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2012-2013 Senators Present: Dale Murray, UW-Baraboo/Sauk County; Troy Kozma, UW-Barron County; Carrie Desnoyers, UW Colleges Online; Paisley Harris, UW-Fond du Lac; Bill Gillard, UW-Fox Valley; Berel Lutsky and Mel Johnson, UW-Manitowoc; Lou Pech and Paul Whitaker, UW-Marathon County; Mark Klemp, UW-Marinette; Amanda Hakemian, Steve Kaiser, and Jeff Verona, UW-Marshfield/Wood County; Brandon Fetterly, UW-Richland; Bob Hein, UW-Rock County; Jena Jaeckels, Richard Krupnow, and Matt Raunio, UW-Sheboygan; Dan Anhalt and Mark Peterson, UW-Washington County; Ron Gulotta, Margaret Hankenson, and Barb Reinhart, UW-Waukesha; Jessica Frame and Alex Roberts, Student Senators

2012-2013 Senators Absent: Marc Boucher, UW-Baraboo/Sauk County; Marc Sackman, UW-Fox Valley; Ian Reese, Student Senator

2012-2013 Alternates Present: Kim Schatz, UW-Fox Valley (Marc Sackman)

Others Present: Greg Ahrenhoerster, Alternate Chairs’ Representative; Rich Barnhouse, Associate Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management; Joyce Bell, Classified Staff Advisory Council Secretary; Rose Brust, Classified Staff Advisory Council Vice Chair/Interim Chair; Margaret Cleek, Interim Director of Distance Education; Ray Cross, Chancellor for UW Colleges and UW-Extension; Pam Dollard, Director of Human Resources; Mary Ann Gerrard, Special Assistant to the Chancellor; Greg Lampe, Provost and Vice Chancellor; Harry Muir, Deans’ Representative; Rosemary Potter, Special Assistant to the Chancellor; Lisa Seale, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs; Steve Wildeck, Vice Chancellor for Administrative and Financial Services for UW Colleges and UW-Extension; Patti Wise, Special Assistant to the Provost for Returning Adult Academic and Student Services; Linda Baum, Assistant to the Senate

Others Absent: Colleen Godfriaux, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Budget and Planning; Holly Hassel, Chairs’ Representative

1) The March 15, 2013 meeting of the UW Colleges Senate was called to order at 1:20 p.m. by UW Colleges Senate Steering Committee (SSC) Chair Mark Peterson.

2) UW-Waukesha Dean Harry Muir welcomed the Senate to Waukesha. As the Deans’ Representative to the UWC Senate, he remarked that hosting the meeting made him nervous about everything, but he was pleased to welcome the Senate to campus. He had recently
attended a meeting where working with underprepared students was discussed and had also just addressed Phi Theta Kappa at UW-Waukesha. Dean Muir noted that he enjoys working with both groups of students and believes that the UW Colleges as a whole does as well. That attitude is what makes the Colleges special and the work of the Senate so important, Dean Harry Muir concluded, encouraging the assembly to do good work during the meeting.

3) Roll Call of 2012-2013 Senate and Introduction of Alternates. Assistant to the UW Colleges Senate Linda Baum circulated the attendance sheet. SSC Chair Peterson introduced Greg Ahrenhoerster (Professor and Chair, English, UW-Waukesha) attending as the Alternate Chairs’ Representative for Holly Hassel, and Kim Schatz (Associate Professor, Chemistry, UW-Fox Valley) attending for Marc Sackman. Peterson noted several guests attending the Senate meeting: Joyce Bell (Library Services, UW-Waukesha; Classified Staff Advisory Council Secretary), Rose Brust (Graphic Designer, UW-Marathon County; Classified Staff Advisory Council Vice Chair/Interim Chair), Pam Dollard (Director of Human Resources), Patti Wise (Special Assistant to the Provost), and Margaret Cleek (Interim Director of Distance Education).

4) The agenda (Attachment 1) for the March 15, 2013 meeting of the UW Colleges Senate was approved by unanimous voice vote [Fetterly/Johnson].

5) The minutes of the January 9, 2013 meeting of the UWC Senate held at UW-Fond du Lac (found posted in Public Folders>All Public Folders>Governance>Senate>Senate Minutes>2012-2013) were unanimously approved [Anhalt/Gillard].

6) Reports

a) Chancellor Ray Cross drew attention to some additional items from the budget handout

Vice Chancellor for Administrative and Financial Services Steve Wildeck had distributed during a presentation to the Senate earlier. First, if the proposed budget passes, UW System will have the ability to go forward with pay plans without seeking JCOER approval, which would be a significant change. There is also a proposal for 30 credits of what is often called a “common transferrable core.” This is a legislative attempt to force transferability between institutions, at least for the core courses, that many states have in place. Chancellor Cross noted that rehired annuitants would have to have a service break of 75 days, increased from 30, and could not have an annuity if they work more than 2/3’s time. Chancellor Cross then spoke to the institutional priorities for the current year, mentioning them in turn and pointing out how progress had been made towards reaching the priority. For example, the chancellor reminded all that the BAAS accreditation was successfully completed. The program implementation is moving forward on pace for Fall, and PRISM will be able to accommodate BAAS students by April. Chancellor Cross mentioned the position searches for the Director of the Division of Entrepreneurship and Economic Development and for the Director of the Office of Inclusivity.

Chancellor Cross then spoke to the topic of remedial education. He stated that on
average nationwide, forty percent of freshmen take at least one remedial course. In Wisconsin approximately 20% of freshmen take a remedial course, and even at Harvard 11% attend such courses. Some people hold the attitude that if the student needs remedial courses they should perhaps be sent back to high school. UW-Milwaukee has a 17% success rate with remedial students. The UW Colleges, on the other hand, has more than a 60% success rate with full time students and 56-57% with part time students. The chancellor acknowledged that there is something of a no-win situation about it—if the role of teaching remedial courses is embraced and excelled at, then there is a risk of being seen as only good for that and of losing the higher level students. Alternate Chairs’ Rep Greg Ahrenhoerster related that the classes should be less ghettoized by putting the best faculty on them and offering better financial support for them than the IEM does. Vice Chancellor Wildeck stated that the IEM makes developmental programs more attractive to offer as they are revenue generators, English perhaps less so than some; he also said that how decisions are made on what courses are offered has not been changed with the implementation of IEM. Chancellor Cross said that they will check into the matter, tweak it if necessary, and educate the necessary people of the facts and figures. SSC Chair Peterson wondered if there was any research on retention rates in light of remedial education. Ahrenhoerster stated that Holly Hassel has extensive research on remedial English courses and retention at UW-Marathon County. Senator Johnson replied that UW-Manitowoc also has such information. Senator Kozma expressed that there are opportunities for programs beyond English and Math and that expanding should be examined. Chancellor Cross concluded that remedial courses should also be thought of in light of the Flex Option.

b) Provost and Vice Chancellor Greg Lampe noted the location of his report (Attachment 2) in the provided Senate materials. He gave his thanks to all for their assistance in the successfully completed continuing accreditation of the UW Colleges, the accreditation of the Bachelor of Applied Arts and Sciences (BAAS) degree, and the revision of the UW Colleges mission statement review by the Higher Learning Commission (HLC). The reports will be posted to the Provost’s SharePoint site as soon as possible. As the provost works on revising the UW Colleges operational plan, the items uncovered as needing improvement during the HLC review will begin to be embedded in the plan. Provost Lampe noted that Patti Wise, Special Assistant to the Provost for Returning Adult Academic and Student Services, was to thank for much of the information in the BAAS degree-completion section of the written report. He said that the BAAS degree curriculum looks very good with 29 courses approved to date and more to come. Though waiting on the federal government to finalize the financial aid piece of the BAAS degree-completion program, PRISM (PeopleSoft) and the e-application should all be ready and able to handle BAAS degree-completion students soon. Provost Lampe reminded the senators that he has been distributing the updates from the Flexible Associate of Arts and Science Degree Committee following each of the committee’s meetings. Twenty-six courses are currently in development and by Spring 2014 the AAS should be available in a Flexible Option format. Kim Kostka (Professor, Chemistry, UW-Rock County) has been appointed as the UW Colleges Flexible Option Coordinator. She will be working six hours per week through the end of this spring semester, and 50% this summer and
throughout the next academic year. Provost Lampe concluded by informing the Senate that the UW Colleges Concurrent Enrollment Implementation Committee, co-chaired by Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Lisa Seale and Associate Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management Rich Barnhouse, has submitted their final report and recommendations for implementing a concurrent enrollment program Colleges-wide. Provost Lampe will be following the committee’s recommended four stage implementation process and will be putting out a call for a UW Colleges concurrent enrollment program coordinator (the first step in the recommended four stage process) shortly.

c) Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Lisa Seale called attention to her written report (Attachment 3) in the binder of Senate materials. She stated that her report was structured as a thank you to the four coordinators that she works with: the UW Colleges Institutional Assessment Coordinator, the UW Colleges Engaging Students in the First Year Coordinator, the UW Colleges Professional Development Coordinator, and the UW Colleges Service-Learning Coordinator. It is also a good description of what each of the four does, so those who are interested might speak to them about taking on the role in the future. Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Seale encourages everyone to seek out shared governance or service opportunities.

d) Associate Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management Rich Barnhouse had left the meeting for a prior commitment, but his report (Attachment 4) was pointed out in the Senate materials.

e) Senate Steering Committee Chair & UWC Faculty Representative Mark Peterson directed attention to his report (Attachment 5) in the collection of written materials. He said that at the faculty reps meeting there was a general consensus that the publishing of salaries by Gannett newspapers was a good thing as it showed how underpaid the UW System employees are in comparison to others. At the Board of Regents meeting many were upset over the HRS overpayments of $33 million; not many were concerned with the PETA protest. UW System Vice President Nook had shared a report about remedial education that seemed to say university remediation programs have little effect on college success. UW Colleges, however, does do a good job with remedial education, Peterson stated.

f) Academic Staff Lead Senator Richard Krupnow called attention to his written report (Attachment 6) in the materials. He reported that the Academic Staff Council had approved including limited appointees in academic staff governance with an AS Bylaws change, but Chancellor Cross did not sign off on that change. Earlier in the day during the meeting of the Senate Steering Committee it had been decided to include those select limited appointees as ex-officio members of the Senate; Krupnow will be developing language to make the necessary changes. Academic Staff Lead Senator Krupnow concluded by noting that the interim Academic Staff titling guidelines are out and will be tentatively numbered ASPP #708.
g) UW Colleges Academic Staff Representative Carrie Ann Desnoyers related the location of her report (*Attachment 7*) in the Senate materials. She is working on the Academic Staff Leadership Conference to be held July 25-26 in Madison. Free admission for IAS has been suggested. She asked if there was a grievance procedure for academic staff; Lead Academic Staff Senator Krupnow will send her the information on finding the procedure. Desnoyers concluded with the update that the contract with Desire to Learn is up for renewal in June; satisfaction is high for both students and faculty/staff, and so indications are that the contract will be renewed, but possibly for a shorter term.

h) Student Governance Council President Ian Reese was not in attendance, but the Student Governance Council (SGC) report (*Attachment 8*) was given by SGC Vice President Alex Roberts. The SGC is preparing for the SUFAC Summit in April. They want to better prepare the next set of students, he said, for their roles in shared governance. The shared governance documents outlining rights and responsibilities of students are in various places, Roberts said, and so an effort is being made to compile them in a single place for easier reference. Hopefully all campuses will have one soon, SGC Vice President Roberts concluded.

i) Senate Academic Policy Committee Chair Troy Kozma (*Attachment 9*) shared that a number of introductions from the Senate Academic Policy Committee (SAPC) were on the upcoming agenda. The committee has been working with the Faculty Professional Standards Committee on revising Chapter 4 of the UW Colleges Constitution to match the statutory definition of department and include a definition of program. The SAPC is also working on a cross-listing policy, but as there seems to be no consensus on what a cross-listed class is or what it is for, it has turned out to be a large problem. He has asked that the issue be addressed at the Deans and Chairs meeting. After gathering information from around the Colleges the SAPC has decided not to have a Colleges-wide early alert policy, suggesting instead that early alerts be left up to the individual campus, and that they be asked to share best practices with each other.

j) Senate Budget Committee Chair Matt Raunio located his report (*Attachment 10*) in the supplied binder of materials. Raunio noted that the budget had been quite thoroughly discussed that morning. Senator Harris asked about the mention in Raunio’s report of the possible gender bias discovered in the report by the consultant Guell. Harris stated that she was under the impression that it was a definite gender bias, not a possible bias. Vice Chancellor Wildeck replied that when presented with findings the data is either accepted or re-examined. The UW Colleges is reexamining their data and whether the same conclusion is reached or not, a conclusion will be reached by the end of the academic year. If the decision is that there is a gender bias, it will be corrected as of the date of discovery, which is January 1, Vice Chancellor Wildeck stated.

k) Faculty Professional Standards Committee Chair Paul Whitaker (*Attachment 11*) related that the Faculty Professional Standards Committee (FPSC) would have introductions coming up later in the day and has been a very busy committee this year. In addition to the adoptions and introductions on the agendas today, the committee had studied FPP
and determined that they would not recommend a change in the voluntary transfer policy in light of the IEM. As noted by SAPC Chair Kozma, the FPSC has been working on defining programs, their powers and responsibilities, and on a possible revision of Chapter 4 of the Colleges Constitution, to bring the definition of “department” in line with state statute.

1) Senate Assessment Committee Chair Deborah Paprocki was not in attendance. Her report (Attachment 12) was pointed out in the provided Senate materials.

7) Old Institutional Business

a) Adoption: Proposed Revision of UWC Bylaws 6.2 and 6.4 (“Elected Senate Bylaws Committees”) [SAPC] allowing a designee to attend SCC and/or SBCC meetings in place of the SAPC Chair (Attachment 13). SAPC Chair Kozma explained that the purpose of the proposed changes would be to ensure that there is a representative from the SAPC at the meetings of the Senate Curriculum Committee and the Senate BAAS Curriculum Committee as the Bylaws stipulate. He expressed that if either of the curriculum committees was being attended by a designee and something very weighty came up, the designee would bring it to the SAPC Chair and the rest of the SAPC. The motion passed unanimously [Gillard/Raunio].

b) Adoption: Proposed Revision of IP #320 (“Policy on Evaluation – Instructional Academic Staff (Category B), including Returning Retired Faculty”) [SAPC] revising schedule of visiting IAS (Attachment 14). Senator Gillard said that his campus had expressed concern around workload issues for faculty in departments such as English and Mathematics; if faculty had to increase the number of visits to IAS, it would be like an unfunded mandate for faculty. Senator Kozma suggested that IAS could do peer visits of IAS, to which Senator Murray replied that it is an assumed duty of faculty, but it is not in the IAS contract. Alternate Chairs’ Rep Ahrenhoerster stated that front loading the visits for IAS is logical and gives them the feedback at the beginning when help might be needed to do a better job. He continued that if the UW Colleges is not constantly hiring new IAS it should not create a huge workload, and that the visits are very important. Senator Harris agreed that visits are very important and suggested that departments will figure out how to cover them. Lead Academic Staff Senator Krupnow expressed that it is unlikely that many IAS would be willing to take on visiting other IAS when it is not required in contracts or in policy. Senator Gillard noted that the policy will still need to be updated in terms of online visitation and similar issues. The proposed revisions were adopted with one dissenting vote [Fetterly/Reinhart].

c) Further Update on New Criminal Background Check Policy and Procedures [Dollard]. UW Colleges Human Resources Director Pam Dollard informed the Senate of the new requirements for criminal background checks (CBCs) that had been mandated by the Board of Regents policy. Drafts were circulated explaining the categories of employees and how they were arrived at, the various CBC requirements for each, and their required levels of training. Vice Chancellor for Administrative and Financial Services Steve
Wildeck added that basically everyone in the UW Colleges is considered to be in a position of trust and will need to have a CBC when they are hired and receive the basic training requirement. Other employees will need recurring checks and will be required to self-disclose anything more than a traffic fine, the vice chancellor continued; he reminded the Senate that as has been the practice, a substantial relationship to job duties test will continue to be applied in relation to those disclosures by Human Resources. As Provost Lampe said, the public needs to be reassured that the UW Colleges campuses are safe places to visit. There were questions regarding Continuing Education staff and instructors being subject to the checks, checking other databases for CBCs as a possible money saving method, and the cost of the program. Human Resources Director Dollard noted that language will be inserted into contracts and other communications to inform people that the checks will be performed, including on a repeating basis, as necessary. The phrase “case-by-case basis by campus management” for determinations regarding who CBCs would be performed on was questioned; it was expressed that the checks were seemingly being done for everyone, even if they were not ever left alone or unsupervised. HR Director Dollard suggested that it may perhaps be felt that casting a wide net is for the best. Vice Chancellor Wildeck said that the directive might be further clarified with some simple guidelines, but the campuses will not be micromanaged by the institution in their decisions. It was also questioned why arrests must be self-disclosed, to which Vice Chancellor Wildeck replied that depending on the nature of the offense and the test against job duties, a change of duties or a suspension might be necessary until the situation is resolved.

d) Other. There was no more Old Institutional Business on the Senate agenda.

8) New Institutional Business

a) Introduction: Proposed Revision of IP #320 (“Policy on Evaluation – Instructional Academic Staff (Category B), including Returning Retired Faculty”) [FPSC] giving IAS written notification regarding merit and how to improve rating (Attachment 15). FPSC Chair Whitaker explained that in light of possible renewable contracts for IAS, it was necessary that IAS be notified of results of their evaluation and how it might be improved. Senator Gillard asked if there should be something mentioning it as an annual event, but Whitaker pointed out that IV.A spoke to it being every year.

b) Introduction: Proposed Revision of IP #104 (“Course and Instructional Policies”) [FPSC] adding a policy on grading and moving office hours policy (Attachment 16). FPSC Chair Whitaker pointed out that this proposed revision included moving an existing short, stand-alone policy into IP #104 and adding a new part into #104. The UWC policy on office hours is currently a brief policy numbered IP #310.01. This proposal does not change it, but moves it to be part of IP #104. A short piece on grading is added to the policy, saying that the instructors have to do their grading unless there is an exception from the department.
c) Introduction: Proposed Revision of IP #106 (“Atypical Course Policy”) [SAPC] adding designations for BAAS internship courses and adding Service-Learning courses (Attachment 17). Special Assistant to the Provost Patti Wise informed the Senate that the proposed changes to the policy were to add what was necessary to align BAAS internship courses with the existing internship policy and create Service-Learning (SL) courses for AAS and BAAS. A typo was pointed out in IV.G where “IP” should be “IN.” It was further discussed that since there is a stipulation of how a department can submit an internship course application to the Senate Curriculum Committee in IV.C, there should be parallel language for submission to the Senate BAAS Curriculum Committee created in a new IV.D. SAPC Chair Kozma will modify the policy as discussed and send it to Assistant to the Senate Baum for circulation to the Senate.

d) Introduction: Proposed Revision of IP #301.01 (“Administering the Student Survey of Instruction”) [SAPC] updating Student Survey of Instruction to account for new software and alternate modes of instruction (Attachment 18). SAPC Chair Kozma related that this proposal was very similar to the version that had been through the Senate process but not signed by the chancellor earlier in the year. It incorporated some additional revisions suggested by the provost to deal with concerns of Online, such as setting the last three days of instruction as the default time for the SSI to be given, and making it the responsibility of the instructor to inform the students of the date of the SSI. Kozma said that some tweaks to the policy were also made to reflect concerns brought forth by the deans executive assistants.

e) Introduction: Proposed Revision of IP #202 (“Academic Procedures and Regulations”) [SAPC] mandates method of midterm grade reporting (Attachment 19). The proposed changes to this policy, SAPC Chair Kozma explained, are to standardize the manner in which midterm grades are reported. He noted that the policy does not explicitly say “PRISM” in case that is not always the method used, but said that this way the grades are in a format that all are familiar with and that is accessible for advisors.

f) Introduction: Proposed Revision of IP #104 (“Course and Instructional Policies”) [SAPC] clarifying prohibition of scheduling student activities during final exam period (Attachment 20). SAPC Chair Kozma noted that the current policy reads that a committee meeting could take place during final exams if held off campus. The policy revisions are to clarify that no events or meetings that involve students can be held during that time.

g) Introduction: Proposed Revision of IP #141 (“Bachelor of Applied Arts and Sciences Degree”) [FPSC] IAS teaching BAAS courses and clarification that experiential learning portfolios are submitted to departments (Attachment 21). FPSC Chair Whitaker explained that he would summarize the rationales for IP #141, IP #141.01, and IP #141.02 together. The changes were to replace the term “faculty” with “instructor” so that IAS were not excluded from teaching BAAS courses if departments deemed them qualified to instruct the course. The proposals also covered having prior learning portfolios submitted to departments for review, rather than to faculty for review. Lead
Academic Staff Senator Krupnow asked about the term “instructor” as it actually is connected to faculty. Provost Lampe replied that in the UW Colleges it has not been in general use for a first-year tenure track faculty member for some time; it now has the more generic definition of “teacher.”

h) Introduction: Proposed Revision of IP #141.01 (“Bachelor of Applied Arts and Sciences Degree Guidelines for Professional Experience Courses”) [FPSC] IAS teaching BAAS courses and clarification on submission of experiential learning portfolios to departments (Attachment 22) (see above, 8g).

i) Introduction: Proposed Revision of IP #141.02 (“Bachelor of Applied Arts and Sciences Degree Professional Experience: Credit for Prior Experiential Learning”) [FPSC] IAS teaching BAAS courses and clarification that experiential learning portfolios are submitted to departments (Attachment 23) (see above, 8g).

j) Introduction: Proposed Revision of IP #106.01 (“LEC 100 First-Year Seminar Policy”) [SCC] streamlines modification of LEC 100 courses and clarifies instructor evaluation (Attachment 24). SSC Chair Peterson pointed out the written rationale in the Senate materials. Alternate Chairs’ Rep Ahrenhoerster reported that the proposed changes had been discussed with the academic department chairs, and they seemed supportive of the revision.

k) Other. SSC Chair Peterson noted the 2013-2014 Call for Nominations being circulated. He asked that the senators read through it and think about further service to the Colleges and encouraging others to serve. It will be circulated electronically to the Senate and UWC-ALL soon. Peterson also asked those faculty senators whose terms are expiring to request that their campuses hold their elections as soon as possible so any new senators can be invited to the April 26 Senate meeting.

9) Other Institutional Business

a) Resolution of Appreciation for Pam Dollard. Senate Steering Committee Chair Peterson read the resolution for Director of Human Resources Pam Dollard in the Senate materials (Attachment 25). Senator Gillard added that he felt Dollard had gone beyond what others working on the project within the UW System had in order to keep her constituency informed. The resolution was adopted by acclamation as Pam Dollard received a round of applause.

b) Other. There was no further Other Institutional Business on the UWC Senate agenda.

10) Adjournment. The UW Colleges Senate concluded their business and was adjourned at 3:35 p.m. by acclamation.
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MINUTES

2012-2013 Faculty Senators Present: Dale Murray, UW-Baraboo/Sauk County; Troy Kozma, UW-Barron County; Paisley Harris, UW-Fond du Lac; Bill Gillard and Marc Sackman, UW-Fox Valley; Berel Lutsky, UW- Manitowoc; Lou Pech and Paul Whitaker, UW-Marathon County; Mark Klemp, UW-Marinette; Amanda Hakemian, UW-Marshfield/ Wood County; Brandon Fetterly, UW-Richland; Bob Hein, UW-Rock County; Matt Raunio, UW-Sheboygan; Mark Peterson, UW-Washington County; Ron Gulotta, Margaret Hankenson, and Barb Reinhart, UW-Waukesha

2012-2013 Faculty Senators Absent: Marc Sackman, UW-Fox Valley

2012-2013 Faculty Alternates Present: Kim Schatz, UW-Fox Valley (Marc Sackman)

Others Present: Greg Ahrenhoerster, Alternate Chairs’ Representative; Rose Brust, Classified Staff Advisory Council Vice Chair/Interim Chair; Ray Cross, Chancellor for UW Colleges and UW-Extension; Greg Lampe, Provost and Vice Chancellor; Lisa Seale, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs; Linda Baum, Assistant to the Senate

Others Absent: Holly Hassel, Chairs’ Representative

1. Call to Order 2012-2013 Faculty Council of Senators. The UW Colleges Faculty Council of Senators (FCS) was called to order at 3:46 p.m. by UW Colleges Faculty Representative to System Mark Peterson.

2. The roll call of 2012-2013 faculty senators was circulated by Senate Assistant Linda Baum.

3. The agenda for the March 15, 2013 FCS meeting was approved unanimously [Gillard/Kozma].

4. The minutes of the January 9, 2013 meeting of the Faculty Council of Senators held at UW-Fond du Lac (posted in Public Folders>All Public Folders>Governance>Senate>Senate Minutes>2012-2013) were unanimously approved [Fetterly/Kozma].

5. Reports

   a) Chair Mark Peterson had nothing to add to his report to the full Senate.
b) Faculty Professional Standards Committee Chair Paul Whitaker reiterated that the FPSC is working with the SAPC to define programs. They are studying how interdisciplinary programs are handled at other institutions. One option is to pull the two small programs that are currently housed within other departments and house them together in a new place. Whitaker asked that comments be sent to him. Senator Murray asked what the justification might be for removing the programs from their departments. FPSC Chair Whitaker said that historically the reason the programs are housed where they are is because the person who proposed them belonged to that department. Senator Gulotta hypothesized that an interdisciplinary program that houses the two small programs could be created. It could possibly be a temporary home until there is a way to change a program into a department.

6. Old Business

a) Adoption: Proposed Revision of FPP #501.01 (“Promotion, Tenure, and Third-Year Tenure Progress and Retention Review Dossier Format”) [FPSC] no final hard copy (Attachment 26). FPSC Chair Whitaker summarized the written rationale. Provost Lampe stated that it is a mistake to dictate how the provost, whoever it might be, has to do their work. Senator Gillard said that the tenure process is very difficult for everyone and if it can be made easier, do so. He suggested adding submitting a hard copy to the campus and provost to the January 4 part and all would be done. Senator Gulotta replied that the candidate would have to create two dossiers: one to submit in electronic format, and then reformat it to get it to print out correctly unless they have access to Adobe Acrobat Pro in which case the dossier can be printed out in the same format. There was discussion of whether there could be wider access to the Adobe Acrobat Pro software, and of another brand (Latex) that some departments use to create their dossiers. It was readily agreed to by all that the tenure process is very important to all involved in the process. There were comments that it seemed ironic to be eschewing technology when the technology infusion task force had been at work. It was also discussed as to what the help from the office of the dean mentioned in the policy might mean, and how it could vary from campus to campus. People were sensitive to creating extra work for those who were not connected to the tenure process. It was suggested that a pilot of some sort be started, and also that the proposal be rejected and reworked. The proposed revision passed with thirteen in favor, one against, and one abstention [Lutsky/Fetterly].

b) Adoption: Proposed Faculty Council of Senators Bylaws [SSC] (Attachment 27). Senator Gillard explained that although the Faculty Council of Senators had existed for some time, they had not had a set of Bylaws. The proposed Bylaws passed with one vote against [Harris/Gulotta].

c) Other. No Old Business remained on the Faculty Council agenda.

7. New Business
a) Introduction: Proposed Revision of FPP #501 (“Criteria and General Procedures for Appointment, Retention, Tenure Progress, Tenure, and Promotion (Bylaws)”) [FPSC] clarifying role of dean in tenure track retention decisions (Attachment 28). FPSC Chair Whitaker summarized the rationale supplied in the written materials; the revision would clarify that the dean would write a letter every year of the tenure process. Whitaker then said that Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Lisa Seale had pointed out certain language in the policy stating what campus deans should do that could be copied in the changes the FPSC was proposing. It was agreed to use that language. FPSC Chair Whitaker will revise the proposal before sending it to Assistant to the Senate Baum for circulation to the Faculty Council.

b) Other. There was no further New Business on the FCS agenda.

8. Other Business

a) Discussion: Should we set institutional parameters for accepting transfer credits from private or for-profit institutions? Chancellor Cross stated that his philosophy is that the receiving department faculty have the responsibility to determine what transfer credits are acceptable, regardless of where the credits come from. He cautioned that some in education treat the topic lightly, and that the UW Colleges cannot. The chancellor gave an example of a student appealing the denial of transfer credits from Globe University, wherein the student argued that Globe was accredited by CHEA and was therefore an accredited institution. The UW Colleges has restricted the acceptance of credits from for-profit institutions, but when the student services employee was presented with that argument, they put the appeal forward to the academic department for a decision. Chancellor Cross clarified that the Council of Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) is not an accrediting body, but a catch-all group that certifies accrediting agencies. Globe is accredited by the Council for Independent Colleges and Schools (ACICS). Chancellor Cross asked the Faculty Council for an opinion on if the institution should have a set of principles or a policy regarding how the UW Colleges deals with credit transfer from the for-profit institutions, or should the process remain in the hands of faculty and student affairs staff. The chancellor pointed out the UW System Undergraduate Transfer Policy that had been distributed, read a section of the policy, and directed attention to the “Joint Statement on the Transfer and Award of Credit” mentioned therein. The statement primarily speaks to inter-institutional agreements and how credits are evaluated, but it does not speak to accreditation. Chancellor Cross again argued that the question of transferability must be left to faculty and their expertise, but asked the Faculty Council if it was either a good idea or unwise to have a policy.

Senator Fetterly asked what accrediting body the Colleges recognized. It was answered that the UW Colleges recognized the Higher Learning Commission (HLC), which is one of the regional accrediting bodies. UW System is concerned that if the UW Colleges refuses to accept credit from Globe University, they would be in non-compliance with the UWS policy. Provost Lampe had explained to them that was not the point of the conversation, and said the Colleges were troubled with the inclusion of CHEA in the
policy. Provost Lampe further related that transfer is an important part of the Colleges mission, and a conversation of what principles to operate and make decisions under is a necessary one.

Chancellor Cross reiterated his point that the UW Colleges should not accept just any credits from any institution. He stressed that the credibility of the institution be guarded. In response to a question, Provost Lampe explained that every time a student transfers the receiving institution determines how credits will transfer or if they will transfer—as electives, as equivalents, or not at all—based on what departments have determined. Senator Gulotta suggested that four-year institutions have more leeway in accepting credits as they can apply them towards general education; they are more selective in applying credits towards the major. The UW Colleges does not have that luxury as everything goes towards general education, so the departments must be more selective in accepting credits. Senator Raunio stated that it is vital that the UW Colleges be consistent campus to campus and department to department. In response to a question of how the process of acceptance or denial works, Chancellor Cross explained that is what he is looking for, a set of parameters for student affairs to be able to look at and see whether the course will transfer. Senator Peterson said that just looking at the course syllabus does not necessarily answer the question of comparability of the course; the question of the quality of instruction is answered more by who is accrediting the institution, and that is covered by the HLC when other such groups are suspect. The registrar is the transfer coordinator, and if there is something not on the list of accepted courses, it should go back to the registrar and then to the department. Provost Lampe acknowledged it is somewhat problematic due to the disperse nature of the UW Colleges, but it is important to be followed. Chancellor Cross asked the Faculty Council to think about the issue, and apologized as he had to leave for another engagement.

b) Other. There was no additional Other Business for the Faculty Council to discuss.

9. Adjournment. The March 15, 2013 meeting of the UW Colleges Faculty Council of Senators was adjourned at 5:05 p.m. by UW Colleges Faculty Representative Mark Peterson.
UW COLLEGES
Academic Staff Council of Senators
Friday, March 15, 2013
UW-Waukesha
3:45 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.

MINUTES

Members Present: Richard Krupnow (Lead Senator), Dan Anhalt, Jeff Verona, Steve Kaiser, Jena Jaeckels, Melvin Johnson, Carrie Desnoyers

Guests Present: Pam Dollard, Steve Wildeck

Meeting called to order at 3:40 pm.

Johnson moved to approve the minutes of the 9 January 2013 meeting. Jaeckels seconded. Motion approved by acclaim.

Kaiser moved to approve the agenda for the current meeting. Anhalt seconded. Motion approved by acclaim.

Krupnow announced that the academic staff had been notified of the upcoming Academic Senate election, via email from Dave Carlson.

Pam Dollard led a discussion regarding revisions to Academic Staff Personnel Policy #704, which is currently in its feedback period (until 27 March 2013). She noted that the revision is intended to bring all issues regarding promotion and progression into a single policy. A revised version of the policy will be circulated prior to the end of the feedback period.

Krupnow announced that the new policy for titling of Instructional Academic Staff is in its feedback period.

Krupnow announced that he will be checking the Senate constitution and bylaws regarding the possibility of adding an ex-officio position for limited appointments who are no longer represented on the Academic Staff Senate.

Meeting adjourned at 4:20 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Jeff Verona
Schedule

UW COLLEGES
Meetings of Senate, Faculty Council of Senators, Academic Staff Council of Senators, and Committees
Friday, March 15, 2013
UW-Waukesha
9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Coffee and Collegiality
8:30 a.m. - 9:00 a.m.
Room C101

Committee Meetings
9:00 a.m. - 10:55 a.m.
- Senate Academic Policy Committee
  Room A100
- Senate Budget Committee
  Room C158
- Faculty Professional Standards Committee
  Private Dining Room
- Senate Steering Committee
  Room C101

Presentation
11:00 a.m. - 11:25 a.m.
- State Budget Update
  Room C101
  Rosemary Potter, Government Relations

Presentation
11:30 a.m. - 12:20 p.m.
- Flexible Option Update
  Room C101
  Aaron Brower, Interim Provost & Vice Chancellor, UWEX

Lunch
12:25 p.m. - 1:10 p.m.
Private Dining Room

UW Colleges Senate
1:15 p.m. - 3:40 p.m.
Room C101

Council Meetings
3:45 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.
- Academic Staff Council of Senators
  Room C158
- Faculty Council of Senators
  Room C101
Draft Agenda
UW COLLEGES
Senate
Friday, March 15, 2013
UW-Waukesha
1:15 p.m. - 3:40 p.m.

1) Call to Order of 2012-2013 Senate

2) Welcome by UW-Waukesha Dean Harry Muir

3) Roll Call of 2012-2013 Senate and Introduction of Alternates

4) Approval of Agenda

5) Approval of Minutes: January 9, 2013, UW-Fond du Lac (posted in Public Folders>All Public Folders>Governance>Senate>Senate Minutes>2012-2013)

6) Reports

   a) Chancellor Ray Cross
   b) Provost and Vice Chancellor Greg Lampe
   c) Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Lisa Seale
   d) Associate Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management Rich Barnhouse
   e) Senate Steering Committee Chair & UWC Faculty Representative Mark Peterson
   f) Academic Staff Lead Senator Richard Krupnow
   g) UW Colleges Academic Staff Representative Carrie Desnoyers
   h) Student Governance Council President Ian Reese
   i) Senate Academic Policy Committee Chair Troy Kozma
   j) Senate Budget Committee Chair Matt Raunio
   k) Faculty Professional Standards Committee Chair Paul Whitaker
   l) Senate Assessment Committee Chair Deborah Paprocki

7) Old Institutional Business

   a) Adoption: Proposed Revision of UWC Bylaws 6.2 and 6.4 (“Elected Senate Bylaws Committees”) [SAPC] allowing a designee to attend SCC and/or SBCC meetings in place of the SAPC Chair

   b) Adoption: Proposed Revision of IP #320 (“Policy on Evaluation – Instructional Academic Staff (Category B), including Returning Retired Faculty”) [SAPC] revising schedule of visiting IAS

   c) Further Update on New Criminal Background Check Policy and Procedures [Dollard]

   d) Other
8) New Institutional Business

a) Introduction: Proposed Revision of IP #320 (“Policy on Evaluation – Instructional Academic Staff (Category B), including Returning Retired Faculty”) [FPSC] giving IAS written notification regarding merit and how to improve rating

b) Introduction: Proposed Revision of IP #104 (“Course and Instructional Policies”) [FPSC] adding a policy on grading and moving office hours policy

c) Introduction: Proposed Revision of IP #106 (“Atypical Course Policy”) [SAPC] adding designations for BAAS internship courses and adding Service-Learning courses

d) Introduction: Proposed Revision of IP #301.01 (“Administering the Student Survey of Instruction”) [SAPC] updating Student Survey of Instruction to account for new software and alternate modes of instruction


f) Introduction: Proposed Revision of IP #104 (“Course and Instructional Policies”) [SAPC] clarifying prohibition of scheduling student activities during final exam period

g) Introduction: Proposed Revision of IP #141 (“Bachelor of Applied Arts and Sciences Degree”) [FPSC] IAS teaching BAAS courses and clarification that experiential learning portfolios are submitted to departments

h) Introduction: Proposed Revision of IP #141.01 (“Bachelor of Applied Arts and Sciences Degree Guidelines for Professional Experience Courses”) [FPSC] IAS teaching BAAS courses and clarification on submission of experiential learning portfolios to departments

i) Introduction: Proposed Revision of IP #141.02 (“Bachelor of Applied Arts and Sciences Degree Professional Experience: Credit for Prior Experiential Learning”) [FPSC] IAS teaching BAAS courses and clarification that experiential learning portfolios are submitted to departments

j) Introduction: Proposed Revision of IP #106.01 (“LEC 100 First-Year Seminar Policy”) [SCC] streamlines modification of LEC 100 courses and clarifies instructor evaluation

k) Other

9) Other Institutional Business

a) Resolution of Appreciation for Pam Dollard

b) Other

10) Adjournment
Draft Agenda
UW COLLEGES
Faculty Council of Senators
Friday, March 15, 2013
UW-Waukesha
3:45 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.

1. Call to Order 2012-2013 Faculty Council of Senators

2. Roll Call of faculty senators and alternates

3. Approval of Agenda

4. Approval of Minutes: January 9, 2013, UW-Fond du Lac (posted in Public Folders>Public Folders>Governance>Senate>Senate Minutes>2012-2013)

5. Reports
   a) Chair Mark Peterson
   b) Faculty Professional Standards Committee Chair Paul Whitaker

6. Old Business
   a) Adoption: Proposed Revision of FPP #501.01 (“Promotion, Tenure, and Third-Year Tenure Progress and Retention Review Dossier Format”) [FPSC] no final hard copy
   b) Adoption: Proposed Faculty Council of Senators Bylaws [SSC]
   c) Other

7. New Business
   a) Introduction: Proposed Revision of FPP #501 (“Criteria and General Procedures for Appointment, Retention, Tenure Progress, Tenure, and Promotion (Bylaws)” [FPSC] clarifying role of dean in tenure track retention decisions
   b) Other

8. Other Business
   a) Discussion: Should we set institutional parameters for accepting transfer credits from private or for-profit institutions?
   b) Other

9. Adjournment
Roll Call

Select Recorder

Minutes from January 2013

Approve Agenda

I. AS Elections
II. ASPP #704
III. IAS Titling
IV. Adjourn
Attachment 2

UW Colleges Provost & Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs
Report to the UW Colleges Senate
March 15, 2013

Update on Higher Learning Commission Self-Study Process: I am pleased to report that on Friday, March 1, Chancellor Ray Cross received the following notification from the Higher Learning Commission:

This letter is formal notification of the action taken concerning University of Wisconsin Colleges by the Higher Learning Commission. At its meeting on February 25, 2013, the Institutional Actions Council (IAC) acted on the items below. This letter serves as the official record of this action, and the date of this action constitutes the effective date of your new status with the Commission.

**Action.** The IAC continued the accreditation of the University of Wisconsin Colleges with the next Reaffirmation of Accreditation in 2022-23.

**Action.** The IAC concurred with the evaluation findings and approved the institution’s request to offer the Bachelor of Applied Arts and Sciences and the change in wording in the mission statement to reflect the addition of this degree.

This is outstanding news and brings to an end our comprehensive self-study process. Our next steps will be to review and share the recommendations from the peer evaluator team that visited us in November 2012. Additionally, we will post the reports of the peer evaluator team that reflect on our three requests: continued accreditation of the Associate of Arts and Science degree; the accreditation of the Bachelor of Applied Arts and Sciences degree; and the UW Colleges mission change.

Once again, I want to thank everyone for their commitment to the self-study process. As you can see, the results were excellent!

Update on Bachelor of Applied Arts and Sciences Degree: I am pleased to report that significant progress has been made since the January meeting of the Senate. Below is a brief update of the most recent developments:

- **Curriculum:** To date, I have approved 29 courses for the BAAS degree completion program, and nine more have received preliminary approval by the SBCC. Of these, fourteen are designated as Cognitive Skills, 24 are Global Studies, eight are Service-Learning, and three are Internship courses. All approved UW Colleges and UW System partner institution courses are posted on the UW Colleges Website.
• **BAAS Program Plan and Curricular Sequence**: A two-year program plan is being developed by each of the six BAAS degree-completion program Associate Deans incorporating an array of UW Colleges approved courses and a selection of online courses from the affiliated UW System partner institution. The Associate Deans met on Friday, March 8, to finalize the curricular sequence for Fall 2013 and Spring 2014.

• **Compensation for Course Development**: Faculty and IAS can receive stipends for course development for the BAAS under an agreement signed by the Provost and active through Friday, May 31.

• **BAAS Degree-Completion Instructors**: The Senate Faculty Professional Standards Committee will be introducing a revision to Senate policy to allow faculty and qualified IAS members to teach any of the BAAS curriculum. Under the currently approved policy, only faculty members are eligible to teach the BAAS degree professional experience courses, including service-learning courses and internships.

• **PeopleSoft Configuration**: In February, the UW Colleges contracted with CedarCrestone, a consulting firm, to provide guidance and direction in the requirement analysis and configuration of the new BAAS degree-completion program in the current UW Colleges PeopleSoft software application. All BAAS degree student information, including student records, financial aid, and student financials, will be managed in PeopleSoft under the new configuration. Testing is now underway and BAAS courses will be loaded by mid-March. PRISM should be ready to accommodate BAAS degree-seeking students by Monday, April 1.

• **Marketing Campaign**: Now that the BAAS degree-completion program has received HLC accreditation, UW Colleges Marketing is now phasing in the marketing campaign based on recruiting students who are “driven to finish.” The following marketing materials have been created: A UW Colleges BAAS degree Web page; six campus-specific BAAS degree Web pages; a BAAS degree blog with information on curriculum, forms, and resources for faculty and staff; a tri-fold BAAS degree brochure for community partners; and a four-page Frequently Asked Questions document. A flyer for prospective students will be ready by March 15.

• **BAAS Degree Academic Advisors/Coaches**: With the notice of HLC accreditation, we are now prepared to hire six campus-based BAAS degree Academic Advisors/Coaches, each at .25 FTE. The BAAS degree Academic Advisors/Coaches are responsible for recruiting, admitting, advising, and retaining students in the BAAS degree-completion program.
program. They will actively work to retain BAAS students through intrusive advising and ongoing coaching through frequent email and telephone communication.

- **Wisconsin Technical College System (WTCS) Student Access to the BAAS Degree-Completion Program**: I chaired a task force that met throughout the fall to consider possible options that would provide a pathway into and through the BAAS degree-completion program for WTCS students. A final report and recommendations were submitted to Chancellor Ray Cross in early February and the WTCS Student Access to the BAAS Degree Task Force met with Chancellor Cross to discuss the recommendations. At the end of the meeting, it was decided that none of the recommendations were satisfactory. Currently, a subgroup of the committee is developing other options for Chancellor Cross’ consideration.

I will continue to keep you informed of future developments.

**Update on the Flexible Associate of Arts and Science Degree Committee**: In early September 2012, the Flexible Associate of Arts and Science (AAS) Degree Committee was formed to explore how the Flexible Option model might be implemented in the UW Colleges. To date, the committee has met six times. Below is a brief update of the developments since the January Senate Meeting:

- The UW Colleges Flexible Associate of Arts and Sciences Degree Committee, which is composed of twelve faculty members (three faculty members from each division and one department chair from each of the three divisions), has added two new members: Ian Reese, Student Government Council president, and Laura Pedrick, the UW-Milwaukee Flexible Option Coordinator. I continue to chair the committee.

- In February, the Philosophy department joined the academic departments and programs developing materials for the Flexible Option. In all, 17 out of 18 UW Colleges academic departments are now participating in Flexible Option development activities.

- To date, UW Colleges academic departments have identified 26 courses for development from a face-to-face to a Flexible Option format.

- Currently, the UW Colleges is focused on developing instructional materials for general education liberal arts courses offered within the freshman and sophomore year. With the addition of the development of a Chemistry lab course to the Flexible Option, the UW Colleges should be able to provide the Associate of Arts and Science degree in a
Flexible Option format by spring 2014. The UW Colleges Flexible Associate of Arts and Science Degree Committee will continue to guide these efforts.

- At its December meeting, the UW Colleges Flexible AAS Degree Committee reviewed and endorsed a proposed compensation schedule for academic departments committed to developing competencies, assessments, and instructional materials for the Flexible Option. Since December, twelve participating academic departments have submitted an itemized budget for my review and approval. I have approved all twelve budgets.

- The most pressing issue facing the participating UW Colleges academic departments is the need for professional development in the curricular design of the Flexible Option model. To that end, a UW Colleges professional development day will be held at the UW-Fond du Lac campus on Saturday, April 20. The day will begin with a general session for all Flexible Option developers. Following the general session, developers will have an opportunity to meet and work with other developers within their respective divisions (humanities, social sciences, natural sciences and mathematics). Consultants will be available throughout the day to answer questions, provide feedback, and offer guidance on competency and assessment development.

- At its January 31 meeting, UW Colleges Flexible AAS Degree Committee members discussed the appointment process for a UW Colleges Flexible Option coordinator position. Following the meeting, I worked with UW Colleges Human Resources Director Pam Dollard, UW-Extension Interim Provost Aaron Brower, and UW-Milwaukee Flexible Option Coordinator Laura Pedrick on drafting a position description. Once the position description was finalized, I put out a call to UW Colleges-all email list requesting nominations and self-nominations. In all, I received eight nominations (three faculty, three instructional academic staff, one continuing education director, and one student services coordinator). A screening committee consisting of four members from the UW Colleges Flexible AAS Degree Committee (Iddi Adam, Caroline Geary, Mark Peterson, and Kirthi Premadasa) and three members from the Office of Academic and Student Affairs (Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Lisa Seale, Associate Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management Rich Barnhouse, and me) was formed and met on Thursday, February 28 to review the materials submitted by each of the candidates and select a Flexible Option Coordinator. I have offered the position to the candidate and we are working out the final details of the appointment.

- At the request of the UW Colleges Flexible AAS Degree Committee members, a UW Colleges Flexible Option Developers email list has been created. The list was launched in
February and is proving to be useful to the developers as they are using the list to ask questions and share ideas about development work going on at the department level.

- In early March, a UW Colleges Flexible Option SharePoint site has also been created to help facilitate the sharing of competencies, assessments, and resources across departments. Academic department and program developers are posting their work on competencies and assessments, and sharing Flexible Option resources.
- On Wednesday, March 6, the UW Colleges Flexible AAS Degree Committee members met to discuss faculty roles in and workload implications of faculty engagement in the UW Colleges Flexible Option model. Committee members offered their perspectives on how faculty members might be engaged in advising and coaching students enrolled in the Flexible Option. Workload implications and compensation were also discussed during the meeting.
- As per the committee’s directive, I will continue to share a meeting summary after each of our committee meetings UW Colleges-wide. I will keep the Senate informed of future actions taken by the committee.

**Update on UW Colleges Concurrent Enrollment Implementation Committee Report:** The UW Colleges Concurrent Enrollment Implementation Committee submitted its final report and recommendations to me in early February. On February 12, I met with committee members to discuss the report and its recommendations, and to receive their advice for moving concurrent enrollment efforts forward UW Colleges-wide.

The membership of the committee was as follows:

**Co-chairs:**
Richard Barnhouse (Associate Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management)
Lisa Seale (Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs)

**Campus Executive Officer and Deans:**
Charles Clark (UW-Manitowoc)
Paula Langteau (UW-Marinette)
Martin Rudd (UW-Fox Valley)

**Associate Dean:**
Karen McLeer (UW-Richland)

**Assistant Campus Dean for Student Affairs:**
Joyce Atkins (UW-Fond du Lac)

**Assistant Campus Dean for Administrative Services:**
Ed Janairo (UW-Sheboygan)

**University Relations:**
Dorothy Thompson (UW-Richland)

**University Relations (Central Office):**
Mickey Michuda (Madison)

**Academic Department Chairs Representative:**
Dan Kallgren (History, UW-Marinette)

**Faculty Representatives:**
John Fons (Associate Professor, Computer Science, Engineering, Physics and Astronomy, UW-Rock County)
Tricia Wessel-Blaski (Assistant Professor, Psychology/Education, UW-Washington County)

**Continuing Education:**
Susan Adams (UW-Waukesha)

I want to thank committee members for their commitment to the task and their excellent report. Their work will make implementing a UW Colleges-wide concurrent enrollment effort possible. I am very grateful for all their hard work!

The final report clearly establishes a path forward for implementing a concurrent enrollment program UW Colleges-wide. Specifically, four implementation stages are recommended. They are as follows:

- **Stage One:** Putting an infrastructure in place to administer the program. This includes appointing a coordinator and an advisory committee to make decisions or recommendations to the appropriate administrative functions about strategic planning for the UW Colleges concurrent enrollment program.

- **Stage Two:** UW Colleges campuses establishing relationships (or continuing relationships) with local school districts in their respective regions including signing memoranda of understanding. Academic departments will work to approve qualified high school teachers to teach UW Colleges courses to high school students in the high school, and guidance counselors and faculty mentors will be identified, oriented and placed.

- **Stage Three:** Orienting high school personnel, including guidance counselors and high school teachers, to the UW Colleges concurrent enrollment program through such
means as workshops and Web-based introductions/orientations to the UW Colleges. UW Colleges faculty mentors will be identified and will provide new high school teachers with discipline-specific training and orientation. The UW Colleges coordinator will develop a comprehensive concurrent enrollment program manual and work with respective academic departments to develop a manual specific to each course taught in the UW Colleges concurrent enrollment program.

- Stage Four: UW Colleges courses are taught by approved high school teachers to high school students in the high school with all the attendant support for high school teachers and other participants in place.

I plan on following the four stage sequence recommended by the committee and described briefly above.

The immediate next step, therefore, will be to develop a position description for the UW Colleges concurrent enrollment coordinator and then once a coordinator is appointed, to name an advisory committee to guide our implementation efforts. To date, a position description for the coordinator position has been created and under review. I plan to initiate a UW Colleges-wide call for nominations shortly. Please be assured that implementing a UW Colleges-wide concurrent enrollment program will be done thoughtfully, respectfully, and slowly to ensure a high quality program.

I will continue to keep the Senate informed of any developments regarding the implementation of a UW Colleges concurrent enrollment program.

Respectfully submitted,

Greg Lampe, Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs

3.11.2013
Leadership opportunities in the UW Colleges take many forms, including service and shared governance positions on the Senate and the thirteen campuses. Additional opportunities are found in the coordinator positions housed in the Office of Academic Affairs, four of which typically report to the associate vice chancellor for academic affairs. I would like to report on the leadership work of four coordinators, thanking them for the initiatives they have undertaken this year and encouraging those interested in taking on similar roles in the future to talk with them about their experiences.

**UW Colleges Assessment Coordinator**

Valerie Murrenus Pilmaier (Assistant Professor, English, UW-Sheboygan) is integrating the work of campus assessment coordinators (CACs) more fully into the UW Colleges Assessment Program by creating a mentoring program for new CACs, preparing a CAC handbook, and planning for a new Fall meeting for CACs to network with one another. Campus assessment programs being the newest portion of the Assessment Program, Val has taken the initiative in helping to grow its support systems. She is also providing leadership in discussions underway among the Senate Assessment Committee (SAC), campus assessment coordinators, and the Office of Academic Affairs about the idea of SAC providing a common cycle for campus assessment projects. In addition, Val is coordinating SAC research into information literacy, in conjunction with the UW Colleges Library Council Assessment Committee.

**UW Colleges Engaging Students in the First Year Coordinator**

Jennifer Flatt (Professor, English and World Languages, UW-Marinette) is working closely with several groups of campus Engaging Students in the First Year (ESFY) coordinators on multiple fronts, including launch of a new class visit project for First-Year Seminar (LEC 100) courses, final development of rubrics for assessing LEC 100 learning outcomes, and continued exploration of the ESFY Program’s place in campus Strategic Enrollment Management iPlans. Jennifer has met with many institutional leadership groups, including the Senate Assessment Committee/Department Assessment Coordinators/Campus Assessment Coordinators at their January 2013 meeting at UW-Waukesha, and the Department Chairs at their meeting last week at UW-Fox Valley. Together with a planning group, Jennifer organized a highly successful ESFY Spring Conference that took place March 1, also at UW-Fox Valley, focused on the theme of “Forging First-Year Alliances,” which brought together many Student Affairs and UW Colleges Libraries personnel involved in campus- and Colleges-wide ESFY projects, along with many
LEC 100 instructors, campus ESFY coordinators, two deans, and Office of Academic and Student Affairs members.

**UW Colleges Professional Development Coordinator**

Asif Habib (Associate Professor, Chemistry, UW-Waukesha) is collaborating with the Marketing Office to design a new communication tool that will appear on the Grants Web site soon, a blog that will take the place of the emailed Professional Development Notes announcing periodic opportunities for UW Colleges, regional, and UW System professional development opportunities. Asif continues to work closely with the Senate Professional Development Committee and serves as their link to the provost’s office in shepherding committee recommendations for such important opportunities as sabbaticals, Summer Research Grants, and student Posters in the Rotunda.

**UW Colleges Service-Learning Coordinator**

Mike Jurmu (Associate Professor, Sociology, UW-Fond du Lac) has reactivated the Service-Learning Advisory Group and is reengaging with instructors who provide service-learning opportunities for students in their courses, conducting an instructor survey to assess the scope and depth of service-learning across UW Colleges. On March 22, Wisconsin Campus Compact is hosting its 10th Anniversary Civic Engagement Institute in Madison, and Mike has led the Service-Learning Advisory Group’s planning for a UW Colleges-led panel. Mike is also working with campus deans to designate a service-learning contact person for each campus. As the professional experience coordinators for each of the BAAS (Bachelor of Applied Arts and Sciences degree-completion program) gear up, he is working with Patti Wise (in her role as BAAS Project Manager) and the BAAS Advisory Group, as well.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa Seale
March 11, 2012
Attachment 4

UW Colleges Associate Vice Chancellor for
Student Affairs and Enrollment Management
Report to the UW Colleges Senate
March 15, 2013

Spring 2013 Enrollment

According to the Bluebook enrollment report, as an institution the UW Colleges has seen an enrollment decline in headcount of 2.4% from 13,674 (Spring 2012) to 13,341 (Spring 2013) or 333 students across the institution. Our current enrollment headcount has returned to the numbers that were experienced in 2010. The Full-Time Equivalency (FTE) declined by 4.8% from 8742 (Spring 2012) to 8323 (Spring 2013) or 419 FTE across the institution. Our current enrollment FTE has returned to the numbers that were experienced in 2009. These declines were expected; and much like Fall 2012, the declines were less than anticipated.

Enrollment Management

The UW Colleges Strategic Enrollment Management Plan (iPlan) was implemented during Fall 2012 and has been in active use since that time (see 10-26-12 report). On February 20, 2013 the Assistant Campus Deans for Student Affairs and the University Relations Directors met at UW-Marathon County to discuss revisions and adjustments needed within the strategy and technology. The group also discussed guiding principles/goals for FY14. Over the course of Spring and Summer 2013, the iPlan for FY14 (year 2) will be implemented.

2013 Spring Student Affairs Conference

UW-Fond du Lac is hosting the Spring Student Affairs Conference on Friday, March 8. Whereas the Fall conference was focused on exchanging best practices, new programs, and concepts for consideration, the Spring conference will be focused on internal student affairs operations. The conference will provide updates regarding the Registrar’s Office, Financial Aid, Hobsons-Connect, and cross-institutional operational group sharing. Additionally, the annual Student Affairs awards will be presented. The awards include: outstanding academic staff member in student affairs, outstanding classified staff member in student affairs, outstanding team in student affairs, and outstanding external contributor to student affairs.

ESFY Roundtable

Jennifer Flatt, Lisa Seale and I will be facilitating a roundtable discussion during the ESFY Conference on Friday, March 1, hosted by UW-Fox Valley. As I have described in previous reports, ESFY and Enrollment Management are working together to strategically incorporate ESFY programs into the iPlan. The purpose is to provide a more comprehensive approach to campus retention initiatives. Our roundtable discussion will provide campuses the opportunity to brainstorm and share best practices across the institution.
Operational Advisory Group for UW Flex Academic and Student Support

The initial meeting of the Advisory Group occurred on January 23, 2013 for a 90-minute conference call. A two-day retreat (noon-to-noon) was held on February 5 and 6, 2013 at Chula Vista Resort in Wisconsin Dells.

The group has been established by UW Extension to provide input into the development of the academic and student support framework necessary for the enrollment of students in the first cohort of flexible program options. It is anticipated that these offerings will be available during the Fall/Winter of 2013. UW Extension has assembled a group of experts with representation from admissions, financial aid, registrars, bursars, transfer coordinators, advisors and enrollment management functional areas including academic and student support services. The group includes staff members from the UW Colleges and UW-Milwaukee. Both institutions will serve as the initial Flex institutions for the UW System.

The Operational Advisory Group is charged with:

1. Identifying those components essential to enabling students to enroll in and progress through Flex options.
2. Developing both short-term and long-term solutions to putting in place the academic and student services so that students may enroll in and progress through Flex options, beginning in Fall/Winter 2013.
3. Determining the right balance for which components of each academic and student support system will need to operate at the institutional level and be housed there, and which will need to be centralized through UW-Extension.

(Per 01/09/13 memo from: Aaron Brower, Interim Provost, UW-Extension, and Special Assistant to the President for Educational Strategies).

Specifically, the desired outcome is to create a framework that allows students to seamlessly enroll in the Flex option with either institution. The Operational Group is one of three advisory groups that have been established. Additionally, a faculty/instructional academic staff group has been convened, as well as an administrative advisory group.

The UW Colleges representatives include Larry Graves, Admissions/Registrar/Transfer Coordinator, Bill Trippett, Director of Financial Aid, Laura Rader, Bursar, Rich Barnhouse, Associate Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management, Vicki Keegan, Director of Marketing, and Kristin Fillhouer, Assistant Campus Dean for Student Affairs, UW-Rock County. I will continue to keep the Senate informed as the Operational Group’s work progresses.

Respectfully submitted,

Rich Barnhouse
Associate Vice Chancellor,
Student Affairs and Enrollment Management
03.01.13
The Senate Steering committee met on January 28th, February 11th, & Feb 25th. Summaries of Senate Steering’s agenda items and a log of the chair’s “action items” follow at the end.

Highlights:

- **Meetings with System:** I attended Faculty Representatives meetings on February 1st and March 1st, and the Board of Regents meetings on Feb 7-8 and March 7 – more of which, below.

- **The 301.01 review:** Sections of the Senate-adopted revisions to 301.01 – specifically on administering the SSI for online courses – was not approved by the Chancellor. Workload estimates from the director of distance ed suggested that implementing the policy as written would be impracticable. The Provost felt, in good conscience, that he could not ask the Chancellor to approve a policy he couldn’t implement.

  I am happy to report that the Provost called in the directors or D2L and CITS to verify the work load estimates provided by the director of distance education concerning the amount of time actually required to administer the SSI for courses taught online. Rather than the 25 or more hours asserted again and again by the director of distance education, the Provost discovered that 4-5 hours was a more accurate estimate. This consultation produced some thoughtful and practical recommendations for SAPC to consider as they now go forward with, what should be, only slight modifications to their originally introduced and adopted proposed revisions of IP #301.01.

  Our thanks to the Provost for sifting and winnowing the radically different work load estimates to produce such a satisfactory result.

  In my capacity as the chair overseeing committee work within the Senate, I would be remiss if I did not note that the original estimates on which SAPC based its proposed (and adopted) revisions were correct from the start. The overestimations in required workload have cost Senate committees (and committee members) nearly a year’s worth of committee time and frustration.

- **Calls about the calendar:** I fielded e-mail from three different campuses on a couple of different issues related to next year's academic calendar. One group complained about the evil of Saturday exams and two more raised questions about the timing for our Winterim – specifically about whether Central compared the timing of our Winterim with the timing of spring semester on the four-year comprehensives with an eye to picking off their students. The Provost forwarded these concerns to his staff.
The-way-we-do-the-things-we-do Department: My concerns about the lack of clear parliamentary procedure for the introduction of Senate business, currently dictated by IP#405, rest on the question of whether the Steering Chair should read #405 strictly (i.e. anything introduced is discussed and sent to the Collegia) or loosely (i.e. anything introduced is discussed and – then, if everyone still thinks it’s okay and no one finds anything that warrants a delay in sending introduced material on to the Collegia pending further review – it’s sent to the Collegia).

Many thanks go out to archaeological perspicacity of Linda Baum who dug through the dusty remains of the 2003-2004 Senate meeting minutes. The very same question was raised and discussed, exhaustively, back in 2003.

In 2003 the Senate questioned whether to vote on “Introductions” – what the documents refer to as an "initiation vote" – before sending the introduced revisions on to the campus Collegia. Some felt that such a vote might short circuit the role of campus Collegia in shared governance. Others felt that an initiation vote would improve procedural clarity. In January 2004 the Senate even passed a resolution supporting a strict reading (any item introduced is discussed and then sent to the Collegia).

As chair, I’m content to follow this resolution and give #405 a strict reading. By way of contrast, during our conversations at Steering both the Provost and Associate Vice Chancellor encouraged me to adopt a loose reading of #405 – to allow the chair to exercise some discretion and, perhaps, send items back to committee that “may not be quite ready yet.” I would be perfectly content to do so – if and when the Senate adopts “chair’s discretion” as a revision of the current #405. Until that time, I will follow the 2004 resolution, adopt a strict reading of the current #405, and send anything introduced in the Senate on to the Collegia. I thank the committee for its indulgence in this fairly wonky excursion into parliamentary procedure.

For full juicy wingding policy giddiness you can find all the details of this discussion from 2003 and 2004 in <shudder> Public Folders.

Here’s the address: PublicFolders > All Public Folders > Governance > Senate >…Senate Minutes > Historical > 2003-2004.

Check the Senate Minutes for 1-21-04 and look for Attachment 9: Resolution regarding Institutional Policy #405, Procedures for Creating and Revising Senate Policies. It appears on p.56.

Highlights and notes from the Faculty Reps and Board of Regents meetings: recovered from my reports to Senate Steering:

FACULTY REPS MEETINGS FEB 1ST

A few choice details from the Feb 1st FacReps meeting in Madison:

• The faculty reps were brought up to speed on Gannett’s posting of salaries across the state. The general sense from press releases state wide is, essentially: “UW System
employees have lousy pay – even the tech schools pay their faculty better.” The consensus at System is that this impression is the right one to leave in the minds of Wisconsin’s citizens.

[Something to think about: the fac rep from River Falls leaned over to the rest of us and noted that, technically speaking, the state of Wisconsin isn't really “paying” UW faculty, since the state now only covers about 14% of the costs. Our students are paying us, not the State.]

- Moreover, the comprehensives, some of which have lost as much as 10% of their tenured faculty during the last few years, have the feeling that they're becoming a training ground for faculty going elsewhere – the phrase “the UW has become a farm team for other university systems” occurred with notable frequency. Faculty are leaving either to other states where they can earn significantly more or to industry.

- The prairie fire at System these days is the HRS debacle. A fuller account follows below, under the Regents Meeting.

- Dave Giroux rolled out a Press Toolkit for the new “Knowledge Powers Wisconsin” marketing campaign. All the system schools are expected to use it in their PR (eg. “Knowledge Powers Fox Valley,” “Knowledge Powers UW-GB,” “Knowledge Powers Wisconsin Cheese,” etc.).

[The copy in the ad avoids proper use an Oxford Comma. I objected. Dave explained that even Kevin Reilly is pro-Oxford comma. To me this is merely one more sign that the anticipated Zombie Apocalypse is not inbound but has, already, quietly, taken place.]

Social media have been infiltrated: Twitter handle: @UWPOWERSME

- At lunch we heard an update on the Flex Option from Aaron Brower, Interim Provost, UW-Extension. They have an “Operations Group” (which will look into operations like registration and tuition) up and running. They have a retreat scheduled to start brainstorming.

[New metaphor: the Flex Option as “All-Inclusive Resort” model, rather than “Old Country Buffett”.]

Still awake? But wait, there’s more!

I attended the Board of Regents meeting on February 7/8 in Madson.

For full details, please check the following links, especially the Day 1 and Day 2 news summaries.

BOARD OF REGENTS MEETING & Feb 7/8th

February 7 and 8, 2013
- February Outline Agenda (7 pages, 464 KB)
- February Agendas and Supporting Materials
  - Full Board - Thursday a.m. (5 pages, 73 KB)
  - Education Committee (87 pages, 1,719 KB)
  - Business, Finance and Audit Committee (77 pages, 1,355 KB)
  - Capital Planning and Budget Committee (23 pages, 735 KB)
  - Research, Economic Development and Innovation Committee (6 pages, 171 KB)
  - Full Board - Friday a.m. (5 pages, 108 KB)
  - Day 1 | Day 2 news summary

Highlights:

- **PETA protest.** While VP Mark Nook was explaining the latest retention data for under-represented minorities, two protestors, one of them James Cromwell (the famous actor/vegetarian/activist… the farmer in *Babe*), walked into the middle of the 18th floor board room, held up large posters of experimental lab animals, (cats with electrodes stuck in their brains), and began saying “Shame on you for allowing this. This isn't science. This is torture.” The faculty reps thought they were very professional and that the regent response was courteous and appropriate. Have a look at their streaming video here: http://allanimalsblog.org/2013/02/07/3374/


- I attended the Capital Planning and Budget Committee to hear a Report on City and County Financial Support, specifically: a report from Chancellor Cross, the Sheboygan County administrator, and Sheboygan’s new dean, Jackie Joseph-Silverstein on Sheboygan's latest building project. Steve Wildeck gave a quick history of our relationship with the counties. As usual, the local political leaders believe that **UW-Sheboygan is the best kept secret in Sheboygan county.**
**HRS overpayments**: the real focus of this particular Regents meeting and, one expects, President Reilly’s life for the next few months. For the full account see Reilly’s testimony before the Joint Legislative Audit Committee about UW System benefits overpayment January 22, 2013

The argument I heard: changing from the old to the new system, both in terms of hardware and software, was terrifically “complex.”

(Complex = each month UWS issues 79,000 checks to 26 campuses and 70+ extension offices, and then deducts different kinds of benefits and many UW employees who have multiple jobs each with their own set of multiple funding streams.)

The Regents are getting biweekly reports from a taskforce assigned to straighten this out.

System has a three pronged approach: 1) an internal audit function including a “vigorous review,” 2) an external risk assessment to exam policy, process, people, and technology, and 3) full cooperation with the LAB.

Nonetheless, Regent Rogers asked the central question: “How do you just lose $33 million?”

Answer: the system is really really complex.

Stay tuned.

**Flex Update**: A 25 Jan WSJ story appeared on UW’s Flex Option. The story got 5600 LIKES on FB. Flex was featured on southern California public radio. AAC&U association meeting heard a presentation on Flex. 650 possible students have now asked for more info. The pilot (with 100 students) is already running.


**Quick details**: 75% of current students are now “post-traditional.” Calling them non-traditional when today only about 25% of students are anything like what we used to call “traditional” doesn’t make any sense. Nearly half of all US College students receive Pell grants. Federal student loan rate has doubled since 2003. Ditto for defaults.

**Presentation of 2013 Regents’ Diversity Awards**

a. Individual: Professor Angela Bauer, UW-Green Bay
b. Individual: Professor Douglass Henderson, UW-Madison
c. Team: McNair Scholars Program, UW-Whitewater

Finally:
- **New protocols on responsibilities to children due to be implemented on campuses by March 1st.**

Full from too much information, but happily caffeinated, I headed north on 151 toward UW-Washington County the relatively quieter informational background radiation of the Kettle Moraine.

**Here’s a summary of the most recent SSC agendas.**

As always governance-wonk thrills are available in great abundance on the brand new Senate website.

**Business before Senate Steering**

**2013-01-09**

a. Revision to #104 IV H. Students attending committee meetings during finals week. [refer to SAPC plus SCC and SBC?]
b. Policy revision for cross-linked courses, specifically for WOM. [Holly Hassel]
c. Task SOPC and SAPC to begin the process of integrating online best practices into policy? [Peterson]
d. Possible policy revisions regarding IS, AP, and Math core courses.
e. Revisiting question from SSC #8 agenda item 5h: constitutional foundation for student participation in evaluating faculty.

**Other Business**

SSC Spring Meeting dates: 28 January, 11 Feb, 25 Feb, 1 April, 15 April, 6 May.

Discussion: integrating the Classified Staff Council into shared governance.

**2013-01-28**

a. Proposed revision of #320 to include Assoc. Deans in IAS visitation reports circulation
b. Nominations to UW Colleges Colloquium Planning Committee.
c. Proposed revision to #501 and FAR timelines [from Marc Sackman]
d. Using social media to make renewal, tenure, merit, and promotion decisions. [also from Marc Sackman]
e. Housekeeping: Revision of language in IP #301.01.II.A: “retention” to “rehiring.”
f. Proposed revision of #403 and 403.01. Revising the forms to reflect recent updates. [Chair’s rep Holly Hassel]

**Other Business**

Parliamentary procedures governing Senate Introductions. [Peterson]

**2013-02-11**

a. Recommendations from the task force on Service Learning and Internships. [Patti Wise]
b. Senate involvement with LEAD team activities.
c. Marathon’s request to revisit the Academic Calendar and the evil of Saturday exams.
e. FPSC update on FPP# 603
f. FPSC recommendations on IP#141 regarding IAS teaching BAAS courses.
g. Marathon’s proposed revision to Constitution 3.05

2013-02-25
a. 301.01 workload issue and suggestions. [to SAPC]
b. Housekeeping changes: from “Student Services” to “Student Affairs”
c. Introductions from FPSC: proposed revisions of #501 (clarifying the role of deans) and #320 (requiring adequate feedback for IAS with renewable contracts).
d. FPSC’s request for advice on moving the grading and office hours policies into #104.
e. Senate procedures: whether to require a motion and vote on introductions.
f. Resolution thanking UPS conversion participants.
g. Final member of Spring Colloquium Planning committee: Gigi Koenig.

Chair’s Action Items and activity log:

a. **Peterson** will steer IP #104.IV.H to SAPC, asking them to study the matter of meetings during finals week (Colleges-wide? Student participation?).
b. **Peterson** will send the question of possible policy creation for cross-listed courses to SAPC with the note that they include SCC (transfer issues, etc.) in the discussion.
c. **Peterson** will task Hassel with having department chairs work on online visitation policies and ensuring that someone with online experience is included in the evaluation process. Hassel is to report back before the end of the semester.
d. **Peterson** will contact the senators/representatives of UW-Marathon County, explain the situation surrounding the Constitutional foundation for student participation in faculty evaluation, and ask how they wish to proceed with the item they sent.
e. **Peterson** will send out meeting requests for the upcoming SSC meetings.
f. **Peterson** will formally notify Hankenson, Gillard, Seale, Bloedow, and Krupnow of their ad hoc committee membership and advise them to start work as soon as possible.
g. **Peterson** will contact the Classified Staff Advisory Council and inform them that a member is invited to attend and offer a report at the SSC meetings.
h. **Lampe** will ask Brigham to write a description of UWC Online Curriculum Advisory Committee and circulate it along with membership list.
i. **Peterson** will contact Flatt regarding IP #320 and send the matter to SAPC (returning IAS and visitation reports to associate deans).
j. **Peterson** will inform Joneson, Plessel, and Habeck of their membership on the UW Colleges Colloquium Planning Committee. Peterson will also send out another call.
k. **Peterson** will check with Pam Dollard regarding reasoning behind timelines for FPP #501 and report to the next SSC meeting.
1. **Peterson** will inform Professor Sackman that policy is clear on what can be used in tenure, renewal, promotion, and merit decisions.

m. **Peterson** will send IP #301.01 to SAPC regarding the change of “retention” to “rehiring.”

n. **Peterson** will steer IP #403 and #403.01 to SOPC to review the language for possible updates in light of new documents from the Online program.

o. **Peterson, Seale, and Baum** will research Senate parliamentary procedures for the next Steering meeting.

p. **Peterson** will steer the first, third, and fourth recommendations of the SL/IN Task Force to SAPC. The Registrar and Service-Learning Coordinator are good references. Report back in time for possible March Senate introductions.

q. **Peterson** will send the second recommendation of the SL/IN Task Force to SCC. The fifth and sixth recommendations will also be sent for consideration. Report back in time for possible March Senate introductions.

r. **Lampe** will send information on setting the Academic Year calendar to UWMC for their consideration.

s. **Peterson** will inform Saleh and Jacobson of their appointment to the UWC Colloquium Planning Committee, notifying Asif Habib as well.

t. **Peterson** will send out a call for an AAS member on the UWC Colloquium Committee.

u. **Peterson** will steer IP #141 and IP #141.01 to FPSC to change “faculty” to “instructor.”

v. **Peterson** will contact the UWMC Steering Committee for clarification on their suggestions around UWC Constitution 3.05, reminding them of significance of Constitutional changes.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Peterson, Chair
Senate Steering Committee
Academic Staff Elections

The Academic Staff Council of Senators is currently considering changes to its bylaws that would allow select limited appointees to serve as academic staff for governance purposes only. The specific wording under consideration is:

"For purposes of voting in Council elections and being elected to the Council, and being appointed by the Council to represent academic staff on any committee, persons who hold limited appointments are eligible provided they do not currently hold a faculty position and are not already represented in shared governance via groups, such as Deans and Associate Deans groups, that routinely meet with UW Colleges administration."

To date, with feedback from academic staff having waned, academic staff expressed overall support for the proposed change. Two significant though minority objections have, however, been expressed: one, it is more important to address the issue of administration's increased use of limited appointments in the name of flexibility as it results in an increased number of Colleges employees being excluded from shared governance; two, including limited appointees in academic staff governance means those limited appointees would be voting on personnel policies to which they are not subject because, as the System Legal ruling makes clear, counting them as academic staff for governance "in no way changes the rights and responsibilities as outlined by law, regulations and policy as to limited appointments."

On March 5, 2013, the required thirty-day feedback period - allowing all academic staff the opportunity to respond to the proposed change - will expire. I am scheduling a teleconference for the AS Council to vote on the bylaws change that day and hope to speak with the Chancellor the following day for acceptance or rejection, as academic staff elections must be completed by the end of March and within a fortnight.

Academic Staff Personnel Policy #704

HR Director, Pam Dollard, submitted to the AS Council proposed revisions to ASPP #704. The proposed revisions would update promotion and retitling procedures, bringing the policy into line with current UPGs and practice, and expedite implementation of salary changes based on promotion or retitling. Currently, the policy requires that Administrative Academic Staff wait
until the next annual budget cycle for any increase in salary to take effect. The new policy would implement salary changes on the first pay period following promotion or retitling.

I requested and received permission from the AS Council to run the required thirty-day day feedback period concurrently with the feedback period from the AS Personnel Committee, in an attempt to expedite the policy review process. To date, the only feedback received has been from Karen Greenler, ASPC, and Dave Carlson at UW Rock; the two provided detailed recommendations that the ASCS will discuss at its March 15, 2013, meeting. Pam Dollard has been invited to attend that meeting to answer any questions about proposed changes to 704.

**University Staff Shared Governance**

Margaret Hankenson and Lisa Seale have been reviewing the UW Colleges Constitution and recommending changes for inclusion of University Staff in shared governance. As the academic staff representative serving on the ad hoc committee formed to address University Staff participation in shared governance in Colleges, I have been reviewing the recommendations and offering feedback as needed.

**IAS Titling Guidelines**

The AS Personnel Committee is working on IAS titling from two angles: one, develop guidelines to address the full range of IAS workload expectations, including the requirement that IAS participate in scholarship especially at the no-prefix and Senior levels; two, develop interim guidelines for promotion/retitling until a more detailed policy can be developed and implemented.

On March 12, 2013, I and ASPC Chair, Bob Apfel, are scheduled to meet with Chancellor Cross and Provost Lampe to discuss the ASPC’s recommendations. I will update the AS Council, including the results of said discussion, at its March 2013 meeting.

Respectfully Submitted
March 1, 2013
Richard Krupnow
Academic Staff Representatives Meeting Report, Friday, February 1, 2013

Discussion among Academic Staff Representatives
- Annual Academic Staff Leadership Conference
- Theme: The Changing Nature of Higher Education
- Possible Tracts
  - Personnel System
  - Flex Options
  - Effective Academic Staff Evaluations
  - Training for Leadership
  - Online Education/ Hybrid Online Course Design
  - Changes in Student Body

July 25 and 26 – Concourse Hotel

Joint Session of Academic Staff and Faculty Reps with Senior Vice President Mark Nook, and Associate Vice President Stephen Kolison
- Knowledge Powers Wisconsin
  - UWPowersMe – twitter handle
    - Faculty and staff can volunteer to take the reins of the accounts for a day or week

Academic Staff Representatives Meeting Report, Friday, March 1, 2013

Discussion among Academic Staff Representatives
- Discussion of Grievance Procedures and Dismissal for Cause Policy
  - Reviewed recommended changes to Dismissal for Cause System Policy
  - Reviewed Dismissal for Cause policies from multiple UW Institutions
  - Discovered that UW Colleges has a Grievance Procedures policy for faculty and not for staff.
    - We should discuss this as we should have a policy for Academic Staff, or revise the current policy to include Academic Staff.
- Classified staff opportunity to become AS
  - Will senate members host meetings on their campuses to share ideas and promote discussion of the possible change and its impact
    - Multiple campuses have hosted sessions
    - More have plans to host sessions
    - What will the colleges do?
- Academic Staff Leadership Conference
- I am on the conference planning committee
- Save the date has been created: http://www.uwsa.edu/acss/asreps/confer.htm
2013 Academic Staff Leadership Conference
THE CHANGING NATURE OF HIGHER EDUCATION
2013 Conference: The University of Wisconsin System Administration is hosting this year’s conference, July 25-26, 2013, at the Concourse Hotel, Madison, WI.
Registration for the Conference Opens May 2013.

- Does the provost pay for some attendance fees?
  - Provost Lampe has offered to further financially support the attendance of UW Colleges Academic Staff (historically 6 people)
  - There has been a suggestion to offer a complete attendance fee waiver for all Teaching Academic Staff to promote increased attendance.

- Sal Carrenza (leading the conference committee) will send a survey to gauge interest in topics to narrow down the list.
- I have volunteered to present on online/ hybrid course design and technology.

Governor’s Budget Recommendation (Freda Harris, Associate Vice President for Budget and Planning) (See Fact Sheet for Biennial Budget - at end of document)
- This year’s proposed budget includes a Flexible Block Grant Funds. This fund will be used to cover increases in fringe benefits, utility costs and possible pay plan increases. It is unsure what type of funding will remain.
- Governor has recommended that the BOR gain the flexibility to decide what to do with this block of money.
- Creating a pay plan is a high priority however the details of this will not be known until the budget is finalized and utility costs are known.
- Still unsure what will happen to tuition rates
- This is a positive budget, best we have seen in a long time.
- Send message that this budget is what we need.

Update on Desire to Learn (Lorna Wong, Director of Learning Technology Development)
- Our contract with D2L is up for renewal in June 2013.
- Satisfaction surveys indicate that satisfaction is high among students and faculty/staff.
- Currently planning to renew contract.
- Plan to negotiate a shorter term contract, with option for renewal.

BOR Meetings and Other Issues (Mark Nook, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs)
- One Day Deep Dive Meeting
  - Topic One: Achieving Quality Access and Success
    - Knowledge Powers Wisconsin
    - More Graduates!
      - Threats: high school enrollment and graduates down; Quality (hanging on to staff with low salaries)
      - Opportunities: try and draw more of the high level graduates; new markets (adult and non-traditional students)
      - Chancellors from Parkside, River Falls and Colleges will speak

30 Core Credit Transfer (Mark Nook and Terry Brown, Senior Special Assistant, Academic and Student Affairs)
- Proposal to create 30 Core Credits of Gen Ed that would transfer between all state higher education institutions( tech schools, community college, universities)
Currently have 8 institutions that accept 30+ Credits (6 of them accept the same 30)
Half of the states already have legislation to this effect

University of Wisconsin System
Fact Sheet on Biennial Budget

New Resources (best budget for UW in many biennia):

The recommended budget provides $181.3 million of new GPR biennially, $188.2 million when fees are added (GPR/Fees) for:

Cost to Continue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost to Continue</th>
<th>Base $</th>
<th>Biennial GPR</th>
<th>Biennial GPR/Fees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary Adjustments</td>
<td>$645,000</td>
<td>$913,200</td>
<td>$1,290,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>$12,846,400</td>
<td>$18,187,800</td>
<td>$25,692,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Leases/Required Moves</td>
<td>$863,300</td>
<td>$1,688,500</td>
<td>$1,688,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td>$25,833,800</td>
<td>$42,413,200</td>
<td>$42,413,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cost to Continue</strong></td>
<td><strong>$40,188,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$63,202,700</strong></td>
<td><strong>$71,084,500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Initiatives</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incentive Grants</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbone Center (one time match)</td>
<td>$3,750,000</td>
<td>$3,750,000</td>
<td>$3,750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARM/Triumph</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flex Option</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
<td>$1,950,000</td>
<td>$1,950,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible Block Grant Funds*</td>
<td>$57,056,000</td>
<td>$89,444,500</td>
<td>$89,444,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total New Initiatives Funds</strong></td>
<td><strong>$73,606,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$118,144,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$118,144,500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Flexible Block Grant funds may be used for fringe benefit cost increases from FY ’13 through FY ’15, cost of utilities increases, compensation increases or other priorities of the Board.

Major Changes Recommended in the Budget for the UW System

Funding to assist with fringe benefits and compensation are included in the UW Budget rather than being supplemented from the state’s compensation reserve as in the past.

The UW System is authorized to establish pay for faculty and staff without JCOER approval.

Veterans who enrolled in the military from other states but have resided in the state for 5 years would be eligible for WI GI Bill benefits; provides eligibility for children and spouses of disabled veterans who enrolled from other states under certain conditions and removes time limitations on benefits of spouses of veterans who died in the line of duty or received a 30% or greater disability in the line of duty. A requirement that veterans maintain a 2.0 GPA was added.
The statute exempting the university from the Department of Administration’s (DOA) authority to sell or lease state property and facilities is repealed.

The UW System and the Wisconsin Technical College System are required to enter into an agreement that ensures no less than 30 credits of core general undergraduate courses transfer towards graduation.

The budget would allow the UW System to continue to participate in third-party internet consortia that advance research or higher education (Internet2) or new entities if approved by DOA.

Participation in the Course Options program has been expanded to include the university, allowing students to take university courses to apply to graduation. The Department of Public Instruction (DPI) will determine the amount school districts will pay.

Changes were made to the ability to operate or establish a charter school.

**Major Changes Impacting the UW System**

No increases were made to UW financial aid programs, however additional funding is provided for the Wisconsin Covenant program in the Higher Educational Aids Board (HEAB).

The service break required for rehired annuitant would increase from 30 days to 75 and rehired annuitants would no longer be permitted to receive an annuity if they work more than 2/3’s time.

The Group Insurance Board is required to impose a $50 per month premium surcharge for eligible employees who use tobacco in 2014 and 2015.

The Group Insurance Board must offer employees the option for a high-deductible healthcare plan that includes a health savings account.

Currently, the state may not pay more than 88% of the average premium costs of the lowest cost health insurance plans. The budget bill provides that the state may not pay more than 88% of the average premium cost in each tier.

The budget includes language that enables the sale of state heating plants, but no funding or FTE are removed.

DOA is required to let all construction projects that exceed $185,000 through a modified single prime contracting process.

Respectfully Submitted,
March 5, 2013
Carrie Ann Desnoyers
SGC continues to remain busy as we progress through the spring semester. We have been encouraged to see many colleges students taking a leading role in advocating for their rights as students, as well as lobbying on legislative issues related to higher education.

On February 20th, President Reese was a panelist in a budget town hall discussion on the UW-Marathon Campus. Other speakers were Campus Dean and CEO Keith Montgomery, Wausau Daily Herald Opinion Editor Rob Mentzer, and Representative Mandy Wright, of the 85th Assembly District. The forum was a first look at the impact the budget might have on the UW System and the Colleges in particular.

SGC has a campus visit planned to UW-Barron County on March 29th. We look forward to this opportunity to visit with their Student Government Association, and discuss how SGC can better serve them going forward.

Lastly, and perhaps most importantly, SGC is excited to announce it will be hosting a SUFAC/Shared Governance Summit for all UW-Colleges Students. This summit will be on April 13-14. UW-Fox Valley has graciously agreed to host this event. This summit will focus on gathering information from our veteran colleges student leaders, and organizing it in a format that will be helpful to our incoming student leaders. Institutional memory is a constant struggle for Colleges student leaders, and we trust our efforts to address this concern will be helpful.

Forward for Students,

Ian D. Reese
Attachment 9

Senate Academic Policy Committee Chair
Report to the UW Colleges Senate
March 15, 2013

1. Update on Revision of Chapter 4 of UWC Constitution.

Chairs’ Rep Hassel brought to Women’s Studies the suggestion that the language in Chapter 4 be amended to match that of the statutory definition of a department. The Women’s Studies program agreed that this revision, if passed, would satisfy the concerns and request of Chair’s Rep Hassel. With this settled, SAPC will be meeting with FPSC to settle on final language for a revision to be brought to the Senate in April.

The other outstanding issue was defining the role of smaller, department-based programs. As of the writing of this report, neither SAPC nor FPSC have received any feedback from these programs. SAPC Chair Kozma will attempt to solicit some feedback, hopefully in time for the March meeting with FPSC.

2. Update on a Crosslisting Policy

Chairs Rep Hassel initiated this request and has spoken with SAPC Chair Kozma. Kozma has also spoken to SCC and Registrar Graves about the policy. Unfortunately, there appears to be no consensus on what, exactly, a cross-listed class is or its primary purpose. This lack of a shared meaning translates into quite divergent policy positions. SAPC believes that, in the end, this is an issue that should be resolved by the departments and Kozma has asked that this issue be addressed at the Deans and Chairs meeting to see if any consensus could be reached.


Currently each campus has its own Early Alert program. SAPC was asked whether there should be a Colleges-wide policy to guide this. SAPC polled steering chairs, Student Services and faculty from all campuses and also the Online program to see (i) what methods are employed and (ii) whether there was support for a universal policy.

Based on feedback, SAPC does not believe that a universal Early Alert system should be initiated. As each campus offers unique challenges, a universal system would make the Early Alert program less responsive and less nimble than having individualized campus programs. SAPC does recommend, however, that each campus communicate with each other on their programs so as to share best practices.
4. Introduction of Revisions to Institutional Curricular Policy #202

Currently each campus decides on how to distribute midterm grade results. SAPC was asked whether there should be a Colleges-wide policy. SAPC polled steering chairs and Student Services from all campuses and also the Online program to see (i) what methods are employed and (ii) whether there was support for a universal policy.

Based on feedback, SAPC recommends that all campuses (and the Online Program) make use of PRISM to distribute midterm grades. The primary reason for this comes from the fact that students may take classes from different campuses (or Online). Having a central and consistent reporting system will allow student advisors a more complete picture of student’s progress.

5. Introduction of Revisions to Institutional Curricular Policy #104

SAPC was asked to review the policy which precludes meeting during exam week for committees and organizations with student membership. The current policy only prohibits meeting on campus; SAPC has broadened this restriction so that no meetings may be conducted at any location.

6. Introduction of Revisions to Institutional Curricular Policy #106

With the approval of the BAAS degree, the Colleges will need to offer upper year Internship classes and Service Learning courses. This revision will set out a policy framework for departments to do so. It creates an upper year Internship category for the BAAS degree with a new Internship (IN) designation. This revision also creates a new type of course – Service Learning – which will have its own (SL) designation.

SAPC was also asked to consider removing the “10 day prior” rule for internships in order to provide more flexibility for campuses in securing an internship partner. Upon discussions with Registrar Graves and Special Assistant to the Provost Wise, it became clear that the 10 day rule should stay. Given the amount of approvals necessary, 10 days is a reasonable timeframe; shortening it would put undue pressure on departments and campus curriculum committees.

However, in those cases where an instructor wishes to offer an internship class but, at the 10 day deadline, has not yet secured an intern partner, SAPC suggests that departments and campus curriculum committees consider granting “provisional” acceptance to internship courses, subject to the condition that the intern partner is secured by the first day of classes. We believe that this will allow considerable flexibility while still safeguarding departmental and campus oversight.
7. Reintroduction of Revisions to Institutional Curricular Policy #301.01

An earlier version of this revision passed the Senate but was not approved by the Chancellor on the grounds that the proposed revisions would not be workable in an Online setting. The Provost suggested changes which would ameliorate these concerns. This version adopts two of these proposals. First, it makes clear that it is the responsibility of instructors to inform ONL students that an SSI is being conducted and sets out specific manners in which this is to be done. Second, it makes the last 3 days of instruction the default time in which an ONL evaluation will take place, although the policy also makes it clear that instructors have the option of changing this date to best reflect their curricular needs. A final suggestion, that the SSIs take place within a one week period, was also considered. However, there was a clear sense from departments that this would be restrictive and concern was expressed that, for certain courses, it would not be possible to schedule an SSI which did not take place during the same class that a major assessment was being given or returned. As a result, SAPC believes the 3 week /last 20% of the semester period should remain as is.

Respectfully submitted,
Troy Kozma
Chair of Senate Academic Policy Committee
The last meeting of the Senate Budget Committee’s (SBC) held at the January 9, 2013 Senate meeting. The following issues were discussed.

**Budget Overview**
The State and UW Colleges budgeting process was discussed in detail. It is clear that State support as a percentage of total revenue has declined significantly over the past several years. It is very likely this trend will continue. While the next budget is impossible to completely predict at this point, it seems like there will not be a lapse and some initiatives may be funded.

**Salary Issues**
Salary compression, differential salaries and other compensation issues continued to be extensively discussed. The consultant’s presentation (Guell) explained several faculty compensation related issues in the UW Colleges. Guell report indicated a possible gender bias in the overall compensation structure. This will be corrected if UW Colleges staff research validates that finding.

The merits of the suggested approaches to the other issues were considered as were possible funding sources. A reallocation of Online income seems to be a central component of any solution to the salary issues. Dedicated tuition increases appear to not be a viable alternative.

**Faculty Positions**
Under the IEM the each Campus determines the number of tenured and tenure track positions at the local level. While funding for these positions is established at a predetermined level, a Campus can operate either above or below this level based on local conditions. How to determine the optimal level for a Campus was briefly discussed and may be further analyzed at the meeting today.

**Ongoing Issues**
In addition to the previously listed issues, the continuing implementation of Integrated Enrollment Management (IEM) will be a primary issue. The BAAS degree, Tuition structure, Online revenue sharing, IAS compensation and the role of the SBC in UWC governance are other major issues to be address this year.

Respectfully submitted,

Matthew Raunio
Chair, Senate Budget Committee
March 7, 2013
The Faculty Professional Standards Committee has one item up for adoption at today’s meeting - a revision to FPP #501.01 regarding printing hard copies of tenure dossiers. We are also introducing several items today.

1) **FPP#501.01 - Printing of hard copy of tenure dossiers: adoption**
   Based on discussion and a straw poll at the April 27, 2012 Faculty Council meeting, we drafted a proposed revision to FPP#501.01, eliminating the requirement for preparation of hard copies of dossiers. After soliciting and responding to comments from department chairs, we introduced this proposed revision to vigorous discussion at the January meeting. After vigorous discussion and circulation to campuses, it is up for an adoption vote today.

2) **IP 141, 141.01, & 141.02 - BAAS instructional responsibilities: introduction**
   The BAAS policies currently use the term “faculty” in relation to instruction of BAAS courses and for review of experiential learning portfolios. Given that it may be desirable or necessary to offer BAAS teaching or review opportunities to qualified IAS, the proposed revisions replace the term “faculty” with “instructor,” clarify that students should submit experiential learning portfolios to departments (not to faculty), and make wording more consistent throughout the policies.

3) **IP#104 - Hiring graders and relocating IP#310.01: introduction**
   At the April 2012 Senate meeting, the issue of hiring LTEs or students to do routine grading was discussed. Overall, the Senate was opposed to this idea, and SSC charged FPSC with further investigation. After soliciting and discussing comments from department chairs, we drafted a proposed new policy. As we considered what number to give the new proposed policy, we realized that it would best be housed within IP#104, which outlines various instructional responsibilities for both faculty and IAS. At the same time, we discovered that IP#104 would be a logical “home” for IP#310.01, which outlines office hours expectations. The proposed revision of IP#104 being introduced today includes the new proposed grading policy and the proposed move of IP#310.01 to a new home within IP#104. If this gets adopted, we would need to follow up with a proposal to rescind the free-standing IP#310.01.

4) **FPP#501 - Role of deans in 2nd-year retention decisions: introduction**
   SSC asked FPSC to clarify the role of deans in faculty retention decisions. The proposed revisions to FPP#501 make the deans’ role in retention decisions consistent throughout the tenure process. Specifically, deans would need to notify the faculty member and include with the notification of retention copies of department and campus letters along with reasons for continuing the appointment. The proposed language parallels the language regarding department and campus retention committee letters in these years.
5) **IP 320: IAS and Renewable Contracts – introduction**
Some non-instructional academic staff in the UW Colleges hold renewable appointments, and such appointments have not yet been offered to IAS. One sticking point is how to deal with nonrenewal of an IAS holding a renewable contract. ASPP #804 addresses nonrenewal of Academic Staff for poor performance in section 0.20, but that wording is not particularly relevant for IAS, where performance evaluation is done by a campus or departmental committee. The proposed addition to IPP#320 will require that IAS who hold a renewable appointment be given adequate feedback on performance and suggestions for improvements, so they can act to avoid non-renewal for unsatisfactory performance.

6) **FPP 603: Voluntary Transfers and IEM – completed**
FPSC affirms the right of faculty to continue to engage in voluntary transfers. Prior to the IEM, the open faculty position typically was allocated to the campus that lost a faculty member through voluntary transfer. Under the IEM, this is no longer true, but this change in practice does not conflict with existing policy (FPP 603 para 2), which reads as follows: “nor is there any guarantee that the faculty member will be replaced at his/her previous UW Colleges campus by someone of the same rank, salary, or percentage of time.” After consulting chairs, and recognizing that campuses need to retain staffing flexibility under the IEM, we have recommended to SSC that no changes to FPP#603 are necessary.

7) **Defining Academic Programs in policy – in progress**
The UW Colleges currently has three academic programs: Women’s Studies (free-standing), American Indian Studies (housed within Political Science), and Religious Studies (housed within Philosophy). However, “program” is never defined in policy, so the rights and responsibilities of academic programs are not laid out in policy, nor are procedures for creating or dissolving programs, moving housed programs from one department to another, or converting a program into department. FPSC is working with SAPC to determine what policy changes are needed to adequately define the current status of academic programs while anticipating future policy needs. We’ve met with Holly Hassel (Chair of Women’s Studies and Chair of Chairs) and folks from UWSA System Legal about this. We’ve asked SSC to charge members of the two housed programs to provide us with more explicit details on the specific challenges they’ve faced due to the complete absence of “program” in Senate policies.

8) **Merit Procedures for Online Instructors – on hold for now**
At some point, we expect to work with SOPC on a number of related issues, including identifying a home campus and defining service to that campus for online instructors, and determining if policy should permit appointment of full-time online instructors without also specifying a resident campus. Given a number of other items related to UWC Online being in flux, this is on hold for now.

Respectfully Submitted,
Paul Whitaker
Chair, Faculty Professional Standards Committee
Since the last SAC report to the Senate in January 2013 the committee met via Wisline on January 16 to complete plans and the agenda for the January 23, 2013 meeting with Department Assessment Coordinators (DACs) and Campus Assessment Coordinators (CACs) which was held at UW Waukesha.

The committee was very pleased when the UWC Senate voted at their January 9 meeting to approve the addition of a fifth institutional proficiency, “Intercultural Skills.” This vote was an important step to complete the project carried out by SAC and the DACs during four years of discussion and development of this proficiency. SAC and the DACs are already involved in the next steps to incorporate this proficiency in the institutional assessment cycle.

SAC held a meeting on January 23 at UW Waukesha with the DACs and CACs. The meeting was well attended with approximately 40 present. During the morning sessions there were discussions of several topics and two presentations by guest speakers and groups.
1) There was a brief update and discussion of the fall HLC visits. Further follow up will take place after the final HLC report is available with the specific recommendations related to assessment.
2) SAC updated the group on the adoption of the Intercultural Skills proficiency by the Senate and thanked the DACs for their work on the project. The committee will keep the group informed of progress on the next steps.
3) Jennifer Flatt presented the LEC 100 rubrics for Proficiency A and discussed the development of these rubrics. She indicated that the rubrics for Proficiencies B and C are in development now.
4) Rich Barnhouse and Jennifer Flatt presented information on the website (I plan) that can be used to incorporate ESFY into strategic enrollment management. This can be used to assess campus-based practices.
5) Peggy Turnbull, Dyan Barbeau, Kelley Hinton, Connie Scofield and Scott Silet gave a presentation to the group regarding information literacy and the potential for assessing this skill through the creation of an institutional proficiency.

The afternoon period was dedicated to break-out sessions for the DACs and CACs. The CACs discussed the current year’s campus assessment plans, the intercultural skills proficiency and continued discussion of the possibility of moving to an assessment cycle and rotation of specific projects for campus assessment. The CACs also indicated that it would be useful for them to have an additional meeting for Campus Coordinators to discuss items particular to campus assessment. The DACs discussed the current spring assessment plans, a review of the data from Fall and the implementation and rubrics for the new intercultural skills proficiency.

SAC held a committee meeting at the end of the afternoon to evaluate the activities of the day and decide on the next steps for implementation of the new proficiency. It was decided that
the proficiency should be incorporated in the assessment cycle beginning in the Fall of 2013. It will be offered as an assessment option for department assessment.

The committee will meet in May at UW Waukesha to prepare for the June and August meetings with DACs.

Submitted by
Deborah Paprocki
SAC Chair
March 1, 2013
Background and Rationale
Both the Senate Curriculum Committee (SCC) membership and the Senate BAAS Curriculum Committee (SBCC) membership currently include the Chair of the Senate Academic Policy Committee (SAPC) as a non-voting, ex-officio member. This revision allows for the SAPC Chair to designate another member of the SAPC committee to attend the SCC and/or meetings in her/his place thus ensuring that, in the case of a scheduling conflict, a representative would be present.

The proposed changes are in bold, red, italicized and underlined font.

UW Colleges Senate Bylaws

Established 11/12/94
Revised 3/18/95
Revised 1/11/96
Revised 5/4/96
Revised 3/8/97
Revised 4/23/99
Revised 3/14/03
Revised 5/2/03
Revised 4/29/05
Revised 10/19/07
Revised 1/16/08
Revised by the Senate 3-7-08
Revised by the Senate 1-14-09
Revised by the Senate 4-24-09
Revised by the Senate 10-23-09
Revised by the Senate (SSC) 1-13-10
Revised by the Senate (SSC) 3-5-10
Revised by the Senate (SSC) 4-23-10
Revised by the Senate (SIITC) 2010-10-22
Revised by the Senate (SSC) 2011-01-12
Revised by the Senate (SSC) 2011-04-29
Revised by the Senate (SOPC) 2011-10-21
Revised by the Senate (SSC) 2011-10-21
Revised by the Senate (SSC) 2012-01-11

6.0 Elected Senate Bylaws Committees

[...]

2) Senate Curriculum Committee
Revised by the Senate 2012-01-11

The Senate Curriculum Committee shall consist of eight voting members: two faculty members from each academic division and no two from the same department, serving two year staggered terms; one student services representative; and one student. Faculty and academic staff shall be elected by the Senate and serve staggered two year terms. The student member shall be chosen annually by the Student Governance Council. The UW Colleges Registrar shall serve as a non-voting ex-officio member of the Committee. The Senate Academic Policy Committee Chair, or a member of the
Senate Academic Policy Committee designated by the Senate Academic Policy Chair, shall serve as a non-voting ex-officio member of the Committee as a liaison from the Senate on matters of academic policy, and, as necessary, shall take procedural issues to the Senate Academic Policy Committee for review.

In consultation with the Provost and Vice Chancellor, the Committee shall review course designations for the Associate of Arts and Science Degree, course offerings and proposed curriculum modifications in keeping with Senate policies. Appeals of the actions of the Committee shall be made to the Senate Steering Committee.

/…/

4) Senate Bachelor of Applied Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee
   Added by the Senate 2011-10-21
   Revised by the Senate 2012-01-11

The Senate Bachelor of Applied Arts and Sciences (B.A.A.S.) Curriculum Committee shall consist of eight voting members that include six faculty, one adult student advisor, and one student. Two faculty shall come from each academic division and no two shall come from the same academic department. Faculty and the adult student advisor shall serve two-year staggered terms; the student shall serve a one-year term. Faculty and staff committee members shall be elected by the Senate. The student member shall be chosen annually by the Student Governance Council. The UW Colleges B.A.A.S. Program Manager and the UW Colleges Registrar shall serve as non-voting ex-officio members of the Committee. The Senate Academic Policy Committee Chair, or a member of the Senate Academic Policy Committee designated by the Senate Academic Policy Chair, shall serve as a non-voting ex-officio member of the Committee as a liaison from the Senate on matters of academic policy, and, as necessary, shall take procedural issues to the Senate Academic Policy Committee for review.

In consultation with the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the Committee shall review course designations for the Bachelor of Applied Arts and Sciences degree, course offerings, and proposed curriculum modifications in keeping with Senate policies. Appeals of the actions of the Committee shall be made to the Senate Steering Committee.

/…/

[End]
Background and Rationale
The Senate Academic Policy Committee (SAPC) was charged by Senate Steering to look into the issue of IAS visitations, specifically toward allowing more frequent visits early in an IAS career, and to give departments the ability to be more flexible in their departmental policy. Potential changes to IP #320 related to renewable contracts (from Richard Krupnow) are to be kept in mind by SAPC. This charge was in response to a request by Holly Hassel to revise the policy. In her request she indicated “The visit schedule for IAS should be changed to reflect that best practice in providing feedback to instructors involves more frequent colleague visits early in the instructor’s work with the institution, with visits occurring with less frequency as the instructor gains experience. Ideally, revised language would accommodate one visit per semester the first year, one visit per year subsequent years through the third or fourth year of employment (or some similarly situated schedule that might vary by department). IAS who have been teaching on our campuses for five, ten, and even 20 years do not require the kind of ongoing feedback the current policy promotes (continued visits every 2, 3, or 4 years ad infinitum), while new instructors could benefit from more frequent feedback early in their teaching careers with the institution.” Discussion during the October 26 2012 SAPC meeting led to the suggestion that the policy would be drafted with the model of existing faculty visits. Faculty visits currently are required in the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd years, with visits in the 4th and 5th years being at the discretion of the departments. Post-tenure review occurs after the 5th year post-tenure, but does not specifically require classroom visitations.

Proposed changes are in bold, red, underlined italics.

UW Colleges Senate Policy
Institutional Personnel Policy Affecting Faculty and Academic Staff #320
Policy on Evaluation – Instructional Academic Staff (Category B), including Returning Retired Faculty

I. Instructional Academic Staff (Category B), including Returning Retired Faculty
A. All instructional academic staff, regardless of percentage of appointment, shall be evaluated. The only exception will be instructors paid with one lump sum (i.e. coaches,
applied music instructors).

B. Merit evaluations will be done by academic departments and campuses in alternate years, with each committee reviewing Activity Reports, student evaluations, and any other evidence of achievement, over a two-year period. The campus dean must be included in the discussion of campus merit evaluations, but will be excused prior to final deliberations. The department chair will serve ex officio on the department merit committee.

C. Evaluation of instructional academic staff is based on the following:
   1. Completion of Activity Report form (IP#301). The campus is responsible for the distribution of the activity reports each year before the end of the fall semester.
   2. Student evaluations for all classes taught in the first two semesters of instruction. Thereafter, student evaluations every third semester (e.g., fall 2001, spring 2003, fall 2004, etc.). (Returning retired faculty shall administer the Student Survey of Instruction every third semester.)
   3. When available, written reports of class visits by members of the instructional academic staff member’s department or delegated authority.

D. It is the responsibility of the campus to notify the instructional academic staff of the requirement to submit the Activity Report form and copies of the class visitation reports to the appropriate campus/department committee chair.

II. Departmental and campus responsibilities for instructional academic staff, including Returning Retired Faculty.
Revised 4-24-09

A. Newly hired instructional academic staff can expect the following:
   1. A departmental visit will occur within the first semester of initial employment. At the discretion of the department, a visit may also occur in the second semester of initial employment. Some items that may be evaluated are teaching skills, student participation, presentation methods and relevancy of information.
   2. A copy of the visitation report should be sent to the department chair, the chair of the campus evaluation and merit committee, the associate dean, the campus dean and the staff member within 30 days of the classroom visit. After receiving a copy of the visitation report, the instructional academic staff member may elect to contact the department chair for more information.

B. Returning instructional academic staff can expect the following:

   1. A departmental visit will occur at least once every four years during the second and third years of employment. Departmental visits during the fourth and fifth years may be conducted at the discretion of the department.
After the initial five years of employment, departmental visits will occur once every five years. However, departments may request additional visitations. Department bylaws may establish a regular visitation schedule beyond the minimum required, but not to exceed one visitation every two years.

2. A departmental visit shall occur prior to any promotion of an instructional academic staff member. Additional department visits may be scheduled at the request of the department chair, the campus dean, or the instructional academic staff member. A copy of the visitation report should be sent to the department chair, the chairs of the campus evaluation and merit committees, the campus dean and the staff member. The results of the visit will be included in the promotion file.

C. Returning retired faculty can expect the following:
   1. A departmental visit may occur at the request of the department chair, the campus dean, or the faculty member.

III. Implementation
   Each year the vice chancellor shall provide deans and department chairs with detailed set of instructions including deadlines, implementation details and a complete list of instructional academic staff in the pool.

IV. Performance Evaluation
   A. Each year, the relevant campus committee or department will review the evaluation materials and decide whether an instructional academic staff member is meeting the expectations for the position. A performance rating will be assigned as follows:
      -- "meritorious": exceeding expectations;
      --"satisfactory": meeting expectations;
      --"unsatisfactory": failing to fulfill expectations.
   
   B. When the evaluation process is completed and a rating has been determined, the department chair or campus committee, depending on which does the evaluation, will inform the campus dean, the vice chancellor, and the instructional academic staff member of the results. An unsatisfactory rating may result in nonrenewal of a teaching contract.

V. Reconsideration Appeal Process
   If the instructional academic staff member does not agree with the evaluation, he/she should contact the department chair or campus committee to ask for reconsideration of the results. The instructional academic staff member should submit the reason(s) for reconsideration.

[End]
UW Colleges Senate
Update: March 15, 2013
University of Wisconsin Colleges and University of Wisconsin-Extension
Criminal Background Check Policy

Purpose

To provide a safe and secure environment for the employees, students, partners and clients of UW Colleges and UW-Extension.

Policy Statement

Except as otherwise provided in the University of Wisconsin System Criminal Background Check Policy or in this policy, UW Colleges and UW-Extension shall conduct a criminal background check on each new hire for a University position. Criminal background checks shall be conducted on candidates recommended for hire, either prior to the extension of an offer of employment, or as part of an offer of employment that is made contingent upon a successful criminal background check. A criminal background check shall also be conducted on current employees and volunteers holding a “position of trust with access to vulnerable populations”, as defined below, who have not previously been subject to such a criminal background check by the University. Employees and volunteers holding a position of trust with access to vulnerable populations shall be subject to a criminal background check every four years, and shall be required to self-disclose certain criminal offenses.

Definitions

- **New Hire:** A ‘new hire’ shall be defined as any prospective employee that is not currently a UW Colleges or UW-Extension employee. Current UW Colleges and UW-Extension employees who are moving to a different position within UWC or UWEX will not be subject to a criminal background check unless such a check is otherwise required by this policy (e.g., movement to a position of trust), by law (e.g., the fiduciary responsibility law or caregiver law), or the majority of the position’s duties will be performed within residential facilities. If a former UW Colleges or UW Extension employee is being rehired after an absence of one year or less the Director of Human Resources will determine whether a criminal background check must be completed.

- **Position of Trust:** A “position of trust” is defined as a paid or volunteer position with one or more of the following responsibilities:

  a. **Access to vulnerable populations** – Responsibilities require unsupervised or significant access to vulnerable populations, defined as minors, medical patients and other populations as identified by the institution. For purposes of this policy, a minor is a person under the age of eighteen (18) who is not enrolled or accepted for enrollment at a UW System institution. Examples of settings with vulnerable populations include child care centers, summer camps for minors, precollege or enrichment programs, and health care facilities. This category also includes employees who are not directly working in these units but have unsupervised access to the unit when the vulnerable population is present. This category does not include...
faculty or instructional academic staff performing regular teaching, service, and research responsibilities unless these responsibilities include unsupervised or significant access to vulnerable populations.

b. Property access – Responsibilities require the use of master keys/card access and pertains to employees with key access to offices, facilities, or worksites other than their own worksite, including UW residential housing facilities.

c. Financial/fiduciary duty – Responsibilities require handling, receiving, or having custody of money, checks or securities, or accounting for supplies or other property; authorizing (or making appropriations for) expenditures; approving, certifying, signing or countersigning checks, drafts, warrants, vouchers, orders or other documents providing for the paying over or delivery of money, securities, supplies or other property, or service of process; maintaining or auditing accounts of money, checks, securities, time records, supplies, or other property, or taking physical inventories of money, checks, securities, supplies, or other property.

d. Executive positions – Responsibilities involve top-level management functions throughout the institution including roles as Chancellor, Provost, and Dean. Executive positions are defined as all limited appointments and include any movement from a limited appointment to a different limited appointment, including within the same institution.

Coverage of Employee Groups, Prospective Hires and Employees

Criminal background checks must be conducted on prospective hires who are not University of Wisconsin employees, and on employees currently not in a position of trust who are seeking to move to a position of trust within the University through promotion or otherwise. Criminal background checks must be conducted on current employees holding a position of trust with access to vulnerable populations, as defined above, who have not previously been subject to a criminal background check by the institution. A criminal background check must be conducted every four years for employees in positions of trust with access to vulnerable populations.

Unless otherwise required by this policy or by law, the University of Wisconsin Colleges and University of Wisconsin-Extension generally will not conduct criminal background checks for the following employee and non-employee categories: (1) temporary or limited term employees, (2) positions to be filled by a vendor or contractor, (3) hourly student employees, (4) interns, and (5) unpaid volunteers. In making a determination to the contrary, the level of direct supervision and guidance provided to the employee or volunteer and the nature of the duties of the position shall be considered.

Coverage of In-House Vendors and/or Vendor Services for Contractors

To the maximum extent feasible, any agreement with a vendor or contractor whose employees, affiliates, or volunteers will have routine or unsupervised access to vulnerable populations in the course of the contract must include a representation from the vendor or contractor stating that these employees, affiliates, or volunteers have satisfied a criminal background check conducted by a criminal
background check vendor selected by the contractor that includes a check of the vendor’s proprietary national criminal background check database.

**Coverage of Volunteers**

UW Colleges and UW-Extension shall conduct criminal background checks for prospective volunteers when the volunteer position involved is a position of trust, or when required by law to perform criminal background checks for specified volunteer positions. In all other cases the institution should consider the level of direct supervision and guidance provided to volunteers and the nature of the duties of the volunteer position to determine whether a criminal background check is appropriate.

Upon implementation of this policy criminal background checks must be conducted on current volunteers holding a position of trust with access to vulnerable populations, as defined above in this policy, who have not previously been subject to a criminal background check by the institution. A criminal background check must be conducted every four years for volunteers in a position of trust with access to vulnerable populations.

**Coverage of Certain Users and Lessees of University Lands and Facilities**

Facilities use agreements or leases with outside organizations that use or lease University lands and facilities to operate multi-day programs for minors, or programs for minors that involve an overnight stay, must include a representation from the organization that its employees, affiliates, or volunteers have satisfied a criminal background check conducted by a criminal background check vendor selected by the organization that includes a check of the vendor’s proprietary national criminal background check database.

**Conducting Criminal Background Checks**

Finalists for employment must complete and sign a criminal background check authorization form. An applicant’s failure to consent to a criminal background check or falsification of any related information is grounds for the rejection of the applicant. Similar procedures must be implemented for current employees, volunteers and prospective volunteers who are subject to criminal background checks.

A criminal background check on prospective hires, employees and volunteers must include a check of the Wisconsin Department of Justice, Crime Information Bureau electronic database, and a check provided by a criminal background check vendor that includes the following components:

- **Social Security Number Trace** – Authenticates applicant’s information and generates a list of addresses the applicant has lived at for the last seven years; as part of the trace, the University may verify that the social security number is valid and appropriately assigned to the applicant.
- **Criminal Felony/Misdemeanor by County of Residence** – superior and municipal court records in any county in the U.S.
- **Sex Offender Registry** – sex offender search by state.
University officials will have certain additional duties under the federal Fair Credit Reporting Act when retaining a vendor to perform criminal background checks.

The required criminal background check for current employees and volunteers holding a position of trust with access to vulnerable populations who have not been previously subject to a criminal background check by the University also shall include a criminal background check using a vendor’s proprietary national criminal background check database, as shall the required background check that recurs every four years for employees and volunteers holding such positions.

Additional criminal and non-criminal checks (e.g., motor vehicle, etc.) may be run when appropriate in relation to the position.

UW Colleges and UW-Extension must conduct an appropriate U.S. criminal background check on an applicant for employment, current employee, or volunteer who is a foreign national and subject to this policy. A criminal background check in the individual’s prior country(ies) of residence will be also conducted if his/her country(ies) of residence provides a criminal background check for the time period during which the individual was a resident. A media search is not considered an appropriate criminal background check and, therefore, institutions are not required to conduct media searches.

**Application of the "Substantial Relationship" Test under the Wisconsin Fair Employment Act**

Wisconsin law prohibits an employer from discriminating against an applicant or employee on the basis of arrest or conviction record unless the pending criminal charge or conviction substantially relates to the circumstances of the position. Applicants with a criminal history will not automatically be disqualified from employment, and a current employee’s criminal history will not result in automatic disciplinary action or dismissal. If a criminal background check reveals a pending criminal charge or criminal conviction, the institution must engage in an individual analysis to determine whether a substantial relationship exists between the pending charge or criminal conviction and the functions of the position.

If a substantial relationship exists, UW Colleges or UW-Extension may decide that individual should not be employed in the position. If a contingent offer has already been extended or employment has commenced, the offer should be rescinded and the appointment terminated.

Information collected in connection with the background check will be treated confidentially to the extent permitted by the Wisconsin Public Records Act and other applicable laws. An individual or individuals in Human Resources will be designated as responsible for all aspects of managing criminal background checks. Appropriate training shall be provided, with the completion of the training documented. The individual(s) responsible for maintaining records will be required to sign a confidentiality agreement.

**Self-Disclosure of Arrests, Charges, or Convictions**
Employees or volunteers who hold positions of trust with access to vulnerable populations, as defined in this policy, must report any criminal arrests, charges, or convictions (excluding misdemeanor traffic offenses punishable only by fine) to the institutional office of human resources within twenty-four (24) hours or at the earliest possible opportunity. Failure to make the required report may constitute a violation of this policy and may result in disciplinary action, up to and including dismissal.

**Statutorily Mandated Background Checks**

Notwithstanding anything in this policy, UW Colleges and UW-Extension shall continue to perform criminal background checks for certain, specified positions in the form and manner required by state or federal law. Laws mandating criminal background checks for certain positions include: the Wisconsin Caregiver law (covering prospective caregivers for vulnerable populations such as minors, as well as those licensed by the state to provide direct health care services and treatment to clients); the Wisconsin Fiduciary law (covering positions that involve accounting, auditing, financial management, accounts receivable, accounts payable, procurement, retail operations, tax and fee collections, payroll, and handling of cash and checks); and the federal Public Health Security and Bioterrorism Preparedness and Response Act of 2002 and the Agricultural Protection Act of 2002 (covering employees who handle and work with hazardous agents or materials in campus labs, buildings or storage facilities).

**Other Criminal Background Checks**

Nothing in this policy shall be construed to prevent UW Colleges or UW-Extension from conducting a criminal background check on any current employee or volunteer at any time, given a reasonable basis on which to do so.

**Related Regents Policy Documents and Applicable Laws**

Regent Policy Document 20-19
Wis. Stat. § 111.335
Procedures:

1. Hiring.
UW Colleges and UW-Extension incorporate the following steps into the hiring process.

a. **Announcing a Vacancy** – All vacancy announcements should contain the following statement: “Employment will require a criminal background check.” A brief newspaper advertisement that directs candidates to a web site that contains the statement, “Employment will require a criminal background check,” meets this requirement.

The following language may also be added to vacancy announcements: "A pending criminal charge or conviction will not necessarily disqualify an applicant. In compliance with the Wisconsin Fair Employment Act, the University does not discriminate on the basis of arrest or conviction record."

b. **Offering a Position** – Criminal background checks should be completed prior to making an offer of employment. If a check is not completed before an offer is made, the offer must be made “contingent on the results of the background check” and the check must be completed prior to commencement of employment, except in special cases approved by the Director of Human Resources or designee. In most cases, only the applicant being offered the position will be checked. However, there may be circumstances where more than one applicant is checked.

c. **Appointment Letters** – If an appointment is offered contingent on the successful completion of a criminal background check, or an employee is permitted, upon approval of the Director of Human Resources or designee, to commence employment pending completion of a check, the appointment letter must state the appointment will be withdrawn or terminated if the individual’s criminal background check results are unacceptable. The following statement may be used in the appointment letter.

“This appointment is conditional pending the results of a criminal background check. The appointment will be withdrawn or terminated if the results are unacceptable”.

d. **Consent Form** – Prior to conducting a criminal background check, the candidate must sign a consent form. The form will specifically ask a candidate to self-disclose past convictions or any currently pending criminal charges. An individual who declines to sign the consent form shall no longer be considered a candidate for the vacancy. An applicant’s failure to accurately and completely disclose his or her criminal conviction history may be grounds for removal from further consideration for a position. A candidate shall submit the consent form directly to Human Resources where it will be maintained in confidence to the extent permitted by the Wisconsin Public Records Act and other applicable laws.

2. Conducting Criminal Background Checks.
Criminal background checks will be managed by the Human Resources Office to include checks of records in all jurisdictions deemed prudent. The following process will be used:
a. The Human Resources Director will identify at least one employee to manage the criminal background check policy and practices. This individual will be responsible for all activities involved with the checks including determining the scope, conducting checks, referring checks to outside vendors, and making recommendations on results. A key component of this role involves keeping information confidential except on a need-to-know basis or as required by the Public Records Act. A breach of confidentiality, or the inappropriate use of criminal background check information, may constitute a work rule violation and may be grounds for disciplinary action.

b. The employing unit or department is responsible for notifying Human Resources that a check needs to be conducted. The employing unit or department is responsible for ensuring that candidates or designated division or campus representative submit the completed consent form directly to the Office of Human Resources.

3. Making the Decision Regarding Substantial Relationship.

Wisconsin’s Fair Employment Act states that employers cannot discriminate against prospective or current employees based on past or pending arrests or convictions. There are exceptions to this requirement if a “pending criminal charge” or “conviction record” is determined to be “substantially” related to the “circumstances of the particular job.” To determine if there is a relationship, the University needs to review the circumstances of an offense, where it happened, when, etc. - compared to the circumstances of a job - where is the job typically done, when, how, etc. The more similar the circumstances, the more likely a “substantial” relationship exists.

The provost or designee shall be the final decision-maker for all faculty positions, as well as all academic staff positions or other positions that are within the UW Colleges campuses, and UW-Extension divisions, departments or other administrative structures that ultimately report to the provost. The vice chancellor for administration or designee shall be the decision-maker for all other positions, that are within UW Colleges campuses and UW-Extension divisions, departments or other administrative structures that ultimately report to the vice chancellor. For UW Colleges and UW-Extension this decision-making authority is delegated to the Director of Human Resources as the designee of the Provost and of the Vice Chancellor. If a background check uncovers a pending criminal charge or a criminal conviction, Human Resources will consult with UW System legal counsel or other offices and individuals as appropriate to determine whether the criminal activity is substantially related to the functions of the position.

In assessing the results of criminal background checks, Human Resources will review each candidate on a case-by-case basis in order to determine whether there is a substantial relationship between a conviction or pending charge and the position and whether the applicant should be further considered for the position. Factors to be considered include (but are not limited to) the following:

The Offense.
The nature, severity and intentionality of the offense(s) including but not limited to:

a. The statutory elements of the offense;
b. The individual’s age at the time of the offense;
c. Number and type of offenses (felony, misdemeanor, traffic, other);
d. Time elapsed since the last offense;

e. The individual’s probation or parole status;

f. Whether the circumstances arose out of an employment situation; and
g. Whether there is a pattern of offenses.

**The Position.**
The duties, responsibilities and circumstances of the position applied for, including but not limited to:

a. The nature and scope of the position, including key access to residential facilities, key access to other facilities, access to cash and access to vulnerable populations, including minor children;

b. The nature and scope of the position’s student, public or other interpersonal contact;

c. The nature and scope of the position’s autonomy and discretionary authority;

d. The amount and type of supervision received in the position or provided to subordinate staff;

e. The sensitive nature of the data or records maintained or to which the position has access;

f. The opportunity presented for the commission of additional offenses; and

g. The extent to which acceptable job performance requires the trust and confidence of the employer, the University or the public.

Following a consideration and analysis of these and other appropriate factors, and following appropriate consultation with other offices or individuals, Human Resources will make the final determination on whether to approve the appointment or to remove the candidate from consideration on the basis of the results of the criminal background check. Human Resources will be responsible for documenting the basis for the decision to allow or not allow appointment of a candidate based on the criminal background check review.

**4. Candidate Notification of Negative Results.**
If a candidate is removed from consideration based on the criminal background check results, the results will be provided to the candidate and the candidate will be given a three working day time period to refute the information. Additional time extensions may be provided to the candidate at the sole discretion of the Director of Human Resources or designee. If a private, commercial background check vendor is used, the UW Colleges and UW-Extension and the vendor will ensure compliance with the federal Fair Credit Reporting Act.

**5. Keeping Records.**
Records gathered or created as a result of the criminal background check process will be kept by the Director of Human Resources in separate, sealed files segmented by the candidate/employee’s name. The files will be maintained separately from a candidate or employee’s general personnel records. These records should include:

- Disclosure and Consent Form
- Information collected from the criminal background check
- Analysis and decision whether criminal activity (if any) was substantially related to position
Correspondence related to criminal background check

If a candidate is denied employment on the basis of the results of a criminal background check, the records will be securely maintained for a period of seven years after the position has been filled, and may be accessed only on a need-to-know basis or as required by applicable law. In the case of a hired candidate, the criminal background check records should be maintained for the duration of the candidate’s employment with the institution.

6. Other Background Checks/Evaluations.
As noted previously, other types of background checks and/or evaluations may be conducted due to the nature of specific positions. Examples include checks required under Wisconsin’s Caregiver Law (Wisconsin Statutes, Chapters 48 and 50) and Fiduciary Responsibility Law (Wisconsin Statutes, Section 230.17(3)). Additionally, the nature of certain positions could involve the need to conduct non-criminal background checks such as drug analyses, psychological evaluations, and credit checks. Nothing in this policy precludes UW Colleges and UW-Extension from conducting position specific checks (criminal and non-criminal) on an as-needed basis.

Any questions related to this policy should be directed to the institutional Human Resources Office.

Authority: Regent Policy #20-19, Resolution, adopted 12/08/06, amended 12/07/12.

Implemented: October 2007, amended 3/1/2013

[End]
Introduction: March 15, 2013
Proposed Revision of Institutional Personnel Policy #320
(“Policy on Evaluation – Instructional Academic Staff (Category B), including Returning Retired Faculty”)

Rationale:
Some non-instructional academic staff in the UW Colleges hold renewable appointments, but these have not yet been offered to Instructional Academic Staff. ASPP #804 addresses nonrenewal of Academic Staff for poor performance in section 0.20, but that wording is not particularly relevant for Instructional Academic Staff, where performance evaluation is done by a campus or departmental committee. The proposed addition to IPP#320 will require that IAS who hold a renewable appointment be given adequate feedback on performance and suggestions for improvements, so they can act to avoid non-renewal for unsatisfactory performance.

The proposed changes are in bold, red, italicized and underlined font.

UW Colleges Senate Policy
Institutional Personnel Policy Affecting Faculty and Academic Staff #320
Policy on Evaluation – Instructional Academic Staff (Category B), including Returning Retired Faculty

Policy Effective November 20, 1995
Amended, January 16, 2002
Reorganized and Renumbered, March 15, 2002
Amended by the Senate, May 2, 2003
Revised by the Senate, May 7, 2004
Revised by the Senate April 24, 2009

I. Instructional Academic Staff (Category B), including Returning Retired Faculty
A. All instructional academic staff, regardless of percentage of appointment, shall be evaluated. The only exception will be instructors paid with one lump sum (i.e. coaches, applied music instructors).

B. Merit evaluations will be done by academic departments and campuses in alternate years, with each committee reviewing Activity Reports, student evaluations, and any other evidence of achievement, over a two-year period. The campus dean must be included in the discussion of campus merit evaluations, but will be excused prior to final deliberations. The department chair will serve ex officio on the department merit committee.

C. Evaluation of instructional academic staff is based on the following:
   1. Completion of Activity Report form (IP#301). The campus is responsible for the distribution of the activity reports each year before the end of the fall semester.
2. Student evaluations for all classes taught in the first two semesters of instruction. Thereafter, student evaluations every third semester (e.g., fall 2001, spring 2003, fall 2004, etc.). (Returning retired faculty shall administer the Student Survey of Instruction every third semester.)

3. When available, written reports of class visits by members of the instructional academic staff member’s department or delegated authority.

D. It is the responsibility of the campus to notify the instructional academic staff of the requirement to submit the Activity Report form and copies of the class visitation reports to the appropriate campus/department committee chair.

II. Departmental and campus responsibilities for instructional academic staff, including Returning Retired Faculty.
Revised 4-24-09

A. Newly hired instructional academic staff can expect the following:
1. A departmental visit to occur within the first semester of initial employment. Some items that may be evaluated are teaching skills, student participation, presentation methods and relevancy of information.

2. A copy of the visitation report should be sent to the department chair, the chair of the campus evaluation and merit committee, the associate dean, the campus dean and the staff member within 30 days of the classroom visit. After receiving a copy of the visitation report, the instructional academic staff member may elect to contact the department chair for more information.

B. Returning instructional academic staff can expect the following:

1. A departmental visit will occur at least once every four years of employment. Department bylaws may establish a regular visitation schedule beyond the minimum required, but not to exceed one visitation every two years.

2. A departmental visit shall occur prior to any promotion of an instructional academic staff member. Additional department visits may be scheduled at the request of the department chair, the campus dean, or the instructional academic staff member. A copy of the visitation report should be sent to the department chair, the chairs of the campus evaluation and merit committees, the campus dean and the staff member. The results of the visit will be included in the promotion file.

C. Returning retired faculty can expect the following:

1. A departmental visit may occur at the request of the department chair, the campus dean, or the faculty member.
III. **Implementation**

Each year the vice chancellor shall provide deans and department chairs with detailed set of instructions including deadlines, implementation details and a complete list of instructional academic staff in the pool.

IV. **Performance Evaluation**

A. Each year, the relevant campus committee or department will review the evaluation materials and decide whether an instructional academic staff member is meeting the expectations for the position. A performance rating will be assigned as follows:

-- "meritorious": exceeding expectations;

--"satisfactory": meeting expectations;

--"unsatisfactory": failing to fulfill expectations.

B. When the evaluation process is completed and a rating has been determined, the department chair or campus committee, depending on which does the evaluation, will inform the campus dean, the vice chancellor, and the instructional academic staff member of the results. An unsatisfactory rating may result in nonrenewal of a teaching contract.

C. *Instructional Academic Staff with renewable appointments must be given written notification of merit, including information about how to improve their performance if the merit rating is less than Satisfactory, in compliance with Academic Staff Personnel Policy #804.*

V. **Reconsideration Appeal Process**

If the instructional academic staff member does not agree with the evaluation, he/she should contact the department chair or campus committee to ask for reconsideration of the results. The instructional academic staff member should submit the reason(s) for reconsideration.

[End]
Rationale:
There are two changes in this proposed revision: a new policy on hiring of graders, and relocating an existing stand-alone policy on office hours, IP#310.01, into this policy.

The need for the policy on hiring graders arose when a campus desired to hire a part-time support staff member to perform routine grading for faculty on their campus. When they asked if such work would violate any Senate policies, it was discovered that there was no policy on the hiring of graders. The majority of Senators at the April 2012 Senate meeting were opposed to the hiring of graders; grading was seen as an essential part of instruction and an important aspect of the oft-touted, close student-instructor relationship in the UW Colleges. Senate discussion indicated the need for a policy to require that faculty/IAS, as a duty of their positions in the UW Colleges, conduct all the course grading and assessment of class products. Recognizing the need for some flexibility in this requirement, the proposed new policy in Section VI allows department chairs to grant one-time exceptions to this requirement. Departments can also write exceptions into departmental bylaws for situations that might recur on a regular basis, such as individual music instructors who are not the instructor of record, computer programs like ALEKS in math that do automated grading, or peer grading.

The Senate adopted a very short policy on office hours expectations (IP#310.01) in 2010. The policy number was chosen based on the idea that the office hours policy might someday be housed under a future instructional responsibilities policy to be numbered IP#310. Since the existing policy IP#104 already addresses instructional issues relevant for both IAS and faculty, it is the logical home for the proposed new grading policy and the existing office hours policy. The proposed revision of IP#104 that follows includes both of these. If approved, we would need to rescind the current free-standing office hours policy IP#310.01.

Proposed changes are in bold, red, italicized and underlined font.

UW Colleges Senate Policy
Institutional Curricular Policy #104
Course and Instructional Policies

Reorganized and Renumbered March 15, 2002
Revised by the Senate, October 15, 2004
Revised by the Senate, March 4, 2005
Revised by the Senate, October 28, 2005
Revised by the Senate, January 18, 2006
Revised by the Senate (SAPC) April 29, 2011

I. Class Attendance
Revision Adopted by the Senate, April 23, 1999, p.5
Revised by the Senate, March 4, 2005
Revised by the Senate 2011-04-29
Instructors may establish reasonable class attendance policies that make allowances for legitimate absences and which comply with legal mandates such as Wis. Admin. Code Chapter UWS 22 Accommodation of Religious Beliefs, Rehabilitation Act of 1973, specifically Section 504, and the Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990. If an instructor determines that a specific number of absences will affect the student's grade, the attendance policy should state that this refers to unexcused absences. In these cases, the instructor should identify a mechanism to verify excused absences. Any class attendance policy must be announced in the syllabus.

Students are responsible for completing all work missed because of any absences from class as determined by the instructor. If students will be absent from class because of a field trip or any extracurricular activity sponsored by the UW Colleges, the instructor or other staff member in charge of the activity shall confirm this for any instructors whose classes students will miss.

II. Course Syllabi

A. The purpose of a syllabus is to:

1. Give an overview of the course.
2. Help students know what is expected in the course.
3. Provide a reference about the course for transfer issues.
4. Aid in communicating UW Colleges assessment goals.

The syllabus is not a binding agreement and is subject to change. Students should be notified if changes are made to the syllabus.

B. At the beginning of the term all faculty and instructional academic staff will provide written syllabi to students enrolled in their courses. Every course syllabus will contain the following information:

1. The course title, number, section (if applicable), number of credits for the course, semester, and year.
2. Information about the instructor (e.g., the instructor’s name, office number, office hours, office telephone number, and e-mail address).
3. Course description and/or course overview.
4. A statement about grading procedures including +/- grades if used.
5. A statement about activities outside regularly scheduled class time (field trips, exams, etc.) if they are a required component of the course.
6. A statement about course attendance requirements
7. A list of learning resources (e.g., required texts, recommended readings).
8. A description of major course components (e.g., topics, objectives, course proficiencies, activities and/or assignments).
9. A tentative schedule including the number of exams or evaluations.
10. A statement of Colleges-wide and/or department-specific assessment goals and procedures for courses that are part of assessment for the semester.

C. At the start of each semester syllabi will be submitted to the instructor's campus dean and filed in an accessible location to be determined by the dean.

III. Office Hours

Adopted by the Senate Steering Committee 9-23-2009
Initiated by the Senate 10-23-2009
Adopted by the Senate 1-13-2010
Revised and adopted by the Senate (FPSC) 2011-10-21
Moved from IP #310.01 on XYZ

All faculty and instructors must hold a minimum of one office hour per week for every three credit hours he or she teaches. For the purposes of this policy, laboratory instruction and discussion sections do not count as credit hours. Office hours must be held either in the faculty’s or instructor’s office or in a suitable on-campus location. Except in the case of distance education courses, office hours may not be offered by phone, e-mail, or online. Online and distance education faculty and instructors must offer a reasonable alternative to face-to-face office hours.

IV. Activities that Occur Outside of Regularly-Scheduled Class Time (renumbered from III to IV)

Adopted by the Senate, March 3, 1990, pp. 9, app. 15
Ratified by the Senate, May 12, 1990, pp. 3, app. 10
Revised by the Senate, March 4, 2005

When field trips, exams, or other class activities are required that take place outside of regularly-scheduled class times:

A. This information shall be printed as part of the course description in the campus Course Schedule.

B. Funding for such activities shall be determined when the schedule of courses is being developed.
   1. Special course fees may be assigned to cover field trip transportation costs. Procedures to be followed are detailed in UW Colleges Administration Policy on Special Course Fees.
   2. GPR funds may be used with advance approval by the campus dean after consultation with the campus curriculum or budget committees. The decision to use GPR funds shall be part of the campus annual budget process.
C. Such activities shall be scheduled for minimal disruption of the participants’ class schedule.

V. Final Exams (renumbered from IV to V)

Ratified by the Senate - September 13, 1980: page 3, App. 6 and 8
Revision ratified by the Senate - May 13, 1989; page 3, App. 6
Revision ratified by the Senate - May 3, 1991; page 3
Revision adopted by the Senate - March 16, 1995; page 4, App. 8
Revised by the Senate, March 4, 2005
Revised by the Senate 2011-04-29

A. Each UW Colleges academic department shall have a written statement of its final examination policy. Such policies shall include a stipulation of the courses for which final examinations are mandatory, permissible methods of testing, material that may be covered, and any other guidelines which will assist faculty in conforming to departmental expectations about final examination practices. These policy statements shall also indicate the procedure by which a faculty member may request an exemption.

B. Final examination schedules shall be published in the campus Course Schedule to show the exact date and time of all regularly-scheduled final examinations.

C. Final examinations in courses offered for two or more credits during a traditional 16-week semester regardless of delivery method shall be given at the time indicated in the published schedule, unless the faculty member has received permission for an alternative time from the campus dean, and shall not exceed two hours in length. An exception to this policy is a take-home final examination, which may be given only if departmental policy permits and then must be due at the time of the regularly scheduled final examination. Final examinations in courses offered for two or more credits may not be given during a regular class period. This policy does not preclude an instructor's making special arrangements for individual students.

D. Final examinations for courses in delivery formats other than the traditional 16-week semester shall follow the calendar indicated for that format.

E. Final examinations in one-credit courses offered for less than a full semester may be given prior to or during the final examination period.

F. Students who have more than two examinations on one day or two examinations scheduled for the same time must make arrangements at least one week in advance with one of the instructors concerned to take one of the examinations at an alternate time. When an informal arrangement cannot be made, the instructor of the course of lowest enrollment shall provide an alternate examination time. Examinations in studio or recital courses shall not conflict with regularly scheduled final examinations.

G. When an instructor does not return the final examination, students will have the
opportunity to review their final examination or discuss it with the instructor up to one semester after the course is completed.

H. No major activities, events, or organizational meetings which involve students may be scheduled at a UW Colleges campus between 4:00 p.m. of the last day of classes and the end of the exam period. Any exceptions to this policy must be approved by the campus dean, in consultation with the campus collegium steering committee.

VI. **Grading**

*Adopted by the Senate on XYZ*

A. **All assessments and grading of student work within a course shall be completed only by the instructor of the course. Automated grading, if set up by the instructor, is permitted. Exceptions to this policy may be permitted based on departmental bylaws or approval of the chair of the respective department.**

VII. **Recommendations for Campus Administrators** *(renumbered from V to VII, and all subsequent sections renumbered by adding 2)*

*Revised by the Senate, March 4, 2005*
*Revised by the Senate, October 28, 2005*
*Revised by the Senate 2011-04-29*

The following recommendations for administrators are made to provide consistent information concerning class scheduling and class instruction to all students within the UW Colleges.

A. **Campus administrators shall be responsible for creating final exam schedules.**

B. **Campus administrators should act promptly to accommodate any reasonable request for variance in the scheduling of final exams, as recommended by department chairs.**

C. **It shall be the responsibility of campus administrators to see that final exam variances do not affect students adversely.**

D. **The course instructor should be identified in the Course Schedule whenever feasible. The generic “TBA (to be announced)” should be used only if the instructor has not been identified when the Course Schedule is published.**

E. **The mode of delivery should be clearly listed for non-traditional classes such as DE, blended, or other alternative course delivery formats.**

F. **Students shall be informed of administrative policy requiring the use of UWC email accounts to deliver university news and information about campus, UW Colleges and UW System events. Students shall be encouraged to check their campus email accounts on a regular basis.**
A. Students should expect a final examination or some other appropriate form of final evaluation in each course. Normally, an instructor's final exam policy is outlined in the course syllabus distributed early in the semester.

B. Final examinations in courses offered for two or more credits will be given during the final examination period designated on the campus Academic Calendar. Exams in one-credit courses or courses of less than a semester’s duration may be given prior to or during examination week, depending on the instructor and nature of the course.

C. Examinations given during the final exam period shall not exceed two hours. Take-home final exams will be due at the time of the regularly scheduled examination.

D. If students have more than two examinations on one day or two examinations scheduled for the same time, they may arrange with one of the instructors concerned to take one of the examinations at an alternate time. If such arrangements cannot be made, the instructor of the course of lower enrollment shall provide an alternate examination time. These arrangements must be made at least one week prior to the final exam period.

E. Physically handicapped students who require special aids or equipment for taking final exams should consult with course instructors at least one week prior to the scheduled exam so that special arrangements can be made.

F. Students are expected to be in attendance at the scheduled final examination of each of their courses. Failure to attend an examination may result in failure in that course.

G. No variation, other than those mentioned in this policy, from the scheduled time of examinations is permissible unless the course instructor agrees that circumstances warrant such variation.

H. When the instructor does not return the exam, students will have the opportunity to review their final exams or discuss their final evaluations with the instructor up to one semester after the course is completed.

I. Students are expected to activate and use their university email accounts in order to maintain communication with the campus and university community. Official administrative notices will be issued through UWC email accounts. Students are expected to check these accounts on a regular basis.

[End]
Rationale:
With the approval of the BAAS degree, the Colleges will need to offer upper year Internship classes and Service Learning courses. This revision will set out a policy framework for departments to do so. It creates an upper year Internship category for the BAAS degree with a new Internship (IN) designation. This revision also creates a new type of course – Service Learning – which will have its own (SL) designation.

Proposed revisions are in bold, red, italicized, underlined font.

UW Colleges Senate Policy
UW Colleges Senate Policy
Institutional Curricular Policy #106
Atypical Course Policy

IV. Internship Courses
Adopted by the Senate (SAPC) March 11, 2011
Revised by the Senate (SAPC) 2012-10-26

A. Internship Courses can be proposed to allow students to gain valuable professional experience outside the classroom under the supervision of an approved instructor and community or business partner. The purpose of an Internship Course is to provide an opportunity for a student to apply concepts learned from related coursework in a career or service-oriented environment.

B. All Internship Courses must be structured learning experiences monitored and evaluated by the instructor and the partner supervisor that synthesizes coursework with application outside the classroom to gain practical experiences in a given field.
C. Departments that do not have a xxx-294 course in the UWC catalog can submit an application for a new course using the specific Senate Curriculum Committee forms, obtain approvals from the Department, Campus and Senate Curriculum Committees, and a final approval from the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

D. Internship courses require departmental approval on a course by course basis. Proposal for an internship course shall be done using the specific Senate Curriculum Committee form for such courses and must be approved at least 10 days prior to the start of the semester they are to be completed. The proposal shall first be submitted to the appropriate department committee by the initiator. If the department approves the course, the Department Chair shall forward the signed form to the Campus Curriculum Committee for review. If the Campus Curriculum Committee approves the course, the Chair of that committee shall forward the signed form to the Department, the campus Student Service Office, the UW Colleges Registrar, and the initiator.

E. All Internship Courses
   1. shall receive 1 credit for 48 hours of student involvement.
   2. shall be reviewed and approved by the Department and Campus Curriculum committees.
   3. must be approved at least 10 days prior to the start of the semester they are to be completed.
   4. will have a course number of xxx-294 for consistency and tracking purposes.
   5. will be given an AP Degree Designation unless otherwise requested and approved by the Senate Curriculum Committee.

F. AAS Courses
   1. will have a course number of xxx-294 for consistency and tracking purposes.
   2. will be given an AP Degree Designation unless otherwise requested and approved by the Senate Curriculum Committee.

G. BAAS Courses
   1. will have a course number of xxx-394 for consistency and tracking purposes.
   2. will be given an IP Degree Designation unless otherwise requested and approved by the Senate Curriculum Committee.

V. Service-Learning Courses

A. Service-learning is a teaching and learning approach that integrates community service with academic study. The central feature of the service-learning component is service to others combined with reflection upon the role of this service in community and individual life.

B. A stand-alone service-learning course may be created, but the expectation is that
service-learning experiences will be integrated into an academic course. Students will have the opportunity to gain direct experience with issues they are studying in the course and engage in efforts to analyze and solve work- or community-related problems in the context of an instructor-supervised project.

C. Instructors can add service-learning to an existing Associate of Arts and Science AAS) degree course by embedding a service-learning component. Courses approved for the Bachelor of Applied Arts and Sciences (BAAS) degree with a Service-Learning (SL) designation will partially fulfill the requirement for the Professional Experience component of the BAAS degree.

D. Service-learning courses for the AAS and BAAS degree are for-credit and include a non-paid service-learning component. Departments can submit an application for a new course with a service-learning component using the specific Senate AAS and BAAS Curriculum Committee forms, request approvals from the Department, Campus and Senate AAS/BAAS Curriculum Committees, and obtain final approval from the Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs.

E. Courses that are approved with a service-learning component or as a stand-alone service-learning course will receive a Service-Learning designation (SL) by the Senate AAS or BAAS Curriculum Committee. The SL designation can be combined with other course designations such as HU, SS, NS/LS, FA, EL, CS, or GS.

1. **AAS degree** – a service-learning designation can be requested by completing the appropriate senate curriculum committee form.

2. **BAAS degree** – a service-learning designation can be requested by completing the appropriate senate BAAS curriculum committee form.

VI. **Interdisciplinary Studies and Lecture Forum Courses**

Ratified by the Senate, September 13, 1986, p. 5, Appendix 5
Revised by the Senate April 27, 2007
Revised by the Senate 2012-03-16

[...]
UW Colleges Senate
Introduction: March 15, 2013
Proposed Revision of UW Colleges Senate Policy #301.01
(“Administering the Student Survey of Instruction”)

Rationale:
When the Colleges adopted the new Class Climate software, it became necessary to amend Senate Policy to reflect the differences between the old and new means of administering the Student Survey of Instruction. This revision does so. As the Senate Academic Policy Committee worked through this, it became clear that there was an additional issue here – 301.01 did not adequately handle courses taught in non-traditional formats. Senate Academic Policy Committee collaborated with the Senate Online Programming Committee to bring these alternative modes of instruction in line with the rules governing SSIs in face-to-face settings.

An earlier version of this revision passed the Senate but was not approved by the Chancellor on the grounds that the proposed revisions would not be workable in an Online setting. The Provost suggested changes which would ameliorate these concerns. This version adopts two of these proposals. First, it makes clear that it is the responsibility of instructors to inform ONL students that an SSI is being conducted and sets out specific manners in which this is to be done. Second, it makes the last 3 days of instruction the default time in which an ONL evaluation will take place, although the policy also gives instructors the option of changing this date to best reflect their curricular needs.

Proposed changes are in bold, red, underlined italics.

UW Colleges Senate Policy
Institutional Personnel Policy Affecting Faculty and Academic Staff
#301.01
Administering the Student Survey of Instruction

Revision Ratified by the Senate, March 15, 1986, p. 12 (corrected by Senate Minutes, May 16-17, 1986, p. 4) Revision
Ratified by the Senate, May 17, 1986, p. 4, 6
Ratified by the Senate, March 15, 1986, p. 7, 10-12 att. 9
Revision ratified by Senate Oct. 8, 1999, p. 5, att. 9
Revision ratified by Senate April 27, 2001, p. 8, att. 8
Revision ratified by Senate May 3, 2002, p. __, att. ___
Reorganized and Renumbered March 15, 2002
Amended by the Senate May 2, 2003
Revised by the Senate May 7, 2004
Revised by the Senate, March 4, 2005
Revised by the Senate, April 29, 2005
Revised by the Senate, March 3, 2006

The purpose of the Student Survey of Instruction is to evaluate instructors for purposes of tenure, promotion, merit and retention. To ensure fairness and parity of treatment, no other
student survey regarding instruction shall be administered by administration, departments or campuses (with the exception of course visitation surveys administered by a peer that become incorporated into the visitation report and do not, in themselves, become part of the employee personnel file).

I. For Faculty

A. The Student Survey of Instruction form approved by the UW Colleges shall be administered for all faculty classes every third semester (e.g. fall 1998, spring 2000, fall 2001, etc.). Additional student surveys will be administered in the fall and spring semesters of classes taught by first-year probationary faculty and in the spring semester of classes taught by second-year probationary faculty and in the fall semester of classes taught by fifth-year probationary faculty.

B. Administration of the form shall be a campus responsibility, or in the case of Online instruction, the responsibility of Distance Education. Campuses should contact central administration early enough to assure sufficient forms are available to meet all deadlines. Forms shall be made available to the faculty at least three full weeks before the end of the course. For those courses taught Online, the Distance Education program shall consult with instructors and arrange for administration of the survey as indicated in IV. B.

C. Materials related to the implementation of the Student Survey of Instruction, including the Student Survey of Instruction form; instructions to students; instructions for identifying class and instructor on the Student Survey of Instruction Course Section sheet; and statistical data summary to be reported to campuses, departments, and faculty, are located in IP Personnel Policy #301.01, Appendices 1 and 2.

D. In addition, instructors, departments, or campuses may request occasional student evaluations of personnel in unscheduled semesters. If departments require additional evaluations, the department chairs shall inform central administration and the campuses or Distance Education in a timely manner of the need to set up administration.

E. Departments and/or individual faculty can include up to ten additional evaluation questions; the numbering for the additional questions will start at number 21. The questions should be printed on a separate sheet with the department and class clearly identified, and should be distributed at the same time as the standard form. One copy of the additional questions should be sent to the campus or Distance Education, and department, and the processing center.

II. For Instructional Academic Staff, including Returning Retired Faculty

A. For rehiring, retention and merit purposes, the Student Survey of Instruction shall be administered in the classes of instructional academic staff in accordance with the schedule in Institutional Personnel Policy #320. Administration of the form shall be a campus responsibility, or in the case of Online instruction, the responsibility of Distance Education. Campuses should contact central administration early enough to assure sufficient forms are available to meet all deadlines. Forms shall be made
III. **For Distance Education, LEC 100, Accelerated, Blended, Interdisciplinary Studies, or Other Special Courses**

A. Additional questions can be added using the procedures outlined in I.E.

B. Courses with multiple instructors shall have one form for the class.

C. The statistical analysis and comments for all courses will be referred to the respective departments, campuses, and instructors involved. However, the results of multiple-instructor, or other special courses (e.g. LEC 100, one-credit Interdisciplinary Studies linking seminar), shall be separate from and not included in the statistical summary for the instructor.

D. Results for Distance Education courses in the first semester taught in a mode (e.g. Instructional Television, Compressed Video, Point-to-Point, Online, Blended or Accelerated) that is new to the instructor shall not be used in personnel decisions. Results shall be separate from and not included in the statistical summary for the instructor for that semester only.

**E.** Accelerated courses must adjust the time frame in which to offer the survey so that it occurs within the last 20% of the class. (For seven or eight week classes, the evaluation should take place in the final 10 days of class. For five week classes, the evaluation should take place in the final week of class.)

IV. **Procedures**

**A. For Face-to-Face and Blended Instruction**

1. Packets of survey and section forms shall be made available to all scheduled instructors at least three full weeks before the end of the course. (In special circumstances, departments may request or approve of administration earlier in the semester.)

2. In the interest of efficient processing, no later than the fifth week of classes for the semester in which all classes are scheduled to be evaluated, the Processing campus shall circulate information guiding campuses, departments, faculty and instructional academic staff to the materials related to the implementation of the Student Survey of Instruction located in IP Personnel Policy #301.01.

3. The campus dean shall: i) provide for a secure drop-off point and temporary storage for completed forms; and ii) for transmission of forms to the processing location; and iii) 

4. **Central Office will make an electronic copy of the forms and be responsible for** making two copies of the reverse (written comment) pages and their distribution to respective departments chairs. **Campuses**, and, after final grades have been submitted, **shall distribute**
results to individual faculty. The original forms, following processing, will be returned to the campus, and shall be retained by Central Office for seven years six months. The statistical results shall be maintained in a permanent personnel file for each instructor.

D. 5. The instructor shall inform the students at least two days or one class period before the evaluation is to be done. **The instructor must conduct the evaluation during a class period within the final 20% of the semester.** The instructor shall not schedule the evaluation the day a major exam is given or returned or a major assignment assessment is conducted or is returned. The instructor can request review of the course syllabus prior to the evaluation, and in multiple-instructor courses can inform students that only one form will apply to the course and that comments on individual instructors can be written in the spaces provided.

E. 6. Each faculty member shall complete the identifying section sheet prior to the administration of evaluations. The instructor shall write the course identification number on the board, and designate a student from each class to administer the forms and return the forms to the drop off point. The instructor will not be present during the administration of the evaluation, although a colleague may be. At least ten minutes shall be allowed for completion of the forms. Evaluations shall only be completed during the class time in which they are distributed. Under no circumstances shall the instructor collect or handle the completed forms until after final grades have been submitted, nor shall the instructor lobby students by word or deed for higher ratings.

F. 7. The person administering the form shall read the following statement before distributing the forms:

> It is the policy of the University of Wisconsin that students be given the opportunity to evaluate teaching faculty. You are not required to complete the evaluation, but your participation is encouraged. Do not write your name on the form. It will become a public document that your instructor will not have access to until the semester is over and your final course grade is recorded. Do not talk with others while completing this form. Please write freely and honestly.

> The information obtained on this form will be considered when making decisions regarding salary, promotion, or tenure. Your instructor will find your evaluations helpful when improving his/her teaching and course content.

> If any item does not apply to you or the course, mark the “not applicable” column. Use a #2 pencil, not a ballpoint, filling in each circle completely. **Use a black or blue ball-point pen or thin felt tip pen, marking each box with an X.** Please write legibly. You will have at least 10 minutes to complete the evaluation.

G. 8. The only attachments accompanying the student forms will be the instruction section sheet identifying the class and, where applicable, a sheet listing additional questions.

B. For Online Instruction

1. **An electronic version of the survey must be a component of all Online courses in which the Student Survey of Instruction is required or requested via IP Policy**
2. Prior to the start of each semester, the Director of Distance Education shall arrange for each section that is to be evaluated to be linked to an electronic version of the Student Survey of Instruction.

3. The Director of Distance Education, in consultation with the instructor, shall assign a three day period in which the evaluation shall take place. The default period will be the last full three days of instruction. However, an alternate evaluation time will be assigned if the default period would overlap with any day in which a major assessment is conducted or returned. Additionally, an instructor may request an alternate evaluation period, provided that it takes place within the last 20% of the semester and does not overlap with the giving or returning of a major assessment. Evaluations shall only be completed during this three day period.

4. At least one week before the evaluation period is to begin, instructors shall inform students of the evaluation time period via email and by posting the dates on the class News page. The instructor can request review of the course syllabus prior to the evaluation, and in multiple-instructor courses can inform students that only one survey will apply to the course and that comments on individual instructors can be typed in the online forms provided.

5. Under no circumstances shall the instructor be given access to the completed surveys until after final grades have been submitted, nor shall the instructor lobby students by word or deed for higher ratings.

6. The following statement will precede the Student Survey of Instruction:

It is the policy of the University of Wisconsin that students be given the opportunity to evaluate teaching faculty. You are not required to complete the evaluation, but your participation is encouraged. The survey will be anonymous. It will become a public document that your instructor will not have access to until the semester is over and your final course grade is recorded. Do not work with others while completing this survey. Please answer freely and honestly.

The information obtained on this form will be considered when making decisions regarding salary, promotion, or tenure. Your instructor will find your evaluations helpful when improving his/her teaching and course content.

V. Processing And Distribution Of Statistical Results
A. **For Face-to-Face and Blended classes**, completed evaluation packets, separated by class and instructor, will be sent to the individuals authorized to process the forms. All packets should be submitted no later than the end of the final exam period for the semester in which the evaluation is conducted.

B. The statistical results will be electronically distributed to individual faculty members, to the relevant departments, and the campuses. For tenured faculty and instructional academic staff, **Central Office** the campus will retain the original forms for **six months** and electronic **copies and** data, including statistical summaries, for at least five years. For probationary faculty, **Central Office** the campus will retain the original forms **for six months**, statistical summaries and electronic **copies and** data for at least seven years. Departments are encouraged to retain the electronic data, including statistical summaries, for tenured faculty at least five years and for probationary faculty for seven years.

C. After the data processing is complete, the original forms will be **returned to retained by Central Office** the campus. The campus will retain the original forms **for six months** and electronic data for at least ten years. Departments are encouraged to retain the electronic data for at least ten years.

D. Electronic data on faculty or instructional academic staff who are no longer employees of the UW Colleges can be deleted from their respective e-mail accounts 30 days after the data has been sent.

---

**Appendix 1: Notes to Student:**

1. The only attachments accompanying the student forms will be **this instruction** the section sheet identifying the class and, where applicable, a sheet listing additional questions.
2. Under no circumstances may instructors see the survey forms until after the grades have been turned in. The forms should be delivered to the drop off location by the student.
3. Instructors who bring the forms to class and students who circulate them should make only those remarks about the forms which are pertinent to the task of gathering student reactions.

**Appendix 2: Statistical data to be reported to Campus, Department, and Faculty**

For each item:
- Frequency distribution
- Mean
- Standard Deviation
- Correlation Matrix (to be sent to Instructor)

Summary data shall not include distance education, Interdisciplinary Studies or one-credit courses offered outside of regular departments, such as Freshman Seminar. Such courses
are identified in the tenth column on the section sheet. Departmental and campus merit committees can request extraction of the “global instructor” (q. 17) or other small set of responses for each faculty member under review. Compilation does not include summation.
**Rationale:**
Although midterm grade reporting is mandated by Senate policy, its implementation is left to individual campuses. The implementation creates problems for Distance Education courses, where students and instructors are on campuses which use different methodologies for midterm grade reporting. The use of the official grade reporting software, currently PRISM, will alleviate this issue since all instructors and students are familiar with its use. In addition, student advisors also have access to midterm grades reported in this manner, thereby allowing for more relevant student tracking and advisement.

**Proposed revisions are in bold, red, italicized, underlined font.**

---

**II. Grading System**
Revision adopted by the Senate, January 14, 2000
G. Mid-term and Final Grades. Instructors shall submit grades reflecting students' progress in each course through such a portion of the semester that students can be formally notified by the end of the ninth week of the regular semester or at least 3 working days before the withdrawal deadline published in the course schedule for courses not offered in the traditional 16-week format. The specific mechanisms for collecting and distributing midterm grades should be determined at each UW Colleges campus. Midterm grades will be reported in the same way as final grades. Unlike final grades, midterm grades will not become part of a student’s official academic record.
Rationale:
Section IV. H needs to be clarified to indicate that any event, meeting or activity involving students cannot be scheduled during the final exam period regardless of location. As currently written, this prohibition only applies to events etc. that are scheduled “on a UW Colleges campus,” which might leave open the possibility of scheduling off-campus activities during finals.

Proposed revisions are in bold, red, italicized, underlined font.

UW Colleges Senate Policy
Institutional Curricular Policy #104
Course and Instructional Policies

IV. Final Exams

A. Each UW Colleges academic department shall have a written statement of its final examination policy. Such policies shall include a stipulation of the courses for which final examinations are mandatory, permissible methods of testing, material that may be covered, and any other guidelines which will assist faculty in conforming to departmental expectations about final examination practices. These policy statements shall also indicate the procedure by which a faculty member may request an exemption.

B. Final examination schedules shall be published in the campus Course Schedule to show the exact date and time of all regularly-scheduled final examinations.
C. Final examinations in courses offered for two or more credits during a traditional 16-week semester regardless of delivery method shall be given at the time indicated in the published schedule, unless the faculty member has received permission for an alternative time from the campus dean, and shall not exceed two hours in length. An exception to this policy is a take-home final examination, which may be given only if departmental policy permits and then must be due at the time of the regularly scheduled final examination. Final examinations in courses offered for two or more credits may not be given during a regular class period. This policy does not preclude an instructor's making special arrangements for individual students.

D. Final examinations for courses in delivery formats other than the traditional 16-week semester shall follow the calendar indicated for that format.

E. Final examinations in one-credit courses offered for less than a full semester may be given prior to or during the final examination period.

F. Students who have more than two examinations on one day or two examinations scheduled for the same time must make arrangements at least one week in advance with one of the instructors concerned to take one of the examinations at an alternate time. When an informal arrangement cannot be made, the instructor of the course of lowest enrollment shall provide an alternate examination time. Examinations in studio or recital courses shall not conflict with regularly scheduled final examinations.

G. When an instructor does not return the final examination, students will have the opportunity to review their final examination or discuss it with the instructor up to one semester after the course is completed.

H. No major activities, events, or organizational or committee meetings which involve students may be scheduled at a UW Colleges campus between 4:00 p.m. of the last day of classes and the end of the exam period. Any exceptions to this policy must be approved by the campus dean, in consultation with the campus collegium steering committee.

[...]
Rationale:
The current policy uses the term “faculty” where it describes oversight and instruction of Internships, Service Learning projects, and Capstone Senior Seminars, as well as evaluation of Experiential Learning portfolios. The proposed revisions clarify that Experiential Learning portfolios are submitted to departments for review, not to faculty, as specified in IP# 141.02. In addition, the term “faculty” is being replaced with “instructor” so that Instructional Academic Staff are not prohibited from BAAS instructional opportunities. Departments would retain the responsibility for evaluating qualifications of instructors in relation to new teaching assignments.

Proposed changes are in bold, red, italicized and underlined font.

UW Colleges Senate Policy
Institutional Curricular Policy #141
Bachelor of Applied Arts and Sciences Degree

The Bachelor of Applied Arts and Sciences Degree

I. Degree Description

The UW Colleges B.A.A.S. degree-completion program expands baccalaureate opportunities for place-bound adults. It addresses the UW Colleges’ revised mission of “providing a single baccalaureate degree that meets local and individual needs.” To fulfill the UW Colleges mission of access to high quality academic programs and success at the baccalaureate level, and to strengthen and enhance the institution’s commitment to the Wisconsin Idea, the UW Colleges Bachelor of Applied Arts and Sciences degree includes four sequenced curricular components that prepare students to apply theoretical knowledge, higher order intellectual skills, and practical experience to achieve solutions to complex problems encountered in contemporary workplace and community settings.

A. Bachelor of Applied Arts and Sciences Degree Curricular Components

The four sequenced curricular components that make up the 60-credit degree-completion program are defined as follows:

1. Professional Experience
   Internship (IN)
The internship combines classroom-based education with workplace-based experiential learning related to the degree-seeking student’s career-related skill and professional development.

**Service-Learning (SL)**
The course-integrated project conducted as a volunteer in a local organization provides an opportunity to analyze and solve work- or community-related problems. The central feature of the service-learning component is service to others combined with reflection upon its role in community and individual life.

**Credit for Prior Experiential Learning**
A degree-seeking student may present an experiential learning portfolio addressing university-level knowledge of a subject acquired outside of a traditional classroom to a UW Colleges [department](#) faculty for evaluation for experiential learning credit.

2. **Global Studies (GS)**
A curricular component that will enable students to develop knowledge of global cultures, the world economy, and the natural world needed to engage contemporary and enduring problems from a global perspective.

3. **Cognitive Skills (CS)**
A curricular component that requires students to acquire higher order intellectual skills in a variety of disciplines and contexts.

4. **Capstone Senior Seminar (CSS)**
A full academic year of individualized instruction in the student’s area of interest working closely with an instructor on the student’s professional development. The completion of the seminar should result in a tangible project/study/report that will help the student into the next career stage.

II. **Bachelor of Applied Arts and Sciences Degree Proficiencies**

To fulfill its mission, the UW Colleges expects all students who graduate with a UW Colleges Bachelor of Applied Arts and Sciences degree to achieve and demonstrate the following skill-based competencies:

A. **Integrative Learning**
Students must be able to:
- Integrate past work/life experience with the college experience,
- Identify, analyze, and develop strategies to meet local community and business needs,
- Understand the role of service in the development of healthy communities,
- Adapt to a continuously changing work world, and
- Demonstrate persistent learning through the capacity to apply research skills, critical analysis, group discussion techniques, and disciplined writing in community and work settings.

B. **Knowledge of Human Cultures and the Natural World**
Students must be able to:
- Demonstrate a broad knowledge of global issues, processes, trends, and systems,
- Communicate effectively across contemporary cultural boundaries, and
Work effectively in a variety of cross-cultural environments.

C. Practical and Cognitive Skills
Students must be able to:
- Demonstrate analysis, synthesis, evaluation, decision-making, and critical and creative thinking skills,
- Identify, analyze, and evaluate arguments as they occur in one’s own and others’ work,
- Write coherent, organized, well-developed, and substantive texts that follow the conventions of standard written English, and
- Apply effective leadership, teamwork, relationship management, and conflict resolution skills in the workplace.

III. Bachelor of Applied Arts and Sciences Degree Requirements

A. Liberal Arts Breadth Requirements
Students entering the Bachelor of Applied Arts and Sciences degree-completion program will have completed a UW Colleges Associate of Arts and Science degree or equivalent liberal arts associate degree.

B. Level of degree work
A minimum of 60 credits of junior/senior-level work is required for the UW Colleges B.A.A.S. degree.

C. Residency
A total of 30 credits of the 60 credits of the UW Colleges B.A.A.S. degree must be earned at the UW Colleges, including 15 Professional Experience credits, a Global Studies core course, a Cognitive Skills core course, a 6-credit Capstone Senior Seminar, and three credits of Global Studies, Cognitive Skills, or Electives.

D. Collaboration
A total of 30 credits of the 60 credits of the UW Colleges B.A.A.S. degree must be earned in UW partner approved junior/senior-level Global Studies, Cognitive Skills and/or Elective courses.

E. GPA minimum
A minimum 2.0 cumulative grade point average (GPA) in all courses for the UW Colleges B.A.A.S. degree, including all transfer credits necessary to complete the 60-credit degree requirement.

IV. Bachelor of Applied Arts and Sciences Curricular Requirements

A. Professional Experience Requirements
In these components of the UW Colleges Bachelor of Applied Arts and Sciences degree, students must complete 15 credit hours of experiential learning integrated with academic
in a prior experiential learning portfolio, be awarded up to six credits for university-level knowledge of a subject acquired outside of a traditional classroom equivalent to approved UW Colleges B.A.A.S. degree course(s). The ratio of Professional Experience components will vary by student; it will depend on the nature of the student’s program and the number of experiential learning credits awarded. Students in an internship will be jointly supervised by an instructor and a designated workplace mentor. Service-learning activities will be course-integrated. The Professional Experience component of the degree will be offered by the UW Colleges.

B. Global Studies Requirements
In this component of the UW Colleges Bachelor of Applied Arts and Sciences degree, students must complete 15 credit hours of junior/senior-level courses designated as Global Studies (GS). All students must complete a required UW Colleges three-credit GS core course. Junior-level standing is required for enrolling in this course. Nine to twelve Global Studies credits will be approved junior/senior-level Global Studies courses offered by the UW partner.

C. Cognitive Skills Requirements
In this component of the UW Colleges Bachelor of Applied Arts and Sciences degree, students must complete 15 credit hours of junior/senior-level courses designated as Cognitive Skills (CS). All students must complete a required UW Colleges three-credit CS core course. Junior-level standing is required for enrolling in this course. Nine to twelve Cognitive Skills credits will be approved junior/senior-level Cognitive Skills courses offered by the UW partner.

D. Capstone Senior Seminar Requirements
In this component of the UW Colleges Bachelor of Applied Arts and Sciences degree, students must complete a full academic year of individualized instruction working alone or in teams with a UW Colleges instructor on a project with regional impact and global perspective and that uses higher order intellectual skills. Senior-level standing is required for enrolling in this course.

E. Electives
The UW Colleges Bachelor of Applied Arts and Sciences degree includes nine credits of approved junior/senior-level UW partner and/or UW Colleges Electives apportioned so that the total degree credits are a minimum of 30 credits at the UW Colleges and 30 credits at the UW partner.

V. Bachelor of Applied Arts and Sciences Course Degree Designations
A. UW Colleges Bachelor of Applied Arts and Sciences Applied Studies
Applied Studies courses for the UW Colleges Bachelor of Applied Arts and Sciences will have the following degree designations: Internship (IN), Service-Learning (SL), Global Studies (GS), Cognitive Skills (CS), Capstone Senior Seminar (CSS), and Elective (E).

VI. UW Colleges Departments and Disciplines

The following is a list of UW Colleges academic departments and programs, and the disciplines or programs included within each of these academic departments:

*Anthropology and Sociology*
  *Anthropology, Sociology*

*Art*
  *Art*

*Biological Sciences*
  *Biology*

*Business and Economics*
  *Business, Economics*

*Chemistry*
  *Chemistry*

*Communication and Theatre Arts*
  *Communication, Theatre*

*Computer Science, Engineering and Physics*
  *Astronomy, Computer Science, Engineering, Engineering Graphics, Engineering Mechanics, Physics*

*English*
  *English, Learning Resources (LEA) (non-degree credit classes)*

*Geography and Geology*
  *Geography, Geology, Meteorology*

*Health, Exercise Science, and Athletics*
  *Exercise Science, Health, Physical Education*

*History*
  *History*

*Mathematics*
  *Mathematics*

*Music*
  *Music, Music Applied*

*Philosophy*
  *Philosophy, Religious Studies*

*Political Science*
  *American Indian Studies, Political Science*

*Psychology*
  *Education, Psychology*

*World Languages*
  *French, German, Spanish, Chinese, Italian*

*Other Programs and Courses*
Interdisciplinary Studies (INT)
Lecture Forum (LEC)
Women’s Studies (WOM)

[End]
Rationale:
The proposed revisions replace “faculty” with “instructor,” so that Instructional Academic Staff are not prohibited from BAAS instructional opportunities. Departments would retain the responsibility for evaluating qualifications of instructors in relation to new teaching assignments. The proposed revision also clarifies that Experiential Learning portfolios are submitted to departments for review, not to faculty, as specified in IP# 141.02.

Proposed changes are in bold, red, italicized and underlined font.

UW Colleges Senate Policy
Institutional Curricular Policy #141.01
Bachelor of Applied Arts and Sciences Degree Guidelines for Professional Experience Courses

I. Description of B.A.A.S. Professional Experience Component

The Professional Experience component of the UW Colleges Bachelor of Applied Arts and Sciences (B.A.A.S.) degree program includes 15 credit hours of experiential learning integrated with academic instruction, and university-level knowledge of a subject acquired outside of a traditional classroom equivalent to an approved UW Colleges B.A.A.S. degree course. The three elements of the professional experience component are internships, service-learning and prior experiential learning in a workplace, workshop/seminar, volunteer organization or a non-profit agency.

II. Guidelines for Professional Experience Courses

A. Internships

The internship component of the UW Colleges B.A.A.S. degree seeks to further develop the student’s professional skills in an intellectually rigorous manner to merit academic credit. These internships combine classroom-based education with career-related skill development. The internship is arranged with a local business, agency, non-profit or other type of organization. Over an entire academic term, the student’s work is jointly supervised by the faculty instructor offering the course and the employer or community counterpart from the organization.
B. Service-Learning
The central feature of the service-learning component of the UW Colleges B.A.A.S. degree is service to others combined with reflection upon the role of service in community and individual life. Service-learning projects are integrated into a specific course with variable models for the nature of the integration (e.g., throughout the semester or at particular points in the semester). Students have an opportunity to gain direct experience with issues they are studying in the course and engage in efforts to analyze and solve work- or community-related problems in the context of an instructor faculty-supervised project. Projects are often collaborative in nature. Service-learning projects could include volunteer work within public or private schools, community service programs, or agencies focusing on issues such as education, the environment, legal aid, immigrant support, child care, domestic abuse, veteran support, and other socially oriented services.

C. Prior Experiential Learning
This component provides UW Colleges B.A.A.S. degree-completion students an opportunity to earn up to six credits toward the B.A.A.S. degree for prior experiential learning equivalent to university-level learning. Any UW Colleges B.A.A.S. degree-seeking student will have the option to present a portfolio of university-level knowledge of a subject acquired outside a traditional classroom to a UW Colleges department faculty for evaluation for credit. Evaluation for credit is based on the learning derived from the experience rather than the experience itself. (See IP #141.02.)

[End]
Rationale:
The proposed revisions in Part I clarify that Experiential Learning portfolios are submitted to departments for review, not to faculty. In Part II, “faculty” is replaced with “instructor,” so that department chairs have the option of selecting either Instructional Academic Staff or faculty, based on their expertise, to review Experiential Learning portfolios. Revisions in Part III use consistent wording for the reviewers of portfolios.

Proposed changes are in bold, red, italicized and underlined font.

UW Colleges Senate Policy
Institutional Curricular Policy #141.02
Bachelor of Applied Arts and Sciences Degree Professional Experience: Credit for Prior Experiential Learning

I. Description of Credit for Prior Experiential Learning in the B.A.A.S. Degree-Completion Program

The UW Colleges has a long-standing policy of granting credit for prior learning based on nationally standardized exams. Four current options are: Advanced Placement (AP), College Level Exam Program (CLEP), International Baccalaureate (IB), and Defense Activity for Non-traditional Education Support (DANTES) Subject Standardized Tests and military transcripts. A fifth option is UW Colleges academic department policies that govern credit by exam or retroactive credits after successful completion of a UW Colleges course. In these cases, documentation is provided to the UW Colleges Registrar’s Office where it is reviewed by trained personnel following relevant guidelines and policies.

This policy covers granting up to six credits toward the Bachelor of Applied Arts and Sciences (B.A.A.S.) degree for experiential learning equivalent to university-level learning. The policy requires UW Colleges B.A.A.S. degree-seeking students to present a portfolio of university-level knowledge of a subject acquired outside a traditional classroom to a UW Colleges faculty department for evaluation for credit. The portfolio is a written description of the learning achieved and documentation to support the student’s claim of experiential learning equivalent to that of a particular UW Colleges B.A.A.S. degree course. Evaluation for credit is based on the learning derived from the experience rather than the experience itself. Any credits awarded toward the UW Colleges B.A.A.S. degree will not count toward the residency
requirement or in the grade point hour computation. Policies of other institutions of higher education will determine whether UW Colleges experiential learning credits are transferred into their degree programs.

II. Criteria and Guidelines for Experiential Learning Portfolio Materials and Submissions

A. Matriculated UW Colleges B.A.A.S. degree-seeking students enrolled for at least three credits may submit an experiential learning portfolio in which they seek to demonstrate learning equivalent to a UW Colleges B.A.A.S. approved course.

B. UW Colleges B.A.A.S. degree-seeking students cannot earn academic credit for experiential learning for which they earned or transferred credit from another institution of higher learning. Nor can a student submit a portfolio for a B.A.A.S. approved course they have previously taken in order to try to improve the course grade.

C. The experiential learning for which UW Colleges B.A.A.S. degree-seeking students seek to earn degree credit must be based on experiences in employment, volunteer activities, workshop/seminar participation, and/or publications or performances.

D. UW Colleges B.A.A.S. degree-seeking students have the option of taking a one-credit course that covers learning theory and how to document learning. After the completion of this one-credit course, student may elect to create an experiential learning portfolio. This one credit does not count towards the six credit maximum for experiential learning.

E. The experiential learning portfolio must include:
   1. a standardized request form;
   2. a 300 word abstract summarizing the learning and how it was achieved;
   3. the student’s university transcript;
   4. the student’s resume;
   5. a current syllabus for the UW Colleges B.A.A.S. approved course for which the student seeks experiential learning credit;
   6. a 2,000 to 3,000 word well-documented narrative that describes the experiential learning in relation to theories, concepts and corresponding literature; and
   7. documentation that reflects familiarity with theories of the academic discipline that are central to the experience and supports the experiential statements in the narrative. The documentation may include certificates from workshops/seminars completion, copies of publications, and newsletter or newspaper articles.
   8. at least one letter from a present/past direct supervisor addressing the experiential learning in relation to the course content.

F. Completed experiential learning portfolios must be submitted to the relevant academic department chair for departmental review and credit assessment by one or more instructor(s) faculty qualified in the relevant area.
G. One experiential learning portfolio may be submitted per semester through the B.A.A.S. degree-seeking student’s penultimate semester as all portfolios must be submitted prior to the student’s final semester in the B.A.A.S. degree-completion program.

H. Any materials submitted to the UW Colleges in one experiential learning portfolio may not be submitted in any subsequent experiential learning portfolio.

I. UW Colleges B.A.A.S. degree-seeking students must pay a non-refundable assessment fee when presenting an experiential learning portfolio for evaluation.

III. Guidelines for Experiential Learning Portfolio Evaluation

A. UW Colleges academic department policies will govern experiential learning portfolio evaluation; however, some standard guidelines apply to all academic departments:

1. upon initial review of the experiential learning portfolio by the department, faculty the evaluating instructor(s) may require that additional information be made available to support the request. That information may include an interview with the student or the results of an exam.

2. the academic department’s decision on the experiential learning portfolio must be given to the B.A.A.S. degree-seeking student no later than one semester after the student submits the portfolio.

3. upon review of the experiential learning portfolio, the number of credits to be awarded is determined by the evaluating instructor(s) faculty and reviewed by the academic department chair, but in no case shall the number of credits granted for an experiential learning portfolio exceed that of the UW Colleges approved B.A.A.S. course.

4. all requests for re-assessment of an experiential learning portfolio, whether approved or denied, must go to the reviewing faculty evaluating instructor(s) and their academic department chair(s)

5. in the case of a disagreement over the awarding of credit or the number of credits to be awarded, the appeal process will follow Senate IP #204, Grade Appeal Policy.

[End]
UW Colleges Senate
Introduction: March 15, 2013
Proposed Revision of Institutional Curricular Policy #106.01
(“LEC 100 First-Year Seminar Policy”)

Rationale:
Senate Steering Committee directed SCC to work with the institutional Engaging Students in the First Year (ESFY) Coordinator to review IP#106.01 and the process of modification of existing LEC 100 courses. Current policy interpretation suggests that any change in a LEC 100 course requires a curriculum modification proposal and review by SCC. Most modification requests are filed to change the instructor or transfer an LEC 100 course from one campus to another. This is cumbersome for the instructor who initiates the change, the local campus ESFY coordinator, the SCC, and the Office of Academic Affairs. In consultation with the ESFY coordinator SCC proposes the following policy changes so that instructor changes for an LEC 100 can be made at the campus level with department chair approval. This removes SCC from this aspect of the LEC100 review process but also makes instructional changes more flexible and timely. The campus can more easily substitute instructors should a last minute change be needed. This would make a LEC 100 course similar to all other courses where last-minute instructor changes are made by campus personnel with department chair approval. (II.E.2). If the campus location of a currently approved LEC 100 course changes but the content does not then we have proposed a process to expedite the course transfer. The process of making these changes and the requirements for notification and approval of said changes are now spelled out more clearly in the policy (II.E.4). The third policy modification removes the implication that the department monitors assessment of the course. Institutional LEC100 assessment tools based on the three core course goals are used to assess all LEC 100 courses. While academic departments continue to serve as home departments for particular LEC 100 courses, and are encouraged to conduct class visits regarding the subject of inquiry and to read instructor evaluations, the department does not play a role in designing a LEC100 assessment tool, or evaluating the assessment results. The statement that the department is in charge of course assessment has been removed, and the option for instructor evaluation has been added. (I.B.2)

Proposed changes are in bold, red, italicized and underlined font.

UW Colleges Senate Policy
Institutional Policy #106.01
LEC 100 First-Year Seminar Policy

Adopted 4/29/05
Revised by the Senate, March 3, 2006
Revised by the Senate, October 20, 2006
Revised by the Senate April 27, 2007

I. First Year Seminar Courses (LEC 100)
Revised by the Senate April 27, 2007

104
A. Definition

First-Year Seminar courses are designed specifically for newly entering students. Such courses will be offered only under LEC 100 designation. LEC 100 courses are designed to combine academic content with strategies for academic success as described in the FYS initiative course guide: “The First-Year Seminar will help students develop a sense of responsibility for their own education and learning, introduce students to the skills necessary for academic and life success, provide students with an understanding of their membership in an academic community, and instill in students an appreciation for a liberal arts education and a joy for learning. Because these achievements are best realized within an intellectually substantive context, each seminar instructor will incorporate a subject of inquiry of his or her choice for students to explore as they develop strategies for academic success.”

Courses that fit this definition include first-year experience courses, introduction to college courses, extended orientation courses and all other courses designed to enhance the first-year college experience. LEC 100 courses will receive elective credit unless they receive approval for other degree designations from the Senate Curriculum Committee.

B. Criteria

Because all for-credit courses and instructors must be approved by an academic department (UW Colleges Constitution 4.03) and because the special nature of LEC 100 courses invites the participation of instructors who may not belong to regular academic departments, the following criteria will be used for approval of courses.

1. A LEC 100 course must have the approval of the participating academic department(s).

2. If the course content bridges more than one academic department then the course and instructor must gain approval from all academic departments that are involved in the proposed course as stipulated by Institutional Curricular Policy #101.01. One department must be designated the home department for purposes of course instructor evaluation and assessment.

3. If a potential LEC 100 instructor does not belong to any academic department then the course and the instructor must gain approval of the academic department(s) that will have jurisdiction over the content of the course.

4. If a potential LEC 100 instructor does not belong to any academic department and if no department or discipline claims jurisdiction over the content of a potential course,
then the instructor must find an academic department willing to sponsor the course and provide its approval.

II. Guidelines for Approval
Revised by the Senate, October 20, 2006

A. Proposals will include the following information:
1. Course rationale including a statement focusing on how the course meets the institutional goals for FYS courses:
   Goal #1: To promote active learning as well as student involvement and responsibility in the learning process.
   Goal #2: To assist students in the development of life management skills.
   Goal #3: To engage students on the campus.
2. Brief course description including the subject of inquiry for the course.
3. List of course objectives
4. Course syllabus

B. Proposals are submitted to the chair of the proposing instructor’s department and subsequently to the campus Curriculum Committee.

1. If the proposing instructor is not a member of a recognized academic department then the instructor shall submit curriculum approval forms to the campus Curriculum Committee and the department which has jurisdiction over the course content.

2. If there is no department with clear jurisdiction over the proposed course content, then the instructor and campus curriculum committee shall seek a department which will sponsor the course and instructor as described in IP#106 (IV.B).

C. The campus curriculum committee and the department(s) forward the proposal and approval forms to the Senate Curriculum Committee.

D. The Senate Curriculum Committee reviews the proposal and then forwards the proposal to the Provost for final approval.

E. Continuing Designation
1. Once the LEC 100 course is approved, the proposing instructor need not seek approval again for the same course. Significant changes to the subject of inquiry or pedagogical approach should be discussed with the Campus ESFY Coordinator
and Institutional ESFY Coordinator to determine if a new course proposal is required.

2. A new instructor on the same campus may teach an approved LEC 100 provided that the following criteria are met. Campus Engaging Students in the First Year (ESFY) Coordinators will provide oversight to this review process with the assistance of the Institutional ESFY Coordinator.
   a. The instructor is approved by the department of record
   b. The course is taught with a similar syllabus and content outline
   c. The campus curriculum committee approves the offering of the course

2. 3 A LEC 100 approved after June 1, 2006, may The same course can be taught at another campus without submitting a new course proposal if the following criteria are met:
   a. The instructor is approved by the department of record
   b. The course is taught with a similar syllabus and content outline
   c. The campus curriculum committee of the new instructor approves the course.
   d. SCC form SCC 009 is submitted to the Senate Curriculum Committee to be reviewed and forwarded to the Provost for final review and approval.

3. 4 Courses that were initiated prior to December 31, 2005 shall go through the review process specified herein (II) and instructors shall file form SCC 009 Modified before June 1, 2006.

[End]
Whereas Pam Dollard, University of Wisconsin Colleges Director of Human Resources, played a leading role in the creation of the new University of Wisconsin Personnel System by serving on the Balance of the System University Personnel System Project Team, and

Whereas Pam co-chaired the Employment Environment Working Group, whose charge was to study performance management, career progression, job security and discipline appeal rights, while at the same time assessing current processes in all UW employment categories and recommending the best options, and

Whereas Pam immediately involved the institution’s Senate and, thereby, its faculty, staff, and students, in the creation of committees and working groups to devise the new personnel system, and

Whereas Pam provided frequent and constructive updates to the UW Colleges Senate on the progress of those working groups, and

Whereas Right from the start and throughout the process Pam has honored both the spirit and the letter of shared governance that we cherish in the UW Colleges, therefore

The University of Wisconsin Colleges Senate hereby resolves to thank UW Colleges Director of Human Resources Pam Dollard for her hard work, good humor, and collegiality as she completes her work on the new Balance of the UW System Personnel System.

Great job, Pam!
Attachment 27

UW Colleges Faculty Council of Senators
Adoption: March 15, 2013
Proposed Revision of Faculty Personnel Policy #501.01
(“Promotion, Tenure, and Third-Year Tenure Progress and Retention Review Dossier Format”)

Background and Rationale
As currently written, FPP #501.01 I.E reads:

The campus evaluation committee will forward a copy to the campus dean to place in the
candidate’s campus file. The dean’s office will create one single hard copy of the dossier
and send it to the provost in support of department/campus/dean recommendations.

The policy was written this way so that the final person to see the dossier before it was sent to
the provost’s office would be the one to print it, thereby ensuring that no changes could be made
between that person and the provost. Despite this being the policy, it was far more common for
the candidate to prepare the required hard copy of their dossier.

During the 2011-12 academic year, the question was raised whether the policy should be
amended to fit practice. The consensus among the Campus Executive Officers and Deans, and
the Deans’ Executive Assistants was that the faculty member who is being considered for tenure
should be responsible for creating a hardcopy of the dossier and not the dean’s office. They also
argued that

- It seems unfair to faculty or IAS to have someone else print and assemble their final
dossier, especially for something as important as tenure or promotion. Faculty and IAS
have an investment in the results; the person printing and assembling does not.
- This creates liability for the Deans Executive Assistants or the workstudy student who
may ultimately do the task.
- There is a strict policy on how to create the single hard copy. This is time consuming for
the Deans Executive Assistants, especially since clerical work is not part of their position
description.

The provost issued a similar statement, that faculty should be responsible for creating the final
hard copy of their dossier.

Since this portion of the policy was written, electronic preparation and circulation of dossiers
has become much more common, leading to substantial reductions in costs for printing,
collation, and postage, and time required for distribution of dossiers. This raises the
fundamental question of whether an official final hard copy of the dossier is still needed.

The proposed revisions below continue to permit preparation and circulation of dossiers in
either electronic or paper format, but eliminates the requirement that a final paper copy be sent
to the provost’s office.
UW Colleges Senate Policy
Faculty Personnel Policy #501.01
Promotion, Tenure, and Third-Year Tenure Progress and Retention Review
Dossier Format
====================================================================
Implementation: September 1994
Revision: March 1, 1998
Reorganized and Renumbered: March 15, 2002
Revised by the Senate: May 7, 2004
Revised by the Senate: October 15, 2004
Revised by the Senate: March 4, 2005
Revised by the Senate March 6, 2009
Revised by the Senate (FPSC) 2010-10-22
Revised by the SSC 2010-11-15

TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEW DOSSIERS AND THIRD-YEAR TENURE PROGRESS AND RETENTION REVIEW DOSSIERS: PREPARATION, PROCESS AND FUNDING

I. Preparation and Funding
   Revised by the Senate March 6, 2009

   A. The candidate has full responsibility for constructing the dossier in accordance with the established guidelines, which follow.

   B. The campus will assist the candidate with reproducing and digitizing all materials which have been gathered by the candidate for the requirements of the dossier, including those non-paper materials added by individual department guidelines, and with distributing those materials to the departmental evaluation committee. Departments will keep the required non-paper materials to a minimum, to allow economical accumulation and distribution.

   C. The cost of copying the final tenure dossier will be handled on the campus as an institutional expense. Assistant campus deans for administrative services should submit a budget transfer request to the central office controller. The request should identify the candidate and the copying and mailing costs to be reimbursed to the campus. The cost of using commercial services for duplicating or reimbursement to individuals will not be covered by the university without prior approval from the vice chancellor for administrative and financial services.

   D. Dossiers received by the department will be forwarded to the campus evaluation committee by January 25.

   E. The campus evaluation committee will forward a copy to the campus dean to place in the candidate’s campus file. The dean’s office will create one single hard-forward a
copy of the dossier and send it to the provost in support of department/campus/dean recommendations.

F. Faculty are expected to keep their dossiers up to date. That is, they build their tenure and/or promotion dossiers year by year, starting from the first year.

II. Statement of Request and Self-Assessment
The self-assessment should be in narrative form (maximum 10 printed single-spaced pages) in which the applicant presents a guided history of accomplishments pertinent to the request for personnel action. In addition to a Curriculum Vita, the presentation should describe and interpret the quality of activities in all the areas: teaching, scholarship, professional development and university service. In the case of promotion, materials should address progress since the last promotion. To support the self-assessment, the narrative should include references to documents in A-D. Departments may require additional information.

III. Documentation Appendices
Revised by the Senate 2010-10-22

Please include the documentation described below and any other documentation you believe pertinent to your self-assessment.

A. Teaching
1. Lists (may include a brief annotation that assesses the relationship and value of the activity to your teaching effectiveness)
   a) Summary of courses taught and enrollments
   b) Grading/assessment procedures and results
   c) New course preparations
   d) Assessment procedures (as used for assessing student learning for improvement of teaching)

2. Evaluations
   a) Evaluations of teaching by former students when mandated by FPP #501 for promotion to tenure
   b) From the most recent two semesters available: 1) Student Survey of Instruction Reports as received from the UWC Office of Student Affairs and 2) Copies or transcriptions of written comment sections from Student Survey of Instruction (per Senate policy; originals should be available if a committee requests during the process)
   c) Results of colleague visitations

3. Materials
   a) Selected samples of course syllabi, examinations, and course materials (two currently taught courses)
   b) Selected samples of innovations in course development and/or teaching practices
   c) Selected samples of grading (assessment of student learning limited to the course)
d) Selected samples of assessment activities (assessment of student learning for use for improvement of teaching)
e) Other

B. Scholarship and Professional Development
1. Lists (may include a brief annotation of the significance of the items listed; e.g., published in refereed journal.
   a) Publications
   b) Professional presentations
   c) Fine Arts creations (as appropriate)
   d) Grants submitted/received
   e) Professional meetings attended
   f) Consultations
   g) Other: additional credit coursework and/or degrees earned.

2. Materials
   a) Submit copies of materials as requested by department unless duplicated elsewhere in the dossier.

C. University Service
1. Lists (annotate briefly to reflect significance of service and/or accomplishment on committee)
   a) Committee assignments (Department, Campus, Colleges-wide, System-wide)
   b) Special assignments

D. Community Service
1. Lists (annotate briefly to reflect significance of service and/or accomplishment)
   a) Professional presentations
   b) Special projects
   c) Consultations

E. Retention Letters (both departmental and campus) from all prior retention decisions.

IV. Format
Revised by the Senate March 6, 2009

All dossiers, except for a single hard copy of the final tenure dossier, may be transmitted in an unalterable electronically format. Preparation of a hard copy of an electronically circulated dossier is the responsibility of the individual who desires a hard copy. If a department requires the candidate to circulate hard copies of the dossier, each copy. The single hard copy of the final tenure dossier should include the self-assessment, the appendices, and any other material in one two-inch, three-ring binder. Use both sides of the page, organize and number them clearly, and provide separators between sections. Keep the documents unstapled so they can be easily duplicated and mailed. Items like videotapes and slides can be treated separately.
V. Senate Policy Deadlines (may vary given Board of Regents schedule)

Faculty dossier to:

- Department Chair: January 4
- Campus Committee: January 25
- Dean: February 15
- Provost: March 15
- Board of Regents: May 1

VI. Criteria and Procedures for Third-Year Tenure Progress Review and Retention Dossier

Criteria and Procedures for the third-year tenure progress review and retention dossier shall conform as closely as possible to the “Criteria for Procedures for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor” included in FPP #501, Section IV.

[End]
attachment 28

uw colleges faculty council of senators
adoption: march 15, 2013
proposed faculty council of senators bylaws

uw colleges
faculty council of senators
bylaws

article i: name

the name of this organization shall be the faculty council of senators.

article ii: purpose

pursuant to uw colleges constitution 2.04, the faculty council of senators shall represent the faculty perspective to the uw colleges senate. the faculty council of senators shall also administer all faculty personnel rules, i.e. those senate policies numbered in the 500s and 600s.

article iii: structure

section 1. the senate steering committee chair shall chair the faculty council of senators and will be responsible for convening and conducting meetings of the faculty senators as necessary.

section 2. the faculty council standing committees are the faculty appeals and grievances committee and the faculty professional standards committee.

section 3. the faculty council of senators shall establish ad hoc committees as necessary; these committees may include faculty who are not senators.

article iv: membership

section 1. current faculty senators comprise the faculty council of senators.

article v: meetings

section 1. the faculty council of senators meets on the same days as the uw colleges senate. special meetings of the council may be called by the senate steering committee chair or by petition of a majority of the faculty council of senators.
Section 2. A majority of the Council members constitutes a quorum.

Section 3. The Senate Steering Committee chair shall prepare the agenda and shall include it in the UW Colleges Senate agenda.

Section 4. The minutes of all meetings shall be distributed with the UW Colleges Senate minutes.

**Article VI: Amendment Procedures for Personnel Policies and Procedures**

All actions of the Faculty Council of Senators that create policies or revise existing policies must use the following procedure.

Section 1. A written proposal must be introduced and discussed at a Faculty Council of Senators meeting.

Section 2. If changes are made in the written proposal as a result of the initial Faculty Council of Senators meeting, a revised version must be provided to all constituents for their consideration and it must be circulated with the minutes.

Section 3. After introduction, all Faculty Senators must bring the proposal to their constituents for their response.

Section 4. If Faculty Senators submit substantive amendments, such amendments must be available to all Senators no later than two weeks prior to the Faculty Council of Senators meeting at which an adoption vote is planned. All Faculty Senators must present proposed amendments to their constituents for their response.

Section 5. A proposal may be adopted no earlier than the first full Faculty Council of Senators meeting after the meeting where the proposal was introduced. If changes or amendments offered at the adoption meeting are substantive and deemed by the Senate to require further campus consideration, adoption may be postponed until the following meeting while Faculty Senators consult with their constituents.

Section 6. Upon adoption of the policy or the policy revision, the Faculty Council of Senators chair in consultation with the author or authors will send a clean copy of the document to the Chancellor for approval.

Section 7. The Chancellor will communicate acceptance or rejection to the Faculty Council of Senators chair in a timely manner. The Faculty Council of Senators chair will notify others as necessary.

Section 8. Once the policy is accepted, the Faculty Council of Senators chair is responsible for its inclusion in the appropriate files. The policy will include the date of the Senate meeting at
which adoption or revision occurred and the names of the committees or individuals responsible.

Section 9. All Faculty personnel policy (Senate policies numbered in the 500s and 600s) will be subject to this procedure unless an emergency arises.

Section 10. In an emergency, policies developed between Faculty Council of Senators meetings may be approved by the Senate Steering Committee as interim policies subject to the Chancellor’s approval. Once approved by the Chancellor, interim policies must be subjected to the standard system of introduction and adoption outlined above.

Article VII: Amendment Procedures for Bylaws

Section 1. Any proposed amendment of the Bylaws must be submitted in writing to the Faculty Council of Senators and shall be considered within 60 calendar days of receipt of the proposed amendment.

Section 2. All Faculty shall be notified of the proposed amendment at least 30 calendar days before the meeting at which action is to be taken.

Section 3. In order to be proposed for adoption, an amendment shall be approved by two-thirds of the Faculty Council of Senators.

Section 4. A proposed amendment, approved by the Faculty Council of Senators, shall be forwarded to the Chancellor by the chair.

Section 5. The Faculty Council of Senators shall inform the Faculty of the final disposition of the amendment.

[End]
Rationale:
The role of campus deans in retention decisions is clearly spelled out for third-year faculty, but for first, second, fourth and fifth year retentions, the policy simply requires the dean to “inform the faculty member of his/her retention.” The current policy provides deans with no guidance on how to communicate the retention decision. This proposed revision clarifies the deans’ role in retention decisions for years 1, 2, 4, and 5 by replacing the phrase “…inform the faculty member of his/her retention” with “…include with the notification of retention copies of the department and campus letters along with his/her evaluation of reasons for continuing the appointment.” This language parallels the language regarding department and campus retention committee letters in these years.

The proposed additions are in bold, red, italicized and underlined font.

UW Colleges Senate Policy
Faculty Personnel Policy #501
Criteria and General Procedures for Appointment, Retention, Tenure Progress, Tenure, and Promotion (Bylaws)
Procedures specified in the following documents must be followed:
1. Wis. Stats. Chapter 19, Subchapter IV (Open Meeting Law)
2. Wis. Stats. Chapter 36
3. Wis. Administrative Code
4. UW System Faculty Personnel Rules
5. UW Colleges Faculty Handbook
6. UW Colleges Constitution (See especially Chapter 5.00, Definitions of Tenure Appointment and Probationary Appointment; Chapter 6.00, Written Notice of Non-Renewal; Chapter 6.01, Reconsideration of Non-Renewal; Chapter 6.02, Appeals Against Non-Renewal.)
7. UW Colleges Senate Policies (including but not limited to the following):
   IP #321 Counting Ad Hoc Experience for Probationary Appointments
   FPP #510: Institutional Need and Tenure Positions
   FPP #509: Faculty Affiliation for Deans

* All timeline provisions refer to working days.

III. Criteria and Procedures for Retention of Probationary Tenure-track Faculty

A. Criteria for Retention of Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty

1. The individual has made appropriate progress toward meeting the criteria for tenure as described in IV.

2. The individual has either made progress toward or received an appropriate degree or has made progress toward the academic preparation as indicated in the letter of appointment.

Additional Consideration. The requirement for an appropriate degree may be waived in cases of outstanding professional accomplishment widely recognized in the discipline.

B. Procedures for Retention of Probationary Tenure-Track Faculty

Revised by the Senate March 5, 2010
Revised 4-23-10
Revised by the Senate 2012-03-16

1. General Retention Procedures

a. September 1. By September 1, of each academic year the provost shall provide appropriate department chairs, campus committee chairs, and campus deans with a complete roster of probationary faculty. Information regarding prior years of service granted, number of years on UW Colleges tenure track, leaves of absence, and other pertinent information shall be included.
b. Department's Role in Retention Decisions. The department executive committee is the first body to make retention decisions regarding probationary faculty. If a decision is negative, the process stops and the faculty member is notified of his/her non-retention by the provost as described in sections 2-5 below.

c. Campus' Role in Retention Decisions. If the department's recommendation is positive, it is forwarded to the campus committee for retention which, in turn, forwards both its and the department's recommendations to the campus dean.

d. Campus Dean's Role in Retention Decisions. If the department's recommendation is positive and the campus committee’s recommendation is negative, the campus dean shall notify the provost who shall notify the faculty member as described in sections 2-5 below. If the recommendations of both the department and campus committee for retention are affirmative and the campus dean concurs, he/she, after notifying the provost, shall notify the probationary faculty member of retention decision. If the campus dean does not concur with the affirmative recommendations, he/she shall consult the department and the campus committee for retention. If, following consultation, the dean still does not concur, he/she shall advise the department and campus committee for retention in writing of his/her continuing non-concurrence and forward all recommendations to the provost, who shall then make the final decision and notify the faculty member.

2. Procedures for Retention of First-Year Probationary Faculty (Note: timelines subject to change on notification from the provost).

a. November 30. By November 30, class visitations shall be conducted by at least two different members of the appropriate department.

b. January 4. The probationary faculty member shall submit the retention dossier to the department.

c. February 1. By February 1, the department executive committee shall forward its recommendation to the campus committee for retention. For affirmative recommendations, reasons for continuing the appointment shall be provided. If the recommendation is negative, no further action shall be taken by the campus committee and the department executive committee shall also notify the provost who shall notify the faculty member of the non-renewal for the next academic year.

d. February 15. By February 15, the campus committee for retention shall forward to the campus dean both its and the department's recommendations.
For affirmative recommendations, reasons for continuing the appointment shall be provided.

e. March 1. By March 1, notification of either retention or non-retention shall be given to the faculty member. If the recommendation is affirmative, the campus dean shall inform the faculty member of his/her retention include with the notification of retention copies of the department and campus letters along with his/her evaluation of reasons for continuing the appointment. If the recommendation of the campus committee is negative, the campus dean shall notify the provost, who shall notify the probationary faculty member of the non-renewal for the next academic year.

f. In cases of initial probationary appointments for fractional years, the first year retention process shall be waived without prejudice. The retention decision shall be considered positive.

3. Procedures for Retention of Second-Year Probationary Faculty (Note: timelines subject to change on notification from the provost).

The rationale for the earlier timeline of the Procedures for the Retention of Second-Year Probationary faculty is to be in compliance with UWS 3.09.

a. November 1. By November 1, class visitations shall be conducted by at least two different members of the appropriate department.

b. November 7. The probationary faculty member shall submit the retention dossier to the department.

c. December 1. By December 1, the department executive committee shall forward its recommendation to the campus committee for retention. For affirmative recommendations, reasons for continuing the appointment shall be provided. If the recommendation is negative, no further action shall be taken by the campus committee, and the department executive committee shall also notify the provost who shall notify the faculty member of the non-renewal for the next academic year.

d. December 10. By December 10, the campus committee for retention shall forward to the campus dean both its and the department's recommendations. For affirmative recommendations, reasons for continuing the appointment shall be provided.

e. December 15. By December 15, notification of either retention or non-retention shall be given to the faculty member. If the recommendation is affirmative, the campus dean shall inform the faculty member of his/her retention include with the notification of retention copies of the department
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and campus letters along with his/her evaluation of reasons for continuing the appointment. If the recommendation of the campus committee is negative, the campus dean shall notify the provost, who shall notify the probationary faculty member of the non-renewal for the next academic year.

4. Procedures for Tenure Progress Review and Retention of Third-Year Probationary Faculty (Note: timelines subject to change on notification from the provost).

A special tenure progress review shall be conducted in the third year of the candidate's probationary appointment. Criteria and Procedures for the Third-Year Tenure Progress Review shall conform as closely as possible to the "Criteria and Procedures for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor," included in Section IV of this document.

Tenure Progress reviews provide an opportunity for both department and campus to inform the candidate of progress toward tenure. The absence of concerns, or the indication of Satisfactory progress toward tenure, should not be construed as a commitment to make a positive recommendation at the time of the tenure decision.

   a. November 30. By November 30, class visitations shall be conducted by at least two different members of the appropriate department.

   b. January 4. Probationary faculty member shall submit retention and tenure-review dossier to the department.

   c. April 3. In the case of an appointment split between a home department and a secondary department, by April 3 of the faculty member’s third year of probationary appointment, the secondary department shall forward to the home department its recommendation in the personnel case.

   d. April 15. By April 15 of the faculty member's third year of probationary appointment the department executive committee shall evaluate the candidate's general progress toward tenure and toward meeting the particular conditions noted in the letter of appointment. If the results of the tenure progress review justify retention, the department shall forward to the campus committee for retention its recommendation for continuing the appointment the next academic year along with reasons why the appointment should be continued. At the same time, the department shall forward a copy of its tenure progress review, including recommendations for improvement, to the appropriate campus dean(s).

   If the results of the tenure progress review do not justify retention, the department shall notify the campus retention committee of its decision not to retain and no further action shall be taken by the campus committee. The
department shall also notify the provost who shall notify the faculty member that the next academic year will be his/her terminal appointment year.

e. **April 22.** In the case of an appointment split between a home and a secondary campus, the secondary campus’s committee for retention shall receive the same documentation regarding the department’s decision as the home campus, and shall forward to the home campus its recommendation in the personnel case by April 22.

f. **May 1.** By May 1, the campus committee for retention shall forward to the campus dean both its and the department's recommendations. For affirmative recommendations, reasons for continuing the appointment shall be provided. The committee shall also forward a copy of its tenure progress review, including recommendations for improvement, to the appropriate campus dean(s).

g. **May 15.** By May 15, notification of either retention or non-retention shall be given to the faculty member. If the recommendation is affirmative, the dean shall include with the notification of retention copies of the department and campus tenure progress reviews along with his/her evaluation of the candidate's general progress toward tenure, based upon information contained in the tenure progress reviews. The dean shall also send copies of his/her evaluation to the department chair and the chair of the campus committee for retention.

If the recommendation of the campus committee is negative, the campus dean shall notify the provost who shall notify the probationary faculty member of the non-retention decision and that the next academic year will be his/her terminal appointment year.

5. Procedures for Retention of Fourth-Year and Fifth-Year Probationary Faculty (Note: timelines subject to change on notification from the provost).

a. The deadline for submission of the retention dossier for fourth- and fifth-year probationary faculty shall be at the discretion of the department chair, but no earlier than January 4 and no later than April 1.

b. **April 1.** By April 1, class visitations may, at the discretion of the department, be conducted by one or more members of the department.

c. **April 15.** By April 15, the department executive committee shall forward its recommendation to the campus committee for retention. This recommendation shall include a nomination for early tenure where applicable (see Section IV.C). For affirmative recommendations, reasons for continuing the appointment shall be provided. If the recommendation is negative no further
action shall be taken by the campus committee, and the department executive committee shall also notify the provost who shall notify the faculty member that the next academic year will be his/her terminal appointment year.

d. May 1. By May 1, the campus committee for retention shall forward to the campus dean both its and the department's recommendations. For affirmative recommendations, reasons for continuing the appointment shall be provided.

e. May 15. By May 15, notification of either retention or non-retention shall be given to the faculty member. If the recommendation is affirmative, the campus dean shall inform the faculty member of his/her retention include with the notification of retention copies of the department and campus letters along with his/her evaluation of reasons for continuing the appointment. If the faculty member is nominated for early tenure and accepts the nomination, the process of collecting letters and other tenure processes can start on this date. If the recommendation of the campus committee is negative, the campus dean shall notify the provost, who shall notify the probationary faculty member of the non-retention decision and that the next academic year will be his/her terminal appointment year.

[...]

[End]
To: Richard Krupnow, Lead Academic staff Senator

Pursuant to your request of November 16th, 2012, the Academic staff committee has revised the draft of the titling guidelines for IAS put forward by the ad Hoc Academic staff committee. Upon discussion we decided to put forward an interim policy to be effective until such a time that funds are available to reimburse IAs for additional requirements such as scholarship and service. Since no titling policy is in effect currently it was thought that some policy was needed both for those doing the hiring and those hired. Attached you will find the committees draft of this interim policy

The committee will continue to work on an extended policy building on the foundation provided by the interim policy. This extended policy will include scholarship as requested by the Chancellor and other issue brought forth by various interested parties. Our intention is to complete this extended policy by the time of the April Senate meeting.

The Academic Staff Personnel Committee

Dan Anhalt
Robert Apfel, chair
Karen Greenler,
Brittany Lueth
Margaret Malay

Attachment 1, Interim Titling Guidelines for Instructional Academic Staff
Interim Titling Guidelines for Instructional Academic Staff
University of Wisconsin Colleges

The primary responsibility of all categories of Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) is teaching. However, University of Wisconsin System Unclassified Personnel Guidelines allow for and identify activities external to classroom instruction as part of the expectations, duties, and responsibilities of Instructional Academic Staff (IAS).

An IAS teaching a full workload (by faculty standards) at the UW Colleges is paid at an 80% rate because they are not required to perform scholarship activities, institutional, campus, or departmental service, thus their title description should account for this fact.

Therefore, the following criteria should be taken into consideration when determining the appropriate title – Associate Lecturer, Lecturer, or Senior Lecturer – when hiring or rehiring Instructional Academic Staff within UW Colleges.

1) A terminal degree should not be seen as a requirement for any Instructional Academic Staff title, though possession of a terminal degree may be considered when determining title at hire or rehire. Ideally, candidates should possess the following minimum degrees within their discipline of hire: Master’s for degree courses; Baccalaureate for non-degree courses such as developmental Math and English. However, minimum degree requirements for instruction may vary by academic department.

2) Any previous advancement in rank will be grandfathered in. For example an IAS member hired as Senior Lecturer before the change in policy will retain that rank regardless of meeting any new standards for the rank.

3) If an IAS member is hired by more than one UW Colleges Campus, she/he will retain the highest rank achieved by the staff member while working at any one campus.

4) The appropriate rank at which IAS are hired is a joint decision by the appropriate department(s) and campus(es).

5) While departments or campuses may recommend applying for a higher title/rank, IAS are responsible for initiating the request and providing any and all supporting documentation to the appropriate Department Chair and the campus Associate Dean. The Associate Dean will then distribute copies to all appropriate individuals.

6) Any advancement in rank will be effective in the term following the final approval of the advancement regardless of contract length. For example any rank change approved in Fall would be effective for the Winterim or Spring term, as appropriate.
The following guidelines should be followed when determining the title and rank of an IAS at the time of hiring or rehiring. Factors relevant to an individual IAS, as determined by campuses and departments, may warrant variation from these guidelines but should be reserved for exceptional cases. Additional factors may allow for advancement in rank earlier than prescribed in these guidelines. These factors would include, but are not limited to, the following: scholarly work (such as publications) at both academic and non-academic institutions, superior performance evaluations, and service to the institution, campus or department. Note: teaching experience is normally weighted more heavily than other professional experiences.

**Associate Lecturer**

Associate Lecturers independently teach a course(s) based on broad guidelines defining the scope of the subject matter to be taught and the range of topics to be covered. Effective classroom delivery, testing and grading are the primary duties expected of lecturers at this level. Truly short-term hires should be hired at the Associate Lecturer level unless there are compelling reasons for higher titling – e.g. degree held or teaching experience – as determined by the campus and department in consultation.

**Minimum requirements**

Bachelor’s degree for non-degree (developmental) courses
Master’s Degree for degree courses.

**Lecturer (No-Prefix)**

No-Prefix Lecturers demonstrate the experience and academic qualifications necessary to both effectively teach and develop a course based on broad guidelines defining the scope of the subject with the specific topics and emphasis given to those topics being determined by the No-Prefix Lecturer. Classroom instruction remains the primary focus.

**Minimum requirements**

Bachelor’s: 3 years full-time equivalent* of teaching experience**
Master’s: 2 years full-time equivalent* of teaching experience**
Terminal degree or ABD: 1 year full-time equivalent* of teaching experience**

**Senior Lecturer**

A Senior Lecturer has extensive teaching experience and subject matter expertise in an academic discipline. A lecturer at this level has gained a reputation among his or her peers for demonstrably sustained superior contributions to teaching. At this level the independent
selection, organization and development of course content, and instructional materials and pedagogical approaches are expected. The direct delivery of instruction is the primary responsibility of this title.

Minimum requirements
Master’s: 4 years full-time equivalent* of teaching experience**
Terminal degree or ABD: 3 years full-time equivalent* of teaching experience**

*For the purposes of these guidelines full time is defined as IAS appointments of 80% or higher.

** Teaching experience includes full responsibility for courses.