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UW COLLEGES
Senate
Friday, October 24, 2014
UW-Richland
1:40 p.m.

MINUTES

2014-2015 Senators Present: Annette Kuhlmann, UW-Baraboo/Sauk County; Marcy Dickson and Luke Dock, UW Colleges Online; Lisa Schreibersdorf and Mike Winkler, UW-Fond du Lac; Kathy Immel, Evan Kreider, and Juli McGuire, UW-Fox Valley; Julie DeZeeuw and Jessica Van Slooten, UW-Manitowoc; Rose Brust, Joanne Giordano, Holly Hassel, and Katie Kalish, UW-Marathon County; Mark Klemp, UW-Marinette; Caleb Bush, Steve Kaiser, and Jeff Verona, UW-Marshfield/Wood County; Faye Peng, UW-Richland; Michael Gorman and Stephen Schmid, UW-Rock County; Matt Raunio, UW-Sheboygan; Mark Peterson, UW-Washington County; Julianna Alitto, Ron Gulotta, and Margaret Hankenson, UW-Waukesha

2014-2015 Senators Absent: Tamara Lavender, UW-Baraboo/Sauk County; Troy Kozma, UW-Barron County; Lynn Weber, Central Offices; Christi Larson, UW-Washington County

2014-2015 Alternates Present: Jayant Anand, UW-Barron County (Kozma); John Carter, UW-Richland (Larson); Kay Sbarbaro, UW-Sheboygan (Lavender); Roseann Stenstrup, UW-Marinette, (Weber)

Others Present: Greg Ahrenhoerster, Chairs’ Representative, Rich Barnhouse, Associate Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management; Mike Bartlett, Associate Dean, UW Colleges Online; Aaron Brower, Interim Chancellor; Joe Foy, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs; Greg Lampe, Provost and Vice Chancellor; John Short, Deans’ Representative; Rose Smyrski, Interim Assistant Vice Chancellor for Communications and External Relations; Glena Temple, Dean, UW Colleges Online and Distance Education; Steve Wildeck, Vice Chancellor for Administrative and Financial Services for UW Colleges and UW-Extension; Linda Baum, Assistant to the Senate

Others Absent: Christine Curley, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Office of Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion; Pam Dollard, Director of Human Resources

1) The October 24, 2014 meeting of the UW Colleges Senate was called to order at 1:55 p.m. by UW Colleges Senate Steering Committee (SSC) Chair Mark Peterson.

2) UW-Richland Associate Dean Brandon Fetterly welcomed the Senate assemblage to “the prettiest campus in the Colleges,” UW-Richland. Associate Dean Fetterly pointed out that the Senate was meeting in a room that had the day prior hosted a gathering of student scholarship recipients and the scholarship donors. The UW Colleges’ job is to attract, retain, and graduate the best students. Those are the desired end results of the work the Senate is doing that he asked everyone keep in mind. For those staying for the UW Colleges Senate
Leaders Retreat the next day who might have some free time, he suggested going to a local orchard for an apple, and taking a walk to enjoy the area. As a former senator, he added a final reminder to do good work. Associate Dean Fetterly was thanked for the hospitality with a round of applause.

3) Roll Call of 2014-2015 Senate and Introductions of New Senators and Alternates. Assistant to the UW Colleges Senate Linda Baum circulated the attendance sheet. SSC Chair Mark Peterson introduced new classified/university staff senators Rose Brust from UW-Marathon County, and Juli McGuire, UW-Fox Valley, and then classified/university staff alternates John Carter (Christi Larson), UW-Richland, Kay Sbarbaro (Tamara Lavender), UW-Sheboygan, and Roseann Stenstrup (Lynn Weber), UW-Marinette. Jayant Anand (UW-Barron County) was there for Senator Troy Kozma. Chair Peterson went on to note and recognize others in attendance: Mike Bartlett, Associate Dean, UW Colleges Online; Joe Foy, attending his first Senate meeting as the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs; Rose Smyrski, Interim Assistant Vice Chancellor, Communications and External Relations; and Glena Temple, Dean, UW Colleges Online and Distance Education.

4) The agenda (Attachment 1) for the October 24, 2014 meeting of the UW Colleges Senate was unanimously approved [Kreider/Klemp].

5) The minutes of the April 25, 2014 meeting of the UW Colleges Senate held at UW-Fond du Lac (posted in Public Folders and http://www.uwc.edu/employees/senate/meetings) were approved by unanimous vote [Alitto/Kalish].

6) Reports

a) Interim Chancellor Aaron Brower shared that he had been spent the morning at an administrative staff meeting with UW System President Ray Cross. Budget discussions are moving from positioning UW Colleges in the UW System budget, to focusing on what the governor sends to the legislature, with lobbying shifting to the governor and legislature. Interim Chancellor Brower informed the Senate to expect to hear messages tying the UW to economic development and talent pathways, even though he believes that people in UW System understand the broader role that UW institutions, including UW Colleges, play in the state’s well being. Interim Chancellor Aaron Brower noted the work of the faculty compensation group, saying that the Faculty Council would hear their draft recommendations later in the afternoon. The committee has done a great job thinking of every angle, and he thanked them for their good work. Finally, an ad hoc gender issues group has been formed, the interim chancellor was happy to relate, and Evan Kreider and Amy Reddinger have agreed to co-chair. Such issues cannot be fixed outright, Interim Chancellor Brower cautioned, noting they will be working in increments into the future.

b) Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs Greg Lampe referred to his written report (Attachment 2) in the Senate materials. Provost Lampe explained that in the last biennial budget the Course Options statute had been adopted and, consequently, concurrent enrollment, dual enrollment, and Course Options-like-Youth
Options programs would be paid for by local school districts. UW System President Ray Cross realized that the change had a large impact on students' access to these programs, especially concurrent enrollment programs, and initiated a stop-gap measure to sustain concurrent enrollment for this year. UW System is paying for the courses for a year while System Legal is working on language to present to the State legislature to fix the Course Options statute. The provost will update the Senate when the revised language is released. A January introduction is expected in order to have the statute fixed before the 2015-2016 academic year. The provost then briefly updated the Senate on the Bachelor of Applied Arts and Sciences (BAAS) degree completion program. There are now senior level students enrolled in the BAAS degree completion program. As many as nine students could graduate with a BAAS degree in May. Enrollments have almost doubled from the first year to the second year, and as an institution we must consider how large the program should be. The provost announced that UW-Stevens Point has approved the revised memorandum of understanding, leaving only UW-Platteville and UW-Superior to do so. Next, the provost discussed the Associate of Arts and Science (AAS) degree revision process. The AAS degree review and revision will be similar to the self-study process conducted several years ago. Provost Lampe related that the first question to be addressed is how to go about structuring the review and revision processes. It will, he said, be an inclusive, structured process, and he will begin thinking about how to organize a committee like a Steering Committee and begin to develop details for a timeline. Curriculum reform marches side by side with the review and revision process. The review will require examining the structure of the associate degree along with curriculum. Reminding the Senate that he had worked with UW System on the associate degree standards which had not been updated since the 1980's, Provost Lampe shared that he has a meeting with UW System administration in two weeks. It is possible that the UW Colleges will be granted an exception to pilot the new associate degree standards.

c) Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Joe Foy pointed out the location of his report (Attachment 3) in the materials. He asked the senators to please let him know if there were things his office could be doing. Noting that models for assessing the BAAS program would soon be sent to the Senate BAAS Assessment Committee (SBAC) for review, Associate Vice Chancellor Foy thanked Stephen Schmid for agreeing to serve as the BAAS Assessment Coordinator, a position that will involve a great deal of work.

d) Associate Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management Rich Barnhouse noted his written report (Attachment 4), and shared the news that UW Colleges was the first institution to be granted approval to award financial aid for a Flexible Option program without compromise of the program. The associate vice chancellor offered that there is one problem at the moment—PRISM. The software does not support the ability to award financial aid to Flexible Option students at this time; therefore, the Flex team will be working with UW-Extension to determine how to make it work. Wisconsin is one of two states that has student conduct as part of State statutes, so it is difficult to keep them up to date with changes in law. Federal law has changed and requires UWS Chapter 17 to be modified; there will be a System-wide task force working on that project. In preferred name resolution news, Associate Vice Chancellor Barnhouse
reported that using the UW-Stout model has proven to be successful with PRISM, and a
data feed from PRISM to D2L has started. It should be ready for campuses to implement
in Spring 2015, and communications will be sent out to inform people. He concluded his
report by saying that the headcount from Fall 2013 to Fall 2014 stayed about the same,
which is very positive, and that the FTE fell just slightly as anticipated.

e) Senate Steering Committee Chair & UWC Faculty Representative Mark Peterson called
attention to his report (Attachment 5). There were no questions.

f) Academic Staff Lead Senator Jeff Verona detailed the location of his written report
(Attachment 6) in the provided materials.

g) UW Colleges Academic Staff Representative Danielle (Marcy) Dickson pointed out the
written report (Attachment 7) she had submitted. She noted that the Supreme Court had
blocked the voter ID issue, so it was not of current import.

h) University Staff Lead Senator Rose Brust located her report (Attachment 8) in the
materials. The threshold issue is something that she believes may be coming to a head.
Many LTEs cannot vote on campuses and the numbers of full time classified staff are
dwindling. Something may come forward to change the situation.

i) Senate Academic Policy Committee Chair Caleb Bush pointed out his report (Attachment
9). He noted that the committee has been very busy.

j) Senate Budget Committee Chair Stephen Schmid drew attention to his report (Attachment
10) in the materials. There were no questions.

k) Faculty Professional Standards Committee Chair Ron Gulotta called attention to his
written report (Attachment 11).

l) Former Senate Assessment Committee Chair Debbie Paprocki had submitted a report
(Attachment 12). SSC Chair Peterson noted it and asked that any questions be sent to her
or the current chair.

m) Institutional Review Board Chair Kathy Immel recognized her written report (Attachment
13) in the binder of materials. She mentioned the committee’s concern over not being
able to have the student committee member from last year, who had received the
mandatory training and was interested in continuing on the committee, do so yet since the
Student Governance Council (SGC) was not active to approve her membership. Since
most UWC research involves students as participants, input from a student member is
crucial and having to wait months for a student member to be chosen/confirmed by SGC
impairs the effective functioning of the IRB. Associate Vice Chancellor of Student
Affairs and Enrollment Management Rich Barnhouse announced that the SGC was
holding elections that day. Senator Hassel asked Institutional Review Board (IRB) Chair
Immel about how the third point in the report might impact SOTL research. Immel
replied that the IRB policy on “‘using persons with whom one has an authority
relationship as research subjects”’ can be remedied easily, giving the example of having a
different instructor hand out a survey to students. Jayant Anand, IRB member and former chair, added that if as an instructor he hands out a survey saying it is voluntary, there is still a perceived level of authority over the students, a power differential; something to offset that authority needs to be determined so participation is truly voluntary for students. Hassel asked if a particular problem had been brought to the awareness of the IRB. Anand replied that there had not, and there were no student complaints; however, there were response differences between classes where the instructor handed out a survey versus where a different person came in and handed out the survey. IRB Chair Immel stated that the aim of the additional IRB policy statement is not to penalize SOTL; it is designed after what is used in four-year institutions. Senator Kalish said that SOTL research generally falls under exempt or expedited review. Alternate Senator and IRB member Anand replied that such a decision lies with the IRB, following the Federal definitions, and those definitions did not have SOTL in mind. Senator Bush felt the students’ risk would be covered under the informed consent form, and that this was IRB mission creep. Senator and IRB Chair Immel replied that the consent form assures the protection of the students’ rights. Senator Van Slooten expressed that this was a roadblock to SOTL research, causing heightened tension and frustration. Immel stated that the IRB was aware of the issue and sensitive to that; she noted there will be a time for feedback and suggestions. Also, many IRB members are involved in SOTL research and have themselves utilized the suggested procedures for reducing perceived coercion. Interim Chancellor Aaron Brower related that the discussion was very similar to one held on the UW-Madison campus. They had determined to err on the side of caution, deciding that any apparent coercion or power dynamic had to be lessened.

7) Old Institutional Business

a) Adoption: Proposed New UW Colleges Constitution Chapter 11 (“Academic Programs”) [SAPC] defining academic programs in the Constitution (Attachment 14). SSC Chair Peterson informed the Senate that twelve campus collegiums had approved the proposal. Chair of Chairs Ahrenhoerster noted that in section 11.01 of the proposed new UWC Constitution Chapter 11 it says who can teach, but felt there should be further clarification around membership and the voting members of the program. Senator Hassel replied that the bylaws of Women’s Studies define members versus affiliates. Senator Bush added that section 11.07 specifies that each program must have bylaws, and that there is a danger of being too specific in the Constitution. Senator Kreider informed the Senate that the proposal did not pass at UW-Fox Valley. There was a general feeling that the existing programs are subsets of established departments; if there were an autonomous program, it should become a department. The motion to adopt carried with two nay votes [Hassel/Raunio].

b) Adoption: Proposed Amendment of UW Colleges Constitution Chapter 12 (“Amendments”) [SAPC] renumber chapter (Attachment 15). The proposed change had been endorsed by all thirteen campus collegiums. The motion to adopt passed by unanimous vote [Krider/Kalish].
c) Adoption: Proposed New Institutional Policy #408 (“Procedure for the Creation of New Departments”) [SAPC] new policy to note procedure for creation of departments (Attachment 16). Senator Peng related that UW-Richland had had a mixed reaction to this policy. There had been confusion around II.B.4.b, she said. Senator Bush explained that if a department is formed, there may or may not be a person from that department on the campus. Senator Gulotta added that if the entire section is read in line as an “if/then,” it made more sense. Senator Van Slooten asked if tenure lines and funding for them similar to those for existing departments would be established if a new department was created. SAPC Chair Bush replied that tenure lines and funding would be created for a new department as for existing departments. There would also be the possibility of current faculty going there. The adoption passed with one opposing vote [Klemp/Gulotta].

d) Adoption: Proposed Revision to IP #405 (“Senate Procedures”) [SSC] remove requirement to keep hard copies of Senate minutes at Central (Attachment 17). The proposal to no longer keep hard copies of Senate minutes at Central passed by unanimous vote [Alitto/Gorman].

e) Adoption: Proposed Revision of UW Colleges Senate Bylaws 1.0 ("Committee Minutes and Annual Reports") [SSC] update Public Folders reference (Attachment 18). The revision updating the reference to Public Folders was unanimously adopted [Alitto/Dickson].

f) Other. There was no other Old Institutional Business.

8) New Institutional Business

a) Introduction: Proposed New Institutional Policy #407 (“Approval of Departmental Bylaws”) [SAPC] policy to delineate process of departmental bylaw approval (Attachment 19). SAPC Chair Bush pointed out that a previous version of this policy had been approved by the Senate in April. However, the interim chancellor had not signed the policy, pointing out that budget and workload implications must be taken into account, too. The Senate Academic Policy Committee had revised the policy with those suggestions in mind, and the new language is found under II.A and II.A.3. Without this policy, no process or timeline for bylaw approval is delineated in Senate policy.

b) Introduction: Proposed Revision of IP #301.01 ("Administering the Student Survey of Instruction") [FPSC] altering language so SSI is not known as "public document" (Attachment 20). Faculty Professional Standards Committee Chair Gulotta handed out a revised version of the proposed introduction. He drew attention to the improved language for the introduction under IV.A.7 and IV.B.6. It was pointed out that a position title was incorrect in IV.B.2 and 3; where it states “Director of Distance Education” it will be changed to “Dean of UW Colleges Online and Distance Education.”

c) Introduction: Proposed Revision of IP #103 (“UW Colleges Certificate Program”) [SAPC] increasing access to non-credit certificates in Continuing Education courses
SAPC Chair Bush noted that a number of UW-Extension offices want to offer non-degree certificates, which are currently tied to the requirements for credit certificates. The proposed changes, he related, are to remove those ties to credit certificates and instead stress the community need for the non-credit certificate. Provost Lampe pointed out that IV.B calls for the recommendation to go to the UW Colleges Continuing Education Director. That position no longer exists; the proposals are submitted to the provost. Senate Assistant Linda Baum will make the change in the version of the introduction that is sent to the constituents. Senator Hassel asked for an example of a non-credit certificate. Provost Lampe mentioned the Buddhist certificate, and SAPC Chair Bush gave an example of a possible digital photography certificate. Hassel expressed the thought that the name “non-credit certificate” is confusing. It was explained that in the work world, a non-credit certificate is often sought as a way to enhance job knowledge. Chairs’ Representative Ahrenhoerster suggested that UW Colleges stop calling the for-credit certificates “certificates.” Provost Lampe explained that a certificate was meant for students who wanted a concentration of a particular topic but not a degree, and the studies are transcripted. An emphasis is a concentration within the AAS in case the student stops after receiving the associate degree. A non-credit certificate is not within a degree or even transcripted.

d) Other. No other New Institutional Business was on the agenda.

9) Other Institutional Business

a) Other. There was no Other Institutional Business for the Senate to discuss.

10) Adjournment. The UW Colleges Senate reached the end of the agenda at 3:20 p.m. and SSC Chair Mark Peterson announced the Council meetings would begin after a short break and that the Senate was adjourned.
2014-2015 Faculty Senators Present: Annette Kuhlmann, UW-Baraboo/Sauk County; Lisa Schreibersdorf, UW-Fond du Lac; Kathy Immel and Evan Kreider, UW-Fox Valley; Jessica Van Slooten, UW-Manitowoc; Holly Hassel and Katie Kalish, UW-Marathon County; Mark Klemp, UW-Marinette; Caleb Bush, UW-Marshfield/Wood County; Faye Peng, UW-Richland; Stephen Schmid, UW-Rock County; Matt Raunio, UW-Sheboygan; Mark Peterson, UW-Washington County; Julianna Alitto, Ron Gulotta, and Margaret Hankenson, UW-Waukesha

2014-2015 Faculty Senators Absent: Troy Kozma, UW-Barron County

2014-2015 Faculty Alternates Present: Jayant Anand, UW-Barron County

Others Present: Greg Ahrenhoerster, Chairs’ Representative; Aaron Brower, Interim Chancellor; Joe Foy, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs; Greg Lampe, Provost and Vice Chancellor; Paul Whitaker, Chair, UWC Faculty Compensation Committee; Steve Wildeck, Vice Chancellor for Administrative and Financial Services for UW Colleges and UW-Extension; Linda Baum, Assistant to the Senate

1. Call to Order 2014-2015 Faculty Council of Senators. The UW Colleges Faculty Council of Senators (FCS) was called to order at 3:40 p.m. by UW Colleges Faculty Representative to UW System Administration Mark Peterson.

2. The roll call of faculty senators, alternates, and others was circulated by Assistant to the UW Colleges Senate Linda Baum.

3. The agenda for the October 24, 2014 meeting at UW-Richland was amended to move the Old Business before the Reports. The agenda as amended was approved unanimously [Peterson/Kreider].

4. The minutes of the April 25, 2014 meeting of the UW Colleges FCS held at UW-Fond du Lac (posted in Public Folders and http://www.uwc.edu/employees/senate/meetings) were unanimously approved [Alitto/Klemp].

5. Old Business

   a) Adoption: Proposed Revision of FPP #508 (“Policy on Ineffective or Inactive Performance”) [FPSC] written action plan and detail on initiating further action (Attachment 22). FPSC Chair Gulotta noted that the change allowed for a written action plan that would include a timeline, and that either the dean or chair could move for
further action to the chancellor. Senator Immel noted that Fox had concern with the “and/or,” and thought it best left as a joint move. Senator Kuhlmann said that UW-Baraboo/Sauk County had the same reservations; UW-Fond du Lac did as well, reported Senator Schreiber-Sdorff. FPSC Chair Gulotta noted balances are still kept: both dean and chair decide upon a course of action after a problem is identified; if dean and/or chair decides problem remains, (s)he takes it to appropriate committees for consultation before submitting to the chancellor. Senator Kreider added that UW-Fox Valley was also against the “and/or” change, saying that getting more input on such a matter would be important. The revision carried with four senators against [Kreider/Hassel].

b) Other. There was no other Old Business for the Faculty Council.

6. Reports

a) Chair Mark Peterson had nothing to add to the written report noted earlier.

b) Faculty Professional Standards Committee Chair Ron Gulotta called attention to his FCS written report (Attachment 23) in the materials, and said that the FPSC has been studying merit policy for more than two years following several charges from SSC. The committee found issues in addition to those they were tasked to examine and decided the best course of action is to revamp the policy completely. It was time, FPSC Chair Gulotta said, to share progress with the FCS and get feedback before moving further. A report specific to the merit policy work was handed out. One charge from SSC was to examine potential bias, especially gender bias, and also to look at the SSI and whether it was valid or introduced bias. A literature review was circulated. Gulotta summarized that it is felt there are issues with quantitative data, but gender bias differences tend to average themselves out except in disciplines where students are predominantly male or female. With qualitative, written comments, there is more bias. FPSC recommends that the SSI needs to have a smaller emphasis placed on it, particularly in merit reviews, and other measurements of teaching performance be expanded. FPSC Chair Gulotta went on to ask how to improve the data from the activity report that is received by those evaluating instructors, and how should it be more fairly evaluated. The committee studied the policy carefully and found a provision that stipulates deans and chairs are to share with faculty the criteria that are to be used in merit considerations the following year. Unfortunately, they are not, or are not consistently made known by either department or campus. Gulotta circulated a handout that UW-Fond du Lac shares with their faculty members regarding evaluations. Gulotta next asked how service should be rated in relationship to professional development and teaching. Should the rating to be consistent between campus and department or not? He reminded the FCS that he had proposed 60%-20%-20% to the group last year, but they counter-proposed 70-15-15. Department chairs, however, did not like the 30% for service and professional development. It was discussed whether percentages had to be used versus language like “primary.” Chairs’ Rep Ahrenhoerster replied that consistency is important and good, and that departments are a better judge of professional development; however, there is probably not consistency between campus and department so perhaps campuses should not judge professional development, so perhaps they should not judge that matter.
Senator Kuhlmann noted that the same document is used in the merit exercise; it is not rewritten or revised for a campus or department. She also expressed that professional development has a lot to do with teaching, even when it is not listed on an activity report. Senator Bush argued that too much emphasis is put on results of the SSI. Since most colleagues do not see a particular instructor teach, the SSI is used instead of firsthand knowledge, but it is simply not a good indicator. He also stated that campuses know about an instructor’s professional development: they see the fliers for a guest lecture, or fund the travel to a conference, so he feels there should be consistency between campuses and departments. Gulotta explained that evidence for professional development is supposed to be given in an activity report. There was conversation regarding the lack of incentive for participating in the merit exercise. FPSC Chair Gulotta noted a proposal to possibly reward service with stipends as there are generally not the funds through merit to do so. He suggested an amount of service or campus awards that would receive a stipend that would be available every year. Senator Kalish noted that a onetime payment for service is not as much incentive as ongoing merit. FPSC Chair Gulotta asked about criteria, or a set of rubrics that would guide people in writing their activity reports. A set of rubrics for effective teaching, for example. Gulotta distributed a sample rubric for one element. The topic will be on the next Faculty Council agenda in January. FPSC Chair Gulotta will circulate the various handouts and solicit feedback via email.

7. New Business
   a) Other. There was no New Business on the Faculty Council agenda.

8. Other Business
   a) Discussion: Update from Faculty Compensation Committee [Paul Whitaker]. SSC Chair Mark Peterson introduced Paul Whitaker (UW-Marathon County), Chair of the Faculty Compensation Committee. FCC Chair Whitaker began by distributing a handout. He shared the charge of the committee, noted that lengthy meetings had been held weekly, and that a meeting had been held two weeks ago with Interim Chancellor Brower, Provost Lampe, and Associate Vice Chancellor Wildeck to share the recommendations of the committee. Meetings with the deans, chairs, and associate deans were held to gather feedback. Now the committee is sharing their recommendations with the Faculty Council to inform and gather feedback. Whitaker told the Council that the FCC often expressed wanting to use the available funds for an across the board salary increase to try to increase the morale of all, but State statute prevents that option. The money can only be used to adjust salaries for equity, market, or retention factors. They focused on retention, impactful raises, not adding to biases, market factors/distance to market, and decompression as a side effect, not the main focus. He let the Faculty Council know that the committee had worked with information and principles only; they were supplied with aggregate data regarding the faculty salary structure and the effects of different possible adjustments, but they never had any data on individuals. With that background in place, Whitaker moved on to the recommendations.

The Faculty Compensation Committee recommends three criteria be used in allocating
salary adjustments: market factors (40% of available funds, less a discretionary fund), merit ratings (50% of available funds, after the discretionary fund is set aside), and years in rank (10% of available funds, after the discretionary fund has been established). A discretionary fund is recommended to be funded with $60,000; this fund would be utilized by deans and department chairs to identify and award adjustments to faculty members who are felt to have been missed by the established criteria. The chancellor’s office would work with the deans and chairs on how to make those salary adjustments.

- A faculty member whose salary is at least 21.5% below their adjusted peer salary would be eligible for the market factor adjustment. An individual’s adjusted market salary is calculated by adjusting the peer average salary for the individual’s discipline and rank up or down by the number of standard deviations the person is above or below their UWC peers, by discipline and rank. The hope is to not increase compression, but to decrease or at least remain parallel with current compression while offering increases. The faculty member’s salary would then be boosted 15% of the difference between their current salary and the adjusted peer salary. The limit prevents the market bump from being very large, but keeps it significant.

- Merit adjustments were felt to be the best way to recognize those who consistently go above and beyond in various ways, even though the incentive of a merit pay plan has only been available twice since 2003. It would be available for those faculty members with at least one merit ranking above meritorious in the last six years (the length of time since there has been a state pay plan with a merit component, and allowing for three years each of campus and department rankings; an assistant’s first year and the mandatory meritorious rank is not considered). Average scores over those six years multiplied by a merit factor of about $975 would give the amount of the potential raise.

- All faculty members would be eligible for the years in rank adjustment as a reward for increasing institutional knowledge. The sum would be found by looking at rank held over the last ten years and multiplying by various factors (1 for each year as an assistant, 1.5 for each as an associate, 2 years as a professor, and a years-in-rank factor of approximately $26).

- The salary adjustments must meet a $2000 minimum in order for an adjustment to be awarded, as it was determined the salary change had to be large enough to strengthen retention while still meeting one or a combination of the criteria (market, merit, and years in rank).

Senator Gulotta asked the interim chancellor, provost, and vice chancellor why faculty salary decompression was not a focal point. He said that decompression of faculty salaries had been an institutional priority for several years and was the impetus behind this committee, but this plan was neutral on the issue, and would actually make it worse. Interim Chancellor Brower answered that there was far less money available than what would be truly necessary to address compression. The FCC’s recommendations comprise a creative strategy to address many salary issues and to make some change to the faculty salary structure, and that was the intent. In addition, some decompression does result from the strategies. Interim Chancellor Brower believes the recommendations to be a
defensible long-term strategy, and that is important in this situation, as UW-Madison and UW-Oshkosh are the only institutions which have utilized the tool, and they have only offered adjustments to up to 30% of their faculty, whereas UW Colleges hopes to reach between 40 and 50% (with the addition of the discretionary fund). FCC Chair Whitaker related that the committee thought about decompression when starting their work, and that the standard deviation versus four-year institutions is “ridiculous.” He stated that salaries will be decompressed because of salary increases, the salary structure will be spread out, and that the committee had received information on those distribution changes across departments, campuses, and genders.

Senator Kalish thanked Chair Whitaker and the committee for their work. She wondered about those who are below market but also low merit as opposed to those who are low market and higher merit receiving adjustments that may benefit the low merit faculty instead of the other way around. FCC Chair Whitaker replied that the FCC had the qualification that a faculty member must have at least one year above meritorious to be eligible for the merit adjustment, and that the comment had already been made that such a qualification should be considered for the market factor adjustment, as well. The committee will discuss the topic.

Senator Alitto wondered why $2000 was determined to be the “significant” threshold for receiving the increase. A promotion from assistant to associate professor garnered a $1500 increase, and that was felt to be significant. FCC Chair Whitaker replied that if normal merit increases with a 2% pay plan in place was proposed, an assistant starting at $43,000 would have earned $2000 in the time frame they examined. He noted that it was the second substantive comment about the amount, and continued that if the threshold is lowered, other numbers (merit factor amount, years in rank factor, and so on) would have to be modified across the board in a ripple effect. The committee had discussed splitting the promotion raise: a mid-rank bump and a post-tenure one. Vice Chancellor Wildeck and Provost Lampe noted that an earlier group, the decompression committee, had recommended increasing the amount of the raise between assistant and associate, and similarly studied a three-year increase and a post-tenure increase; however, there were no resources with which to back the idea at that time.

Senator Kreider, acknowledging that there can be no across the board increase, thought it possible that 40-50% of faculty might be eligible for increases using these criterion. Interim Chancellor Brower said that giving adjustments to that large of a percentage would be a risk. Kreider wondered if part of the reasoning behind the $2000 floor for increases was the number to whom the raises could possibly be given, and since that answer was affirmative, he suggested that the word “significant” not be used to describe the amount of the raise as many would see less as “significant;” tell people it is being given to the maximum number possible.

Alternate Senator Anand noted that he had heard at the deans and chairs meeting that the increases were to be between $2000 and $7500. He suggested a ceiling for the increases, just as there is a threshold. He suggested giving the money to the institution instead of pushing someone to the maximum bump, reallocate the money somehow. Interim
Chancellor Brower mentioned people perhaps being eligible for a discretionary adjustment in the situations of being just shy of the floor, at the decision of the deans and chairs. Having a ceiling set, the interim chancellor stated, would mean more money for the discretionary fund or that could be retained for a second year or subsequent adjustments. Anand agreed, saying the funds could be kept for phase two or for one-time bonuses. Interim Chancellor Brower said that bonuses would not apply to base as was the charge of the committee, but were another compensation tool to keep in mind. FCC Chair Whitaker explained that there could be faculty members slated to receive $1995 who would receive nothing because they are short of the threshold; that money just went back into the formula, he continued. It was not available to continue on into another set of computations and take $5 from somewhere else. Further, if it were possible to do that, it would increase the number of people receiving increases, which would possibly cause issues. The possibility of lowering the ceiling was a different issue and could be examined. Senator Van Slooten argued that with the $1500 bump from assistant to associate, and the $2000 threshold she envisioned there would be assistants making more than associates with that plan. Senators replied that was already happening. Whitaker noted the floor amount could be looked at, as well, so as not to exacerbate that problem.

Senator Schreibersdorf was concerned that a faculty member’s salary might not be able to adjusted enough with the market factor adjustment to retain them, leading to morale problems. She wondered how far below the adjusted peer salary, or what the minimum gap was in order for them to be eligible. FCC Chair Whitaker noted that information in Guell’s report showed that data. Merit and years in rank are more important in retaining the best faculty, Schreibersdorf contended. SSC Chair Peterson related that full professors tend to have the largest differences from peer salaries, but they are least at risk of leaving. Interim Chancellor Brower said that nationally, associate professors typically are the most mobile, while the assistant professors tend to stay. Chair of Chairs Ahrenhoerster emphatically held that there should be a guarantee that money goes back to salaries, rather than a general fund, if people do leave. Interim Chancellor Brower agreed that compensation funds should belong to an internal base pool.

Interim Chancellor Brower thanked Chair Whitaker and the Faculty Compensation Committee for their important work. He appreciates the time and effort they have put towards helping make the necessary adjustments in this vital issue. Vice Chancellor for Administrative and Financial Services Steve Wildeck reminded the Faculty Council that the problem “is not a one and done.” The work of the committee addresses one portion of one sector of the employee base, so there is still more work to be done. Without an influx of free money from outside the institution, it will have to be paid for through revenue or expenditure, but Vice Chancellor Wildeck said that it is better to reallocate money in this way than to go through the cuts of last year.

b) Other. There was no further Other Business.

9. Adjournment. The October 24, 2014 meeting of the Faculty Council of Senators was adjourned at 5:10 p.m. by UW Colleges Faculty Representative Mark Peterson.
All of the Academic Staff Council members were present (Dickson, Dock, DeZeeuw, Giordano, Gorman, Kaiser, and Verona).

1) The meeting was called to order at 3:34.
2) The minutes and agenda were unanimously approved.
3) Verona will circulate the final version of ASPP 708 (Titling Guidelines for Instructional Academic Staff) on Monday to academic staff and also contact campus liaisons. At the next meeting ASCS will take action and send the final version for approval.
4) The Council discussed proposed revisions to IPP #320 (Merit review for IAS) and strongly supports the change to make IAS merit parallel to faculty merit.
5) The Council reviewed the Academic Staff Council of Senators Bylaws:
   - Dickinson raised the issue that UWC Online Program employees can be prohibited from serving on committees because they are grouped with Central. Verona indicated that the governance opportunities for Online Program academic staff would be addressed if the institution adopts a policy to make UWC Online a virtual campus.
   - DeZeeuw raised the issue of why the bylaws state that at least two of the eight academic staff senators have to be IAS with a 40% position or greater. Verona stated that the language in the bylaws reflected other Senate policies requiring instructional academic staff to serve on committees. The Council discussed this specific issue at length and potential changes to the language. Verona noted that any changes to that part of the bylaws would require changes to the Constitution. He stated that he would bring the issue to Senate Steering.
6) Summer pay for instructional academic staff is substantially lower for many IAS compared to their academic year pay. The Online Program is moving toward a fix summer pay scale.
7) The meeting was adjourned at 4:23.
UW COLLEGES
Classified Staff Council Senators
Friday, October 24, 2014
UW-Richland

MINUTES

Members Present: Rose Brust – UW-Marathon County (Chair)
Juli McGuire – UW-Fox Valley (Vice-Chair, Communications Cte Chair)
Kay Sbarbaro – (UW-Baraboo, sub for Tamara Lavender, Shared Governance Cte Chair)
Roseann Stenstrup – UW-Marinette (sub for Christi Larson, By-Laws Cte Chair)

1. Call to order – Chair R. Brust called the meeting to order

2. Approval of Agenda of October 24, 2014
   Motion to approve – R. Stenstrup
   2nd – K. Sbarbaro
   Motion Carried

3. Approval of 2014-15 Calendar
   Motion to approve – K. Sbarbaro
   2nd – R. Stenstrup
   Motion Carried

4. Discussions of the following topics were held
   a. R. Brust indicated that Director of Human Resources David Prucha will be the USC liaison to the Chancellor.
   b. The UWC constitutional threshold for voting was discussed.
      Motion to forward a request to the Shared Governance Committee to draft language to request the Senate to consider removing a threshold requirement for University Staff from the UW Colleges Constitution, specifically to allow more inclusiveness for all University Staff employees, whether they be permanent or LTE and regardless of level of appointment or FTE. It was further suggested that language may also mention that LTE University Staff not be counted or required for meeting/voting quorum – J. McGuire
      2nd – R. Stenstrup
      Motion Carried
   c. Committee status
      Motion to ask the Council to vote at the meeting of November 14 on forwarding to the Shared Governance Committee the recommendation to move the USC Shared Governance and Communications Committees to adhoc committee status, and to revise the USC Constitution to reflect these changes.
      2nd – R. Stenstrup
      Motion Carried
5. Adjournment – R. Brust
   Motion to adjourn – K. Sbarbaro
   2nd – R. Stenstrup
   Motion Carried

Respectfully submitted,
Juli McGuire – USC
UW-Fox Valley Representative
Attachment 1

Schedule
UW COLLEGES
Meetings of Senate, Committees, and Academic Staff, Classified Staff, and Faculty Councils of Senators
Friday, October 24, 2014
UW–Richland
9:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Coffee and Collegiality 9:00 a.m. – 9:30 a.m.
Pippin Conference Hall

Committee Meetings 9:30 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.
Joint meeting of Senate Steering and Budget Committees Pippin Conference Hall
Senate Academic Policy Committee Room 453
Faculty Professional Standards Committee Room 433

Break 10:30 a.m. - 10:35 a.m.

Committee Meetings 10:35 a.m. - 11:45 a.m.
Senate Academic Policy Committee Room 453
Senate Budget Committee Room 315
Faculty Professional Standards Committee Room 433
Senate Steering Committee Pippin Conference Hall

Lunch 11:50 a.m. - 12:35 p.m.
Pippin Conference Hall

Presentation 12:40 p.m. - 1:35 p.m.
Office of Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Update~ Christine Curley
Pippin Conference Hall
UW Colleges Online and Distance Education: Now and the Future~
Glenda Temple and Bobbie Boettcher

UW Colleges Senate 1:40 p.m.
Pippin Conference Hall

Council Meetings
Academic Staff Council of Senators Room 433
Classified Staff Council Senators Room 453
Faculty Council of Senators Pippin Conference Hall
Draft Agenda
UW COLLEGES
Senate
Friday, October 24, 2014
UW-Richland
1:40 p.m.

1) Call to Order of 2014-2015 Senate

2) Welcome by UW-Richland Associate Dean Brandon Fetterly

3) Roll Call of 2014-2015 Senate and Introductions of New Senators and Alternates

4) Approval of Agenda

5) Approval of Minutes: April 25, 2014, UW-Fond du Lac (posted in Public Folders and http://www.uwc.edu/employees/senate/meetings)

6) Reports
   a) Interim Chancellor Aaron Brower
   b) Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs Greg Lampe
   c) Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Joe Foy
   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 Jeff Verona
   g) UW Colleges Academic Staff Representative Danielle (Marcy) Dickson
   h) University Staff Lead Senator Rose Brust
   i) Senate Academic Policy Committee Chair Caleb Bush
   j) Senate Budget Committee Chair Stephen Schmid
   k) Faculty Professional Standards Committee Chair Ron Gulotta
   l) Former Senate Assessment Committee Chair Debbie Paprocki
   m) Institutional Review Board Chair Kathy Immel

7) Old Institutional Business
   a) Adoption: Proposed New UW Colleges Constitution Chapter 11 (“Academic Programs”) [SAPC] defining academic programs in the Constitution
   b) Adoption: Proposed Amendment of UW Colleges Constitution Chapter 12 (“Amendments”) [SAPC] renumber chapter
   c) Adoption: Proposed New Institutional Policy #408 (“Procedure for the Creation of New Departments”) [SAPC] new policy to note procedure for creation of departments
d) Adoption: Proposed Revision to IP #405 (“Senate Procedures”) [SSC] remove requirement to keep hard copies of Senate minutes at Central

e) Adoption: Proposed Revision of UW Colleges Senate Bylaws 1.0 (“Committee Minutes and Annual Reports”) [SSC] update Public Folders reference

f) Other

8) New Institutional Business

a) Introduction: Proposed New Institutional Policy #407 (“Approval of Departmental Bylaws”) [SAPC] policy to delineate process of departmental bylaw approval

b) Introduction: Proposed Revision of IP #301.01 (“Administering the Student Survey of Instruction”) [FPSC] altering language so SSI is not known as “public document”

c) Introduction: Proposed Revision of IP #103 (“UW Colleges Certificate Program”) [SAPC] increasing access to non-credit certificates in Continuing Education courses

d) Other

9) Other Institutional Business

a) Other

10) Adjournment
Draft Agenda
UW COLLEGES
Faculty Council of Senators
Friday, October 24, 2014
UW-Richland

1. Call to Order 2014-2015 Faculty Council of Senators

2. Roll Call of faculty senators and alternates

3. Approval of Agenda

4. Approval of Minutes: April 25, 2014, UW-Fond du Lac (posted in Public Folders and http://www.uwc.edu/employees/senate/meetings)

5. Reports
   a) Chair Mark Peterson
   b) Faculty Professional Standards Committee Chair Ron Gulotta

6. Old Business
   a) Adoption: Proposed Revision of FPP #508 (“Policy on Ineffective or Inactive Performance”) [FPSC] written action plan and detail on initiating further action
   b) Other

7. New Business
   a) Other

8. Other Business
   a) Discussion: Update from Faculty Compensation Committee [Paul Whitaker]
   b) Other

9. Adjournment
Draft Agenda
UW COLLEGES
Academic Staff Council of Senators
Friday, October 24, 2014
UW-Richland

Roll Call

Select Recorder

Approval of Minutes from ASCS meeting of April 25, 2014 and September 24, 2014
(April 25, 2014 posted in Public Folders and http://www.uwc.edu/employees/senate/meetings; September 24, 2014 included in materials)

Approve Agenda

I. Introduction of ASPP #708 (Titling Guidelines for Instructional Academic Staff)

II. Update from Faculty Professional Standards Committee regarding revisions of IPP #320 (Merit review for IAS)

III. Discussion of review of ASCS Bylaws

IV. Other business

V. Adjourn
# Draft Agenda
## UW COLLEGES
### Classified Staff Council Senators
**Friday, October 24, 2014**
**UW-Richland**

Current Members:
- **Brust, Rose** – UW-Marathon County *(Chair)*
- **Larson, Christi** – UW-Washington County
- **Lavender, Tamara** – UW-Baraboo/Sauk County
- **McGuire, Juli** – UW-Fox
- **Vacancy** (to complete L. Weber term)

Chancellor Appointed Liaison: **Pam Dollard** – Director of Personnel, Human Resources, UW Colleges

*Lead Senator, *UW System Rep

## Call to order

## Approval of Agenda

## Approve 2014-15 Calendar

## Discussion on the following topics:
- Replacement of P Dollard as liaison to Council – request to Chancellor
- Threshold
- Making Shared Governance & Communications Committees USC Ad Hoc committees for recommendation to Council Executive Committee for placement on Council agenda.

## Adjourn
Update on the Department of Public Instruction Course Options: In mid-February of this year, the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction introduced details of Course Options which was included as part of the approved 2013-15 biennial budget. Course Options was fully implemented in the fall of 2014.

Under Course Options, students and parents cannot be charged for college courses being offered in the high schools to high school students. Local school districts are responsible for paying the tuition charged by the providing institution. It is up to the local school district to decide what it can afford to pay for a college course. Because local school districts have not had to pay for concurrent enrollment programs in the past, many of them across the state decided not to continue offering concurrent enrollment opportunities.

In May, UW System President Ray Cross, recognizing that Course Options was significantly impacting high school student access to college courses offered at the high schools and taught by high school instructors, announced that he would use UW System funds to support as a one-year “stop-gap” measure.

In August, UW System Administration allocated funds to each UW System institution offering concurrent enrollment programming. UW Colleges received approximately $787,000 and distributed the funds to UW Colleges campuses offering concurrent enrollment programs in the high school.

Currently, UW System Legal Council is leading efforts to provide Wisconsin legislators a revised Course Options statute that will remedy the problems created by the original Course Options statute. The revised language should be ready for legislative consideration by January 2015.

Tricia Wessel-Blaski and I will continue to keep you informed of any developments regarding Course Options.

Update on the Bachelor of Applied Arts and Sciences (BAAS) Degree Completion Program: The UW Colleges is now in the second year of implementing the BAAS degree completion program. Our institution’s bachelor degree completion program continues to gather momentum and serve our BAAS degree-seeking students. Listed below are the major developments regarding the BAAS degree completion program (my thanks to BAAS Degree Program Manager Patti Wise for providing me with many of these updates):

- **Senior Capstone Seminar:** This fall, UW Colleges BAAS degree offering campuses enrolled our first cohort of students with senior standing. These students are now embarking on their year-long capstone experience, which includes the completion of two required 3-
credit courses, the Senior Capstone Seminar and the Senior Capstone Project. Once the Senior Capstone Seminar and Senior Capstone Project are completed, and all other requirements of the BAAS degree completion program are met, these students will graduate with a bachelor’s degree from the UW Colleges.

- **UW System Substantive Redirect for the BAAS Degree:** In early September, the UW Colleges received UW System approval to make three changes to the BAAS degree completion program.

  1. Flex the 30 plus 30 credit restriction and allow BAAS degree-seeking students to take more UW Colleges courses
  2. Allow students to take any of the 100 UW Colleges BAAS degree-approved UW partner courses with Cognitive Skills (CS) and Global Skills (GS) designations
  3. Expand access to the BAAS degree completion program by admitting students with a WTCS applied associate degree

The UW System-approved program changes will be effective the date a revised Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is signed between the UW partner institution and the UW Colleges campus. To date, UW-La Crosse, UW-Parkside and UW-Stout have signed the revised MOU, allowing UW-Baraboo/Sauk County, UW-Barron County, and UW-Waukesha to implement the changes immediately. The Office of Academic and Student Affairs expect to receive a decision from UW-Platteville, UW-Stevens Point, and UW-Superior during the current fall semester.

- **Enrollments:** The BAAS degree completion program has seen a significant increase in enrollments from 52 students last fall to 91 students this fall. The biggest increase was at UW-Barron County where a substantial number of students with an applied associate degree were admitted. Nine students are enrolled in the year-long Senior Capstone Course, and are on track to graduate in May 2015.

- **Curriculum:** The UW Colleges BAAS degree curriculum includes over 60 upper division courses. The number of BAAS courses offered by UW Colleges faculty and instructional academic staff members increased from ten last fall to fifteen this fall. Courses are being offered face-to-face and via distance education, including point-to-point, compressed video, and web conferencing. Offering BAAS degree completion courses via UW Colleges Online is currently under discussion.

- **Curriculum and Staffing Planning Task Force:** A Curriculum Planning Task Force has been appointed and met in September to draft a master curriculum plan for the BAAS degree completion program, including options for both full-time and part-time students. This will be an institutional plan, with an overall scale and scope to serve students across all six BAAS degree offering campuses. The goal is to map a two-year degree plan that accommodates the scheduling needs of prospective students and the teaching loads of campus faculty and instructional academic staff members. The plan will also explore possible course rotation schedules given the instructional parameters of our academic departments and the online offerings of our partner institutions.
• **Assessment:** Last year the Senate BAAS Assessment Committee (SBAC) conducted an extensive program assessment involving focus groups at all six BAAS degree offering campuses. The top-tier of recommended program changes has since been implemented. This year the SBAC, in consultation with the BAAS Assessment Coordinator, will begin to assess the BAAS core curriculum using a Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP)-based rubric being developed through a grant partnership between UW-Waukesha and UW-Parkside.

• **Internships and Capstone Courses:** As students continue in the BAAS degree completion program, greater numbers are enrolling in these experiential learning courses – 19 and 9 students respectively this semester. The internship seminar brings students together who are placed in a variety of discipline-specific internships to establish learning outcomes, discuss workplace issues, and reflect on the applied learning. The capstone involves one full semester of the capstone seminar and a second semester focusing on the capstone project and presentation. Every capstone student will work closely with a faculty mentor who will receive a stipend for their academic oversight, consultation, and guidance.

Program Manager Patti Wise and I will continue to keep you informed as to how the BAAS degree completion program is progressing.

**Associate of Arts and Science (AAS) Degree Review and Revision Update:** During this academic year I plan to launch a comprehensive review and revision of the AAS degree. To that end, I launched a series of three meeting which are detailed below. In March I met with Senate Steering Committee Chair Mark Peters, then Interim Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Rex Hieser, and Associate Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management Rich Barnhouse to discuss how we might approach the revision process. During our discussion, we reviewed key ideas from the discussion I had with Senate leaders about the AAS review process at the October 2013 Senate Leaders Retreat. Below are the highlights of the March meeting:

**Key Considerations for the review and revision of the AAS:**

- We need to consider what other UW System institutions have done/are doing in terms of revising their respective general education programs (UW-Oshkosh, UW-Stevens Point, and others). Their reform work has an impact on our students’ ability to transfer.
- We need to consider national and UW System general education reform efforts. We need to conduct a thorough environmental scan of general education reform and practices.
- We need to consider what employers want as a skill/knowledge set in the AAS degree. We should look at the UW-Waukesha-UW-Parkside Degree Qualifications Profile efforts.
- We need to account for a wide-range of student abilities and aptitudes as we review the AAS degree.

**Possible Committee Structures for approaching the review and revision of the AAS degree:**

- External Review Committee (composed of faculty members and Office of Academic and Student Affairs administrators)
• Internal Review Committee (composed of faculty members from each of the three divisions [Humanities, Social Sciences, and Natural Sciences and Mathematics)
• Academic Department Committees (each academic department’s curriculum committee or designated committee)
• Humanities, Social Sciences, Natural Sciences and Mathematics Division Committee (composed of 2-3 faculty members from each division)

Staging the AAS review and revision process:

• We discussed having the committees begin their work all at the same time.
• We considered having the review begin with the external review first so that the outcomes of this work could inform the rest of the committees’ work.
• We discussed engaging Assistant Campus Deans for Student Affairs and others in the AAS review at key points in the process.
• We considered the need to appoint a project manager to manage and facilitate the review and revision process.

In mid-August, I convened a meeting to continue discussions about how to proceed with the review and revision of the AAS degree. At this meeting, I met with Chair’s Representative Greg Ahrenhoerster, Associate Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management Rich Barnhouse, Campus Executive Officers and Deans Charles Clark (Manitowoc), Patrick Hagen (Richland), Harry Muir (Waukesha), Carmen Wilson (Rock County), and Dean Yohnk (Barron County). Senate Steering Committee Chair Mark Peterson was invited to the meeting and was unable to attend. I fully briefed Mark following the meeting. Below are the highlights of the August meeting:

Value and Relevance of the AAS degree: We began the meeting with a discussion of the value and relevance of the AAS degree. Among the challenges we will face as we work to revise the degree will be to move the UW Colleges 20th century degree into the 21st century. We will need to consider whether or not to continue with a “cafeteria style” AAS degree to one that is more interdisciplinary and integrated. One of the questions we will need to grapple with is whether or not the AAS degree will be competency-based (like the UW Flexible Option and Lumina’s Degree Qualifications Profile) or outcome based (using the Association of American Colleges and Universities’ (AAC&U) Essential Learning Outcomes or the UW System Shared Learning Goals). To make the degree more valuable and relevant, students, alumni, and employers will need to be engaged in our reform efforts. We will need to continually ask, “What does a 21st century educated person look like? What skills and knowledge will our students need to be successful?”

Four key questions: During the meeting, participants focused on four questions:

1. Why review the Associate degree now? What is the driver for change? Participants made the following points in response to the question:
   • We need to move our 20th century AAS degree into the 21st century.
   • There is momentum within the institution, and especially among the faculty and within the UW Colleges Senate, to revise the AAS degree.
• There is increased interest in the associate degree across the UW System. UW comprehensive institutions are seeing the associate degree as an increasingly important benchmark of academic progress for students.
• There is a need to distinguish the UW Colleges AAS degree from other liberal arts and applied associate degree programs.

2. What problem/issue are we trying to address within the Associate degree? Participants made the following points in response to the question:
• We need to carry the lessons we have learned from developing the UW Flexible Option and the Bachelor of Applied Arts and Sciences (BAAS) degree completion program into the AAS degree.
• We need to align the design and structural elements of the AAS degree with the BAAS degree completion program.
• We need to consider how the AAS degree might be designed to improve student retention and recruitment efforts. Making the degree attractive and coherent could make it easier to retain students through to degree attainment. An attractive AAS degree could become an effective marketing tool in recruiting students. A culminating sophomore capstone experience could be an integral part to the attainment of an AAS degree. Internships, field experiences, and service-learning opportunities in the community could be part of a sophomore capstone experience.
• We need to enhance the student experience by embedding high impact practices throughout the AAS degree experience. First Year Seminar, study abroad, and undergraduate research, for example, could be embedded into the first two years of the student experience. Co-curricular activities should be embedded as well.
• We need to move from a “buffet” style curriculum to a concept-based approach. For an associate degree to be of value, it needs to be valuable for students. We need a more integrated learning environment. We need to make the AAS degree more attractive from the outset so that students are motivated to remain with us and not transfer early.

3. Who should be engaged in the proposal to change the Associate degree? Participants made the following points in response to this question:
• There needs to be an across the board group to guide the reformation of the AAS degree: faculty, instructional academic staff, non-instructional staff, and classified staff. For our reform efforts to be successful, we will need to implement an inclusive process.
• Key constituents/constituency groups will need to be consulted at key times within the AAS revision process. These could include UW four-year comprehensives, Wisconsin Technical College System contacts, employers, a member or members of the Board of Visitors, alumni, and UW Colleges student affairs members.
• We will need to appoint a core group to function as a steering committee (much like the team that led the HLC self-study process) to lead the AAS revision process.
• We should consider an external review group composed of legislators, Board of Regents members, and County Board members. We should be bi-partisan in our approach to the legislature and consult with both democrats and republicans.

4. What strategies and procedures need to be developed to engage our colleagues in a constructive dialogue as we work collaboratively to devise an effective Associate
degree/liberal arts general education program? Participants made the following points in response to this question:

- We need to think about where to begin to introduce the revision process. Ideas included Convocation (August), the Senate Meeting (October), Deans, Associate Deans, Department Chairs Meeting (October), the Fall Student Affairs Conference (November) and campus-based groups (perhaps campus steering committees and/or Collegium) following up on the October and November meetings.
- Engage an AAC&U consultant to help the core group guide the revision process.
- Next summer, send a group of UW Colleges faculty to the AAC&U General Education Reform Conference. Dean Yohnk shared how UW-Parkside sent a team of 10 faculty and administrators to a summer AAC&U General Education Reform Conference and how transformative that experience was to UW-Parkside’s general education reform efforts.

In early October, I met with Debra Humphreys, Vice President for Policy and Public Engagement for the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U), about the UW Colleges review and revision of the AAS degree. During our meeting Debra and I explored how AAC&U might assist us with our review and revision process. Debra also shared materials from the AAC&U that might be of help to us as we frame our approach to the AAS degree review and revision process.

Next Steps:

In the very near future, I plan on forming a committee to work on organizing the structure, process, and timeline for the AAS review and revision process. I will consult with the Senate Steering Committee, the UW Colleges Deans, the UW Colleges academic department chairs, and central office administrators to form the committee.

I will continue to keep you informed of any developments in our planning efforts to review and revise the AAS degree.

Respectfully submitted,
Greg Lampe, Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs
10.20.2014
On September 15, 2014, I officially began in my new role as Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Since beginning in this role, I have had the privilege of participating in several governance committee meetings (Senate Steering, SIEC, IRB, and SPDC), and having conversations and meetings with several folks related to Colleges-wide initiatives related to professional development, grants, developmental education, ESFY, libraries, undergraduate research, the BAAS, and more. I have also been given the opportunity to sit in on, and assist with, academic department program reviews with the Provost and Department Chairs. Each of these have been tremendous learning experiences, and I look forward to continuing to complete my transition into the office and support the great work happening across our thirteen campuses and Online and Distance Education Program.

One of the primary responsibilities I have been dedicating time to during these first several weeks is the continued implementation of the chancellor’s repositioning decisions, as identified in the 2014-2015 Institutional Priorities. This has meant finding ways to realign responsibilities formerly assigned to positions that were eliminated due to budget cuts, as well as assisting campuses, departments and governance groups in finding resources to support their continued work and efforts in a variety of areas. As we identify new processes and responsibilities, I will update the Senate (as is the case below with “Professional Development”).

Departmental Bylaws Review: To-date I have performed reviews of three sets of departmental bylaws (English, Health and Exercise Science and Athletics, and Music), and have returned my comments and recommendations to the department chairs. There are no other departmental bylaws currently outstanding for review.

Position Request Reviews: To-date I have submitted analyses for two faculty positions. The first was a split face-to-face and NODE position in Computer Science that is to be shared between UW-Fox Valley and UWC Online and Distance Education. The second was a 1.00 line to be allocated to UW-Marathon County in the Chemistry Department. These analyses have been shared with the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs who will make a recommendation to the Chancellor for final determination.

Undergraduate Research Journal: The inaugural edition of the UWC Undergraduate Research Journal is being finalized for online publication. I want to extend my thanks to Scott Silet, who has been serving as the coordinating editor-in-chief, Asif Habib and Bob Bermant who are also helping to coordinate the journal, and to the divisional editors Talitha Selby (Sciences) and John Pruitt (Humanities). Thank you also to the faculty and staff who have provided reviews of student work. Now that I am stepping into the AVC of AA role, I will be stepping down as the divisional editor for the Social Sciences. I will be working with Scott Silet on finding a replacement and developing a process for the selection of editors going forward. Funding for the journal will continue for at least the remainder of this academic year, and an analysis of the
impact of the journal will be conducted to see whether there is a continued need for institutional support and funding into the future.

**Professional Development (SPDC):** Following the elimination of the institutional Professional Development Coordinator position, I worked with Scott Bouffleur (chair, Senate Professional Development Committee) and former Interim Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Rex Heiser to develop a process for handling the announcement, evaluation, selection, and reporting of professional development opportunities across the Colleges. Thank you to the SPDC for all their hard work and efforts going forward.

- **OPID:** It had already been determined that as the VT&LC Director and OPID liaison for the Colleges, Jennifer Heinert would be the professional development coordinator for all OPID-sponsored programs (Faculty Colleges, Wisconsin Teaching Fellows, etc.). In this capacity, Dr. Heinert will send out calls, receive any applications, share any applications with the SPDC as needed, and would provide institutional communication with OPID. Whenever applicable, the SPDC will make recommendations on participant applications to the Provost.

- **Sabbaticals:** The SPDC will send announcements and receive all sabbatical requests. The SPDC will send list of recommendations to the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs who will verify budget and resources and communicate all information to the Provost. The AVC for AA will also work with the Director of Budget and Planning in Administrative Services to update figures on instructional backfills for sabbatical releases. The AVC for AA will assist the Provost with the preparation of all communications to applicants. All questions about sabbaticals that were either funded or not selected to funding should go directly to the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs who will serve as a liaison between faculty and the SPDC.

- **Summer Research, GISE, and KSEG Grants:** Follow same process as sabbaticals.

- **Posters in the Rotunda:** Asif Habib, former institutional PD Coordinator, will send out the announcement and collect/coordinate all applications. If there are more applications than what is allotted to the UWC, applicant materials will be provided by Dr. Habib to the SPDC, at which point the SPDC will send list of recommendations to the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs who will communicate recommendations to the Provost and will help develop communications to all applicants informing them of the status of their proposals. When Dr. Habib determines he no longer wants to serve in this capacity, the responsibility will fall to the AVC for AA.
- The Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will be responsible for sending out periodic “Occasional PD Notes,” which will include information on the NEH Summer Stipend, Posters on the Rotunda, Summer Research Grant Case US Professor of the Year Award, Kaplan Fellows, etc.

Teaching Awards (STAC): As with the professional development processes, it was determined that all teaching awards announcements will be sent out by the chair of the Senate Teaching Awards Committee. The chair will receive all applications and will work with the committee to screen and evaluate applications. The committee will report recommendations to the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs who will work with the Provost to develop communications to applicants. All questions about teaching awards from those either selected or not selected for an award should go directly to the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs who will serve as a liaison between staff/faculty and the STAC. Though I was not part of the discussions in which this process was determined, I want to thank the STAC for all their hard work and efforts going forward.

As a final note, I want to thank Rex Hieser for all of his work as the Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and for all of his work assisting me through the transition. His meticulous notes and guides have already proven to be invaluable, and I am indebted to him for his work.

Respectfully submitted,
Joseph J. Foy
September 29, 2014
Flex Operations

The Flex Operations team is responsible for ensuring the overall functionality and alignment of the technical and administrative requirements for the UW Colleges Flexible Option program with UW-Extension. The latest accomplishment of this group was in their contribution to the effort in receiving approval from the Department of Education to award Federal Financial Aid. The UW Colleges is the first institution to ever receive approval to do so, in this educational format.

Although the institution has received approval, the functionality in PRISM/PeopleSoft must be completely modified in a manner that quite simply, does not exist, anywhere. The Flex Operations team will be working closely with UW-Extension to determine the best possible practice, PRISM structure, and software needed to actually administer Financial Aid for the Flexible Option program. This planning will continue through the Fall 2014 and Spring 2015 semesters.

Chapter 17 Revision

Under the direction of UW System President, Ray Cross, a taskforce will be appointed to address the conflicting language that exists between UWS Chapter 17 (State of Wisconsin Statute) and changes to the Clery Act, Title IX, and the Violence Against Women Act (Federal laws). Conflicts have existed since 2011 and therefore, the UW System Office of General Council has requested and received approval to review and update UWS Chapter 17, in order to bring it into line with federal law. The UW Colleges will identify a representative to serve on this system-wide taskforce.

Fund for Wisconsin Scholars

The Fund for Wisconsin Scholars (FFWS) is a privately funded organization. It exists to provide need-based grants to graduates of Wisconsin public high schools who are attending a public college, university or technical college in Wisconsin. The FFWS seeks to ensure that higher education is both accessible and affordable. Specifically, the organization attempts to reduce financial barriers and help reduce student debt. This year, 255 UW Colleges students are eligible to receive a $1,800 grant to supplement the cost of their education. To be eligible for a FFWS grant, students must:

- be a resident of Wisconsin
- have been a full-time, resident student in a Wisconsin public school for four semesters prior to graduation
• have received a Wisconsin public high school diploma or HSED within the past three years
• be under the age of 21 years
• be in a first degree program unless moving from/to an associate degree or to a bachelor’s program
• be enrolled full time in a UW System college or university or Wisconsin Technical College based in Wisconsin
• be a PELL recipient
• have remaining unmet financial need

In September, Aaron Brower, Interim Chancellor, Greg Lampe, Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs and I were invited to meet with the FFWS to describe our students, their needs, and barriers that exist for our students trying to utilize the FFWS’s resources. Our discussion with the FFWS Board focused on the full-time and age requirements, as both are limitations for many of our students. Aaron, Greg, and I will be invited to meet with the FFWS again to continue our discussion.

Preferred Name Update

The UW Colleges Registrar and Director of Admissions, Larry Graves has been working with individuals from his office, colleagues from our campuses, and UW-Stout to identify the most suitable policy and technical setup to provide a preferred name option for our students. To date, Larry and his team have a successful PRISM instance in development and are utilizing UW-Stout’s overall model. Last week, the work began to implement a data feed from PRISM to D2L. The next step is to provide a data feed to the libraries. We anticipate that this project will be completed and implemented on campuses in Spring 2015. Information will be developed to inform students of the Preferred Name option.

Fall 2013 Enrollment

According to the UW System Bluebook enrollment report, the UW Colleges as an institution has seen a slight enrollment increase in headcount (HC) from 14,036 (Fall 2013) to 14,182 (Fall 2014) or an increase of 146 HC. The Full-Time Equivalency (FTE) declined from 8,719 (Fall 2013) to 8,420 (Fall 2014) or 299 FTE. The institution is pleased with the increase in overall headcount and anticipated the decline in FTE as more students enroll part-time.

Respectfully submitted,

Rich Barnhouse
Associate Vice Chancellor,
Student Affairs and Enrollment Management
10.09.14
Attachment 5

Senate Steering Committee Chair
UW Colleges Faculty Representative to UW System Administration
Report to the UW Colleges Senate
October 24, 2014

The Senate Steering committee met on August 28\textsuperscript{th}, September 4\textsuperscript{th} & 19\textsuperscript{th}, and on October 2\textsuperscript{nd}. Full details are chronicled in the Senate Steering minutes, now available on your networked A: drive.

- **Faculty Representative meeting on September 26th 2014.**
  Most of the details can be read in my previous report (emailed 10/3/2014) but here are a few highlights.

  The faculty reps pressed System to be more sensitive regarding requests for faculty to participate in shared governance while off-contract during the summer, we demanded an answer to why UW System is unable to provide a 12 month pay plan for those on 9 month contracts (and why UW System has been unable or unwilling to say why not for – and I’m not kidding about this – about 14 years) and, in keeping with Regent assurances that they want to find a way to address compensation issues, the faculty reps requested that the Regents put together a serious and practicable legislatively funded faculty pay plan.

  In news from System, a much anticipated faculty turnover report went to the Board of Regents this past week (see the links below). It became clear during our meeting that faculty are not alone in working through serious problems with retention. The Academic Staff reps at this meeting brought in some (staggering) numbers for AS turnover. This is still an initial estimate, but between 2011 and 2014, 16,512 employees left the UW System, only 800 of which were the result of retirements. At UW Madison alone (again, an initial estimate) they’re looking at about a 10% turnover per year.

  Even the experienced Interim VP David Ward had his jaw drop.

  The conversation continues.

- **The Regents meeting @ UWSP on October 9 and 10, 2014.**

  Here are all the links you could want. For a quick summary, hit the Day 1 and Day 2 links near the bottom of the list. [The electronic version of this report contains the hyperlinks as indicated.]

  - [October outline agenda](#) (7 pages, 750 KB)
  - October Agendas and Supporting Materials
    - [Thursday Agenda](#) (2 pages, 290 KB)
Four key moments:

1) President Cross issued a statement (I read it in Milwaukee Journal Sentinel) regarding belt tightening, reallocating from within current budgets, finding ways to improve faculty salaries, and possibly cutting some jobs. While the statement raised some eyebrows, nothing that appears in the article I read is substantially different from anything President, then Chancellor, Cross said to the Repositioning Task Force over a year ago as we began to work up ways to staunch the loss of tenure track faculty.

2) You’ll notice that the Colleges appears on Day 1 in Interim Chancellor Aaron Brower’s update on Flex. The US Department of Education has approved federal financial aid for AAS students in Flex. This was a huge hurdle, now passed. We’re the first Flex-style program in the country to be approved.

3) In news both awful and hopeful the faculty retention report came out. While the faculty turnover rate (non-retirement) around System has been running at approximately 3% (a little below, it seems, the 17% we lost in the last 5 years or so), nonetheless, 29% of all staff across UW System received base adjustments (including those for promotions, title changes, and changes in duties) during fiscal year 2014. Faculty over at UW Extension have already seen some compensation adjustments. Let’s hope this portends good news for us.

4) Finally, and most importantly, on Friday the Regents welcomed leaders from the Great Lakes Inter-Tribal Council to a Regent’s meeting for the very first time.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Peterson, Chair
Senate Steering Committee
ASPP #708 (Titling Guidelines for Instructional Academic Staff)

On May 12, 2014, ASPP #708 was adopted on an interim basis by Senate Steering (under #405.G.10) and approved by interim chancellor Aaron Brower. Senate policy stipulates that policies approved on a interim basis “must be subjected to the standard system of introduction and adoption.” Today the AS Council will formally introduce the policy, which will then circulate among the campuses for feedback. The policy will then be up for adoption at the January 2015 Senate meeting.

Revisions to IP #320 (Policy on Evaluation – IAS)

The Council continues to consult with the Faculty Professional Standards Committee regarding IP #320, particularly as it applies merit review for IAS. We hope to revise IP #320 along the lines of FPP #503 (Faculty Merit), which will also require a new version of the Faculty Activity Report which is more appropriate for IAS. The Council and the Academic Staff Personnel Committee will assist in redrafting IP #320.

Revision of ASCs Bylaws

The ASCS Bylaws were last revised in 2000. The Council has been revisiting the bylaws and will circulate any proposed changes to the academic staff prior to the January 2015 Senate meeting.

Finally, the AS Council would like to welcome the members of the Classified (University) Staff Council into the shared governance process.

Respectfully Submitted,
Jeff Verona
October 10, 2014
Interim Senior Vice President David Ward

- A portion of the $95 million requested for the UW Talent Development Initiative is aimed at patching the loss resulting from the UW tuition freeze
- Talent areas:
  - Economy
  - Pathways (target underserved populations)
  - Infrastructure (program/faculty resources)
- Operating Budget will be implemented in June
- Biennial budget request for additional funds ($95 million)
- Compensation request coming in December

Jerry Addie, Academic Staff Rep, UW-Stout

- Continuing loss of academic staff
- Since 2011 4322 academic staff to resignation and 793 academic staff to retirement – point was need of competitive compensation

Tuition Freeze

- Governor Walker is proposing two more years to offset upcoming expenses ($27 million)
- Not much will happen until after November

Voter ID/Student ID

- Students need Voter ID Card and Student ID voter Card – enrollment verification
- Example include:
  - Student schedule
  - Receipt

Respectfully Submitted by
Danielle (Marcy) Dickson

~From notes taken by Annie Weberpal
Senators and Council Reps
The following are the names of the UW Colleges University Staff Council members:
Bell, Joyce (WAK), Brust, Rose (MTH), Carter, John (RLN), Dodge, Dawn (BRN), Larson, Christi (WSH), Lavender, Tamara (BRB), McGuire, Juli (FOX), Messerschmidt, Dawn (MSF), Sbarbaro, Kay (SHB), Schwinn, Tracy (FDL), Sisulak, Lisa (RCK), Stenstrup, Roseann (MNT), Weber, Lynn (UWC), Witte, Curtis (ONL)
The following are the names of the UW Colleges University Staff Council of Senators:
Brust, Rose, Larson, Christi, Lavender, Tamara, McGuire, Juli, Weber, Lynn

Meetings and Calendar
The University Staff Council (USC) maintained the following schedule over the summer months and into the fall, meeting via WisLine and Lync.

- 2014_05-21_22 MEETING System-wide Workshop
- 2014_06-10 Meeting Lync -EXEC CTE
- 2014_06-10 Meeting WisLine
- 2014_06-24 Meeting WisLine
- 2014_07-08 Meeting-WisLine
- 2014_08-07 USC Meeting F2F-UW-Marathon County
- 2014_08-19 Meeting-WisLine

The meetings and tentative schedule for 2014-2015:

- 2014_09-10 Meeting-Lync
- 2014_09-25 Meeting-Closed Session w/P.Dollard-discuss pending classified staff reduction

Wednesday, October 15, 2014—1-2 pm
- Friday, November 14, 2014—2-3 pm
- Friday, December 19, 2014—10-11 am
- Thursday, January 15, 2015—10-11 am
- Thursday, February 12, 2015—2-3 pm
- Thursday, March 12, 2015—2-3 pm
- Thursday, April 16, 2015—10-11 am
- Friday, May 15, 2015—2-3 pm

Most meetings will be held via Lync using the David Wilson Room-UW-Marathon County as public access meeting room. Notification of Lync information stated on all agendas.
**UPS Policy Feedback**
The Council provided feedback on the UPS policies per P Dollard’s request.

**UPS Policy Work**
The Council is continuing its work on the Institutional policies for Layoff, Grievances and Personnel Management. Conferring with UWC HR throughout the process.

**Threshold**
Governance participation “threshold” is a topic of discussion, and feedback has been solicited from UWC classified and lte staff in regard to the possibility of a UWC Constitution amendment.

Respectfully submitted,
Rose Brust, Chair
UW Colleges University Staff Council
The Senate Academic Policy Committee (SAPC) met the morning of August 28, 2014 during UW Colleges Convocation. We discussed and/or acted on the following items:

1) Caleb Bush was elected chair.

2) SAPC reviewed outstanding charges and other work before the committee, including:
   a. The Chancellor’s concerns with IP#407 concerning the approval of department bylaws. We agreed this policy carried high importance and needed to be reintroduced as soon as possible. Caleb Bush agreed to review the Chancellor’s concerns and redraft the policy including the specified language.
   b. Work on IP#107 and IP#110 had been tabled, coming near the end of last academic year, until the Senate reconvened in fall. The committee agreed to examine these two policies this fall. Joanne Giordano agreed to review IP#107, specifically, and begin drafting policy changes.

Shortly after our first meeting convened, several committee members agreed to serve as proxies for the Chair on other Senate committees (resource person positions). Steve Kaiser will sit as SAPC resource person on the Senate BAAS Curriculum Committee, Julianna Alitto will sit as SAPC resource person on the Senate Curriculum Committee, and Katie Kalish will sit as SAPC resource person on the Senate Correspondence Committee. The Chair wants to acknowledge these committee members’ willingness to serve and thank them for sharing the workload.

SAPC then met on September 30, 2014 via WisLine. We discussed and/or acted on the following items:

1) In September 2014, Senate Steering charged SAPC with a clerical review of the introductory statement for IP#408, “Procedure for the Creation of New Departments.” The timeline mentioned in the introduction appeared incorrect. After review of introductions and adoption from AY2013-2014, SAPC Chair determined the correct language for the introduction and made changes. Caleb Bush forwarded the corrected IP#408 to Senate Steering Chair, Mark Peterson.

2) In 2013-2014, SAPC was charged with developing a Bylaws Approval Process that would establish a clear process, protocol, and authority line for bylaws approval. In the spring, SAPC introduced IP#407, and the Senate voted to adopt the policy at our April 2014 meeting. However, Chancellor Aaron Brower returned the policy to Senate Steering without approval, expressing concerns over possible budgetary, workload, and/or personnel issues
embedded in policy language. SAPC Chair redrafted IP#407, and the full committee
discussed the changes. Comfortable with the new language, Caleb Bush finalized the policy
and forwarded it to Senate Steering Chair Peterson for introduction at the October meeting.

3) In the spring semester, 2014, Senate Steering charged SAPC with a review of IP#107
concerning mediated instruction in the Colleges. The language reads hopelessly dated and
inaccurate for current practices. SAPC discussed the policy noting possible conflicts with
department policy, as well as larger institutional concerns in UWC Online. Joanne Giordano
agreed to revise the policy with committee recommendations. The redrafted policy will be
discussed in committee and then distributed by Giordano to Provost Greg Lampe, UWC
Online Dean Glena Temple, the Senate Online Committee, and department chairs for their
review.

4) In September, Senate Steering charged SAPC with a review of IP#204 concerning grade
appeals by students. The specific concern was the use of the word “normally” in the timing
of an instructor response to grade appeals (“normally” thirty days). In the meeting, SAPC
members discussed multiple reasons for changing or maintaining the current language. After
lengthy discussion, the committee agreed that “normally” allowed for an important degree of
flexibility in the timing of instructor AND student responses. The policy as written also
provides for student recourse to department chairs and/or executive committees in the case of
an unresponsive instructor. Students could also rely on Student Affairs personnel for support
in the course of their regular duties. Given these reasons, SAPC decided to return IP#204
unchanged to Senate Steering Chair Peterson.

5) In the spring semester 2014, Senate Steering charged SAPC with a review of IP#110
concerning UW Colleges instruction in local high schools (specifically “Implementation of
GAPP #36). Given the ongoing uncertainty at the state level around providing college
instruction in high schools, who should pay tuition for classes and how tuition should be
paid, SAPC felt the timing inopportune for policy review. As well, there are possible,
important legal ramifications in changing this policy. SAPC agreed to table discussion of this
policy to a later date. In the interim, Joanne Giordano agreed to research state law and
existing policies related to IP#110. We also felt it important to include others like Tricia
Wessel-Blaski and/or Dean Glena Temple in our discussions. As a result, no final action has
been taken on IP#110 to date.

As a final note and using my prerogative as SAPC Chair, I would like to comment on how
effectively this committee has worked together already this year (and last). It is my pleasure to
“lead” this dedicated group of faculty and staff.

Respectfully submitted,
Caleb M. Bush
Chair of Senate Academic Policy Committee
October 24, 2014
The Senate Budget Committee’s (SBC) last regular meeting was on 25 April 2014 at the Senate meeting. The committee gathered at Convocation and later convened via Wisline to elect its chair on 8 September 2014.

At SBC’s Spring meeting, the following topics were discussed:

1. Update and overview of the Budget Reduction Plan: Jason Beier reviewed a handout of the composite impact of budget reduction on campuses.
2. Beier reviewed the FY ‘13 estimates of reserve balances by level of commitment for the Colleges. As was discussed, how reserves are understood vary depending on institutions — e.g., four-year campuses have to plan for buildings whereas the Colleges do not.
3. The committee discussed the status of the Faculty Compensation Plan and the various issues that need to be addressed: compression, retention, hiring, low salary, market differentials, etc. As discussed, faculty is furthest behind in compensation so academic staff and classified staff are lower on the list of compensation needs.
4. SBC was updated on Huron’s review of human resources at both the Colleges and Extension. According to the update, Huron suggested a shift to being strategic in hiring and retention; they provided a structure with different functional units; and, they recommended development and implementation of HR policies.

This Fall, Ron Gulotta, chair of Senate Faculty Professional Standards Committee, contacted SBC concerning the merit distribution formula in FPP 503, which has not been needed for close to a decade. Chair Gulotta consulted SBC after related discussions with Paul Whitaker, chair of the ad hoc Faculty Compensation Committee. After asking around, SBC discovered and forwarded an excellent analysis and model of merit disbursements created by former SBC chair, John Fons.

Likely SBC issues for AY 2014-15 include:
1. Faculty Compensation Plan, disbursement issues, and long-term sustainability.
2. State’s structural deficit and impact on Colleges.
3. Impacts of President Cross’s “belt tightening” and “internal reallocation process” on the Colleges; in particular, impacts on academic programs, staffing, and administrative streamlining.
4. Instructional staff payment options: 12-month paychecks versus nine-months.
5. IAS compensation.

Respectfully submitted,
Stephen E. Schmid
Chair, Senate Budget Committee
10 October 2014
The Faculty Professional Standards Committee has one item up for adoption consideration today by the faculty council of senators. This is a proposed revision of FPP508.

The Faculty Professional Standards Committee also has one new revision to introduce today. Due to a recent revision of opinion by the State’s Attorney General, data and results from the Student Survey of Instruction (SSI) are now considered to be personnel evaluation items and thus not subject to public sharing. To help keep this clean and clear, we have been asked to remove any and all language from policy (IP#301.01) which might be interpreted to suggest that SSI data and results are public documents. For us, this simply means we need to make a minor change to the instructions read to students prior to their completing the SSI.

The committee is working on a comprehensive review of the merit review policies with special attention being given to how such procedures might inadvertently add to gender bias and other forms of bias. It is our intention to provide a mechanism by which any and all merit review committees can consistently evaluate faculty and Instructional Academic Staff. The FPSC is consulting with other committees, including Senate Budget and the Special Committee on Merit Distribution, to look at potential needs to adjust the formula for distribution of merit raise funds, the potential need to add additional merit ranking levels to express levels of success below those levels eligible for higher percentages of merit raise funds (sub-divisions of the meritorious ranking, and the potential need to specify in policy the standards of performance to achieve each level of merit ranking. It is our hope that discussions later today and during the leaders’ retreat will provide direction for creation of a few plans for faculty and others to consider prior to the January meetings. We appreciate the need to get this right, and we hope we can achieve revisions by the end of the academic year.

The committee’s work to create a unified policy covering the various forms of grievances and appeals now scattered across policies in the UW Colleges continues. This unified policy will spell out needed differences, as well as common procedures. It will then charge each respective committee to develop its own procedural guidelines. In this process, we have been working with central office personnel and UW System Legal to be sure the unified policy is consistent with state law and with UW System policy. This action will simplify language in the constitution and add details in the senate policies.

The committee is also working with senate steering to consider a new pilot study of using an online method to gather SSI data. Advancements in software, connections to D2L, and student familiarity with online surveys suggest that if not now, at some time in the future online SSI will yield a response rate which will satisfy our needs, and an online SSI would be more economical.

Respectfully submitted,
Ron Gulotta
Chairperson, Faculty Professional Standards Committee
Attachment 12

Former Senate Assessment Committee Chair
Report to the UW Colleges Senate
October 24, 2014

Since the last SAC report to the Senate in April 2014 the Senate Assessment Committee has met several times via Wisline and held a face-to-face meeting with the Department Assessment Coordinators (DACs) on August 15 at UW Sheboygan. Summaries of these meetings can be found below.

Several members completed their terms on the committee and new members joined the committee as of October 1. Kristin Plessel and Chris Roland will serve as co-chairs of SAC for the 2014-2015 academic year and assessment cycle. Thank you to Institutional Assessment Coordinator Valerie Murrenus Pilmaier and to all committee members for their work throughout the past assessment cycle.

The 2013-2014 assessment cycle is nearly complete with the receipt of the final department assessment reports from the DACs on September 15. The committee members will provide final comments to the DACs by October 15.

The 2014-2015 assessment cycle will get underway with receipt of the plans for Fall assessment from the DACs on October 15. The Departments will choose to assess either Communication Skills, Quantitative Skills or Intercultural Skills. There will be an initial discussion of campus assessment plans with the Campus Assessment Coordinators (CACs) at the end of October.

A major project regarding assessment of the information literacy of our UW Colleges students is currently underway. This project has been under discussion and in planning stages throughout the last several years with input from SAC, UW Colleges librarians, DACS and CACs. During the week of October 6 students received an email with a link to take a survey regarding their information literacy. The survey called SAILS (a standardized multiple choice assessment developed at Kent State University) will provide valuable information for the future indicating to us how well we are currently aiding our students in locating and evaluating information sources. It will also assist the Colleges in identifying any changes that might be made to better prepare our students for carrying out research.

The 2013-2014 Campus Assessment cycle was completed as the CACs submitted the final campus reports to SAC in May. SAC reviewed all of the reports, held a Wisline meeting in June to discuss the reports, and returned comments to the CACs in July. Many worthwhile assessment projects were carried out on the campuses providing useful feedback for future campus improvements or generating ideas for areas that need further evaluation.

As an economy measure SAC decided to hold a June Wisline meeting with DACs rather than the face to face meeting usually held at that time. The committee and coordinators received data and information from Greg Nettesheim from the current assessment cycle and discussed the results.
During the **August 15 face-to-face meeting** with the DACs, the morning session included an extensive discussion in groups of the Analytical Skills Proficiency’s Performance Indicators. Each group worked on revisions to one of the Performance Indicators with an eye to making these indicators more appealing to departments, thus encouraging their use of them the next time they form part of the assessment cycle. Ideas were shared with the whole group and some changes were made.

The afternoon session included discussions of assessment of online courses and continued planning for the information literacy assessment with SAILS.

Submitted by
Deborah Paprocki
SAC Chair
October 8, 2014
1. Review of Research

The Institutional Review Board has met two times already this fall and has completed its review of 27 research protocols since the Annual Report was submitted in April. We anticipate another seven meetings before the end of the spring semester with a total of approximately 75 research proposals.

2. Concern About Student Member

Unfortunately our student member, Jodi Kiffmeyer, has not been able to continue to serve as a voting member of the committee due to delayed SGC approval. We would like to propose a longer term for a student member because we often do not have a student member approved in a timely manner. Seeing as the majority of the research in the UW Colleges involves students as subjects, we find student input invaluable in making these decisions. Now that we have students pursuing the BAAS degree, a longer term is feasible. Is a formal proposal required to extend the student's term from one year to 2-3 years?

3. Policy Considerations

Our proposed policy/procedures regarding noncompliance has been approved by System legal and is waiting to be assigned a UWCAP number. We are also in the process of drafting a policy statement on "using persons with whom one has an authority relationship as research subjects" and policy specifying to whom UWCAP#15 applies, which will also define UW Colleges IRB jurisdiction.

4. Qualitative Research

We have been working on developing a separate protocol for qualitative research or research that uses both quantitative and qualitative methods.

Respectfully Submitted,
Linda Tollefsrud, IRB Coordinator
Kathy Immel, IRB Chair
Background and Rationale
Both SAPC and FPSC were charged several years ago with the task of defining academic programs. In working on this, it became obvious that there is currently no policy that allows for the existence of academic programs much less policy governing their operations. So, SAPC and FPSC drafted the constitutional amendment below which is modeled on Chapter 4: Academic Departments. The proposed amendment has been reviewed by department chairs and their revisions have been incorporated.

Because Chapter 11 – Amendments already exists, an accompanying amendment is introduced changing Chapter 11 – Amendments to Chapter 12 – Amendments.

UW Colleges Constitution
Chapter 11 - Academic Programs  (Chap 11 moves to become Chap 12)

11.00 Academic Programs

An academic program is defined as an institutional functional unit that offers an organized curriculum of related disciplinary or interdisciplinary courses and is recognized by the faculty, senate and chancellor. Academic programs are established to a) address teaching and research needs in a sub-discipline within an academic department, b) coordinate curricula, teaching and research that are multi- or interdisciplinary in nature and, therefore, require expertise from two or more departments, c) address specialized instructional needs that do not fall within the jurisdiction or expertise of existing departments or d) provide instruction, research and service in emerging academic disciplines that may, in the future, become academic departments.

11.01 Membership

All persons teaching credit or non-credit bearing courses in an academic program shall be members of one or more academic departments, and shall be approved to teach in the program by the person’s academic department or departments and the coordinator, director or chair of the academic program. Upon approval of the voting members of an academic program, membership may also be granted to individuals who do not teach in the program but have research, service or other interests.

11.02 Voting Rights

The Program may establish bylaws which grant others voting rights. These bylaws should clearly lay out the grounds for both initial and continuing membership in the program.
11.03 Jurisdiction and Responsibilities

Academic programs may fall under one of the following jurisdictions: a) within one or more academic departments, b) under the direction of the Office of Academic and Student Affairs, c) in collaboration with Academic Affairs and a department or d) as autonomous curricular units that do not have departmental status. In collaboration with the appropriate academic departments, academic programs shall be responsible for maintenance of standards regarding curriculum and teaching personnel within the program. They shall develop and maintain an appropriate curriculum of courses, advise participating departments, the Senate and campus collegium on curriculum within the program, search and screen all candidates for appointment to teach in the program, and regularly evaluate all program members. No appointment, renewal, or promotion may be made regarding faculty or instructional staff of the program, and no one shall teach a credit course in the program’s curriculum, without the approval of the appropriate academic program and appropriate academic department. Academic departments shall provide oversight of academic programs that are housed within one or more departments and shall have final authority regarding courses and instructors within their jurisdiction that are also part of an academic program. Academic programs that are autonomous curricular units without departmental status shall have final authority regarding courses and instructors within their jurisdiction.

11.04 Directors and Coordinators and Chairs of Academic Programs

Each academic program shall have a chair, coordinator or director. For academic programs under the jurisdiction of the Office of Academic and Student Affairs, the coordinator or director is appointed by the Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs. For academic programs administered by one or more departments, the coordinator or director is selected by the chancellor or the chancellor’s designee from among the tenured faculty members participating in the program, following a preferential ballot by all voting members of the program. Academic programs that are autonomous curricular units without departmental status shall have a chair, director or coordinator selected by the chancellor or the chancellor’s designee from among the tenured faculty members participating in the program, following a preferential ballot by all voting members of the program. If the chancellor does not choose the person nominated by the program, he/she shall request that the program make another nomination. Chairs, coordinators or directors shall oversee program curriculum and curricular activities, shall be the spokesperson for the program and shall be responsible for maintenance of program records, for the calling of program meetings, and for such other duties as may be delegated by the program or the chancellor.

11.05 Committees

Each academic program shall have as many committees as it deems necessary to formulate recommendations to the department, the Senate, the campuses, the campus deans, the chancellor, or other individuals or groups. An executive or coordinating committee, which shall have responsibility for curriculum, teaching appointments and evaluation of instructors, shall be established by each academic program.
11.06 Meetings

Each academic program shall hold at least one meeting per semester. Meetings of academic programs may exceed one per semester with the approval of the chancellor.

11.07 Bylaws

Each academic program shall develop and maintain written bylaws specifying the policies and procedures to be followed by the program. Bylaws for academic programs that address teaching and research needs in a sub-discipline within one academic department may have bylaws that are part of the departmental bylaws. Interdisciplinary academic programs will have a unique set of bylaws. Bylaws will be written and maintained by members of the academic program.

11.08 Creation and Termination of Academic Programs

A new academic program can be established upon identification by the faculty, senate and chancellor of the need to a) address teaching and research needs in a sub-discipline within an academic department, b) coordinate curricula, teaching and research that are multi- or interdisciplinary in nature and, therefore, require expertise from two or more departments, c) address specialized instructional needs that do not fall within the jurisdiction or expertise of existing departments or d) provide instruction, research and service in emerging academic disciplines that may, in the future, become academic departments. Academic programs may be terminated upon recognition by the faculty, senate and chancellor that the program no longer addresses teaching, research and/or service needs of the UW Colleges. The Senate shall establish procedures for the development, approval and termination of academic programs.

11.09 Status of Programs Existing Prior to This Amendment

Academic programs existing prior to the adoption of this amendment shall have one year to comply with constitutional requirements.
Background and Rationale
A new Constitutional amendment creating Chapter 11 – Academic Programs has been introduced. This requires changing the existing Chapter 11 – Amendments to Chapter 12 – Amendments.

Proposed amendments are in strikethrough and red, bold, underline and italics font.

UW Colleges Constitution
Chapter 12 - Amendments

Approved by the UW Board of Regents 9/10/93
Revision adopted by the Senate April 24, 2009
Revision adopted by the Senate (SSC) 2014-03-14

12.00 Amendments

Amendments to this constitution may be initiated by a majority vote of the Senate or by a majority vote of at least one-half of the campus collegia. These proposed amendments must be submitted to the Senate and distributed to each campus collegium for discussion at the meeting prior to the one at which the ratification vote will be taken. These amendments are adopted/ratified upon a two thirds vote of the Senate, following a majority vote of at least two-thirds of the campus collegia and become effective upon approval of the chancellor.

[End]
Background and Rationale
At the January 22, 2014 meeting, the Senate adopted an amendment to Chapter 4 of the UW-Colleges Constitution providing authority to create new departments and enabling the Senate to develop policy governing the process of creating new departments. This proposed policy provides the procedure for the creation of new departments.

UW Colleges Senate Policy
Institutional Policy #408
Procedure for the Creation of New Departments

I. Origination and Authority Line of Petitions for Recognition as a Department

UW Colleges Constitution requires that departments be recognized by the faculty, chancellor, and board of regents.

A. The petition to become a department must originate from a group of faculty.

1. The group of faculty seeking departmental status will petition the Senate Steering Committee for departmental recognition. SSC will steer the proposal to the Senate Curriculum, Academic Policy, Faculty Professional Standards and Senate Assessment committees for review.

2. The petition will be presented to the Senate as an introduction for voting. If approved, the introduced petition will be sent for review by the faculty of the UW Colleges campus collegia.

3. Upon receipt of commentary from the collegia, the petition will be voted on by the full senate for adoption.

4. If adopted, the petition will be forwarded to the Chancellor for review. If approved, the Chancellor forwards the petition to the Board of Regents.

5. Approval by the Board of Regents establishes the new department. Since UW System policy ACIS 1.0 delegates the role of the board of regents in approving new departments to the chancellor, the chancellor will have final authority in approving new departments.

II. Information to be Included in Petitions for Departmental Status
Chapter 4 of the UW Colleges Constitution requires that departments consist of faculty that deal with a common field of knowledge or have a common or closely related disciplinary or interdisciplinary interest.

A. Petitions for departmental status will describe the common field of knowledge or disciplinary/interdisciplinary interest.

1. The topics addressed by the proposed department through teaching, research and service will be described.
2. If the proposed department is interdisciplinary, the petition will describe what disciplines are involved and how they contribute to teaching, research and service within the proposed department.

B. Petitions for departmental status will describe the group of faculty that will constitute the new department.

1. The faculty or faculty lines that will constitute the new department will be identified.
2. Faculty workload will be addressed by the petition along with the credit divisor for establishing IAS workload.
3. The petition will describe how the education, teaching, research and service of each faculty or faculty line (position?) addresses the common field of knowledge or closely related disciplinary or interdisciplinary interest of the proposed department.
4. Petitions will indicate if new faculty or faculty lines are required to address the following conditions:

   a. Current faculty or faculty lines do not address all aspects of the common field of knowledge or disciplinary or interdisciplinary interest of the proposed department.
   b. Current staffing will not provide departmental representation on all UWC campuses.

5. Petitions will describe the role of Instructional Academic Staff in the proposed department.
6. Petitions will describe any roles, impacts on and needs for participation of University Staff.
7. Petitions will address the following issues regarding faculty appointments:

   a. The number of faculty appointments, if any, that will be housed only in the proposed department.
   b. The number of faculty appointments, if any, that will be housed in two or more departments.
c. **The number of faculty appointments, if any, that will be moved from existing departments to the proposed department.**
d. **A description of how the establishment of the new department will impact current faculty teaching loads and assignments, research and service within existing departments will be included.**
e. **A description of how the establishment of the new department will impact faculty teaching loads and assignments, research and service on the campuses will be included.**

**C. Courses/Curriculum**

1. **Petitions will describe the curriculum, either existing or in development, and relate the curriculum to the common field of knowledge or disciplinary or interdisciplinary interest of the faculty.**
2. **Petitions will include a list of courses and course descriptions of existing or planned courses that will be offered by the new department.**
3. **Cross-listed courses, both current and proposed, must conform to Chapter 4: Departments of UWC Constitution, specifically section 4.03: Jurisdiction and Responsibilities and Institutional Curricular Policy #101.02: Curriculum Guidelines section VII A. 2.**
4. **Petitions will indicate how courses will transfer to other UW System institutions.**

**D. Bylaws will be submitted with the petition, and should address departmental requirements as outlined in Chapter 4 of the Constitution.**

**E. Petitions will describe how the new department fulfills needs that are not addressed by current departments or programs, and will address the following:**

1. **Demonstration of academic need. Petitions will include a description of teaching and research needs that are not met by current departments that the proposed department will fulfill. A demonstration of academic need may also consider how the proposed department will contribute to other academic programs/disciplines, increasing bachelor degrees in Wisconsin, FLEX degree options and inclusive excellence.**
2. **Petitions will describe how the proposed department contributes to workforce development, including career paths for students, economic development and non-economic benefits.**
3. **A description of how the proposed department contributes to the UW Colleges’ mission of access and The Wisconsin Idea will be included.**
4. **Projected enrollments will be included.**
F. **Budgetary considerations will be addressed, including any new funding requirements, contributions to revenue streams at the campus and UW Colleges levels and a description of long-term financial commitments to be imposed on campuses, the UW Colleges and the UW System.**

[End]
Attachment 17

UW Colleges Senate
Adoption: October 24, 2014
Proposed Revision of Institutional Policy #405
(“Senate Procedures”)

Background and Rationale
Given the space requirements for these documents and the fact that they are already being kept electronically with backup, there is good reason to migrate storage to an all-electronic format.

Proposed revisions are in strikethrough.

UW Colleges Senate Policy
General Institutional Policy #405
Senate Procedures

Revised by the Senate March 6, 2009
Revised by the Senate January 13, 2010
Revised by the Senate (SSC) 2013-10-25
Revised by the SSC 2013-12-13

E. Distribution of Senate Minutes

Senate Minutes, May 5, 1973, p.2
Senate Minutes, April 19, 1974, p.1
Senate Minutes, October 11, 1974, p.5
Ratified by the Senate - May 16-17, 1980, p.1
Adopted revision - March 11, 1989, app. 5.
Revision ratified by the Senate, May 13, 1989, p.4, app. .5
Revision ratified by the Senate, May 3, 2002, p. ___
Revision adopted by the Senate, January 21, 2004

Senate Minutes shall be kept in hard copy at the Central Office.

Copies of draft and approved Senate Minutes shall be posted in the appropriate electronic files of the institution, with notification via email to UWC-ALL within three weeks after each meeting.

[End]
Background and Rationale
With the oncoming extinction of Public Folders we need to adjust the bylaws regarding proper electronic posting and storage of minutes.

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

1.0 Committee Minutes and Annual Reports

All Senate committees, except the appeals and grievances committees, shall post their minutes in a timely manner in Public Folders the appropriate electronic files of the institution. Each Senate committee shall submit an annual report to the Senate Steering Committee Chair as requested by the Chair prior to the last Senate meeting of the academic year, typically no later than April 30. These annual reports shall be published as appendices of the Senate minutes of the last meeting of the academic year.
Rationale:
In academic year 2013-2014, SAPC was charged with drafting policy for the approval of department bylaws, clarifying the process, protocol, and authority for the timely approval of such bylaws. The Senate voted to adopt the original Bylaw Approval Policy on April 25, 2014. In that policy, SAPC decided that administrative oversight is solely responsible for ensuring that bylaws and department policies are not in violation of state or federal laws, or UW System or UW Colleges policy. This language was thought to mirror best practices at other UW System institutions. However, the chancellor did not approve the policy as written, raising concerns that limiting bylaw disapproval to legal and/or policy reasons placed the Colleges and/or individual campuses at risk of inadvertent financial/budgetary/personnel consequences. The current revision includes language addressing the chancellor’s specific concerns, adding unreasonable budgetary, personnel, and/or workload obligations as further reasons for administrative nullification of proposed department bylaws.

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

UW Colleges Senate Policy
General Institutional Policy #407
Approval of Departmental Bylaws

Adopted by the Senate (SAPC) 2014-04-25
Returned unapproved with suggested revisions by Interim Chancellor Aaron Brower 2014-05-16

I. As part of effective governance, each department or functional equivalent shall have developed and approved a set of bylaws.

II. To ensure that each department has adequate bylaws which conform to Senate policy and to form a consistent governance structure, completed bylaws will be sent to the Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee for approval.

A. The Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee will not nullify policy that is in compliance with state and federal law, UW System and UW Colleges policy. Specifically, bylaws must not:

   A. The Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee shall nullify bylaws that are not in compliance with state and federal law, UW System and UW Colleges policy. The Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee may nullify bylaws that have budgetary, workload, and personnel implications. Specifically, bylaws must not:
1. Contradict state or federal regulations, UW System, and UW Colleges institutional policies.

2. Restrict the prerogatives of members and faculty or staff in an illegal manner.

3. **Commit an academic department, a campus, an academic program, or the institution to unreasonable budgetary, personnel or staff/faculty workload obligations without the documented consent of that unit.**

B. If the Chancellor or the Chancellor’s designee finds that individual component(s) of the bylaw or policy are problematic, those particular components will be sent back to the department for review and revision. The Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee will provide a written response that includes the specific policy or policies that the bylaw changes violate. In cases where individual components are problematic, the remaining bylaws or changes to existing bylaws will be approved and enforced while the problematic components are reviewed.

II. Timeline for adopting and changing departmental bylaws:

A. Upon adoption of a change to bylaws or policy, the department will send these adoptions to the Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee within thirty days.

B. Within thirty days, the Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee will review the bylaws for consistency with federal and state regulations, UW System and UW Colleges policies. It will make recommendations for revision if necessary.

1. If the Chancellor or the Chancellor’s designee does not act within thirty days, the bylaws will go into effect.

2. If the Chancellor or the Chancellor’s designee requires more time for a review, the Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee must notify the department or functional equivalent within thirty days and must provide a reasonable timeframe that should not exceed ninety days.

[End]
Rationale:
Due to a new ruling from the state’s Attorney General’s Office regarding the private personnel status of results from Student Surveys of Instruction, UW System Legal Services has requested we alter language we use in our standard instructions read to students when administering the SSI. We are removing the statement that the results become a “public document” so as to avoid potential confusion that SSI results are a public document subject to open records requests. SSI results are now interpreted to be private documents for personnel decision purposes.

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

IV. Procedures
Revised by the Senate (SAPC) 2013-04-26

A. For Face-to-Face and Blended Instruction

1. Packets of survey 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 #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.

4. Central Office will make an electronic copy of the forms and be responsible for their distribution to respective department chairs. Campuses, after final grades have been submitted, shall distribute results to individual faculty. The original forms, following processing, shall be retained by Central Office for six months. The statistical results shall be maintained in a permanent personnel file for each instructor.

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 assignment is conducted or 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.

6. Each faculty member shall 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.

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 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.*

8. The only attachments accompanying the student forms will be the instruction sheet and, where applicable, a sheet listing additional questions.
B. For Online Instruction

Added by the Senate (SAPC) 2013-04-26

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 #301.01.

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 this document 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.

   [...]
Rationale:
Continuing Education provides a variety of programs directly related to community interests and workforce development. Some programs can be directly targeted to specific knowledge or skill sets and can occur in a shorter period of classroom instruction than allowed by current non-credit certificate policy. Current policy states that non-credit certificates are based on “continuing education courses, credit courses, or related activities comparable to the requirements for the credit certificate.” This language raises concern that the coupling of non-credit certificate requirements to credit certificate requirements is overly restrictive and inflexible. This prevents Continuing Education from developing non-credit certificates directly targeted to specific community needs. The revisions below introduce more flexibility by de-coupling the non-credit certificate requirements from the credit certificate requirements.

UW Colleges Senate Policy
Institutional Curricular Policy #103
UW Colleges Certificate Program

Adopted March 3, 2000
Reorganized and Renumbered 3/15/02
Revised by the SSC 2013-02-25
Revised by the Senate (SAPC) 2013-04-26

I. Definitions
A. A "certificate program" is defined as a designated cluster of interrelated courses or continuing education units from multiple disciplines or perspectives with a theme or focus.

B. A "credit certificate program" consists of a cluster of credit courses that are part of the regular curriculum offered at a UW Colleges campus.

C. A "non-credit certificate program" consists of continuing education course work and may have additional requirements or related activities.

II. Requirements
A. For the "credit certificate":
   1. A minimum of 15 credits.

   2. Up to 3 credits can be transferred into a certificate from institutions outside the UW Colleges.

   3. A grade of C or better for all the credit courses.
B. For the "non-credit certificate":
   1. Continuing education courses, credit courses, or related activities that meet the academic, workforce and/or other community needs addressed by the specific certificate comparable to the requirements for the credit certificate.

III. Implementation

A. A program can be proposed and offered by a single campus, but there can be only one institutional certificate in each area. Each campus may replicate the certificate cluster once it is approved. Minor revisions in a certificate program may be made due to campus specific options, with approval of the Provost.

B. The credit certificate program will be available to all students.

C. Certificate courses should be offered on a regular basis so those students may plan appropriately to complete the program. Delivery of courses with technology should be considered to make availability more widespread.

D. The assistant campus dean for student affairs will be responsible for certifying the completion of credit certificate programs. The campus outreach program coordinator will be responsible for certifying the completion of non-credit certificate programs.

E. Upon completion of the credit certificate, a notation of completion will be placed on the student's academic transcript by the Registrar’s Office.

F. Students completing either certificate will receive a document of recognition.

IV. Approval Process

A. A credit certificate proposal will be prepared by a campus dean in consultation with the campus curriculum committee and the relevant academic chairs. It should then be submitted to the UW Colleges Curriculum Committee for its recommendation to the Provost, who will make the final decision.

B. A non-credit certificate proposal will be prepared by a campus dean in consultation with the campus outreach program coordinator. It should then be submitted to the UW Colleges Continuing Education Director for his/her recommendation to the Provost, who will make the final decision.

[End]
Attachment 22

UW Colleges Faculty Council
Adoption: October 24, 2014

Proposed Revision of Faculty Personnel Policy #508
(“Policy on Ineffective or Inactive Performance”)

**Background and Rationale**

This proposed change is to specify that a written Correction Action Plan be developed in cases of alleged ineffective or inactive performance by a tenured faculty member. This plan will then guide evaluation of progress to correct the case of ineffective or inactive performance. This plan will clearly spell out required actions of the faculty member to said faculty member. This change is proposed for the benefit of the faculty member. The other change in this proposal is to grant authority to either campus dean or department chairperson to take cases to the provost when either suspect that actions to correct the problem have failed. The provost then becomes the final judge in the case.

Proposed changes are in bold, red, underlined italics.

---

UW Colleges Senate Policy
Faculty Personnel Policy #508
Policy on Ineffective or Inactive Performance

Reorganized and Renumbered March 15, 2002

A. All faculty of the UW Colleges have a responsibility to maintain the quality of teaching, professional growth and university and community service required by the faculty member’s department and campus.

B. Faculty generally fulfill this responsibility well in their various ways. However, a faculty member may fail in this responsibility as shown through a pattern of ineffective effort or inactivity.

C. The deans of UW Colleges campuses and chairs of academic departments jointly have the primary and continuing annual responsibility for initially identifying possible patterns of ineffective or inactive performance. There can be no checklist for judging whether such a pattern may exist. Rather, standards of "reasonableness" should prevail.

D. If a dean or chair identifies such a possibility, then they shall jointly decide upon an initial course of action to determine the extent of the problem. Following a verbal communication by the department chair or dean to the faculty member that a concern may exist, various steps may be taken. For example, appropriate actions may include but shall not be limited to peer class visitations and evaluations and/or contacts with former students. If the dean and chair are satisfied that a problem does exist then they shall consult first with the provost, and then with the faculty member to decide upon a positive and remedial course of action to resolve the problem. The course of action
should, if possible, include faculty renewal and development measures rather than punitive measures. This course of action shall be specified in a written Action Plan, including an appropriate timeline for completion, and shall be shared with the faculty member, the campus dean, and the department chairperson. The dean and department chair shall involve the relevant campus and departmental committees as appropriate.

E. If the dean and/or chair jointly conclude that remedial efforts to resolve the problem are not successful, the dean and/or department chair, in consultation with their appropriate faculty committees, shall submit the matter to the Chancellor by either (1) filing a formal complaint recommending specific courses of action, or (2) requesting an informal investigation under the provisions of UWS 4.01 (Dismissal for Cause).

F. A pattern of ineffectiveness or inactivity in a faculty member is grounds for discipline under section UWS 6.01 or dismissal for cause under section UWS 4.01, Wis. Adm. Code.

G. Merely being identified for review, as exhibiting a possible pattern of ineffective or inactive performance, cannot in itself be grounds for a formal grievance by the faculty member.

H. Throughout these processes, campus deans and department chairs shall keep adequate records.

[End]
The Faculty Professional Standards Committee has one item up for adoption consideration today by the faculty council of senators. This is a proposed revision of FPP508 to add a written Plan of Action in cases where department chair and campus dean have agreed a faculty member has slipped to a level of ineffective or inactive performance. This corrective plan of action will detail steps to be taken to correct the problem and avoid possible action of termination, and the plan will be shared with the faculty member in question. As well, this revision then allows for further pursuit of action if either the dean or the department chair is unsatisfied with progress on the action plan.

The committee is working on a comprehensive review of the merit review policies. This review has led us to identify at least five areas of concern. (1) We have found the policy, as currently written, to be problematically vague in language regarding the balance of expected performance between teaching, professional development, and service. We have found that due to the vague language in the current policy, some interpret professional development work of more importance than service work while others interpret service work equal to professional development. Then there is disagreement over the level of importance of teaching compared to the other two components of faculty work. (2) While the current policy calls for department chairs and campus deans to provide faculty with the criteria to be used in the next year for determining merit rankings, few faculty actually receive such notification and those that do find the criteria provided to be vague and of little guidance for improving work quality or for proper presentation of work efforts within the Activity Report. (3) There is concern amongst department chairs and amongst faculty over the non-descriptive nature of the “Meritorious” ranking of at least 60% of faculty. This large rank includes too broad a range of performance. Faculty with high levels of performance who did not make the cut for a highly meritorious ranking are placed in the same category as faculty providing just enough performance to not be ranked “Unsatisfactory”. (4) The current merit review policy contains potentials for gender bias favoring male faculty over female faculty. The reliance on both scores and written comments from the SSI as indicators of teaching performance introduces strong potentials for bias tending to advance male instructors over female instructors. This level of bias does not suggest we eliminate use of the SSI, but it does challenge us to use other additional evaluation tools. Another form of bias may enter the process in balancing the other non-teaching aspects of work for faculty. Research has clearly shown that female faculty tend to do a much larger percentage of the service work needed from faculty members, leaving male faculty members more time to devote to research work and other professional development activities. This further calls for a balance in consideration of PD work product with Service work product. (5) There is concern that the current formula for dividing the pool of raise funds across categories of merit rankings may produce too little a differentiation to provide incentive to strive for higher merit status. The typical merit raise differs by a few hundred dollars between the 60+% who receive “Meritorious” rankings and the few who receive the top ranking of “Exceptionally Meritorious”.

It is our intention to provide a mechanism by which any and all merit review committees can consistently evaluate faculty and Instructional Academic Staff. The FPSC is consulting with
other committees, including Senate Budget and the Special Committee on Merit Distribution, to look at potential needs to adjust the formula for distribution of merit raise funds, the potential need to add additional merit ranking levels to express levels of success below those levels eligible for higher percentages of merit raise funds (sub-divisions of the meritorious ranking, and the potential need to specify in policy the standards of performance to achieve each level of merit ranking. It is our hope that discussions later today and during the leaders’ retreat will provide direction for creation of a few plans for faculty and others to consider prior to the January meetings. We appreciate the need to get this right, and we hope we can achieve revisions by the end of the academic year.

The committee’s work to create a unified policy covering the various forms of grievances and appeals now scattered across policies in the UW Colleges continues. This unified policy will spell out needed differences, as well as common procedures. It will then charge each respective committee to develop its own procedural guidelines. In this process, we have been working with central office personnel and UW System Legal to be sure the unified policy is consistent with state law and with UW System policy. This action will simplify language in the constitution and add details in the senate policies.

Respectfully submitted,
Ron Gulotta
Chairperson, Faculty Professional Standards Committee
The Faculty Professional Standards Committee brings to you our work to date on a revision of the Merit Policy, FPP#503. Senate Steering charged our committee over a year ago to look into the merit policy as a beginning to reviewing areas where gender bias might be institutionalized in our policies and procedures. Special concern was drawn to the use of the SSI in evaluating teaching performance for merit. There was further concern this may also impact tenure and promotion decisions, but addressing the potential problems in merit was viewed as a good start. The committee is well aware of some levels of gender bias with use of data, both quantitative and qualitative, from the SSI, but we do not recommend ending the use of this data. Attachment #1 contains a brief review of some key literature on the issue of gender bias and the SSI. More on this later.

Taking the charge from senate steering, we turned our attention to a comprehensive review of the policy. Our attention focused on three key issues: (a) there was a lack of specificity on the balance of ratings between the three elements of teaching, professional development, and service; (b) there was a lack of following the requirement that criteria for merit reviews be published and shared annually; and (c) there were questions regarding the percentages of faculty rated at each level, with specific concern that 60% or more of faculty all receive the same rating, regardless of differences within the Meritorious category. We feel all three of these issues need to be addressed and we are concerned the first two provide opportunity for gendered differences in merit rankings. Such opportunities, where possible, should be removed. We further find that these three areas of concern combine to create a fourth concern. To far too many faculty members the merit ranking process appears to be too arbitrary and open to non-performance issues, like popularity, familiarity, and desire to retain. The lack of clearly stated criteria for selection into each rank of merit adds to potential for those so ranked to question the decision and allows those assigning merit ranks too much room for subjective interpretations unevenly applied to those being ranked.

A.) The current policy only states that teaching is the primary category for merit determination. Our practice of pay for Instructional Academic Staff would seem to indicate that teaching
comprises 80% of our workload, but we have never quantified this, nor have we quantified what percentage of merit ranking should be based on teaching performance. This lack of specificity, we fear, allows merit rankers to consider the teaching of one faculty member differently than the teaching of another. We are also concerned that it does not send a clear message to faculty or the outside world of the value our institution places on teaching. **We recommend that specification be added to the policy.**

The current policy then only lists the other two areas for merit consideration – professional development and teaching. During our gathering of comments from across the Colleges, we learned that some have interpreted the placement of PD before service as an indication that PD is of greater value in merit rankings, and other personnel decisions. This actually has been shown to give a gender preference to male faculty, as female faculty do a disproportionate amount of service work. **We recommend that these two elements of merit consideration be given equal consideration.**

B.) The current policy charges deans and department chairs to share with faculty the criteria for merit considerations to be used in the next year. This seems wise as it allows a faculty member to more clearly address those matters the committee will consider during deliberations. We found a few examples of this being done. Attachment #2 is a copy of such a set of documents from the Fond du Lac campus. We also found many more departments and campuses which failed to follow through on this requirement. This could be remedied by simply calling on all to more closely follow the policy in practice, and the FPSC would find this a welcomed change. However, we also note that criteria from campus to campus can vary, as they can from department to department, with no clear core of criteria. Another problem is that the criteria can too easily change from one cycle to the next. The FPSC believes there needs to be a common core of criteria which still allows for some needed variations between departments, perhaps even between campuses, if a strong case can be made for such variation. Specifying our criteria for merit ranking, we believe, is a much needed exercise in defining who we are as faculty in the UW Colleges. We believe such documentation would assist faculty in meeting true goals of success and make more clear deliberations between faculty members of differing merit rankings. **We suggest as a mechanism to provide the consistency for which we ask that the policy call for the establishment and sharing of a set of common goals and rubrics by which a faculty member might achieve Meritorious, Highly Meritorious, or Exceptionally Meritorious**
rankings for each target goal. (See attachment #3, a sample rubric for one form of service. Similar rubrics would be developed for each goal of service, professional development, and teaching.) **We further recommend the policy charge the creation of a committee to create, and then maintain these common goals and rubrics.** We see this as very similar to the methods used at UW Fond du Lac.

C.) We have held many debates amongst ourselves and have heard these debates shared by many across the faculty over the value of conducting the merit review process when it has so seldom been used over the past decade in determining pay raises. The process is frustrating when the only value is as an annual review of performance. This annual review is weakened in value when 60% or more faculty members receive the same ranking of Meritorious without clear indication of how close or far one is from the Highly Meritorious rank. We understand that inclusion of too many faculty members in the upper rankings would create too small a differential in raise. We believe a review of the percentage divisions is needed, but we find a more urgent need for separation of some form among the majority who receive a rating of Meritorious. **This could be accomplished by adding additional sub-ranks of the meritorious rank, all of whom would receive the same share of merit raise funds.** Alternatively, this could be accomplished by providing a score for each faculty member and a report of the cut-off score for entrance into each higher ranking. This score could also provide feedback to the faculty member on specific areas of strength and weakness as part of the final score.

D.) Subjectivity is a real concern. The fact that those being ranked are left with so little concrete information as to how they differed from those receiving other rankings increases the perception of subjectivity and this diminishes the utility of merit rankings. This needs to be addressed. It is also true that the absence of clear and evenly applied criteria for the rankings allows for too much subjective influence in the ranking process. I am reminded of a famous claim by a former US Attorney General who sought to make a fight against pornography a center point of his tenure as AG. He claimed he could not clearly define what pornography was, but he knew it when he saw it. Such a claim is highly subjective and this is problematic. So, too, is the notion that any faculty member can clearly distinguish a highly meritorious faculty member from a meritorious one. In the absence of clear criteria for selection, other non-performance issues too easily become the basis for decisions and performance issues are only used after the fact to justify a subjective ranking. **Somehow we need the policy to specify means of selection which**
focus on performance issues and not on familiarity or popularity. We recommend the faculty strongly consider a measureable system for determining merit rankings. A measurement system is not perfect, nor completely free of subjectivity, but it should provide fewer opportunities for non-performance issues affecting merit rankings, and it would provide a final measure reportable to each faculty member so she/he could compare to norms and ranges.

We are still at the stage of gathering faculty members’ opinions on how best to revise the Merit policy. We now present to you a draft version of a revised merit policy, incomplete as we accept it currently is. (See attachment #4)

Please note that the revisions call for a specified breakdown between the three areas of performance of 70-15-15, as this was the choice of the senate in a straw vote taken last spring. Department chairs who have given me feedback to date do not like the breakdown. Some want no specified breakdown. We ask again of you senators for your opinions – should there be a specified % breakdown, and if so, what ought to be this scale?

Please note that we maintain use of SSI data as part of teaching evaluation, but we call on a much more broad evaluation based on evidence presented in the Activity Report, guided and judged by the goals and rubrics established by the faculty. We note that to truly address gender bias, those creating the rubrics and those judging based on those rubrics need to be trained on the potentials for gender bias and strategies for avoiding unconscious forms of bias.

Please also note that we call for the creation and use of rubrics for specified goals. We seek your feedback on this addition to the policy.

Our goal today is to get feedback from faculty senators. We will then draw up a narrowed, targeted set of questions to ask of all faculty and administrators in a survey. The survey results, we hope, will guide the committee in drafting a final proposal with reasonable chance of passage.

Respectfully submitted by
Ron Gulotta, Ph.D. Sociology
Chairperson of Senate Faculty Professional Standards Committee
On Behalf of the FPSC
John A. Centra
Noreen B. Gaubatz

Is There Gender Bias in Student Evaluations of Teaching?

Copyright © 2000 by The Ohio State University

It should be noted these authors are academics of higher ed and may be biased towards supporting institutional practices. They conclude there is some gender bias amounting to 10% difference in scores, but argue this is not substantial to criticize SSI or effect differences in faculty ratings. For this a difference of 20% in scores would be needed. Of note is their finding that students of the same sex as the evaluated instructor rated the instructor more highly than did students of opposite sex. What they did not stress is the data which showed the ratings by males of female instructors were much less favorable than the ratings by females of male instructors.

RICHARD L. DUKES AND GAY VICTORIA*
*University of Colorado at Colorado Springs*

THE EFFECTS OF GENDER, STATUS, AND EFFECTIVE TEACHING ON THE EVALUATION OF COLLEGE INSTRUCTION


Overall, the results showed that the components of teaching which were manipulated in this study explained fairly high percentages of the variation in teaching EFFECTIVENESS (ORGANIZATION, 51 percent; ENTHUSIASM, 72 percent; KNOWLEDGE, 72 percent; and RAPPORT, 51 percent). Furthermore, the results showed that the variables of GENDER OF PROFESSOR, GENDER OF SUBJECT, and CHAIR explained only about one percent of the variation in EFFECTIVENESS. The quality of teaching overwhelmed these other variables.

Joey Sprague2,3 and Kelley Massoni2

Student Evaluations and Gendered Expectations:
What We Can’t Count Can Hurt Us!
*Sex Roles, Vol. 53, Nos. 11/12, December 2005 (C _ 2005)*

Does teacher’s gender impact students’ evaluations? We critically evaluated the research literature and concluded that the form gender bias takes may not be easily detectible by quantitative scales. To explore this possibility, we did a qualitative analysis of the words that 288
college students at two campuses used to describe their best- and worst-ever teachers. Although we found considerable overlap in the ways that students talked about their male and female teachers, we also saw indications that students hold teachers accountable to certain gendered expectations. These expectations place burdens on all teachers, but the burdens on women are more labor-intensive. We also saw signs of much greater hostility toward women than toward men who do not meet students’ gendered expectations.

Susan A. Basow
Lafayette College

Student Evaluations of College Professors: When Gender Matters

*Journal of Educational Psychology*

1995, Vol. 87, No. 4, 656-665

In summary, this study demonstrates the complexity of gender variables when they operate in a naturalistic setting. Main effect comparisons, which examine only whether male and female faculty receive different overall ratings, distort the picture of how and when gender variables matter in student ratings. It is important to examine teacher gender along with such factors as student gender, the discipline of the course, and the specific questions on the form. In general, the current results suggest that male faculty are perceived and evaluated similarly by their male and female students, whereas female faculty tend to be evaluated differently, depending on the divisional affiliation of the course. Female faculty tend to be rated highly by their female students, especially in the humanities, but less positively by their male students, especially in the social sciences. Certain questions show more gender effects than others: Male faculty are almost always rated higher on questions of knowledge; female faculty are generally rated higher on questions of respect, sensitivity, and student freedom to express ideas, although female students tend to think so even more than do male students; and female teachers tend to be rated relatively low by male students on thought stimulation, appropriate speech, fairness, nonrepetition, and overall rating. Although the effect sizes are small overall and may not be present at all institutions, these issues can be more than academic; individual personnel decisions are regularly made and based in part on student ratings of professors. Instructors whose particularities (e.g., gender, gender of students, teaching style, gender-typed personality characteristics, and discipline) all are correlated negatively with student ratings may be particularly affected. Anyone using student evaluations should have a sophisticated understanding of how gender variables may operate in such ratings.
Scholars Take Aim at Student Evaluations’ ‘Air of Objectivity’

By Dan Berrett
Article from the Chronicle of Higher Education

Student course evaluations are often misused statistically and shed little light on the quality of teaching, two scholars at the University of California at Berkeley argue in the draft of a new paper.

"We’re confusing consumer satisfaction with product value," Philip B. Stark, a professor of statistics at Berkeley, said in an interview.

"An Evaluation of Course Evaluations," which he wrote with Richard Freishtat, senior consultant at Berkeley’s Center for Teaching and Learning, lays out a mathematical critique of the evaluations and describes an alternative vision for analyzing and improving teaching. Even though evaluations have become ubiquitous in academe, they remain controversial because they often assume a high-stakes role in determining tenure and promotion. But they persist because they are easy to produce, administer, and tabulate, Mr. Stark said. And because they are based on Likert scales whose results can be added and averaged, he said, they offer the comfort of a number. But it is a false kind of security. "Averages of numerical student ratings have an air of objectivity," the authors write, "simply because they are numerical."

Some of what Mr. Stark and Mr. Freishtat write repeats critiques by other researchers: that evaluations often reflect snap judgments or biases about an instructor’s gender, ethnicity, or attractiveness; and that they fail to adequately capture teaching quality. While economists, education researchers, psychologists, and sociologists have weighed in on the use and misuse of these tools, it is relatively unusual for a statistician to do so.

Mr. Stark and Mr. Freishtat find fault with the mathematics underlying the evaluations. Response rates, for example, often vary widely and can bias the results.

The authors are also troubled by the common practice of averaging and comparing scores. Such a practice presumes that a five on a seven-point scale means the same thing to different students, or that a rating of a three somehow balances with a seven to mean the same thing as two fives.

"For teaching evaluations, there is no reason any of those things should be true," they write. "Such averages and comparisons make no sense, as a matter of statistics." (emphasis added)

What Students Can Judge

Student course evaluations have their defenders, who argue that students’ experience in the classroom can offer useful information.
Mr. Stark doesn’t dispute that. Instead of averaging the scores, he suggests reporting their distribution and students’ response rates. A clustering of scores, in which a professor is commonly rated either a two or a seven, for example, might indicate that he or she is polarizing or perhaps good with particular kinds of students.

The authors also criticize evaluation questions that are too broad or ask students to cast judgments for which they are not equipped, such as whether the instructor was effective or the course was valuable.

Instead, Mr. Stark prefers to ask students about things on which they’re experts: Did you enjoy the class? Did you leave it more enthusiastic or less enthusiastic about the subject matter? Could you hear the instructor during lectures? Was the instructor’s handwriting legible?

"It’s totally valuable to ask them about their experience," he said, "but it’s not synonymous with good teaching."

Mindy S. Marks, an associate professor of economics at the University of California at Riverside, agrees that evaluations can often reflect bias in the minds of the students or fail to adequately capture the full range of students’ opinions. But she believes that the comments are often valuable and that the quantitative data can reflect how much students learn.

In a 2010 paper, she and her co-authors found a small but statistically significant relationship between students’ ratings of their instructors in a remedial mathematics course and how much their scores improved between a pretest and the final examination. The evaluation questions might not be perfect, she said, as students tend to see them as asking a broadly similar question.

"They read all the questions as ‘Did I like the professor?’" Ms. Marks said. And the resulting rating, she added, "does have a statistically significant relationship to learning."

Looking at the Classroom

To Mr. Stark, the evaluations as they are now used can paint only a limited picture. In the second part of his paper with Mr. Freishtat, he advocates a system of judging faculty members’ teaching that plays down the averaged scores on student evaluations.

Instead, the system adheres to a set of recommendations that are laid out in many policy handbooks but are seldom truly followed at large research universities, he said. It mirrors the system used by Berkeley’s statistics department, where Mr. Stark is chairman.

Candidates for tenure and promotion produce a teaching portfolio, syllabi, notes, websites, assignments, exams, videos, and statements on mentoring, along with students’ comments on course evaluations and their distribution.
Faculty members also visit one another’s classes and write reports.

"If we want to understand what’s going on in the classroom, we actually have to look at it," he said. "You can’t subcontract the evaluation of teaching to students."

These first four frequently cited studies, and others not here referenced demonstrate the subtlety of gender influence on SSI scores and the conflicting conclusions. My interpretation of such results is that gender, in some cases, does make a difference, therefore all SSI ratings are suspect and non-comparable. Gender needs to be considered in evaluating the meaning of SSI scores, along with the discipline being taught and the balance of male-female students in the class. It is not sufficient to say female sexed instructors need their SSI scores increased by some factor, for a few female instructors may benefit from having mostly female students in a female gendered discipline. On the other hand, some female instructors in masculine disciplines with predominantly male students might suffer great gender bias harm in relying heavily on SSI scores. Due to this complexity of impact of gendered ideas and of the sex of the students and instructors, I would find the comparison across a department or campus of SSI scores a risky business and an unreliable practice. Add to this the critique that the SSI score is flawed statistically due to layers of averaging involved, I find the SSI score an unreliable judge of teacher performance. I also call attention to the study by Sprague and Massoni which evaluated student written comments and found considerable bias in language used to speak about female instructors compared to male instructors. At the very least we need to instruct merit evaluators, when looking at written comments, to consider that the sex of student and instructor might have impact on comments being made by students.

The SSI score, when within close range to a median or mean score, is susceptible to gender bias impacts. An instructor with substantially higher or lower SSI scores probably reflects true differences in teacher effectiveness, but these differences in SSI scores are rather rare. Therefore, I see where some SSI score differences of large scale (more than 0.5 points) can be concluded to represent actual differences on performance, but scores differing by less could have some or all of the difference explained by gendered issues, not true performance differences. I also point out that measurements of style were more influential to student rankings than amount of knowledge gained or skill improvement. Students preferred instructors with more enthusiasm and organization in the classroom over ability to make a point and drive it home. I simply ask if our standards of quality teaching hold high value for enthusiasm and organization, or do we wish to assess effectiveness on other qualities?

On a positive note, what Stark advocates as a quality assessment of teaching effectiveness IS the practice in our institution during tenure decisions, but this practice mostly ends, save the fifth year reviews and promotional periods, after tenure has been granted.

As a final comment, perhaps the gender/sex bias will begin to swing in favor of female instructors in the years ahead given that more women students are entering and remaining in higher educational institutions.

Ron Gulotta, Ph.D., Sociology
UW-Waukesha
ron.gulotta@uwc.edu
1. **TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS**

   a. Teaching effectiveness may be supported, but is not limited to the following ways:

   i. *Displaying a vigorous commitment to teaching:*
      - Works to maintain a strong and current knowledge of the field.
      - Seeks out and develops innovative approaches to teaching.
      - Shares insights on teaching through presentations, workshops, or publications.
      - Serves as facilitator or evaluator of special student-initiated projects, service learning projects, or independent studies.

   ii. *Employing effective teaching strategies:*
      - Communicates high expectations.
      - Establishes good intellectual rapport with students.
      - Engages students in and out of the classroom in an active examination of the topic.
      - Conveys excitement about the material.
      - Fosters conceptual and critical thinking models and encourages an integrated view of knowledge.
      - Respects and responds to the diversity among students.

   iii. *Enabling notable achievements by present and former students.*

   b. Teaching Effectiveness Documentation
      The following are ways a faculty member might document meeting the above criteria.

   i. *Displaying a vigorous commitment to teaching:*
      - Inclusion of new material into a course reflecting changes in the discipline.
      - Use of new technologies within the classroom.
      - Development and participation in IS courses.
      - Development of new courses meeting changing student needs.
      - Giving talks or running workshops on teaching.
      - Attending conferences on teaching.
      - Reading teaching related publications and studies.
      - Receiving competitive teaching awards.
      - Writing textbook reviews.
      - Leading campus or Colleges discussions on teaching.
      - A brief written reflection on teaching that might include the underlying teaching goals behind any new techniques or innovations, how such goals were accomplished, and how they helped improve the quality of teaching.

   ii. *Employing effective teaching strategies:*
      - Student evaluations.
      - Conducting mid-semester assessments and making appropriate course adjustments.
      - Video tapes of classroom instruction and interactions (see #3b).

   iii. *Enabling notable achievements by present and former students.*
• Pre-test and post tests demonstrating student progress.
• Exceptional essays, papers, course projects.
• Assessment results
• Examples of feedback to students

2. **PROFESSIONAL GROWTH & SERVICE**

a. Professional Growth & Service may be supported, but is not limited to the following ways:
   i. Those activities listed in UW Colleges Faculty Personnel Policy #503 I.B.5.b.1 describing professional growth such as
      • Professional society participation.
      • Progress toward or attainment of a terminal degree.
      • Scholarly or professional publication, research, and presentations.
      • Course development
      • Discipline related performance,
      • Other types of professional creativity.
   ii. Non-teaching UW-System, UW-Colleges, Campus, and Department service.
   iii. Community Service in areas related to the faculty member's academic expertise or professional competence.

b. Documentation of Professional Growth & Service
   The following are ways a faculty member might document meeting the above criteria.
   • Listing of society membership, offices held, work conducted for the membership.
   • Courses taken to complete a degree
   • Copies or abstracts of publications
   • Summary of presentation including graphics or visual aids used
   • Summary of course development

3. **DOCUMENTATION COMMENTS**

a. All assertions on an FAR must be supported by reasonable evidence. For articles and conference presentations, this would mean, at a minimum, a citation of where the paper was presented or the article published.

b. There are no limits imposed on the amount of documentation. However, lengthy documentation should be accompanied by a clear and concise summary of the materials submitted.

c. Any teaching or professional growth activity noted in an FAR that involves compensation of any sort, an indication of that compensation should also be indicated in the FAR.

d. Faculty research and professional presentations and/or publications on pedagogy should be included in the professional growth category.

e. The campus committee is bound by individual Department policies in defining what activities count as community service.

f. Some activities might be “borderline”; possibly appropriate in more than one area. Faculty members are discouraged from listing activities in more than one area unless one of the areas is under Teaching Effectiveness. In this case, faculty can detail or document the activity in one area, but only reference it in the other.

g. Specific Department guidelines regarding where particular types of activities must be listed should be followed and then noted for the campus Evaluation Committee. Where department guidelines are not dispositive, the faculty member could also look to the primary audience or primary intent of the activity in order to determine the most appropriate category.
Sample Rubric for Service *(FPSC #3)*

**Service to UW-Colleges**
A faculty member shall provide service to the UW Colleges at the Institutional level.

**Meritorious** – Faculty member was a participating member of at least one committee or working group at the institutional level.

**Highly Meritorious** – Faculty member was a participating member of several committees or working groups at the institutional level and made considerable contribution to the work of at least one of these committees or working groups.

**Exceptionally Meritorious** - Faculty member was a participating member of several committees or working groups at the institutional level and made considerable contribution to the work of several of these committees or working groups.
The performance of every continuing faculty member will be reviewed annually by a committee of peers. This review will be based on evidence of teaching effectiveness, professional development, and professional service to the university and/or wider community. As a result of this review, each faculty member will be assigned to a merit category for the purpose of determining salary adjustments and provided with a brief written performance evaluation.

I. General Procedures
   Revised 1-13-2010

   A. 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.

   B. Merit Rankings

   1. Each year, the relevant committee will commence by determining whether each faculty member is satisfactorily meeting the basic expectations for the position. Individuals who receive an unsatisfactory rating shall not receive either across-the-board or merit salary increases.

   2. All faculty performing satisfactorily will then be separated into three categories: the majority will be in a group considered Meritorious; a smaller number will be judged to be Highly Meritorious; and a few may be judged to have earned Exceptional Merit for the two year period. The latter two groups together will include no more than 40% nor less than 25% of the faculty in the campus or department.

   C. Individual Performance Statements
Each faculty member will be provided with a written individual performance evaluation, indicating areas of achievement as well as areas of possible concern, and including suggestions for improvement or further development if relevant. This statement shall include the faculty member’s Merit Rank Score and a report of the range of scores at each merit level of the entire department or campus reviewed.

1. In departmental years, the written evaluation will be provided by the department chair, in consultation with the department merit evaluation committee.

2. In campus years, the written evaluation may be provided by the dean or the merit committee, as the campus merit committee determines.

3. The written evaluation shall include a statement that a follow-up meeting, conducted either via telephone or in person, may occur at the request of either the faculty member or the chair of the committee which provided the written evaluation. When a follow-up meeting occurs, the committee chair shall prepare a written summary of the meeting, to be signed also by the faculty member, and provide signed copies of the summary to the faculty member and to the personnel files of the department, the campus, and the vice chancellor's office. If the faculty member declines to sign the chair's summary, the faculty member will provide her/his own written summary of the meeting to the committee chair and to the personnel files of the department, the campus, and the vice chancellor's office.

D. Merit Ranking Criteria

1. Merit Ranking shall be guided by the Merit Rank Score. Additional Criteria, as established by the relevant committee, may be used in reaching decisions of Merit Ranks. The Merit Rank Score and other established criteria shall be awarded in three weighted categories: Teaching (70%), Professional Development (15%) and Service (15%).

2. Student evaluations shall be considered as part of the teaching evaluation process. Major consideration shall be given to the content of the Activity Report. Within the Activity Report, faculty members shall document their achievements of the rubric standards for teaching, for professional development and for service, including standards at the meritorious, the highly meritorious, and the exceptionally meritorious levels. The Merit Rank Score should reflect the degree to which a faculty member has demonstrated competency with these rubrics.

3. All department chairs and campus deans shall provide copies of their unit's criteria for merit evaluation to all department or campus members. Campus or departmental policies must adhere to the general guidelines in this policy, although they may include additional specific criteria.

E. Evidence
1. Committees shall consider an Activity Report covering the preceding two years. Faculty shall submit their reports to the relevant committee each year by January 4; any faculty not submitting an Activity Report shall not be eligible for merit consideration.

2. Committees shall consider the results of any student evaluations, required and voluntary, during the two-year period. Student evaluations for merit purposes will be scheduled in all UW Colleges classes at least every third semester.

3. The committees may, in the course of their evaluations, seek or use other information, including the results of class visitations when available.

II. Special Circumstances  
(Revisions adopted by the Senate 1/14/00 and 1/10/01)

a. In the case of split appointments, the home campus or home department will be responsible for the evaluation, after consultation with the other departments or campuses involved.

b. Faculty members on professional leave will be evaluated by the relevant merit committees based on available information. Given that we are a teaching institution and value teaching as 70% of a faculty workload for merit consideration, faculty on professional leave shall have their teaching component of the merit rank score determined based on teaching evaluations over the previous two years of activity reports. Faculty on full leave for personal reasons will not be part of the merit process. (Determination of the nature of leave or other details of implementation shall rest with the Vice Chancellor, on the recommendation of the department chair and in consultation with the dean.)

c. First year faculty appointees will be given a salary increase commensurate with a meritorious merit rating provided that their retention decisions are positive. This policy applies to initial probationary appointees who have served fractional years.

III. Allocation of Faculty Pay Plan Money

A. The Chancellor shall set aside an amount necessary to bring faculty to rank minimum from the merit increment dollar pool.

B. The merit increment pool shall be allocated to meritorious faculty in the following manner:
   
   70% as a Percentage of Current Salary  
   30% as Fixed Awards

C. The 70% to percentage merit shall be applied as a percentage of current salary to all continuing faculty, judged at least meritorious.

D. The 30% fixed awards to meritorious faculty shall be awarded as a fixed dollar amount to all continuing faculty, judged at least meritorious. Ten percent of the merit increment
pool shall be allocated to Highly and Exceptionally Meritorious faculty. The fixed award for exceptionally meritorious faculty shall be 50% larger than the fixed award for highly meritorious faculty. The amount allocated and the fixed awards shall be determined in accordance with current Senate Budget Committee procedures.

III. Dissemination and Implementation

A. Upon adoption by the Senate, a copy of this policy shall be sent to all faculty presently subject to merit evaluation. Subsequently, copies shall be distributed by campus deans to all new faculty at the time of appointment.

B. Each year the Vice Chancellor shall provide campus deans or department chairs with a detailed set of instructions, including deadlines, implementation details, and a complete list of faculty in the department or campus merit pool.

C. Merit recommendations shall be forwarded to the Chancellor by the department or campus dean in the appropriate year.
Attachment 29

Minutes
Academic Staff Council Meeting

September 24, 2014

Members Present: Jeff Verona (lead), Joanne Giordano, Marcy Dickson, Luke Dock, Julie Dezeeuw, Steve Kaiser, Michael Gorman

Verona called the meeting to order at 10:03 am.

Gorman moved to approve the agenda, Kaiser seconded. Motion passed.

Dezeeuw nominated Annie Weberpal to fill a vacant position on the AS Personnel Committee. Gorman seconded the nomination.

Dezeeuw moved to close nominations and elect Annie Weberpal by acclaim. Giordano seconded. Motion passed.

Meeting was adjourned at 10:17 am.
Attachment 30

UW Colleges Academic Staff Council
Introduction: October 24, 2014
Proposed New Academic Staff Personnel Policy #708
(“Titling Guidelines for Instructional Academic Staff’’)

UW Colleges Academic Staff Personnel Policy
Academic Staff Personnel Policy #708
Titling Guidelines for Instructional Academic Staff

The primary responsibility of all categories of Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) is teaching. University of Wisconsin System Unclassified Personnel Guidelines (#1, Attachment 01 section 4) allows for and identifies activities external to classroom instruction as part of the responsibilities of Instructional Academic Staff. However, Associate Lecturers, Lecturers, or Senior Lecturers teaching a full workload at the UW Colleges are paid at an 80% rate because they are not required to perform scholarship activities, institutional, campus or departmental service without additional compensation. These guidelines do not prohibit offering additional compensation to perform these activities nor do they prohibit an IAS from volunteering to perform these activities. However, without compensation, these activities may not be compulsory.

The following criteria should be taken into consideration when determining the appropriate rank – Associate Lecturer, Lecturer, Senior Lecturer or Distinguished Lecturer – when hiring or rehiring Instructional Academic Staff within UW Colleges. Title assignments should take into consideration degree held and demonstrated consistent proficiency in instruction as determined by campus and department standards.

1) A terminal degree should not be seen as a requirement for any Instructional Academic Staff rank, though possession of a terminal degree may be considered when determining rank at hire or rehire. Minimum degree requirements for instruction may vary by academic department but must meet Higher Learning Commission (HLC) standards i.e.: “Instructors... possess an academic degree relevant to what they are teaching and at least one level above the level at which they teach, except in programs for terminal degrees or when equivalent experience is established. In terminal degree programs, faculty members possess the same level of degree. When faculty members are employed based on equivalent experience, the institution defines a minimum threshold of experience and an evaluation process that is used in the appointment process.” Faculty and instructors refer to all those an institution employs or assigns to teach students. Faculty is used to refer to the group rather than to each individual instructional staff member, typically to distinguish faculty from administration (The New Criteria for Accreditation - The Assumed Practices, Higher Learning Commission, adopted February 2012).
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 or the UW Colleges Online Program, 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) When an IAS is rehired, the default is that they will be rehired at the same rank they were previously hired. If the rehire is to be at a different rank, that request must be specifically initiated by the IAS, the rehiring campus, or the rehiring department. The department will request any necessary materials that are required from the IAS in question in order to perform the review of their rank. Academic departments determine the materials that instructors submit and establish criteria for evaluating effective teaching performance within a discipline.

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 upon rehire for the next teaching term, as appropriate.

The following guidelines should be followed when determining the appropriate rank of an IAS at the time of hiring or rehiring. 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.

**Bachelor’s Degree and IAS appointments**

In most cases, a master’s or terminal degree is required for any IAS appointment. However, each department can create written policies for determining when a bachelor’s degree is an acceptable level of qualification for a specific course in their department.

Departments are not required to establish these policies, and in the absence of a departmental policy, a bachelor’s degree is not an acceptable qualification for an IAS appointment.

**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 teaching, assessment of student learning, and grading are the primary duties expected of lecturers at this level. 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
Terminal degree or ABD with teaching experience**
Master’s degree with teaching experience**
Bachelor’s degree with significant teaching experience as defined by written departmental policy (see above)**

**Lecturer (No-Prefix)**
A Lecturer at this level has the experience and academic qualifications needed to develop and teach a course(s) subject to broad guidelines describing the scope of the subject matter to be covered. The direct delivery of instruction is the primary responsibility of this title.

Minimum requirements
Bachelor’s: 3 years full-time equivalent* of teaching experience when allowed by written departmental policy**
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
Bachelor’s: 5 years full-time equivalent* of teaching experience when allowed by written departmental policy.
Master’s: 4 years full-time equivalent* of teaching experience**
Terminal degree or ABD: 3 years full-time equivalent* of teaching experience**

**Distinguished Lecturer:**
A Distinguished Lecturer performs at a level of proficiency typically requiring extensive experience and advanced knowledge and skills. The expertise of an instructional academic staff member at this level is commonly recognized by his or her peers in the discipline and through a reputation that extends beyond his or her work unit. A Distinguished Lecturer is expected to develop new approaches, methods, or techniques to resolve problems with little or no expert guidance and to cope independently with new, unexpected or complex situations. At this level, an instructional academic staff member can be expected to guide or train other instructional academic staff or to oversee their work. A candidate nominated for the distinguished prefix is expected to demonstrate exceptional performance and teaching excellence, be recognized beyond
the work unit as outstanding, and have a reputation of excellence in the profession that is acknowledged by peers who are external to the institution. For an instructional academic staff member to be recognized as Distinguished he/she will have consistently performed at an exceptional level.

The Distinguished Lecturer title is not expected to be part of the normal progression of an instructional academic staff member. Departments are responsible for establishing Distinguished Lecturer criteria that demonstrate an exceptional level of teaching excellence and achievement in a discipline. This title will be granted by the department and campus in consultation with the Provost and Chancellor rather than by request of the instructional academic staff member, and each issuance of this title will be a unique event.

This title is present to allow a campus or department to perform a short term hire of a distinguished member of a profession or to recognize significant contributions from a long standing member of their instructional academic staff.

*For the purposes of these guidelines “full time” is defined as IAS appointments of 80% or higher per term. (e.g. Teaching at a 40% level for two terms would be the equivalent of teaching at the 80% level for one term; Teaching at a 40% level for two academic years would be the equivalent of teaching at the 80% level for one academic year; and so forth.)

**Teaching experience includes full responsibility for courses. Teaching, assessment of student learning, and grading are the primary duties expected of lecturers
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UW COLLEGES

ACADEMIC STAFF COUNCIL OF SENATORS

BYLAWS

Article I: Name

The name of this organization shall be the Academic Staff Council of Senators.

Article II: Purpose

Pursuant to UW Colleges Constitution 7.03, the academic Staff Council of Senators shall establish ad hoc committees and elect academic staff members to the Academic Staff Appeals and Grievance and Academic Staff Personnel committees, and represent the academic staff perspective to the UW Colleges Senate.

Article III: Structure

Section 1. There shall be a lead senator elected annually by the new and continuing academic staff senators before the May April Senate meeting.

Section 2. The Academic Staff Council of Senators may form subcommittees and ad hoc committees as necessary. These committees may include academic staff who are not senators.

Article IV: Membership

Section 1. The UW Colleges Constitution, section 2.02 provides for Senate Membership for academic staff as follows:

Eight academic staff senators, at least one two of which are members of the instructional academic staff with an appointment of .40 or greater, shall be selected by the academic staff who are eligible to participate in senate elections (see Chapter 7.02).

Section 2. At most two academic staff senators may be from any one campus or from UW Colleges central administration.

Article V: Eligibility
Section 1. Current non-instructional academic staff with a 50% or greater appointment, and instructional academic staff with a 40% or greater appointment who chose academic staff status or who joined the institution after December 1990, are eligible to be a candidate for the UW Colleges Senate.

Section 2. All academic staff, regardless of appointment level, are eligible to nominate and vote for new candidates to the Academic Staff Council of Senators.

**Article VI: Nomination Procedures**

Section 1. Annually, in May, the Academic Staff Council of Senators shall designate academic staff members to serve on the Nominations and Elections Committee for the following year. Members shall serve two-year terms with two members being appointed in odd-numbered years and one member being appointed in even-numbered years.

Section 2. The Nominations and Elections Committee shall determine the number of academic staff positions to be filled in each election.

Section 3. The Nominations and Elections Committee shall invite nominations for the Academic Staff Council of Senators and prepare and announce a slate of nominees for each vacancy on the Council. Consideration shall be given to providing representation of campuses, operational areas, women and minorities, and professional and instructional academic staff.

Section 4. Nominations shall have the consent of the person nominated.

Section 5. A biographical sketch of the nominee, consisting of a paragraph of 100 words or less, shall accompany the nominations. The biographical sketches for all nominees will be distributed to all academic staff personnel.

**Article VII: Voting Procedures**

Section 1. The Nominations and Elections Committee will conduct an election by ballot and will inform the lead senator, the Chair of the Senate Steering Committee and the Chancellor of the results of the election by March 31. Ballots will be distributed to all academic staff personnel at least two weeks prior to the due date.

Section 2. Each eligible voter may vote for one person for each vacancy.

Section 3. The Nominations and Elections Committee will count the votes, identify valid ballots, and determine the results of the election.

Section 4. In years in which there is an instructional academic staff senator vacancy, the instructional academic staff nominee receiving the most votes will be elected. The remaining nominees receiving the most votes will be elected.
Section 5. The method of breaking a tie shall be left to the Nominations and Elections Committee.

Article VIII: Term of Appointments

Section 1. Senators shall serve two-year staggered terms.

Section 2. Newly elected academic staff senators will attend the May Senate meeting for organizational purposes and to vote and stand for election to standing committees of the Senate.

Section 3. Senators may serve more than one two-year term.

Section 4. If an academic staff senator is unable to attend a Senate meeting, a senator must find an eligible substitute to attend in his/her place. More than two absences by the elected academic staff senator per academic year may result in removal of the individual from the Senate by a 2/3 vote of the Academic Staff Council of Senators.

Section 5. A vacancy shall be filled through the normal election process whenever possible. However, if the Academic Staff Council of Senators determines the normal election process is not possible, the vacancy shall be filled through appointment by the lead senator, following consultation with academic staff senators and liaisons.

Article IX: Academic Staff Liaisons

Section 1. An academic staff liaison will be appointed at campuses where there are no academic staff senators.

Section 2. The lead senator will work with the campus Dean to identify and appoint an appropriate liaison.

Section 3. The Academic Staff Council of Senators will provide liaisons with a list of expectations and all documents, policies, and other relevant materials.

Section 4. Academic staff liaisons are encouraged to attend meetings of the Academic Staff Council of Senators.

Article X: Meetings

Section 1. The Academic Staff Council of Senators meets at the close of the institution agenda of the UW Colleges Senate. Special meetings of the Council may be called by the lead senator or by petition of a majority of the Academic Staff Council of Senators.

Section 2. A majority of the Council members constitutes a quorum.
Section 3. The lead senator shall prepare the agenda and communicate it to the chair of the Senate Steering Committee for inclusion on the Senate agenda.

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

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

Section 1. Any proposed amendment to the Academic Staff Personnel Policies must be submitted in writing to the Academic Staff Council of Senators and shall be considered by the Council within 60 calendar days of receipt of the proposed amendment.

Section 2. All academic staff personnel shall be notified of the proposed amendment at least 30 calendar days before the meeting at which action is to be taken. The notice shall include a date by which responses to the proposed amendment should be received.

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

Section 4. A proposed amendment, approved by the Council, shall be forwarded to the Chancellor by the lead senator.

Section 5. Within 30 calendar days of receipt of the proposed amendment, the Chancellor shall forward the amendment to the Board of Regents for adoption or inform the Council of reason for not doing so.

Section 6. The Academic Staff Council of Senators shall inform the academic staff of the final disposition of the amendment.

**Article XII: Amendment Procedures for Bylaws**

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

Section 2. All academic staff personnel 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 Council.

Section 4. A proposed amendment, approved by the Council, shall be forwarded to the Chancellor by the lead senator.

Section 5. The Academic Staff Council of Senators shall inform the academic staff of the final disposition of the amendment.
Article XIII: Succession to Lead Senator in Case of Inability to Serve

Section 1. In the event that the Academic Staff Lead Senator cannot fulfill the duties of the office for any reason and the inability to serve is deemed permanent, such as in the event of the Lead Senator resigning or taking employment outside of Colleges, the Academic Staff Senator serving as UW Colleges Academic Staff Representative to UW System, by virtue of serving on UW Colleges Senate Steering Committee, shall assume the role of Interim Academic Staff Lead Senator.

Section 2. The Interim Academic Staff Lead Senator shall request nominations, including self-nominations, from existing members of the Academic Staff Council of Senators for the Lead Senator and shall distribute all nominations, including any accompanying biographical data for the nominees, to the Council no later than 30 days after assuming the role of Interim Lead Senator; and shall convene the Academic Staff Council of Senators no later than 60 days after assuming the role as Interim Lead, to elect a new Academic Staff Lead Senator.

Section 3. In the event the Academic Staff Lead Senator cannot fulfill the duties of the office for any reason and the inability to serve is deemed temporary, such as in the event of illness or surgery, the Academic Staff Senator serving as UW Colleges Academic Staff Representative to UW System, by virtue of serving on UW Colleges Senate Steering Committee, shall assume the role of Interim Academic Staff Lead Senator for the duration of the Academic Staff Lead Senator’s absence, not to exceed 90 days.

Section 4. In the event the Academic Staff Lead Senator’s temporary inability to serve exceeds 90 days, the inability to serve shall be deemed permanent, and procedures in Article XIII, Sections 1 and 2 must be implemented with the date of “assuming the role of Interim Lead” being the date upon which the temporary absence was deemed to be permanent.

Section 5. In the event that the Academic Staff Lead Senator cannot fulfill the duties of the office for any reason and the Academic Staff Representative cannot assume the role of Interim Academic Staff Lead Senator for any reason, the Provost of UW Colleges shall appoint the Academic Staff Senator with the most cumulative years of service on the Academic Staff Council of Senators to serve as Interim Academic Staff Lead Senator and implement procedures in Article XIII, Sections 1 and 2.

Section 6. Vacancy created on the Council due to inability to serve shall be filled following the procedures in Article III, Section 5 of the Academic Staff Council of Senators Bylaws.

[End]
In Article 4, section 2.
Should there be some mention of online? Membership is broken up between campuses and central but online doesn't seem to be either of these. Or is it counted as part of central?

In Article 6, Section 3.
It specifies that the ballot can consider representation of campuses, operational issues, women and minorities, and professional instructional academic staff.

Does that mean the nominations committee could/should remove people from the ballot if there is a need to increase any of those representations? If not, does that clause serve any actual function? If that decision is going to be made by how people vote, then the nominations committee doesn't really ever do anything with those considerations.

Section 5.
Is it necessary to specify a word count for the nominee biography or could it simply be called brief? An exact word limit seems like the sort of thing that eventually comes back to bite you.

Article 13, section 6.
It refers to article 3, section 5 and that section does not exist. Is it supposed to be Article 3, section 1?

Mike Gorman