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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation</th>
<th>Term Expires 2010</th>
<th>Term Expires 2011</th>
<th>Term Expires 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAFES</td>
<td>Kris Hiney</td>
<td>Laine Vignona</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wes Chapin</td>
<td>Patricia Berg</td>
<td>Peter Johansson**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Karl Peterson</td>
<td>John Heppen</td>
<td>(Robyne Tiedeman)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jennifer Willis-Rivera</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COEPS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hilary Pollack</td>
<td>Michael Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Glenn Potts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Division</td>
<td>Kristie Feist</td>
<td>Valerie Malzacher</td>
<td>Jon Levendoski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kristen Hendrickson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kathleen Hunzer (Jr)</td>
<td>Melissa Wilson (Jr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sarah Parks (Jr)</td>
<td>Dennis Cooper (Sr)</td>
<td>David Rainville (Sr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Large</td>
<td>David Furniss (Sr)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Terry Ferriss (Sr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Terry Brown*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Chancellor’s Designee
** Absent
() Substitute

Call to Order: David Rainville called the meeting to order at 3:34 pm

Seating of Substitutes- Robyne Tiedeman for Peter Johansson.

Recognition of Invited Guests: Rich Wallace

Approval of Minutes: Approval of Minutes November 7, 2008: Approval of the minutes was moved by John Heppen and seconded by Dennis Cooper. There was a request to change “diversity id” to “diversity is” in the Chair’s Report. The minutes were approved as corrected by a vote of 17 for, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention.

Chairs Report
On Thursday, November 6, 2008 I attended a meeting of the Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System in Madison. This meeting was a one day meeting in contrast to the regular two day formats that we regularly see.

The meeting was designed primarily to discuss and investigate some issues which are extremely relevant to the UWS and not designed to be one where any policy decisions would be made. The major topics were: faculty compensation and the challenges of maintaining a strong faculty given the current demographics; and professional doctorates. The meeting concluded with the presentation of outstanding teaching awards.

Most of what was presented to the Board concerning faculty compensation was contained in the report that I sent to all of you electronically. This report was presented to the Board by Al Crist. As you know, there is a substantial difference with salaries of UWS faculty and academic staff as compared to our peer institutions. Interestingly, it was emphasized that while data can be obtained for faculty comparisons, it is more difficult to obtain comparable data for academic staff as they are not classified in a similar manner in other states. It was indicated that a 7.78% per year increase in faculty salaries over the next two years of the biennium is required to bring UWS faculty salaries up to the levels of our peer institutions. It was also noted that this is unlikely given the current economic environment. Since that time, the estimated structural deficit in the state budget has grown from 3 to 5 billion dollars with some estimates projecting as high as an 8 billion dollar deficit over the next two years. A major point made also was that the UWS will face major problems in the near future as the average age of UWS faculty is substantially higher that it was only ten years ago and that a large number of retirements is possible in the near future. Projections do not indicate that it will be possible to replace faculty with qualified individuals at the rate which retirements are projected.

In addition to the presentation by Al Crist, there were report from representatives from the UWS Faculty Representatives and UWS Academic Staff Representatives. In both cases a strong argument was made for rectifying the problems that exist in terms of compensation. I do not believe that there was a single Board member who did not understand and appreciate the nature of the problem after the presentation. I spoke with a student member of the Board afterwards that categorically was in favor of raising tuition to increase revenues saying that you get what you pay for. Regardless of the emotional response, I believe that it would be overly optimistic to expect much. The Board will make it recommendation and vote on the Pay Plan for the next biennium at the next BOR meeting to be held at UW-LaCrosse, December 4-5, 2008. I would like to attend that meeting, but we will be interviewing candidates for Chancellor on those dates.

The other important item of discussion was about the role of the UW comprehensive campuses and professional doctorates. The discussion was favorable to the concept of the comprehensive campuses being allowed to develop programs leading to professional doctorates both with and without collaboration of the two doctoral campuses (Madison and Milwaukee). Such degrees would be in the area of licensure leading to degrees such as Doctor of Nursing. It was noted that there are already three such degrees within the UWS.
Finally, the meeting concluded with the BOR Excellence in Teaching Awards. It was my pleasure to witness the awarding of such an honor to Nate Splett from the College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences. Nate spoke eloquently to his dedication to teaching, basically concluding that it was "all about students." He made me proud to be associated with this institution.

In addition to BOR meetings, I have been engaged with work on the Search and Screen Committee for the New Chancellor. We were "sequestered" last Thursday and Friday when we determined who the five finalists for the position would be. I want to recognize the efforts of Jim Madsen who worked tirelessly on behalf of the committee to ensure that we would be able to present the names to the Special BOR Committee which was convened here on Monday afternoon. The names of the finalists were announced in Madison yesterday, and I sent all of you a copy of the press release. In addition to Jim, I also want to thank the other members of the committee many of which are in this body, but more importantly, I want to thank Kay Corey for her efforts as an administrative support person. We all know who really does the work.

I encourage each of you to attend the open sessions for the candidates while they are on campus and to report your impressions and judgment to members of the search and Screen Committee. The first candidate is William Colclough, and the faculty/academic staff open session is from 3:45 - 5:00 p.m. this Thursday in the Blanche Davis Theater. The Faculty Senate luncheon is in the Apple River Room.

Watch Falcon Daily for information concerning the other candidates.

**Vice Chair’s Report:** none

**Other Reports:**
Rich Wallace – Chair of General Education and University Requirements Committee

Wallace stated he was there to address several points. The committee has approved seven courses within this year in the Global Perspectives designator, two in Multiple Disciplinary and 1 in American Cultural Diversity. At present, they are in the process of reviewing assessment documents for twenty-two courses regarding their five-year renewal cycle. While reports are supposed to be 3-4 pages, some are fairly lengthy (through the addition of numerous appendices). The committee is examining how the course goals match the designator for which they’ve been approved, the assessment tools they are using, a summary and analysis of the data, if any changes have occurred in the course, and if the course meets its criteria and goals. The due date for assessment reports was Nov. 1, and the committee has 21 of 22 assessment reports submitted. They have granted a couple of courses a one-year postponement due to issues related to faculty turnover and other issues.

It was asked if the committee produces paper copies of the sizeable reports that come in. Wallace answered that they do not and that the committee works as electronically as
Unfinished Business:

Faculty Senate Luncheons with Chancellor Finalists: Chair David Rainville handed around a sign-up sheet.

New Business Consent Agenda:

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

The approval of the consent agenda was moved by Sarah Parks and seconded by David Furniss. Rainville noted that the group did give the old and new language to him. The consent agenda was passed by a vote of 22 for, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

New Business:

1. A motion from the Executive Committee to endorse a request from the Faculty Senate of the University of Wisconsin - Oshkosh to ask the Legislative Fiscal Bureau to commission a white paper on the issue of faculty salaries, along the lines of what it did on tuition in January 2007 (Informational Paper #37). This informational paper should compile information and statistic relevant to university funding issues, and specifically faculty salaries.

It has been suggested that this paper present yearly data from 1995-2008 for the following variables:

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

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

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

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

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

A motion to endorse this item was moved by Mike Miller and seconded by Terry Brown.

Discussion: It was asked if UW-Oshkosh is writing to Hintz as constituents. Rainville replied that he believed there needs to be a request to Hintz in order for him to call for a white paper. Kristen Hendrickson said that legislators can request information as well. Further discussion focused primarily on salary issues at UW-RF.

Wes Chapin asked about the $2,000 salary bump that was supposed to be added to full professor’s salaries and how this report may be related. Brown replied that it hasn’t been taken off the table, but may be subject to the report concerning the state’s budget deficit which will be coming out soon.

The motion passed by a vote of 22 for, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

2. A motion from the Advising Committee:

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

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

2. Nomination Procedure
Eligible nominators include all current students and alumni of UWRF.

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

3. Selection Procedure
The Advising Committee will collect the nominations. The committee’s selection will not solely be based on the number of nominations received but will also take into account students’ and alumni comments in order to address disparity in advising loads in different departments.
4. **Recommendation to the Chancellor**
The committee’s annual recommendation to the chancellor will consist of a single academic advisor’s name.

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

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

John Heppen made a motion to move this item forward, and was seconded by Terry Ferriss.

Jennifer Willis-Rivera discussed this item as she is on the committee. The previous selection paper was a couple of paragraphs that were fairly vague. The committee had a hard time getting substantive feedback. Typically they would receive about 30 responses from a possible 3000. They wanted to expand the pool and make it easier for students to respond. The pool will still get a postcard, but the nomination form would be online for everyone. This would improve upon past responses such as “They got me out in four years.”

It was noted that since many students had commented on getting out in four years, that may indicate it’s an important criteria, yet it is not on the new form. Willis-Rivera replied that the group went through a number of advising criteria from campuses all over the country and pulled items forth that agreed with UWRF’s Vision and Values statement. They did not put in the question about finishing a degree in four years because there are some programs where the student couldn’t get out in four years because they switched majors, courses were unavailable, etc. Therefore, it may have nothing to do with the performance of their advisor. However, students could discuss this under the qualitative argument section.

There was some concern raised that the nomination form implied a change in the responsibilities of an academic advisor (ie tracking progress of academic and career goals). Willis-Rivera reminded the Senate that this award was designed to be for a person who goes above and beyond normal advising duties.

Hunzer moved to amend the motion to include the language from the Vision and Values card on the nomination form in statement 6 concerning core values, and was seconded by Kristie Feist. The amendment was approved by a vote of 20 for, 0 opposed, 1 abstention.
The original motion was passed as amended by a vote of 21 for, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

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

Discussion:
It was asked to whom University committees would be responsible to and who would have jurisdiction over them. It is anticipated that subcommittees would be formed when there were issues that required shared governance and that those committees would report to the appropriate group. Issues concerning shared governance would advance to Faculty Senate or the Student Senate.

Terry Ferriss moved to set up a committee to formulate the structure of university committees and was seconded by Terry Brown.

Further discussion (not solely concerning the motion).
All groups are required to report to both the Senate and administration due to shared governance.
Is there a need for University Committees? Would there be co-chairs between Administration and Faculty?
If University committees are not formed, every topic or problem will have three committees (student, administrative, and Faculty Senate) with no connection. Other UW system institutions have hybrid type committees.
Why would these committees not remain solely under shared governance as they are now, and have to report to Faculty Senate and the Chancellor.
Sustainability is currently an ad hoc committee and needs a permanent home. It is not always clear what issues are governance issues.
Forming a committee with administration, faculty and students prevents overlap.
Faculty are allowed to consider anything related to the university as issues of shared governance.
There are historic issues at hand.
If issues involve faculty, it should be a faculty senate committee.
The motion is just a suggestion.
Faculty are generally interested in everything.
We only have a short window of time to figure out where Sustainability belongs.
There is a better use of faculty time that an additional committee without a critical charge.
Jennifer Willis-Rivera moved to make an amendment to the motion to read “move to form a committee to formulate what the structure of a University committee might look like” and was seconded by Jon Levendoski.

Discussion on the amendment to the motion. Senators were concerned about staffing the committee and the timeframe involved with the creation of the committee. Would it have to go back to the Executive Committee to formulate the committee, then return to senate for members.

The motion to amend passed by a vote of 10 for, 3 opposed, 7 abstentions.

Terry Ferriss moved to amend the motion to include who constitutes committee. Ferris made a motion to include the following: “The committee shall be constituted by two individuals recommended by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee which are teaching faculty, and two that are recommended by Provost and Vice Chancellor’s office and two students identified by the executive committee of the Student Senate to serve, plus potentially some Academic Staff.” This motion was seconded by Terry Brown.

Discussion: It was noted by several senators that this is a large item and perhaps should not be decided without further thought.

The amendment failed by a vote of 5 for, 7 opposed, and 5 abstentions.

The original motion as amended passed by a vote of 8 for, 6 opposed, 3 abstentions.

The Executive Committee will take up the composition of the committee and how to proceed.

2) The Executive Committee moves to extend the mandate of the current ad hoc Faculty Senate Committee on Sustainability until the creation of a University Committee which will be responsible for the current charges of ad hoc Faculty Committee on Sustainability.

Glenn Potts made a motion to move this item forwarded and was seconded by Jennifer Willis-Rivera.

John Heppen moved to amend the word “University” to “Faculty Senate” and was seconded by Wes Chapin.

Discussion: one senator said that the Sustainability Working Group was designed to extend over everything. If we pass this amendment, does it exclude it from now being a hybrid committee?

The amendment failed by a vote of 2 for, 11 opposed, and 3 abstentions.

Terry Ferriss moved to amend the motion by striking “University” and change Committee to a lowercase c. The amendment was seconded by Hilary Pollack.
The amendment passed by a vote of 15 for, 1 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

The original motion as amended was passed by a vote of 14 for, 1 opposed, and 1 abstention.

3) University Website: John Heppen questioned that with the new website design departments would still have control over their websites. Rainville said that he believes that Faculty Senate Motion 2006-2007 109 was violated, and he plans to write a letter to university administration. Terry Brown said that she is open to feedback as the email everyone received today indicates. She said she has had several meetings to talk about how this communication went out without her knowledge and how the problem can be fixed. That was not done because administration wanted to be in violation of any motion. Brown apologized for how the communication went out. Rainville said that the executive committee will discuss this with senior leadership.

A motion to adjourn was made by John Heppen and seconded by Hilary Pollack. There was unanimous agreement.

Adjournment at 5:20 p.m.