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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><strong>CAFES</strong></td>
<td>Kris Hiney</td>
<td>Laine Vignona</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wes Chapin</td>
<td>Patricia Berg**</td>
<td></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><strong>CAS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peter Johansson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COEPS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hilary Pollack</td>
<td>Michael Miller**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Todd Savage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CBE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Glenn Potts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4th Division</strong></td>
<td>Kristie Feist</td>
<td>Valerie Malzacher</td>
<td></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>(Marshall Toman)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dennis Cooper (Sr)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>David Rainville (Sr)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>At Large</strong></td>
<td>Sarah Parks (Jr)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Furniss (Sr)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Terry Brown*</td>
<td></td>
<td>Terry Ferriss (Sr)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Chancellor’s Designee
**  Absent
()   Substitute

**Call to Order:** David Rainville called the meeting to order at 3:36 pm

**Seating of Substitutes:** Todd Savage for Michael Miller, Andres Straumanis for Pat Berg, Marshall Toman for Kathleen Hunzer

**Recognition of Invited Guests:**
Approval of Minutes of March 25, 2009: Approval of the minutes was moved by Jennifer Willis-Rivera and seconded by Peter Johansson. Discussion: Melissa Wilson was absent at the last meeting, but marked present. The minutes were approved by a unanimous vote.
Chair’s Report:
On Friday, April 3, 2009, I attended a meeting of the Faculty Representatives of the University of Wisconsin in Madison, Wisconsin.

At our pre-meeting, we discussed some issues which were of concern to specific campuses and other which were placed on the formal agenda with UWS Administrators.

The first item we discussed was Collective Bargaining. There is some difference between the Legislative Fiscal Bureau’s analysis and that presented in the Governor’s Budget Proposal. It appears that individual campuses will be able to combine with other campuses for the purpose of forming bargaining units. The analysis of the LFB is apparently based on previous legislation and does not reflect the Governor's proposal. Further, there is language within it to protect: 1. Academic freedom; 2. Rights of appointment provided to academic staff; 3. The mission and goals of the Board of Regents as set forth in WSS; 4. the right of tenure provided to faculty; 5. Rights related to governance granted to faculty and academic staff in WSS Chapter 36. It is still unclear as to whether faculty units and academic staff units could combine for the purpose of bargaining. It is my understanding that the Governor's proposal does not allow that.

Secondly we discussed the Board of Regents concern about making textbooks affordable. In addition to the earlier document that I distributed to you electronically, we examined a set of guidelines approved by the BOR in the Maryland System. We all agreed that we could not endorse any document, but our position would be that we share the concerns that the BOR has concerning textbook affordability.

We discussed the UWS Taskforce on Program Realignment and its composition. Apparently UWS decided to cap its composition at ten members. UWRF will therefore not have representation on it. Later, we were guaranteed that this taskforce would not go further than its mandate of gathering information system wide concerning programs. It would not make any recommendations about the disposition of any programs.

Several campuses were interested in the individual campus response to Domestic Partnership Benefits. It was revealed that most campuses have passed some sort of resolution in support of them.

Additionally we discuss the need of on-line teaching evaluations and alternative scheduling of classes such as M/W and T/R model in contrast to a traditional M/W/F and T/R model. It was noted that some campuses schedule classes on Friday in an attempt to reduce student drinking on Thursday evening. Studies indicate however that it has no effect.

The last item we discussed was the proposed budget solutions campus by campus. I indicated that I was uncertain as to what our solutions would be, but I was informed that there would in all likelihood be no reductions in S&E budgets or positions and that we would primarily deal with the lapse through unfilled positions that have opened up
through retirements and faculty and staff leaving, reserves and growth. Other campuses have been told to look out for more Draconian solutions.

Ever since I brought up the possibility of charging students for repeat courses, many faculty representatives have jumped on the bandwagon and are demanding that this issue be addressed. Later it was revealed that this probably needs to be a campus by campus solution with one aspect being the levying of special fees for retaking classes. Many faculty representatives would like students retaking classes to pay the entire cost of instruction for that repeat class. It has been estimated that this would increase revenues by 540K per semester at UWEC.

At the main meeting, we first had a legislative update from UWS. It was indicated that there are currently regional hearings concerning the state budget and it is expected that the budget will be passed by July 1, 2009. This does appear to be plausible as government is not divided at this point. It was also indicated that the issue of collective bargaining was evolving and that it is difficult to predict what the final details would be.

We also had an update on Inclusive Excellence which is a successor to Plan 2008. Apparently there will be campus visits by a feedback group to gather information. The dates of these visits are being arranged. No dates are firm yet.

Later we discussed the BOR concern for textbook affordability and our position was relayed to Rebecca Martin, Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs.

We also discussed a motion passed by the UW Whitewater Faculty Senate that stated a policy concerning student absences due to military service. Most faculty representatives indicated that they felt this unnecessary as such provisions are already outlined by policies in place on their campuses. Apparently there were several instructors at UW Whitewater that were refusing to excuse students for military service for as little as two weeks of absence.

A program planning workshop was announced for June 19, 2009 and it was indicated that we would be approached to identify individuals to send from our campus. Specifically it was indicated that individuals and department chairs considering new programs should be sent. Additionally chairs of committees.

Finally we discussed the Recruitment and Retention Fund. Campuses are concerned with it distribution as apparently there has been a substantial increase in it in the proposed budget. I have instructed both the chairs of FWPP and the Compensation Committee to propose a policy for its distribution on this campus. It appears from the BOR instructions that the only restriction is that it can not be used to address compression.

Finally, yesterday afternoon the Executive Committee received an email message from Lisa Wheeler, interim Vice Chancellor of Administration and Finance which reads as follows:
Faculty Senate Executive Committee Members,

The second round of adjustments to base salary for Full Professors as proposed in UW-RF Faculty Senate Motion 2007/2008/67 was contingent upon a review of the institution’s financial status during the 2009-2010 budget process. As you know, we are facing a combination of a lapse and a cut to GPR budgets in 2009-2010 that we anticipate to be approximately $2,000,000. Given that significant reduction in our funds, the Executive Cabinet has decided to defer the second round of salary adjustments.

We made this decision with great reluctance and disappointment. I look forward to further discussion when we meet on Thursday.

Lisa

I have forwarded this memo to Steven Olsen, Chair of the Compensation Committee. It is my understanding that it has also made its way to the entire committee and also to members of the FWPP Committee.

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee will also be meeting with incoming Chancellor Dean Van Galen on Monday.

Vice Chair’s Report: Kristen Hendrickson said she was informed this morning there was an error on the senior at-large ballots. An email went out to all faculty that the ballots that were sent were to be disregarded. New ballots went out this afternoon.

Other Reports:

Unfinished Business
1. A motion from the Advising Committee (Peter Rayne-Chair) to approve the following regarding summer school compensation for academic advisors who are not department chair persons, and who are not on twelve month appointments:

Whereas Academic Advisement of incoming students is of vital importance in terms of creating a sense of connection to the University for new students, and getting students off to a productive start along their academic paths toward fulfillment of their academic and career goals, and

Whereas Academic Advisement of these incoming students typically occurs during the summer, when faculty and staff with nine month appointments are not under contract, and if they are teaching summer session courses they are being compensated on a per student per credit basis for only those activities that are directly related to the courses, and

Whereas existing Department Chairperson’s compensation includes certain summer responsibilities including assuring an appropriate departmental presence for new student registration, be it resolved that Academic Advisers who are not Department Chairpersons, and who are not on twelve month appointments be compensated for Academic Advising conducted during the new student registration period.
2. In response to a request from Nan Jordahl for a recommendation for fair and equitable distribution of supplemental academic advisers to aid and advise new students during the summer registration period, the Advising Committee examined current and past student enrollment numbers, and considered them in light of substantial first-hand experience. After discussion the Advising Committee (Peter Rayne - Chair) recommends the following motion (Parts A through E):

A. The Department Chair or designee (separate from any paid supplemental adviser) be present to serve majors within that department and provide general support to the students within their respective colleges for the duration of the new student and transfer registration period.

B. Supplemental Academic Advisers be supplied a substantial stipend as funding permits and be distributed according to the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College or Program</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Number of Department Chairs or Program Heads</th>
<th>Number of Supplemental Advisers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAFES</td>
<td>Animal and Food Science</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plant and Earth Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COEPS</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H &amp; HP</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBE</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Major/Undeclared</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Deans and/or department chairs have discretion to receive nominations and appoint individuals to fill all or part of the suggested allocations.

D. Supplemental Academic Advisers should be chosen that can provide broad support to the programs within their colleges as well as to pre-majors as time permits.

E. Enrollment Services keep Department Chairs informed as to numbers of students and their distribution throughout the advising and registration period.

This item was moved forward by Jennifer Willis-Rivera and seconded by Dennis Cooper. Discussion: A senator asked for clarification on item B – how the allocation was determined. Peter Rayne said that the committee didn’t recommend a stipend amount
because they do not control the budget. The number of advisors were determined by
looking at the estimated number of students coming into each program during summer
registration. The committee assumed that there were ten periods of summer registration,
and students would be spread approximately evenly. They also estimated that each
advisor could handle 2-3 students at one time. The committee considered that the Faculty
Welfare Committee recommended that department chairs be available for summer
advising, and assumed that chairs and program heads are going to do the same allotment
as an additional advisor would. Supplemental advisors that are listed in the same line as
a college would serve at the discretion of the dean. The senator asked why the dean
couldn’t decide where the advisors went. Rayne said the committee was trying to make
their best recommendation which were dependent on actual student enrollment in a
program.

Another senator asked about the discrepancy between contracted months and months of
advising. A senator answered him, saying that the Faculty Welfare Committee and the
Faculty Senate decided that the salary increases afforded to faculty include
responsibilities of summer duties. Provost Terry Brown reminded the senate that there is
an advising DIN of $21,000.

Wes Chapin moved to amend the rubric to reflect six supplemental advisors for CAFES,
four for CAS, three for CEPS, three for CBE, and five for Pre-Majors, and was seconded
by Terry Ferriss. Several senators spoke in favor of making the motion even more
general; stating that there should be 1 advisor for every 50 students. The amendment
failed by a vote of 2 for, 19 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

Terry Ferriss moved to further amend the motion and was seconded by John Heppen.
Several senators spoke in favor of including the formula of 50 students to 1 advisor in the
motion. Wes Chapin called for a four minute recess. The amendment failed by a vote of
2 for, 17 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

Terry Ferriss moved to amend the motion to substitute all of what is currently part B with
the following: all of the supplemental summer advising funds be allocated directly to the
academic deans and vice chancellor for academic affairs based proportionally upon
projected fall enrollments of incoming students. The academic deans and the vice
chancellor for academic affairs will distribute the allocations with the intended goal of
achieving approximately one adviser per 50 incoming students, while assuming
department chairs will also be advising. The numbers need to be monitored and
allocations adjusted annually, and was seconded by John Heppen. The amendment passed
by a unanimous vote.

Terry Brown commended the committee for their work.

Karl Peterson moved to amend part C of the motion to read: The vice chancellor for
academic affairs, and/or academic deans have discretion to receive nominations and
appoint individuals to fill all or part of the suggested allocations and was seconded by
Jennifer Willis-Rivera. The motion failed by a vote of 7 for and 8 opposed.
Dennis Cooper moved to amend part C of the motion to read: The vice chancellor for academic affairs, academic deans and/or department chairs have discretion to receive nominations and appoint individuals to fill all or part of the suggested allocations. The amendment passed by a vote of 17 for, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention.

The motion as amended passed by a unanimous vote.

New Business Consent Agenda:

New Business:
1. It was brought to the attention of the Faculty Welfare and Personnel Policies Committee (Brad Mogen - Chair) that the wording of the Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook that the wording of the Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook 4.9.3.5 Open/Close Hearing is inconsistent with Wisconsin State Statute. The statute reads:

State statute 19.85 (1)(b) Considering dismissal, demotion, licensing or discipline of any public employee or person licensed by a board or commission or the investigation of charges against such person, or considering the grant or denial of tenure for a university faculty member, and the taking of formal action on any such matter; provided that the faculty member or other public employee or person licensed is given actual notice of any evidentiary hearing which may be held prior to final action being taken and of any meeting at which final action may be taken. The notice shall contain a statement that the person has the right to demand that the evidentiary hearing or meeting be held in open session. This paragraph and par. (f) do not apply to any such evidentiary hearing or meeting where the employee or person licensed requests that an open session be held (highlight and bold mine).

As such, the Faculty Welfare and Personnel Policies Committee moves the following changes to the wording of the Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook: 4.9.3.5. Closed/open hearing:

Existing Faculty handbook language reads as follows:

4.9.3.5. Closed/open hearing.

The hearing shall be closed unless the faculty member concerned requests an open meeting in which case it shall be open (see Chapter 19.85 (1)(b) Wis. Statutes, Open Meeting Law)

______________________________________________
FWPP moves the following language replace the existing:
4.9.3.5. Closed/open hearing.

The hearing shall be closed unless the faculty member concerned requests an open meeting in accordance with the provisions of the Wisconsin Open Meeting Law (see Chapter 19.85 (1)(b), Wis. Statutes, Open Meeting Law). The department chair shall notify the faculty member both verbally and in writing (with reference to either the specific statute noted above, or to 4.9.3.5 of the Faculty Handbook), that they may request the tenure review meeting be held in open session.

Approval of this item was moved by John Heppen and seconded by David Furniss. John Heppen moved to amend to the motion to conform to state statute language regarding using meeting/meetings. The amendment passed unanimously. The original motion also passed unanimously.

Adjournment at 4:59 p.m.