting Professor's change from year to year so that the interests of all of the Colleges are fairly represented.
Date: 18 December 1992

To: Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor  
    University of Wisconsin-River Falls

From: Sally Standiford, Chair  
       Faculty Senate

Re: Changes to Instructional Improvement Committee

The Faculty Senate unanimously approved changes to the duties of the Instructional Improvement Committee. The recommendation was to eliminate those duties which duplicated the work the Advising Committee and to respond to Vice Chancellor Taylor's request to advise him about grants dealing with instructional improvement.

I have attached the description of the committee reflecting the changes.

Motion passed by Faculty Senate: 92-93/#12

[Signature] 12/18/92  
Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor  
Date

☑ Approved

[Signature]  
Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor  
Date

☐ Not Approved
Instructional Improvement Committee

1. Membership: Seven faculty, the Vice Chancellor or the Vice Chancellor's designee, the faculty representative to the Undergraduate Teaching Improvement Council, and three students.

2. Term of Office: Three years, with two or three appointed each year in accordance with the number of vacancies occurring; one year for students.

3. Duties:
   a. To initiate and conduct such activities that might be of general value to the faculty in improving their teaching competence.
   b. To evaluate the student academic advising system and to recommend changes which will improve the system's effectiveness. To act as an advisory committee to the Vice Chancellor to aid in evaluation of campus/system funded grants dealing with classroom instruction.
   c. To initiate and conduct activities designed to retain a higher percentage of students enrolling in a degree program.
   d. To suggest and encourage the use of procedures for self-evaluation by faculty.
Date: 18 December 1992

To: Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor
    University of Wisconsin-River Falls

From: Sally Standiford, Chair
    Faculty Senate

Re: Changes to Faculty Hearing, Grievance, and Appeals Committee

The Faculty Senate unanimously approved changes to restrict membership on the Faculty Hearing, Grievance, and Appeals Committee to tenured faculty and one Academic Staff member and to permit the Chair of the Faculty Senate to make temporary assignments to the committee in the event a sitting member perceives a possible conflict of interest.

The nature of the committee work has the potential of putting non-tenured faculty member in a difficult situation. Since restricting membership to tenured faculty may make it difficult to represent all faculty ranks, this change would simply encourage broad representation rather than require it.

I have attached the description of the committee reflecting the changes.

Motion passed by Faculty Senate: 92-93/#11

X Approved

Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor

Date

Not Approved
Faculty Hearing, Grievance, and Appeals Committee

1. Membership: Nine faculty with at least one each from the Academic Staff and/or rank of Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor.
   a. Eight tenured faculty with each of the three colleges represented and with as many ranks as possible represented and one Academic Staff member. The Affirmative Action Officer is an ex-officio, non-voting member.
   b. If members of the Committee perceive a possible conflict of interest regarding a particular hearing or appeal, the Chair of the committee reserves the right to request the Chair of the Faculty Senate to appoint substitute members to serve on the committee. These substitute members will be selected from those who have served previously as members of the Faculty Hearing, Grievance, and Appeals Committee.

2. Term of Office: Three years, with one-third appointed each year.

3. Duties: To function as a hearing body to review appeals and grievances. Appeals and grievances are defined as:
   a. Those allegations made by a faculty member(s) charging deprivation or invasion of academic freedom and/or a denial of equitable treatment in matters covered by the policies adopted by the faculty and administration relating to:
      (1) Appointments, promotions, tenure and salary.
      (2) Teaching loads and duties, i.e. working conditions generally.
      (3) Retention/non-retention of probationary faculty.
   b. Claims of violation of those standards and their application given in Wisconsin Statutes, Administrative Code, Personnel Guidelines, and other Board of Regents Rules and Regulations other than cases which fall within the province of the Termination Committee.

4. The findings of fact and conclusions and/or recommendations of the committee shall not be regarded as preventing grievants from further appeal to such professional associations as the grievants may call upon.

5. To sit as a judiciary body to hear appeals of individual faculty members concerning decisions or actions in the foregoing areas. The committee will investigate the appeal and make recommendations to the Senate and parties concerned.

6. Procedure for Appeals: In the event that the previous procedure has not resolved the grievance, grievance procedures as stated in Chapters 6, 9, and 10 of the Faculty Personnel Rules will be followed or as designated by the Board of Regents Policy, Personnel Guidelines, or State Statute.

7. The confidentiality of the proceedings of this committee shall be maintained. The minutes of the committee will be forwarded to the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate, the Chancellor, and to the grievant. The findings and recommendations of each grievance case shall be forwarded to the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate, the Chancellor, and the grievant.
Dr. Stephen Portch  
Senior Vice President for  
    Academic Affairs  
University of Wisconsin System  
1624 Van Hise Hall  
1220 Linden Drive  
Madison, WI 53706  

Dear Dr. Portch:  

Attached are changes to UW-River Falls' Faculty Personnel Rules. I am requesting that the proposed changes be referred to the Board of Regents for action.  

If you have questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me.  

Sincerely,  

[Signature]  

Gary A. Thibodeau  
Chancellor  

enclosure
Date: October 29, 1992

To: Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor
    University of Wisconsin-River Falls

From: Sally Standiford, Chair
       Faculty Senate

Re: Changes to RF 3.2

At its meeting on October 28, 1992, the Faculty Senate unanimously approved the Faculty Welfare, Personnel and Policy Committee recommendations for changes (with amendments) to Faculty Personnel Rules-Chapter 3: Renewal and Nonrenewal of Probationary Appointments. I have attached the copy of the motion reflecting changes to the previous version. I hope you are able to support our action by your approval.

Motion passed by Faculty Senate: 92-93/10

☑ Approved

Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor

Not Approved

Date
RF 3.2 Criteria for Recommendation.

3.21 The recommendation shall be based on the following criteria factors:

a. Effectiveness in teaching and/or professional area. The personnel needs as determined by the specific mission and programs of the academic unit within the overall mission and programs as defined and set forth for the respective College and University of Wisconsin-River Falls.

b. Professional preparation and experience.

c. Ability and willingness to maintain working relations with colleagues as are essential to effective accomplishments of the mission of the academic unit, the college, and the University. Performance criteria.

c.1 Effectiveness in teaching. This section is to apply to any academic unit (department) faculty member whose appointment normally involves a teaching component. Each academic unit (department) will draw up in writing a set of Teaching Expectations to be used as a guideline for all of its teaching staff carrying out their teaching duties. Teaching expectations shall include, but not be limited to, classroom teaching and its ancillary activities such as advising, testing, professional consultations with students on class progress and with colleagues on curriculum revision and development, class preparation, and syllabus writing. These activities and their relative importance are to be clearly defined in departmental guidelines. The teaching effectiveness criteria for faculty also shall be used to evaluate academic staff with teaching appointments.

The most important performance criterion will be effectiveness in teaching. Effectiveness in teaching will be assessed through peer evaluations, student evaluations, the faculty member’s teaching portfolio, and any other appropriate means of evaluation as approved by a majority of the academic unit’s (department’s) teaching staff.

c.2 Professional Involvement and Accomplishments. Professional involvement and accomplishments in scholarly activities such as, but not limited to, research writing, and artistic production or performance.

c.3 Contributions. Significant contributions at the departmental, college, university, community, state, national, or international level in categories other than those identified above. Such activities include, but are not limited to, advising campus organizations; participating in faculty governance; sharing professional expertise with government, business or private non-profit entities; participation in non-academic local, regional, national and international organizations whose aims parallel the professional interests of the faculty.
d. Professional distinction in research, writing, artistic production or performance.

e. The personal needs, programs, policies, and priorities of the academic unit, college and university, and the qualifications of other individuals to satisfy them.

f. Contributions to the university, the community, the state and the nation in categories other than those identified above.

g. Cumulative peer and student evaluations.

3.22 A supportable, severe deficiency in any or all of the above criteria, c.1-c.3, is a reasonable cause for nonrenewal.

3.22 3.23 Each academic unit (department) will develop a written set of criteria and will determine the relative importance of these criteria for determining renewal using the basic core of the above criteria in RF 3.21 as a model and have it approved with the approval of by the respective College Dean, the Vice-Chancellor, and the Chancellor, shall determine the proportionate weight to attach to the above criteria in the light of its role within the University mission. These criteria are to be provided in writing to and discussed with new faculty members by each academic unit chair.

3.23 3.24 The head of the academic unit concerned shall maintain the professional record indicating the performance of each probationary faculty member with respect to the criteria set forth in Sections 3.21. Such records shall be limited to official university documents relevant to reaching an evaluation.

Original text which remains unchanged is written in plain Times font (12 point).

Original text to be deleted is written with a strikethru.

New text is underlined.
Date: October 29, 1992

To: Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor
    University of Wisconsin-River Falls

From: Sally Standiford, Chair
    Faculty Senate

Re: Changes to RF 3.2

At its meeting on October 28, 1992, the Faculty Senate unanimously approved the Faculty Welfare, Personnel and Policy Committee recommendations for changes (with amendments) to Faculty Personnel Rules-Chapter 3: Renewal and Nonrenewal of Probationary Appointments. I have attached the copy of the motion reflecting changes to the previous version. I hope you are able to support our action by your approval.

Motion passed by Faculty Senate: 92-93/10

☑ Approved

Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor

Not Approved

Date

APPROVED BY BOARD OF REGENTS - December 11, 1992
Faculty Personnel Rules–Chapter 3
Renewal and Nonrenewal of Probationary Appointments

RF 3.2 Criteria for Recommendation.

3.21 The recommendation shall be based on the following criteria factors:

a. Effectiveness in teaching and/or professional area. The personnel needs as
determined by the specific mission and programs of the academic unit within the
overall mission and programs as defined and set forth for the respective College
and University of Wisconsin-River Falls.

b. Professional preparation and experience.

c. Ability and willingness to maintain working relations with colleagues as are
essential to effective accomplishments of the mission of the academic unit, the
college, and the University. Performance criteria.

c.1 Effectiveness in teaching. This section is to apply to any academic unit
(department) faculty member whose appointment normally involves a
teaching component. Each academic unit (department) will draw up in
writing a set of Teaching Expectations to be used as a guideline for all
of its teaching staff carrying out their teaching duties. Teaching
expectations shall include, but not be limited to, classroom teaching and its
ancillary activities such as advising, testing, professional consultations with
students on class progress and with colleagues on curriculum revision and
development, class preparation, and syllabus writing. These activities and
their relative importance are to be clearly defined in departmental guidelines.
The teaching effectiveness criteria for faculty also shall be used to evaluate
academic staff with teaching appointments.

The most important performance criterion will be effectiveness in teaching.
Effectiveness in teaching will be assessed through peer evaluations, student
evaluations, the faculty member’s teaching portfolio, and any other
appropriate means of evaluation as approved by a majority of the academic
unit’s (department’s) teaching staff.

c.2 Professional Involvement and Accomplishments.
Professional involvement and accomplishments in scholarly activities such
as, but not limited to, research writing, and artistic production or
performance.

c.3 Contributions.
Significant contributions at the departmental, college, university,
community, state, national, or international level in categories other than
those identified above. Such activities include, but are not limited to,
advising campus organizations; participating in faculty governance; sharing
professional expertise with government, business or private non-profit
entities; participation in non-academic local, regional, national and
international organizations whose aims parallel the professional interests of
the faculty.
d. Professional distinction in research, writing, artistic production or performance.

e. The personal needs, programs, policies, and priorities of the academic unit, college and university, and the qualifications of other individuals to satisfy them.

f. Contributions to the university, the community, the state and the nation in categories other than those identified above.

g. Cumulative peer and student evaluations.

3.22 A supportable, severe deficiency in any or all of the above criteria, c.1-c.3, is a reasonable cause for nonrenewal.

3.22 3.23 Each academic unit (department) will develop a written set of criteria and will determine the relative importance of these criteria for determining renewal using the basic core of the above criteria in RF 3.21 as a model and have it approved, with the approval of the respective College Dean, the Vice-Chancellor, and the Chancellor, which shall determine the proportionate weight to attach to the above criteria in the light of its role within the University mission. These criteria are to be provided in writing to and discussed with new faculty members by each academic unit chair.

3.23 3.24 The head of the academic unit concerned shall maintain the professional record indicating the performance of each probationary faculty member with respect to the criteria set forth in Sections 3.21. Such records shall be limited to official university documents relevant to reaching an evaluation.

Original text which remains unchanged is written in plain Times font (12 point).

Original text to be deleted is written with a strikethru.

New text is underlined.
November 4, 1992

To: Faculty and Academic Staff

From: Sally Standiford

Re: Faculty Senate Resolution [92-93/8]

I sent you the original version of a resolution rather than the amended version passed by the Faculty Senate. The correct text appears below. I apologize for the error.

FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTION

WHEREAS the Board of Regents, at their September 1992 meeting, voted to repeal UWS 17.06(2), the portion of the UWS Student Code dealing with "hate speech" because of questions about the constitutionality of the rule;

BE IT RESOLVED that we, the faculty of the University of Wisconsin-River Falls:

1. reaffirm our commitment to civil speech and action on this campus;

2. reaffirm our commitment to freedom of expression, regardless of how disagreeable or unpopular the ideas expressed may be;

3. reaffirm our commitment to and support for educational efforts to make UW-River Falls a diverse and open learning community free of hate, bigotry and prejudice of any kind.
Date: October 26, 1992

To: Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor
    University of Wisconsin-River Falls

From: Sally Standiford, Chair
      Faculty Senate

Re: Campus Climate - UWS 17.06 (2)

In your letter to the faculty regarding the Board of Regents decision to repeal UWS 17.06 (2) you asked for campus community support for and commitment to efforts to make UW-River Falls a diverse and open learning community. As part of our continued commitment to the principles outlined in your letter and to the resolution passed by the 1991-1992 Faculty Senate, I am pleased to report the Faculty Senate unanimously passed the attached resolution.

Senators expressed a concern that nothing would come of this resolution, that is, the Senate would pass it but there would be no visibility. I would like to assure them that the (spirit of the) resolution will be very visible to all members of the community, both literally and figuratively. I welcome the opportunity to discuss specific ideas that would have such a result.

CORRECTION: In my earlier letter to you, I appended the original motion presented to the Faculty Senate. The Senate amended the motion which then passed unanimously. I have attached the correct version and apologize to you and the Senate, which had presented thoughtful rationale for the amendment, for my oversight.

Motion passed by Faculty Senate: 92-93/8

☑ Approved
☐ Not Approved

Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor

Date 11/4/92

Approved Signature

Date

Not Approved Signature
FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTION

WHEREAS the Board of Regents, at their September 1992 meeting, voted to repeal UWS 17.06 (2), the portion of the UWS Student Code dealing with "hate speech" because of questions about the constitutionality of the rule;

BE IT RESOLVED that we, the faculty of the University of Wisconsin-River Falls:

1. reaffirm our commitment to civil speech and action on this campus;

2. reaffirm our commitment to freedom of expression, regardless of how disagreeable or unpopular the ideas expressed may be;

3. reaffirm our commitment to and support for educational efforts to make UW-River Falls a diverse and open learning community free of hate, bigotry and prejudice of any kind.
Date: October 26, 1992

To: Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor  
University of Wisconsin-River Falls

From: Sally Standiford, Chair  
Faculty Senate

Re: Campus Climate - UWS 17.06 (2)

In your letter to the faculty regarding the Board of Regents decision to repeal UWS 17.06 (2) you asked for campus community support for and commitment to efforts to make UW-River Falls a diverse and open learning community. As part of our continued commitment to the principles outlined in your letter and to the resolution passed by the 1991-1992 Faculty Senate, I am pleased to report the Faculty Senate unanimously passed the attached resolution.

Senators expressed a concern that nothing would come of this resolution, that is, the Senate would pass it but there would be no visibility. I would like to assure them that the (spirit of the) resolution will be very visible to all members of the community, both literally and figuratively. I welcome the opportunity to discuss specific ideas that would have such a result.

Motion passed by Faculty Senate: 92-93/8

☑ Approved

___ Not Approved

[Signature]

Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor  
Date 10/27/92
WHEREAS the Board of Regents, at their September 1992 meeting, voted to repeal UWS 17.06 (2), the portion of the UWS Student Code dealing with "hate speech" because of questions about the constitutionality of the rule; and

WHEREAS this decision might be viewed as an acceptance of discriminatory harassment;

BE IT RESOLVED that we, the faculty of the University of Wisconsin-River Falls:

1. reaffirm our commitment to civil speech and action on this campus;

2. reaffirm our commitment to freedom of expression, regardless of how disagreeable or unpopular the ideas expressed may be;

3. reaffirm our commitment to and support for educational efforts to make UW-River Falls a diverse and open learning community free of hate, bigotry and prejudice of any kind.
Date: October 26, 1992

To: Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor
    University of Wisconsin-River Falls

From: Sally Standiford, Chair
       Faculty Senate

Re: Scientific Misconduct Statement

Last spring, the 1992-93 Faculty Senate passed an interim Scientific Misconduct Statement with the understanding that a permanent policy would be considered early in the 1992-93 school year.

On September 30, 1992 the Faculty Senate passed the attached Scientific Misconduct Statement that differs from the interim policy in only one aspect:

    Procedures
    (3) Reporting the Office of Scientific Integrity (OSI) where research is funded by PHS grants.
        (d) If the university is unable to complete the investigation within the 420 60-day period.

Motion passed by Faculty Senate: 92-93/6

☑ Approved

☐ Not Approved

Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor

Date 10/27/92
University of Wisconsin-River Falls

Policies and Procedures on Scientific Misconduct

Recognizing that honesty in the conduct of academic research is fundamental to its integrity and credibility and to the maintenance of public trust in the university, the UW-River Falls adopts these policies and procedures for reviewing and investigating allegations of scientific misconduct.

Faculty and staff are reminded that Chapter UWS 8 of the Wisconsin Administrative Code, the Unclassified Staff Code of Ethics, provides that:

Every member of the faculty and academic staff at the time of appointment makes a personal commitment to professional honesty and integrity that meets the demanding standards of the state and national academic communities.

Students are reminded that Chapter UWS 14, Student Academic Disciplinary Procedures, provide under Statement of Principles:

The board of regents, administrators, faculty, academic staff and students of the university of Wisconsin system believe that academic honesty and integrity are fundamental to the mission of higher education and of the university of Wisconsin system. The university has a responsibility to promote academic honesty and integrity and to develop procedures to deal effectively with instances of academic dishonesty. Students are responsible for the honest completion and representation of their work for the appropriate citation of sources, and for respect of others' academic endeavors. Students who violate these standards must be confronted and must accept the consequences of their actions.

Policy and Definition

For purposes of these policies and procedures, "misconduct in science" or "misconduct" means fabrication, falsification, plagiarism or other practices that seriously deviate from those that are commonly accepted within the scientific community for proposing, conducting, or reporting research. It does not include honest error or honest differences in interpretations or judgements of data.

Misconduct in science is prohibited at UW-River Falls, and may be cause for discipline or dismissal.

Misuse by a researcher of University funds (including grant and contract funding from extramural sponsors) is also cause for discipline or dismissal and may be cause for criminal
have been made shall immediately inform, in writing, the Vice Chancellor.

(b) The Vice Chancellor shall appoint an individual or individuals to conduct a prompt inquiry into the allegation or report of misconduct.

1. The individual or individuals conducting the inquiry shall prepare a written report for the Vice Chancellor describing the evidence reviewed, summarizing relevant interviews and including the conclusions of the inquiry.

2. The inquiry must be completed within 60 calendar days of its initiation unless circumstances clearly warrant a longer period. If the inquiry takes longer than 60 days to complete, the reasons for exceeding the 60-day period shall be documented and included with the record.

3. The individual against whom the allegation was made shall be given a copy of the report of the inquiry by the Vice Chancellor, and shall have an opportunity to respond to the report within 10 days of receipt. Any response must be in writing, and will become a part of the record of the inquiry.

4. To protect the privacy and reputation of all individuals involved, including the individual in good faith reporting possible misconduct and the individual against whom the report is made, information concerning the initial report, the inquiry and any resulting investigation shall be kept confidential and shall be released only to those having a legitimate need to know about the matter.

(c) If the inquiry concludes that the allegation of misconduct is unsubstantiated and an investigation is not warranted, the reasons and supporting documentation for this conclusion shall be reported to the Vice Chancellor, who shall be responsible for reviewing the conclusion of the inquiry. If the Vice Chancellor concurs in the conclusion that an investigation is not warranted, his or her determination, and all other supporting documentation from the inquiry shall be recorded and the record maintained confidentially for a period of three years after the termination of the inquiry. If the inquiry or the Vice Chancellor determines that an investigation is warranted, the procedures in paragraph (2) shall be followed.

(2) Investigation of reported misconduct in science.

(a) If an investigation is determined to be warranted under paragraph (1), the Vice Chancellor shall so inform the Chancellor. The Chancellor shall immediately appoint a committee to conduct the investigation. The committee shall be composed of impartial faculty members possessing appropriate competence and research expertise for the conduct of the investigation, and no faculty member having responsibility for the research under
being investigated. The Chancellor or appropriate administrative officer shall afford the individual under investigation an opportunity to discuss the matter prior to taking action under paragraph (3) of this policy.

(3) Reporting to Office of Scientific Integrity (OSI) where research is funded by PHS grants. Where research is funded by an agency within PHS:

(a) A determination that an investigation should be initiated under paragraph (1)(c) must be reported in writing to the OSI Director on or before the date the investigation begins. The notification should state the name of the individuals against whom the allegations of scientific misconduct have been made, the general nature of the allegations, and the PHS application or grant numbers involved.

(b) During the course of the investigation, the granting agency should be apprised of any significant findings that might affect current or potential funding of the individual under investigation or that might require agency interpretation of funding regulations.

(c) The OSI must be notified at any stage of an inquiry or investigation if the university determines that any of the following conditions exist:

1. There is an immediate health hazard involved;

2. There is an immediate need to protect federal funds or equipment;

3. There is an immediate need to protect the interests of the person making the allegations or of the individual who is the subject of the allegations as well as his or her co-investigators and associates, if any;

4. It is probable that the alleged incident is going to be reported publicly;

5. There is a reasonable indication of possible criminal violation. In that instance, the university must inform OSI within 24 hours of obtaining that information.

(d) If the university is unable to complete the investigation within the 60-day period, as described above, the Vice Chancellor must submit to OSI a written request for an extension and an explanation of the delay, including an interim progress report and an estimated date of completion of the investigation. If the request is granted, the institution must file periodic progress reports as requested by the OSI. If satisfactory progress is not made in the institution’s investigation, the OSI may undertake an investigation of its own.
September 9, 1992

To: Chancellor Thibodeau

From: Sally Standiford

Re: 16th Edition of the Faculty Handbook

At the September 2, 1992 meeting, the Faculty Senate voted unanimously to approve the 16th Edition of the Faculty Handbook [1992-93/5]. If you concur with their approval, we recommend that it be forwarded to the Board of Regents for its consideration as soon as possible.

The handbook represents the best efforts of many members of the University community. Their support was demonstrated by their thoughtful and timely responses to requests for H*B*L*P! I am most appreciative of their cooperation, quick responses, and good humor.

As pleased as I am with this product, I know it won't be long before there are changes. We have begun a number of important Senate initiatives which will result in revisions and updates even this semester.

Thank you for your support.

_________________________________________________


Passed by Faculty Senate on September 2, 1992

[Signature]

Approved

Not Approved

Gary A. Thibodeau, Chancellor

Date
TO: Administrative Council
FROM: Sally Margis
Office of the Chancellor
RE: Faculty Senate Motion 92-93/5

Attached is the Faculty Senate Motion approval sheet which has been signed by the Chancellor for motion 92-93/5, which concerns revisions to the Faculty Handbook, 16th Edition.

It is noted on this approval sheet that the Faculty Handbook is attached. Because of the size of the Handbook, it has not been xeroxed and attached at this time. You will each receive a copy of the Handbook when it is returned from the printers.

Attachment

/sam
Date: October 26, 1992

To: Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor
    University of Wisconsin-River Falls

From: Sally Standiford, Chair
    Faculty Senate

Re: Faculty Senate Committee Assignments

At the September 30, 1992 meeting, I presented the attached Faculty Senate Committee assignments and the updated listing of Faculty Senate as part of the Chair's report. The current listing reflects appointments to fill vacancies and some minor shuffling of assignments to balance representation on certain committees. The original assignments had been approved last May by the 1992-93 Faculty Senate.

Chairs Report-September 30, 1992:

Motion 92/93-1

☑ Approved

Not Approved

Gary Thibodeau, Chancellor
10/6/92
Date