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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>CAS</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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jennifer Willis-Rivera</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)** (Sarah Egerstrom)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sarah Parks (Jr)</td>
<td>David Rainville (Sr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>David Furniss (Sr)**</td>
<td>Terry Ferriss (Sr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Large</td>
<td>Terry Brown* **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Doug Johnson)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Chancellor’s Designee
** Absent
() Substitute

Call to Order: David Rainville called the meeting to order at 3:35 pm

Seating of Substitutes- Doug Johnson for Terry Brown, Sarah Egerstrom for Melissa Wilson

Recognition of Invited Guests:

Seating of Substitutes:

Approval of Minutes of December 10, 2008: Approval of the minutes was moved by John Heppen and seconded by Peter Johansson. The motion passed by a vote of 12 for, 1 opposed, and 3 abstentions.
John Heppen moved to reconsider the minutes and was seconded by Laine Vignona. The motion to reconsider the minutes passed by a vote of 11 for, 4 opposed and three abstentions.

Terry Ferris moved to postpone the minutes and was seconded by Wes Chapin. The motion passed with a vote of 15 for, 2 opposed and three abstentions.

Approval of the minutes of February 4th was moved by John Heppen and seconded by Jennifer Willis-Rivera. The minutes were approved by a vote of 14 for, 0 opposed and 6 abstentions.

**Reports:**
**Chair’s Report:**

On Thursday and Friday, February 5 and 6, 2009 I attended the Board of Regents meeting of the University of Wisconsin System in Madison. I was accompanied by UWRF Student Senate President Cindy Bendix who also attended the meeting.

The format of the meeting was the same as usual with an opening meeting on Thursday morning with the Board breaking into its committees in the afternoon. On Friday, the committees reported to the entire BOR and offered motions on their deliberations.

The main item on Thursday was a presentation/update on the UW-System Growth Agenda for Wisconsin (Advantage Wisconsin). The main action steps of the agenda were presented and progress on them was mentioned. The Action Steps are:

1. Shared Learning Goals; they have been developed by UWS faculty representing each of the UWS institutions; they were endorsed by the BOR in December 2008
2. Create the Student Engagement Portfolio; this has often been called dual transcripts and it is in progress.
3. Accelerate Transformation of Knowledge Capacity into Leading-Edge Jobs and Economic Vitality for Wisconsin; this is to attract research funding and spur technology transfer at UW comprehensive institutions. There was a mention of the Tissue and Cellular Innovation Center at UWRF.
4. Model Inclusive Excellence in our Education and Employment; this builds on Plan 2008 and is in progress.
5. Offer UW New Pathways to Wisconsin's Underserved Adult Population; the goal of this is to increase learning opportunities for working adults. UWS has a grant, making Opportunity Affordable, MOA, which is a work in progress.
6. Build a Wisconsin Know How2Go Network, enlisting college undergraduates, faculty, and staff as mentors to K-12 students; the focus here is to expand existing programs at
UWS institutions and to encourage new programs. UWRF was not mentioned although I believe we essentially have such a program with Minnesota partners.

7. Collaborate with the PK-12 Community to enrich college preparation; this initiative focuses on math preparation.

8. Expand UW-Madison Connections Program; this program allows students who qualify for admission to UW-Madison who cannot get into due to enrollment limitations, to enroll in several UW comprehensives for the first two years and then transfer with all credits to UW-Madison. UWRF is currently one of the partners in this program. It was pointed out; that most students stay at the institutions they begin thus benefiting the comprehensive institutions.

9. Ramp up operational excellence and efficiency to focus more resources on the Growth Agenda for Wisconsin; this primarily focuses initiatives to streamline administrative activities and standardize business practices in the UWS

10. Establish New Wisconsin Idea Public Policy Forums that bring research to bear on Wisconsin's biggest challenges; the purpose of this is to link UW expertise to problems facing the State of Wisconsin. There are three public policy forums planned starting with one in May 2009 at UW-Eau Claire.

11. Increase Private Need-based Financial Aid to Supplement State and Federal Assistance to Students; a large number of money has already been secured from four sources totaling over 220 million dollars.

On Thursday afternoon, I attended the Education Committee after trying to attended Business, Finance, and Audit Committee. The problem with that committee was lack of seating and an inaudible list of speakers. At the Education Committee several items were discussed including the Report by the UWS Nursing Education Task Force, Draft criteria for UW System Comprehensive Institutions proposing to offer professional doctorates, and the Know How2Go network.

On Friday I attended the morning meeting which was later closed to discuss personnel decisions. Reports from all of the committees were heard, starting with a show stopping presentation from UW-Green Bay about there Phuture Phoenix Program which is Know How2Go Network initiative.

There was also a very amusing presentation of scholarships to award winning short film entries by future UW students.

At the main meeting the reports from the committees were presented. The important items included motions approving differential tuition at several campuses and a broad discussion about the cost of textbooks. It was indicated that the UW faculty representatives were working on plan to address this. This was news to me.
Marshall Toman asked that I share the following about the Search and Screen for the new provost:

1. The Provost Committee met yesterday to decide upon a list of candidates to invite to campus for interviews.

2. This list has been approved by HR and by Interim Chancellor Foster in consultation with Chancellor Van Galen.

3. Communication with these candidates is on-going. Scheduling will likely be completed by the end of this week.

4. The on-campus interviews are likely to take place between Feb. 27th and Mar. 4, inclusive.

5. Chancellor Van Galen wishes to meet each candidate personally and spend about two hours with each. These interviews are likely to take place between Feb. 27th and Mar. 3 on campus here.

6. Pictures, summaries, and brief vitae of each candidate will be made available from the UWRF Provost Search page, accessible from the home page, probably by the beginning of next week.

7. Feedback on the candidates from the UWRF community will reach every member of the Provost Search Committee if an email is sent to provostsearch@uwrf.edu

At least, that is the current plan. IT will have to make this possible. The switch (currently that address comes to Marshall Toman and the Provost Search’s program assistant, Jenny Hansen) has been requested for early next week.

8. Yesterday, the Provost Search Committee unanimously supported the candidacy of each of the applicants we are currently seeking to bring to campus as both qualified and a good fit for UWRF.

**Vice Chair’s Report**: Vice Chair Kristen Hendrickson corrected her previous statement concerning new seats in the senate. There will be no new seats this year. Vacancies include College of Business and Education, Education and Professional Studies, Arts and Sciences, the 4th division, two Senior at Large and one Junior at Large.

**Other Reports**:

1. Glenn Potts – Glen attended a system wide meeting about MOA (Making Opportunity Affordable), which essentially is a result of the low % of adults with
post-secondary degrees in Wisconsin in comparison to Minnesota and the United States. This program addresses the need to increase numbers of individuals who have advanced degrees, especially focusing on adults. With the comparatively lower population of potential students in the 18 years and less category, the only way to increase the education “status” of Wisconsin is to target adult learners. The program addressed budgets, preparation of students and other matters.

Unfinished Business

New Business Consent Agenda:

Approval of program changes from AP&P
a. TESOL education – minor content change
b. English Broad Area Education – minor content change
c. English Education – minor content change

Glenn Potts made a motion to move the consent agenda forward and was seconded by Kathleen Hunzer. The consent agenda passed by a vote of 20 for, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

New Business:

1. The first reading from the Diversity Committee changing its name from the Diversity Committee to the Diversity and Inclusivity Committee.

2. A motion from AP&P to approve the Guidelines for Reviewers of Academic Program Self-Studies. The document contains the guidelines that reviewers are to follow when reviewing Academic Programs pursuant to UWRF Faculty Senate Motion 2008-2009/47 which approved the Academic Self-Study Tool.

The document is as follows:

**University of Wisconsin – River Falls**

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

The operating paradigm of the UWRF Strategic Plan requires the institution to assess programs and set budget priorities. A self-study of academic programs is one step in this process and will produce a deeper understanding of the quality of and resources devoted to our undergraduate and graduate programs. To ensure that the thoughtful work of faculty can be translated into strategic choices in meeting the University’s mission and vision, program reviewers must analyze the program self-study documentation and offer recommendations regarding our future program array. Important judgments must be made to guide the allocation of our resources.
Academic Program Self-Study Tool  [Faculty Senate Motion 2008-09/47]

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

--1) Mission and Strategic Plan: How is the program critical to the University’s Mission, Vision, and Values and to the “Living the Promise” Strategic Plan?
--2) External and Internal Demand: What is the job outlook for graduates of this program? How many majors, minors, and transfers are there? What is the contribution to General Education and other university program requirements?
--3) Program Quality, Inputs, and Outcomes: Is the curriculum innovative and forward-focused? What is there evidence of teaching effectiveness? What are the professional, scholarly, and creative activities of the faculty in the program?
--4) Productivity, Costs, and Efficiency: What are the cost efficiencies of this program? What are the SCH, FTE, budget, and space utilized or produced by the program?
--5) Benchmarking with Peers: How does the academic program compare with others at peer institutions?
--6) Other Critical Information: What distinctive characteristics or other information are critical to the evaluation of this program?

Academic Program Ratings

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Rating Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Mission and Strategic Plan</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) External and Internal Demand</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Mission and Strategic Plan</td>
<td>Strong alignment with and support for the UWRF Mission, Vision, and Values, and Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clear alignment with support of the UWRF Mission, Vision, and Values, and Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weak alignment with or support of the UWRF Mission, Vision, and Values, and Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) External and Internal Demand</td>
<td>Strong job market for graduates; high internal demand of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good job market; good internal demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weak or no job market; low internal demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Quality, Inputs, and Outcomes</td>
<td>Curriculum is clearly innovative; teaching is highly effective; faculty are very productive in scholarly and creative activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Productivity, Costs, and Efficiency</td>
<td>High productivity of program (SCH/FTE, etc.); extremely efficient use of resources (budget/SCH, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Benchmarking with Peers</td>
<td>Program compares very favorably with peers in terms of cost and productivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Other Critical Information</td>
<td>Information provided is highly significant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

Final decisions on enhancement or reduction/elimination will need to include considerations of university mission and balance of programs, strategic enrollment planning, budget restrictions and obligations, current students and completion of academic plans, implications for accreditations, and other factors.
Resource reallocation resulting from enhancement or reduction/elimination within specific programs will begin immediately but may require longer term adjustment due to the factors mentioned above.

Discussion: Does this document assume funding is currently equitable? The document isn’t about achieving equitable or appropriate funding, but works toward that goal. What is the criteria for maintenance vs maintenance w/monitoring? No criteria, it is just the wording in the document. Will reviews go back to programs? Yes, after every step. What will come back to Faculty Senate? The final recommendations as stated in the timeline. The decisions will not solely be mathematical as is stated within the description of the guidelines. Decisions made should be transparent and based on data. While the process is difficult, it must be done.

Motion passed with a vote of 15 for, 1 opposed, and 3 abstentions.

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

**Faculty Senate Schedule**

**Fall 2009-2010**

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

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

Wednesday, September 9, 2009 - Apple River Room (333 UC)
Wednesday, September 23, 2009 - Willow River Room (334 UC)
Wednesday, October 7, 2009 - Willow River Room (334 UC)
Wednesday, October 21, 2009 - Willow River Room (334 UC)
Wednesday, November 4, 2009 - Willow River Room (334 UC)
Wednesday, November 18, 2009 - Willow River Room (334 UC)
Wednesday, December 9, 2009 - Willow River Room (334 UC)

**Faculty Senate Schedule**

**Spring 2009-2010**

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

All meetings are in the Willow River Room
Motion to approve by Terry Ferris and seconded by Dennis Cooper. Motion passed 17 for, 1 opposed, 0 abstentions.

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

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

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

Motion to approve by Doug Johnson and seconded by Jennifer Willis-Rivera.

Discussion: Domestic partner benefits are currently in the governor’s proposed budget and include only benefits for health care. The particulars as to who qualifies as a domestic partner are within the text of the document.

Motion passed unanimously.

Miscellaneous New Business:

1. David Rainville gave an informal report on the projected budget with $174,000,000 in cuts for the UW-System, $138 million allocated for financial aid for students with household incomes of $60,000 or less and a 5-6% increase in tuition. At this point in time no one knows how this will directly effect UW-RF.
2. Jordan Harshman from Student Senate informed the Faculty Senate that they will be putting forth a motion in the Student Senate concerning the use of automated clickers for voting. If the Faculty Senate wished to use them as well, a cooperative system may be adopted. However, it was noted that voting in the Faculty Senate must be public. This matter will be discussed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

A motion to adjourn was made by Laine Vignona and seconded by Kathleen Hunzer. **Adjournment at 4:33 p.m.**
I PLEDGE TO

SPEAK UP!

Commit to respond to everyday bias and prejudice. Sign this pledge and place it in your book bag, purse, or desk drawer. Post it on your wall for all to see. Share the pledge with friends and family, classmates, co-workers and others. Make as many photocopies as you need. Post the pledge in public places, encouraging others to join.

because what we say matters.

In pledging to respond to everyday intolerance, I will:

- SPEAK UP whenever I hear or see discrimination;
- QUESTION and identify bias when I see it;
- BE MINDFUL of my own behaviors;
- PROMOTE and appeal to higher principles;
- SET LIMITS on what is said or done around me;
- SEEK HELP and help others to work against prejudiced behavior;
- REMAIN VIGILANT and persistent

Name

Signature

Date

E. Craig Morris
Assistant to the Chancellor for Equity, Compliance, and Affirmative Action
117 North Hall, 410 South Third Street, River Falls, WI 54022-5001
Phone: 715/425-3633 Fax: 715/425-0662 Email: craig.morris@uwrf.edu