UW Colleges
Senate, Senate Committee and Council Meetings
November 13, 2015
UW-Marathon County

Minutes of UW Colleges Senate Meeting .......................................................... 3
Minutes of UW Colleges Faculty Council of Senators Meeting ......................... 11
Minutes of UW Colleges Academic Staff Council of Senators Meeting ............ 14
Minutes of UW Colleges University Staff Council Senators Meeting ............... 16

Attachment 1: UW Colleges Senate Schedule and Agenda .............................. 17-19
   UW Colleges Faculty Council of Senators Meeting Agenda ....................... 20
   UW Colleges Academic Staff Council of Senators Meeting Agenda .......... 21
   UW Colleges University Staff Council Senators Meeting Agenda .............. 22

Attachment 2: UW Colleges Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs
   Report ........................................................................................................ 23

Attachment 3: UW Colleges Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Report .... 27

Attachment 4: UW Colleges Associate Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and
   Enrollment Management Report ................................................................. 31

Attachment 5: Senate Steering Committee Chair/UW Colleges Faculty Representative
   to UW System Administration Report ......................................................... 35

Attachment 6: UW Colleges Academic Staff Lead Senator Report ....................... 37

Attachment 7: UW Colleges Academic Staff Representative to UW System Administration
   Report ........................................................................................................ 38

Attachment 8: UW Colleges University Staff Lead Senator Report ....................... 39

Attachment 9: UW Colleges Student Governance Council President Report ........... 40

Attachment 10: UW Colleges Senate Academic Policy Committee Chair Report .......... 44

Attachment 11: UW Colleges Senate Budget Committee Chair Report .................. 46

Attachment 12: UW Colleges Faculty Professional Standards Committee Chair Report .... 47

Attachment 13: UW Colleges Senate Assessment Committee Chair Report ............ 49
Attachment 14: UWC Associate Degree & Curricular Reimaging Project Faculty Coordinator Report

Attachment 15: Adoption: Proposed Revision of the UW Colleges Senate Bylaws 7.5 (“Senate Correspondence Committee”)…

Attachment 16: Adoption: Proposed Revision of IP #101 (“Associate of Arts and Science Degree”)

Attachment 17: Introduction: Proposed Revision of IP #320 (“Policy on Evaluation—Instructional Academic Staff (Category B), including Returning Retired Faculty”)…

Attachment 18: Introduction: Proposed Amendment of UW Colleges Constitution Chapter 2.10 (“Referendum”)…

Attachment 19: Introduction: Proposed Revision of UW Colleges Senate Bylaws 7.0 (“Appointed Senate Bylaws Committees”)

Attachment 20: Introduction: Proposed Revision of IP #202 (“Academic Procedures and Regulations”)

Attachment 21: Introduction: Proposed Revision of IP #110 (“UW Colleges Implementation of GAPP #36”)…

Attachment 22: Adoption: Proposed Revision of FPP #503 (“Faculty Merit Policy and Procedures”)…

Attachment 23: Introduction: Proposed Revision of FPP #501.01 (“Promotion, Tenure, and Third-year Tenure Progress and retention Review Dossier Format”)…

Attachment 24: Introduction: Proposed Revision of FPP #501.02 (“Probationary Faculty Retention Review Dossier”)…

Attachment 25: Adoption: Modification of ASPP #804 (“Non-Renewal of Fixed-Term Renewable Appointments”)…

Attachment 26: Discussion: Revision of ASCS Bylaws
MINUTES

2015-2016 Senators Present: Brad Wilson, UW-Baraboo/Sauk County; Troy Kozma, UW-Barron County; Lucas Dock and Melissa Smiley, UW Colleges Online; Mike Jurmu and Mike Winkler, UW-Fond du Lac; Kathy Immel, Evan Kreider, and Juli McGuire, UW-Fox Valley; Jessica Van Slooten, UW-Manitowoc; Joanne Giordano, Holly Hassel, and Penny Workman, UW-Marathon County; Mark Klem and Roseann Stenstrup, UW-Marinette; Caleb Bush, Steve Kaiser, and Jeff Verona, UW-Marshfield/Wood County; Marnie Dresser UW-Richland; Michael Gorman, UW-Rock County; Matt Raunio and Kay Sbabaro, UW-Sheboygan; Christi Larson and Mark Peterson, UW-Washington County; Julianna Alitto, Ron Gulotta, and Margaret Hankenson, UW-Waukesha; Nic Calvache and Graham Pearce, Student Senators

2015-2016 Senators Absent: Annette Kuhlmann, UW-Baraboo/Sauk County; Bob Hein, UW-Rock County; Tony Landowski, UW-Waukesha; Martin Sandberg, Student Senator

2015-2016 Alternates Present: Dale Murray, UW-Baraboo/Sauk County (Kuhlmann); Mark Fuller, UW-Rock County (Hein); Marly Harmeling, Student (Sandberg)

Others Present: Greg Ahrenhoerster, Chairs’ Representative; Rich Barnhouse, Associate Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management; Rose Brust, UW-Marathon County; Bill Diienzo, UW-Sheboygan; Joe Foy, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs; Caroline Geary, UWC Associate Degree and Curricular Reimagining Project Faculty Coordinator; Clare Hemenway, UW-Marathon County; Maddie Kane, Student, UW-Marathon County; Greg Lampe, Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs; Tamara Lavender, UW-Baraboo/Sauk County; Justeen Mallo-Vollrath, UW-Marathon County; Keith Montgomery, Alternate Deans’ Representative; Kelly Wilz, UW-Marshfield/Wood County; Linda Baum, Assistant to the Senate

Others Absent: Jamie Douglas, Virtual Campus Investigation Committee Co-Chair; Colleen Godfriaux, Associate Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance; Cathy Sandeen, Chancellor, UW Colleges and UW-Extension; Talitha Selby, UW-Washington County; John Short, Deans’ Representative; Molly Vidal, Chief of Staff/Communications, Chancellor’s Office; Steve Wildeck, Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance, UW Colleges and UW-Extension

1) The November 13, 2015 meeting of the UW Colleges Senate was called to order at 1:45 p.m. by UW Colleges Senate Steering Committee Chair Holly Hassel.

2) UW-Marathon County Dean Keith Montgomery said he thought giving a welcome mid-
afternoon after spending the day with the group felt a bit odd, but he did want to make sure everyone felt welcome and comfortable. The dean hoped everyone had enjoyed the food, noting the food service was an independent non-profit co-op that took care of the dorm students all week long as well as those dining on campus and handling events like this. Dean Montgomery said he was looking forward to the meeting at which he would be the alternate Deans’ Rep, and wished everyone a safe trip home. He was warmly thanked.

3) Roll Call of 2015-2016 Senate and Introductions of Alternates and Guests. Assistant to the UW Colleges Senate Linda Baum circulated the attendance sheet. SSC Chair Hassel introduced the new student senator, SGC Financial Director from UW-Waukesha, Nic Calvache. She noted that Mark Fuller (Professor, Mathematics) was serving as the alternate senator for UW-Rock County, Keith Montgomery was attending in place of Deans’ Rep John Short, Marly Harmeling (SGC Executive Director, UW-Sheboygan) was acting in place of student senator Martin Sandberg, and former longtime senator Dale Murray (Associate Professor, Philosophy) had returned to serve as the alternate faculty senator for UW-Baraboo/Sauk County. Chair Hassel next introduced the numerous guests attending the Senate meeting: Rose Brust, Graphic Designer from UW-Marathon County; Bill Dirienzo, Assistant Professor, CSEPA, UW-Sheboygan; Clare Hemenway, Associate Professor, Mathematics, UW-Marathon County; student and editor of the UW-Marathon County student newspaper, Maddie Kane; Tamara Lavender, University Services Associate from UW-Baraboo/Sauk County; Justeen Mallo-Vollrath, a Library Services Assistant at UW-Marathon County; and Kelly Wilz, Associate Professor, CTA, UW-Marshfield/Wood County. Caroline Geary, the Faculty Coordinator for the Associate of Arts and Science Degree and Curricular Reimaging Project was also in attendance again.

4) The agenda (Attachment 1) of the November 13, 2014 meeting of the UW Colleges Senate was approved unanimously [Kozma/Jurmu].

5) The minutes from the September 18, 2015 UWC Senate meeting held at UW-Barron County (posted in Public Folders and at http://www.uwc.edu/employees/senate/meetings) were unanimously approved [Kozma/Van Slooten].

6) Reports

a) Chancellor Cathy Sandeen needed to leave the Senate meeting to attend other meetings in Madison and had asked Provost Lampe to report on her behalf. He said that the discussion around merging the UW Colleges and the Wisconsin Technical College System is no longer being considered at the legislative level. It is possible that this merger discussion will resurface during the next round of budget talks. Lobbying against removing the exemption keeping concealed carry weapons out of UW buildings continues. The chancellor has asked UW Colleges deans to mobilize local government leaders and local law enforcement agencies to lobby against the concealed carry legislation. The legislation is in committee and has been delayed probably until the next legislative session in 2016. The delay allows time to mobilize local efforts against the proposed legislation. Chancellor Sandeen is aware of and appreciates the statements made by students and faculty members; she believes that local lobbying is key to having
an impact on this legislation. Associate Vice Chancellor Rich Barnhouse clarified that the current law allows concealed carry on university grounds, but not in university buildings. It was asked if it made any difference legally in the concealed carry question that UW Colleges buildings are owned by the counties rather than the state. Provost Lampe replied that he did not know; however, it was a question which should be raised. A senator noted that concerned parents should contact their legislators about the safety of students; parents would make excellent lobbyists.

b) Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs Greg Lampe called attention to his written report (Attachment 2). He said that conversations have been held among institutional leadership about how to gather input from the campuses after January 1, 2016 about the implementation of regionalization and consolidation budget reduction activities. It has been determined and is now in the planning stages that he and Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance Steve Wildeck will visit the thirteen UW Colleges campuses. Starting in February and travelling through mid-March, they will discuss any questions or concerns that may have arisen with the regional and consolidated models being put into place. Institutional leaders are also discussing the possibility of reserving an hour each week during February and March during which people across the institution could join a Skype meeting for the same general purposes. The US Department of Education’s Office of Inspector General recently released a report that was critical of competency-based programs. Provost Lampe met with the UW Colleges’ Higher Learning Commission liaison who informed him that one of the main issues in the report is focused on faculty interaction with students. The liaison stated that the UW Colleges Flexible Option program is within federal rules and regulations, and that UW Colleges has faculty-student interactions well documented. Two task forces are currently at work within the Office for Academic and Student Affairs. One task group is working on how to administer the Bachelor of Applied Arts and Sciences (BAAS) degree completion program following the Round 2 decision to eliminate the BAAS Program Manager position. Recommendations from the task force, which is chaired by BAAS Program Manager Patti Wise, are expected to be submitted to the provost in early December. Another task group is working to create a funding model to allow the Office of International Education to become a full cost-recovery program by June of 2017. Director of International Education Tim Urbonya is chairing the task force which is also striving to make recommendations to the provost by early December. A search committee has been charged and the position description posted for the Director of Institutional Research, Assessment and Effectiveness. A new director should be announced by the end of the calendar year. In the absence of Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance Steve Wildeck, it was asked of the provost what would happen to the raises of faculty members who had received one and then left the institution. Provost Lampe replied that he would follow up with Vice Chancellor Wildeck. Provost Lampe was asked to advise Vice Chancellor Wildeck to have the money added to the discretionary fund and distributed to faculty members during phase two compensation adjustments.

c) Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Joe Foy noted the location of his report (Attachment 3) in the materials. BISC Project Manager Christa James-Byrnes had sent out a BISC Round 1 implementation newsletter that included updates from the associate
vice chancellor on the CASE answer desk position, proctoring, and tutoring. A question about the structure of CASE was asked, since tutoring/academic support and the library are not physically together on many campuses. Associate Vice Chancellor Foy replied that right now CASE consists of the CASE Answer Desk. It is a spot in the library where the CASE associate can direct students to tutoring, set up appointments for tutoring, and facilitate accommodations proctoring and non-Online DE proctoring. Eventual co-location will be left up to the REO and staff, but full co-location is the goal.

d) Associate Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management Rich Barnhouse pointed out his report (Attachment 4). The BISC Round 1 Decision 1 Student Affairs positions have all been posted and are in process. Interviews were held over seven or eight days. Layoff notices will be sent out in early December; there will be about 40 fewer people in Student Affairs positions. Associate Vice Chancellor Barnhouse commended the work of the BISC task groups and those working on implementation. Noting that the changes being put in place for UW Colleges are major and that stress levels are rising, AVC Barnhouse asked that the significant life and career changes of many colleagues be recognized, and that they be treated with all necessary respect and consideration. Associate Vice Chancellor Barnhouse thanked SGC President Graham Pearce for his many efforts. Noting that they have worked together with the budget process on BISC as well as through student governance, he said that Pearce has been doing a great job and has been super to work with in every role.

e) Senate Steering Committee Chair & UWC Faculty Representative Holly Hassel drew attention to the report (Attachment 5) included in the Senate materials. She reported that she has been working with the Senate Assessment Committee (SAC) and Institutional Assessment Coordinator Valerie Murrenus Pilmaier on a plan for assessing the regionalization and consolidation changes. Impact of regionalization on governance is a concern that was discussed at the Senate Leaders’ Meeting. A list of action items was created at the meeting of areas of concern: things to do, to monitor, or to follow up on. SSC Chair Hassel will be keeping in touch with campus steering chairs about these concerns. A regional issue that was discussed earlier in the day at the Senate Steering Committee meeting is collegium meetings. She shared that collegium meetings are not held on a set pattern; it would be best if they are scheduled in a way that would allow a regional dean to attend all of them. Hassel is collecting information from the campuses and will meet with incoming REO Keith Montgomery to share the information and have some early discussions about the possibility of coordinating collegium meetings. Another item discussed at the earlier Steering meeting was around the Senate process and the question of having sufficient opportunity to discuss an introduction prior to adoption. Chair Hassel explained that long ago there was a three meeting process, and that the Senate Assistant can remember in depth discussions around introductions. Sometimes those introductory discussions led to revisions of the introduction being sent out after the Senate meeting for senators to share with constituents. SSC will discuss this further, but Chair Hassel noted that she would like to ask that the Senate engage in more thorough discussions today that would give committees more and better feedback on their proposals.
f) Academic Staff Lead Senator Jeff Verona (*Attachment 6*) reported that the Academic Staff Council continues to examine tripwire and divisor issues. The Council plans to look at a revision of their bylaws later in the day. If they meet with approval, the bylaws should be approved by the end of the academic year.

g) UW Colleges Academic Staff Representative Luke Dock pointed out the location of his report (*Attachment 7*) in the written materials. There were no questions.

h) University Staff Lead Senator Juli McGuire noted the location of her written report (*Attachment 8*) and asked that it be read. Saying that the University Staff Council is very busy, she included that many members are on multiple committees. They are learning about position reductions, and trying to keep university staff across UW Colleges informed on that issue.

i) Student Governance Council President Graham Pearce called attention to his report (*Attachment 9*) in the materials, noting that he had included several statements put out by the Student Governance Council (SGC). Pearce stated that he and other students, as System Reps, had met with legislators the previous day. SGC President Pearce related that the legislators had seemed receptive to the student positions. Senator Kreider thanked SGC President Pearce for his work, expressing again that students and families are the voices that need to be heard.

j) Senate Academic Policy Committee Chair Caleb Bush denoted the pages of his written report (*Attachment 10*) and said that the committee’s morning meeting had been very productive. The Senate Academic Policy Committee (SAPC) had discussed drop deadlines and will check with various administrative offices on that topic. SAPC also conferred over IP #408 and UWC Constitution Chapter 11 on programs and jurisdiction which has some language to address and clarify for a February introduction.

k) Senate Budget Committee Chair Margaret Hankenson located her report (*Attachment 11*) in the Senate materials. The Senate Budget Committee (SBC) had unanimously supported the statement from the Academic Staff Council of Senators on the 70% tripwire issue. The committee is also looking at the divisor issue. SBC Chair Hankenson explained some departments calculate contact hours differently for lecture formats than they do for lab formats. It was further pointed out that there are also differences around how much backfill campuses receive for faculty versus IAS who teach online. Department chairs are strongly in favor of changing the inequity. The committee plans to look at the budgetary implications. The Budget Committee was asked to look at IP #320 and FPP #501 and make recommendations around class visitations in light of the changing budget issues. The committee, Chair Hankenson reported, determined that the issues are academic first, and they were not comfortable recommending changes to an academic policy.

l) Faculty Professional Standards Committee Chair Mike Jurmu (*Attachment 12*) reported that the committee would be bringing introductions forth in the Faculty Council meeting later in the day. Faculty Professional Standards Committee (FPSC) has been very busy with charges from the Steering Committee, discussing the American Indian Studies
proposal, and HLC revisions for dual enrollment courses. FPSC is waiting to hear from Steering about some suggested graphics for due dates in tenure and retention policy.

m) Senate Assessment Committee Chair Kristin Plessel was not in attendance. The report she submitted was noted (Attachment 13). Questions should be directed to Chair Plessel.

n) UWC Associate Degree & Curricular Reimagining Project Faculty Coordinator Caroline Geary (Attachment 14) related that the degree reimagining project has made good progress on the depth requirement piece. UW System policy states that an associate degree has to have a two-course sequence in which the first course serves as a foundation for the second course. The degree reimagining leadership team has sent draft language to the departments for review and is collecting their feedback. Feedback is also occurring at the campus level through campus visits. A recurring theme is that students will need to be able to navigate the new degree standards—it cannot be overly complicated. This is critical given the reduction that has taken place in staffing due to state budget cuts. Also, attention needs to be paid to the requirements and shifts taking place at the four-year institutions so UWC students continue to transfer successfully. One of the four-year system partners has already indicated that defining courses in terms of proficiencies can aid in the transfer process. An increase in the number of institutions requiring capstone projects for BA/BS degrees has been noted. Although these experiences are anchored in the major and at the junior/senior level, the skills needed for these experiences are being built through the general education component of the degree. In response to a question, Associate Professor Geary said that increasing the number of degree holders is part of the UW System growth agenda, so UW Colleges needs to be smart about how to increase the number of those attaining the AAS. Associate Degree and Curricular Reimagining Project Faculty Coordinator Geary stated that the project will aim to reimagine the degree as well as loosen bottlenecks and fix aspects of the program that currently do not work.

7) Old Institutional Business

a) Adoption: Proposed Revision of UW Colleges Senate Bylaws 7.5 (“Senate Correspondence Committee”) [SSC] eliminating the committee (Attachment 15). SSC Chair Hassel briefly explained that this piece to eliminate the Senate Correspondence Committee had been introduced following a review of Senate committee structures. The motion carried by unanimous vote [Murray/Peterson].

b) Adoption: Proposed Revision of IP #101 (“Associate of Arts and Science Degree”) [SAC] language update (Attachment 16). The adoption was described as a small change to clarify language around how students search for information. The motion passed with one vote against [Kozma/Alitto].

c) Other. There was no Other Old Institutional Business.

8) New Institutional Business
a) Introduction: Proposed Revision of IP #320 (“Policy on Evaluation—Instructional Academic Staff (Category B), including Returning Retired Faculty”) [FPSC] clarifying who receives and is expected to complete the Activity Report Form (Attachment 17). Faculty Professional Standards Committee Chair Jurmu informed the Senate that the proposed changes are to ensure that IAS who teach in the Spring do not fall through the cracks, failing to receive an Activity Report to fill out and submit. The introduced changes also clarify that the director of Human Resources should be on the list of those receiving evaluation results. Finally, the proposal removes a reference to renewable appointments, as it is practice to provide all IAS with merit reviews. There was some discussion around changing the language from having “the campus” be responsible for notifying IAS to submit the Activity Report to “regional associate deans of academic affairs.” However, as it is not known specifically who is going to have various duties following the implementation of regionalization and consolidation, the question was held until full implementation is in place.

b) Introduction: Proposed Amendment of UW Colleges Constitution Chapter 2.10 (“Referendum”) [SSC] language to include university staff and adding an approval process for SSC determined procedures (Attachment 18). SSC Chair Hassel explained that following some feedback from faculty, a subcommittee was formed by Steering to seek clarity around the criteria for passage of a referendum. One change added university staff to the policy in a continuing effort to be inclusive. The subcommittee found they did not support a single definition of criteria, but did support an additional level of review of any criteria set by the Steering Committee. It was expressed that that proposal caused discomfort with the referendum process; Steering should be involved to invoke a certain standard. Several senators claimed that if the Senate Steering Committee had established criteria and sent them to the initiators of the summer referendum, the initiators would not have then confirmed said criteria and the referendum process would have been at an impasse. Chair Hassel said that a collaborative process should be used to work out the differences. Various senators thought that might be unlikely. It was stated that the way votes were tallied had been the issue; there was a need for checks and balances in the complete process. The subcommittee decided to withdraw the introduction.

c) Introduction: Proposed Revision of UW Colleges Senate Bylaws 7.0 (“Appointed Senate Bylaws Committees”) [SGC] standardize procedure for appointing students as outlined in WI law (Attachment 19). Lead Student Senator and SGC President Pearce informed the assembly that of the eight committees that have student positions, the Senate Informational and Instructional Technology Committee (SIITC) and the Senate Inclusive Excellence Committee (SIEC) require that the student be appointed by the Senate Steering Committee (SSC) rather than by SGC as are the others. It was noted that the language calls for a slate of students from SGC to be submitted with the student then to be appointed by SSC. Pearce further explained that the selection of student reps is the right of students according to Wisconsin statute. The current Bylaws language is confusing and potentially against state law if the SGC candidate is not appointed by SSC.

the Senate that this introduction modified an item passed on a provisional basis by the Senate Steering Committee in late May of 2015 relating to drop deadlines for UWC Flexible Option students. Bush said that the committee had changed some of the SSC proposals, giving flex students the most generous drop deadlines possible—past the midpoint as had been noted in the provisional policy. Senator Kozma asked if there were any financial implications of making those changes; SAPC did not know if there were financial or other implications to the changes.

e) Introduction: Proposed Revision of IP #110 (“UW Colleges Implementation of GAPP #36”) [SAPC] update and rename policy for offering college credit in high schools (Attachment 21). SAPC member Joanne Giordano explained that modifications to this policy included UW System, UW Colleges, and Higher Learning Commission updates over the past twenty years. The proposal updates policy for determining student eligibility, the pathway for student enrollment, approving the credentials for high school instructors, and overseeing instruction. The introduction also includes a proposed name change to make the policy title match the subject matter. A question was asked about I.B. and student enrollment in UW Colleges. Senator Giordano replied that the language aligns with UW System policy; high school students who have UW Colleges credits and are applying to UWC are new admits who just happen to have UWC credits. The students had been enrolled in a program, not the institution.

f) Other. No Other New Institutional Business was brought forth for discussion.

9) Other Institutional Business

a) Other. There was no Other Institutional Business on the agenda.

10) Adjournment. The November 13, 2015 meeting of the UW Colleges Senate held at UW-Marathon County was adjourned at 3:50 p.m. at the conclusion of the business agenda.
UW COLLEGES
Faculty Council of Senators
Friday, November 13, 2015
UW-Marathon County

MINUTES

2015-2016 Faculty Senators Present: Troy Kozma, UW-Barron County; Kathy Immel and Evan Kreider, UW-Fox Valley; Jessica Van Slooten, UW-Manitowoc; Holly Hassel and Penny Workman, UW-Marathon County; Mark Klemp, UW-Marinette; Caleb Bush, UW-Marshfield/Wood County; Marnie Dresser UW-Richland; Matt Raunio, UW-Sheboygan; Mark Peterson, UW-Washington County; Julianna Alitto, Ron Gulotta, and Margaret Hankenson, UW-Waukesha

2015-2016 Faculty Senators Absent: Annette Kuhlmann, UW-Baraboo/Sauk County; Mike Jurmu, UW-Fond du Lac; Bob Hein, UW-Rock County

2015-2016 Faculty Alternates Present: Dale Murray, UW-Baraboo/Sauk County (Kuhlmann); Mark Fuller, UW-Rock County (Hein)

Others Present: Greg Ahrenhoerster, Chairs’ Representative; Bill Dirienzo, UW-Sheboygan; Clare Hemenway, UW-Marathon County; Kelly Wilz, UW-Marshfield/Wood County; Linda Baum, Assistant to the UW Colleges Senate

1. Call to Order 2015-2016 Faculty Council of Senators. The UW Colleges Faculty Council of Senators (FCS) was called to order at 4:05 p.m. by UW Colleges Faculty Representative to UW System Administration Holly Hassel.

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

3. The agenda for the November 13, 2015 Faculty Council meeting at UW-Marathon County was approved unanimously [Raunio/Peterson].

4. The minutes of the September 18, 2015 meeting of the FCS held at UW-Barron County (posted in Public Folders and at http://uwc.edu/employees/senate/meetings) were unanimously approved [Van Slooten/Alitto].

5. Reports

a) Chair Holly Hassel shared an item she had spoken about during the SSC meeting earlier in the day. She is working with UW-Whitewater faculty rep James Hartwick and UW System Vice President for Administration & Fiscal Affairs David Miller on a faculty survey on retention and turnover. They are looking at a more nuanced way of collecting information around motivations to engage or disengage and hope to work with other faculty reps, as well. The UW System Tenure Task Force has suddenly sped up its
timeline. Instead of reporting to the Board of Regents in April, it plans to have draft language ready for the end of November. This is causing some confusion and concern. It was expressed to Hassel that responses in a check box survey or to HR might not be the responses for which they are looking. It was also stated that faculty retention issues have not reached their crescendo. SSC Chair Hassel agreed, but said that documented evidence to give to the Board of Regents will have more weight than the answers gathered by HR.

b) Faculty Professional Standards Committee Chair Mike Jurmu had left for the day. FPSC member and former chair Ron Gulotta related that Chair Jurmu had said there was nothing to add to his earlier report.

6. Old Business

a) Adoption: Proposed Revision of FPP #503 (“Faculty Merit Policy and Procedures”) [FPSC] update and overhaul of merit (Attachment 22). Faculty Rep Hassel noted that there had been extensive feedback from the campuses on this adoption item. One suggestion that came up frequently was to have the rubrics included in the policy. Chairs’ Rep Ahrenhoerster agreed, saying that many had approved of a fellow chairs’ statement that they would like to see the rubrics before approving a policy. Lowering the impact of the SSI was discussed, noting that even with its faults it is a relatively decent tool for distinguishing between good and bad instructors. Hassel noted that she would be asking the Steering Committee to look at forming a work group to revisit the SSI form at their next meeting. The current form has apparently not been revised since 1999. That effort could be complementary, Hassel expressed, to this work. Conversation then turned to how to represent teaching without turning Activity Reports into a dossier. FPSC member Gulotta replied that by setting standards and then revising the reporting form so it is easier to fill out and evaluate, that would be addressed. It was suggested that there be limits, then, on the report form. It was questioned as to the rankings of professional development and service. Gulotta responded that the main thing is to give evidence in each area; the majority weight goes to teaching, and some activities might be able to be listed as both professional development and service. There was some confusion around the use of “meritorious” in II.B, which was determined to mean faculty eligible to receive raises, not those ranked meritorious. It was asked if FPSC should find a different term to utilize in that reference. There was also discussion around what was meant by information “provided by the faculty member” (I.F.3). The information “provided by the faculty member” was meant to refer to items the faculty member provides—not hearsay or information known outside of those documents. The Council also conferred as to whether satisfactory would boost morale or be seen as the new unsatisfactory ranking. With a vote of ten in favor, four opposed, and one abstention, the motion carried [Van Slooten/Klemp].

b) Other. There was no Other Old Business on the agenda.

7. New Business

b) Introduction: Proposed Revision of FPP #501.02 (“Probationary Faculty Retention Review Dossier”) [FPSC] eliminate specific due dates (Attachment 24).

Senator Gulotta introduced the proposed revisions for 7a and 7b. Deadline dates for retention, tenure, and promotion are found in FPP #501, 501.01, and 501.02. FPSC was charged with looking at variances in those dates and determined that the discrepancies were caused when dates were changed in only one policy. Therefore, FPSC is proposing language to eliminate specific dates in 501.01 and 501.02 and refer back to FPP #501 for all deadlines.

c) Other. There was no additional New Business for the Faculty Council.

8. Other Business

a) Other. There was no other Other Business.

9. Adjournment. The November 13, 2015 meeting of the Faculty Council of Senators was adjourned at 4:45 p.m. by UW Colleges Faculty Representative Holly Hassel.
UW COLLEGES
Academic Staff Council of Senators
Friday, November 13, 2015
UW-Marathon County

MINUTES

Roll Call
Present-Smiley
Gorman
Giordano
Kaiser
Dock
Winkler-Recorder
Verona-Chair

Approve Agenda
Moved/Second
Kaiser/Gorman
All in favor

Approval of Minutes from ASCS meeting of September 18, 2015
Moved/Second
Kaiser/Gorman
All in favor

I. Old Business
• Adoption: Modification of ASPP #804 (“Non-Renewal of Fixed-Term Renewable Appointments”) (Attachment 25)
  It was so moved to adopt
  Moved/Second
  Kaiser/Gorman
  All in favor

• Revision of ASCS Bylaws (Attachment 26)
  Version has been sent out for discussion, as published it met with informal approval committee members present.

II. New Business
• Discussion Tripwire language
• Discussion of the IAS Divisor issue
  (document circa 2013)
Chair of Chairs, SAPC, and Steering support revised ‘divisor of twelve’

III. Other business

- Alignment of Activity Report to reflect parity of IAS and Faculty use (UW Colleges Senate Policy Institutional Personnel Policy Affecting Faculty & Academic Staff #301 Activity Report)
- Updates from administration regarding layoffs/repositioning
- Policy #704 discussion (UW Colleges Academic Staff Personnel Policy Hiring, Promotion, Merit, and Review Policy #704 Administrative Academic Staff (Category A) Promotion, Progression, and Retitling Policy)
- AS Degree requirement discussion
- Classified & University Staff CoC (UW Colleges Senate Policy Institutional Personnel Policy Affecting Faculty & Academic Staff #305 Code of Conduct ) discussion and update

IV. Adjourned at 4:45 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Winkler
ASCS member
acting recorder
MINUTES

Present: Christi Larson (WSH), Juli McGuire (FOX), Kay Sbarbaro (SHB), Roseann Stenstrup (MNT), Bradley Wilson (BRB)

Guests: Rose Brust (MTH), Tamara Lavender (BRB), Justeen Mallo-Vollrath (MTH)

Call to order: Chair Juli McGuire

1. Roll call for USC Executive Committee & Senators-C. Larson
4. Discussion regarding the revisions of the bylaws: Bylaws committee chair Brust will call a meeting which USC chair McGuire will attend. Council discussed the importance of moving the bylaws forward with the revisions discussed at the last face to face council meeting.
5. Adjournment:
   Meeting adjourned at 4:30pm

Respectfully Submitted,

Christi Larson-University Staff Council (USC)-Secretary

University of Wisconsin-Washington County Representative
Schedule

UW COLLEGES
Meetings of Senate, Committees, and
Academic Staff, University Staff, and Faculty Councils of Senators
Friday, November 13, 2015
UW–Marathon County
9:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Coffee and Collegiality 9:00 a.m. - 9:25 a.m.
Terrace Room (100)

Committee Meetings 9:30 a.m. - 11:00 a.m.
Senate Academic Policy Committee, Room 243
Senate Budget Committee, Room 217
Faculty Professional Standards Committee, Room 251
Senate Steering Committee, Terrace Room (100)

Presentation 11:05 a.m. - 11:50 a.m.
Discussion: UW System Strategic Planning Survey Results
Terrace Room (100)
Chancellor Sandeen, Chief of Staff Molly Vidal, and SSC Chair Hassel

Lunch (provided by UWC Senate) 11:55 a.m. - 12:45 p.m.
Student Union (173)

Presentation 12:50 p.m. - 1:35 p.m.
Virtual Campus Investigation Committee Recommendations
Terrace Room (100)
VCIC Co-Chair: Jamie Douglas
Committee members: Hassel, Kozma, and Pearce

UW Colleges Senate 1:40 p.m.
Terrace Room (100)

Council Meetings following Senate
Academic Staff Council of Senators, Room 217
University Staff Council of Senators, Room 251
Faculty Council of Senators, Terrace Room (100)
Draft Agenda
UW COLLEGES
Senate
Friday, November 13, 2015
UW-Marathon County
1:40 p.m.

1) Call to Order of 2015-2016 Senate

2) Welcome by UW-Marathon County Dean Keith Montgomery

3) Roll Call of 2015-2016 Senate and Introductions of Alternates and Guests

4) Approval of Agenda

5) Approval of Minutes: September 18, 2015, UW-Barron County (posted in Public Folders and at http://www.uwc.edu/employees/senate/meetings)

6) Reports

   a) Chancellor Cathy Sandeen
   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 Holly Hassel
   f) Academic Staff Lead Senator Jeff Verona
   g) UW Colleges Academic Staff Representative Luke Dock
   h) University Staff Lead Senator Juli McGuire
   i) Student Governance Council President Graham Pearce
   j) Senate Academic Policy Committee Chair Caleb Bush
   k) Senate Budget Committee Chair Margaret Hankenson
   l) Faculty Professional Standards Committee Chair Mike Jurmu
   m) Senate Assessment Committee Chair Kristin Plessel
   n) UWC Associate Degree & Curricular Reimagining Project Faculty Coordinator Caroline Geary

7) Old Institutional Business

   a) Adoption: Proposed Revision of UW Colleges Senate Bylaws 7.5 (“Senate Correspondence Committee”) [SSC] eliminating the committee

   b) Adoption: Proposed Revision of IP #101 (“Associate of Arts and Science Degree”) [SAC] language update

   c) Other

8) New Institutional Business
a) Introduction: Proposed Revision of IP #320 (“Policy on Evaluation—Instructional Academic Staff (Category B), including Returning Retired Faculty”) [FPSC] clarifying who receives and is expected to complete the Activity Report Form.

b) Introduction: Proposed Amendment of UW Colleges Constitution Chapter 2.10 (“Referendum”) [SSC] language to include university staff and adding an approval process for SSC determined procedures.

c) Introduction: Proposed Revision of UW Colleges Senate Bylaws 7.0 (“Appointed Senate Bylaws Committees”) [SGC] standardize procedure for appointing students as outlined in WI law.


e) Introduction: Proposed Revision of IP #110 (“UW Colleges Implementation of GAPP #36”) [SAPC] update and rename policy for offering colleges credit in high schools.

f) Other

9) Other Institutional Business

a) Other

10) Adjournment
Draft Agenda
UW COLLEGES
Faculty Council of Senators
Friday, November 13, 2015
UW-Marathon County

1. Call to Order 2015-2016 Faculty Council of Senators

2. Roll Call of faculty senators and alternates

3. Approval of Agenda

4. Approval of Minutes: September 18, 2015, UW-Barron County (posted in Public Folders and at http://uwc.edu/employees/senate/meetings)

5. Reports
   a) Chair Holly Hassel
   b) Faculty Professional Standards Committee Chair Mike Jurmu

6. Old Business
   a) Adoption: Proposed Revision of FPP #503 (“Faculty Merit Policy and Procedures”) [FPSC] update and overhaul of merit
   b) Other

7. New Business
   a) Introduction: Proposed Revision of FPP #501.01 (“Promotion, Tenure, and Third-year Tenure Progress and retention Review Dossier Format”) [FPSC] eliminate specific due dates
   b) Introduction: Proposed Revision of FPP #501.02 (“Probationary Faculty Retention Review Dossier”) [FPSC] eliminate specific due dates
   c) Other

8. Other Business
   a) Other

9. Adjournment
Roll Call

Select Recorder

Approve Agenda

Approval of Minutes from ASCS meeting of September 18, 2015

I. Old Business
   • Adoption: Modification of ASPP #804 (“Non-Renewal of Fixed-Term Renewable Appointments”)
   • Revision of ASCS Bylaws

II. New Business
   • Discussion of the IAS Divisor issue

III. Other business
   • Updates from administration regarding layoffs/repositioning
   • Updates from committee members

IV. Adjourn
1. Call to order

2. Approval of agenda

3. Approval of prior meeting minutes

4. Continue discussion of revision of bylaws

5. Other discussion items as needed

6. Adjourn
Attachment 2

UW Colleges Provost & Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs
Report to the UW Colleges Senate
November 13, 2015

UW Flexible Option Update: In late September, the U.S. Department of Education’s Office of Inspector General released a report that was critical of competency-based education programs, partially due to concerns about the level of interaction between instructors and students in some of those programs. In the report, the inspector general was particularly critical of the review process that the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) undertook while considering colleges’ proposals for new competency-based credentials.

On Monday, October 19, I met with the UW Colleges’ HLC Liaison Barbara Johnson to discuss the impact of the report on our recent accreditation for offering the UW Colleges Associate of Arts and Science degree in a competency-based, direct assessment mode of delivery. Specifically, I wanted to find out whether or not there was any chance that the UW Colleges UW Flexible Option program would be impacted by the Inspector General’s report and the increased scrutiny of the HLC by the Office of the Inspector General.

During the meeting, Barbara Johnson assured me that the UW Colleges is in good standing with the Commission and is within federal rules and regulations regarding the U.S. Department of Education’s expectations for “regular and substantive interactions” initiated by instructors between instructors and students in the UW Colleges UW Flexible Option program. Barbara Johnson commended the UW Colleges on its numerous responses to “regular and substantive” interaction expectations as established both by the HLC and the U.S. Department of Education. She was very complementary of the ways in which we presented evidence and compelling arguments on the kinds of interactions that occur between instructors and students within the context of our competency-based program. I expressed (on behalf of the UW Colleges) our intent to remain in excellent standing with the HLC and to remain in compliance with HLC accreditation expectations/criteria and federal rules and regulations.

Additionally, Barbara Johnson referenced our March site visit from the HLC and the very positive outcomes that resulted in this comprehensive peer review of the UW Colleges UW Flexible Option program. She believes the timing of the visit and the strong endorsement the UW Colleges received from the HLC Institutional Action Council could not have come at a better time.

At this time, I do not believe that the UW Colleges UW Flexible Option program is at risk or that our program will be reviewed again by the Higher Learning Commission in response to the Office of Inspector General’s report. As always, I will keep you informed of any future developments on this matter.

Update on the Bachelor of Applied Arts and Sciences (BAAS) Degree Completion Program: Task Force Update: Included within Chancellor Cathy Sandeen’s Round 2 decisions was the elimination of the BAAS Degree Program Coordinator position. In mid-November, BAAS degree Program Manager Patti Wise will
convene a task force to determine and recommend a new administrative model for the BAAS degree completion program. The members of the task force are as follows:

- BAAS Degree Program Manager Patti Wise (chair)
- UW-Barron County Engineering Professor Christa James-Byrnes
- UW-Baraboo/Sauk County Campus Executive Officer and Dean Tracy White
- UW Colleges Registrar Larry Graves
- UW-Baraboo/Sauk County BAAS Professional Experience Coordinator and Advisor Jennifer Walsh
- UW-Barron County BAAS Professional Experience Coordinator and Advisor Deborah Neuheisel-Smith
- UW-Barron County BAAS Advisor Kelli Coller
- UW-Richland BAAS Professional Experience Coordinator and Advisor Joanna Muller
- UW-Waukesha BAAS Professional Experience Coordinator and Advisor Kathleen Folbrecht

It is anticipated that this planning process will involve a one day face-to-face meeting in Madison, with one follow-up meeting via Skype. The work of the task force is expected to be completed by early December.

**Capstone Course:** The BAAS interdisciplinary Capstone course has been redesigned to be team-taught by instructors from the three divisions (Humanities, Social Sciences, and Natural Sciences and Mathematics). Students will work with the faculty member in their chosen field of study to select their capstone project. The three instructors will also follow the same cohort of students through both semesters, culminating in the students’ capstone presentations. BAAS degree seeking students will continue to work one-on-one with a faculty member who will receive a stipend for mentoring them throughout the year-long capstone course sequence.

**Senate BAAS Assessment Committee:** The Senate BAAS Assessment Committee (SBAC) has been working with Stephen Schmid, the BAAS Assessment Coordinator, to develop a rubric for reviewing and approving BAAS degree capstone project proposals. The SBAC will be responsible for approving this semester’s capstone project proposals. In the future, it has been proposed that academic departments assign representatives from different disciplines to sit on a review board to approve the capstone proposals and to evaluate the final capstone projects.

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

**Update on International Education:** During the week of October 19, Director of International Education Tim Urbonya convened the first meeting of a task force that has been charged with determining a cost recovery funding model for the UW Colleges Office of International Education. Included within Chancellor Cathy Sandeen’s Round 2 decisions was the expectation to have the Office of International Education become a full cost-recovery program within the 2015-17 biennium. The task force is meeting to create a funding model that will achieve this goal by June 30, 2017.

The task force members are as follows:

- UW Colleges Director of International Education Tim Urbonya (chair)
- UW-Fox Valley Campus Executive Officer and Dean Martin Rudd
During the first meeting of the task force the following points were agreed upon:

- At least in the near term, the Office of International Education should focus its efforts on recruiting and enrolling international students to a targeted subset of campuses in order to conserve the campus’s available staffing and resources.
- For at least the remainder of fiscal year 2016 and perhaps beyond, the Office of International Education should seek to maintain its current level of international programming as the institution and the campuses adjust to the realities of the new regional model.
- The task force needs to develop a strategy for communicating the new financial model concept to faculty and staff members on campuses so that there is an understanding of how the new model will work and why the task force is recommending the model.
- Due to the urgency of having something in place within the next two months, the task force needs to narrow its focus to creating a financial model that ideally allows the Office of International Education and the campuses to keep its current staffing and operations in place for the next 9-12 months. At that juncture, the Office of International Education should evaluate our experiences in the regional model and develop long-term enrollment and staffing goals.
- When analyzing staffing and programming, it is important for the task force to consider that English as a Second Language (ESL) students generate a higher return on investment and also require more staffing and resources. Programs such as IREX and Youth for Understanding (YFU) also require more staffing and resources but do not generate revenues sufficient for cost recovery. However, YFU and IREX students provide much-needed diversity and a generally stronger caliber of student.

The task force’s second meeting focused on reviewing current revenues and expenses of the International Education program and on discussing the general parameters for a financial model. In addition to reviewing the current revenue and expenses of the Madison-based Office of International Education, the task force is collecting and reviewing campus-based revenue and expenses relating to international student programming and staffing.

Office of International Education Director Tim Urbonya and I will continue to keep you informed of the work and outcomes of the task force.

**Update on the Search for the Director of Institutional Research, Assessment and Effectiveness:** On Wednesday, October 21, I appointed a Search Advisory Committee to conduct a national search for the next Director of Institutional Research, Assessment and Effectiveness. The members of the Search Advisory Committee are as follows:

- Cheryl Nessman, Director of Library Support Services (chair)
- Charles Clark, Campus Executive Officer and Dean, UW-Manitowoc
- Teague Mawer, Director of Budget and Planning, UW Colleges
- Tim Dunn, Department of Philosophy, UW-Waukesha
- Kristin Fillhouer, Assistant Campus Dean for Student Affairs, UW-Rock County
Jessica Cole, UW Colleges Associate Registrar
Todd Bailey, Office of Policy Analysis and Research, UW System
Gregg Nettesheim, Institutional Research (consultant to the committee)

The UW Colleges Director of Library Support Services Cheryl Nessman has graciously agreed to chair the Search Advisory Committee. Cheryl will provide excellent leadership and will guide the work of the Search Advisory Committee. I have asked Gregg Nettesheim to serve as a consultant to the committee. Gregg will be able to respond to questions and provide perspectives about the roles and responsibilities of the institutional researcher.

The position description for the Director position is posted on the UW Colleges’ website which can be found by going to the following Internet address:

https://www.careers.wisconsin.edu/psc/careers/EMPLOYEE/HRMS/c/HRS_HRAM.HRS_CE.GBL?Page=HRS_CE_JOB_DTL&JobOpeningId=11024&PostingSeq=1

The new Director of Institutional Research, Assessment and Effectiveness should be announced by the provost no later than December 31, 2015. Professor Bill Bultman is currently serving as the interim Director of Institutional Research, Assessment and Effectiveness. His interim appointment ends on December 31, 2015.

Respectfully submitted,

Greg Lampe, Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs
11.2.2015
Work continues on the implementation of Round 1 budget decisions related to campus-based Centers for Academic Success and Engagement (CASE), which includes Library Services, IT, Net Administration, Accommodations Proctoring, scheduling for Tutoring Services, Photo IDs, and general assistance and directional support. While there are lots of things happening within Academic Affairs, implementation and planning remain the top priority, so I will focus my report entirely on that work. Here is a summary progress of work as of the writing of this report:

**CASE Implementation**

Network Admin (Werner Gade): Recruitment of five System Admin positions is progressing. Screening process is complete and interviews being scheduled for early November. Template for services provided through CITS is nearly completed. Next step is to work with campuses to ensure template addresses appropriate areas.

ITS (Scott Bouffleur): Currently working with HR to identify positions that will be reduced from 1.0 to 0.75. Subgroup of IT Staff working on Distance Education Faculty training initiative and researching future alternative DE formats. IT also working to relocate work stations to CASE desk (library circulation desk) as well as photo ID equipment.

Researching Alternatives to Student Computer Labs (Werner Gade): Survey complete to gather additional information on general access student computer labs, and next step is to determine best way to facilitate the survey distribution to maximize best feedback.

Library Services (Joe Foy): I am pleased to congratulate Jennifer Chamberlain, library director at the University of Wisconsin-Washington County, who was recently named the first ever Executive Director of Libraries. Jennifer brings a wealth of experience to the position, and I know I join her colleagues in welcoming her innovative vision and enthusiastic leadership to this critical position. Jennifer officially starts in her role on November 16, and she and I have already begun working on collaborating on the ongoing implementation within library services. In addition to the hiring of the Executive Director, we recently completed the full application of library task group recommendations to actual staffing level on campus. I have also notified all library personnel who will need to competitively apply for positions within the library on their campuses, and will be working with Executive Director Chamberlain on collaborating with campuses on these processes. HR has helped prepare a listing of vacancies within the libraries. The last step in this process will be the posting of open positions on campuses (first internal, if we are unable to fill will open up). As with the competitive hires, the Executive Director of Libraries and I will work with campuses on how they want to handle these processes. Academic
librarians are scheduled to be hired first with LSA positions to follow (because ALs serve as local supervisors to the LSAs, so ALs need to be named first). This entire process is to be completed by early December, at which point training for accommodations proctoring will begin.

Accommodations Proctoring (Brian Schultz and Joe Foy): Accommodations proctoring has been folded into the contracts provided to LSAs who received additional FTE appointments to cover the accommodations proctoring service. Brian Schultz, Werner Gade, Scott Bouffleur and I will be meeting November 4 to discuss training for CASE-based staff. Brian will assist with the implementation of accommodations proctoring services to be housed in CASE.

CASE Answer Desk (Joe Foy): The recruitment for the CASE Answer Desk positions have been on hold for several weeks as the positions were reevaluated for financial and service impact. The determination has been made to reopen the recruitment with the position being a part-time (70%) position over 9 months. The Answer Desk provides IT and Library support, answers basic questions students might have related to services, and provides directional and scheduling support to library and IT and tutoring services. Answer Desk workers will also be responsible for student IDs and other support functions for campuses.

Course Options Implementation and Planning

As you may recall from my communication in July 2015 on Course Options, recent changes within state statute regarding Course Options have impacted us and our Course Options Program. The primary change in the law is that, although school districts bear the responsibility for covering the cost of the course (the actual expense of offering a class), additional tuition and fees could be charged to students/parents for these classes. Under the law, institutions of higher education (IHEs) and districts would still negotiate final tuition rates and fees.

For the spring, we are encouraging campuses to continue embracing the following principles:

1. **Flexibility for negotiating new agreements**: For any new agreements for the fall semester, campuses have the flexibility to negotiate tuition with school districts. There is no mandated flat rate that campuses are required to charge. The rate we are suggesting is $95/credit for any new agreements. With Course Options there are no explicit limitations set forth in the statutory language around pricing, and there is no differentiation between courses taken at the high school versus at a UW campus. Rather, for Course Options the receipt of college credit determines whether students may be charged. The amount charged to students is determined by the school board and the educational institution. Hence, there is no longer a 50 percent of tuition restriction on setting tuition for Course Options courses—be they courses taught through concurrent enrollment, courses taught through dual enrollment, or high school students coming to our campuses to take our college courses under Course Options. Instead, the amount charged for the courses will be determined through negotiation with the school districts.

2. **Youth Options**: Youth Options still exists within state statutes. Should a student apply to
our institution under Youth Options then the school district is required by law to pay full tuition and fees to the UW Colleges for the course.

3. Billing: Under the new legislation, school districts are responsible for covering the cost of the course. Beyond that course cost, and depending on what is negotiated, districts and parents/students can pay additional tuition, or districts and parents/students can each pay a portion of the additional tuition. **We are strongly encouraging that campuses bill school districts directly as third party payers, rather than attempting to collect tuition from parents/students directly.** This is particularly helpful when working to provide tuition reductions for students on the free and reduced lunch program (see #4), as well as Course Options like Youth Options where it is difficult to track negotiated rates for individual students who have entered courses through this option.

4. Considerations for Students Receiving Free and Reduced Lunch: We continue to recommend that, where practical, campuses provide consideration for offering reduced tuition to students on the free and reduced lunch program. UWO is currently piloting a program where they will split the tuition cost (determined by negotiated rate) 50/50 with the school district for students in the free and reduced lunch program. Though not required to do so at this time, we are encouraging campuses to explore tuition breaks for these students.

It is worth repeating that we are NOT currently imposing institution-wide mandates on cost per credit rates or billing processes. We have established defaults in order to try and provide guidance, help make the manual billing processes less time-intensive, and help protect student information. **Campuses need to communicate all agreements and rates directly to UW Colleges Bursar Poli Hyseni and UW Colleges Controller Laurie Grigg.** It is important that all agreements are clearly communicated to the Bursar and the Controller because of the manual processing that must take place for all of these courses.

The Office of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management has been working with campuses to finalize processing of applications and admissions, determining consolidated and regional functions from campus-based responsibilities and where those tasks will be housed. Once those processes are complete, communication will be forthcoming.

**Course Options Moving Forward:**

This year is a unique year when it comes to Course Options for three primary reasons: 1. The changes in the law took place in July after many agreements were already signed, and we wanted to make a commitment to honoring those agreements and minimizing disruption to our campuses and district partners. 2. GAPP #36 remains temporarily suspended for this year only. System President Ray Cross has not given an indication that this will continue. The suspension of GAPP #36 enables campuses to currently negotiate tuition rates below 50% of current per credit tuition. 3. We are reentering conversations with UWS partners about entering into a consortium agreement, so we need time to see fruit from those discussions before we are prepared to set institutional standards. Campuses, academic departments, and regional
leadership will be kept informed of ongoing planning.

Continuing Education Planning

The planning for the Regional Director of Continuing Education has just completed Phase 2 of its work. Please see the Phase 1 and 2 reports on the BISC SharePoint site for a full update. I am working with Melissa Mayo in the Office of Human Resources on finalizing the position description for these new regional positions, which is scheduled to go out for recruitment soon. Phase 3 work, which will be the final phase of the planning process, has already begun.

It is important to note that except for the fund 104 GPR allocation the UW Colleges receives from UW-Extension Division of Continuing Education, Outreach and E-Learning (CEOEL), Continuing Education within the Colleges operates on a cost recovery basis. Therefore, as is the case currently, staffing levels in CE must be supported through Program Revenue funds. The charge provided to the committee states that “other than the Director position, there are no specific staff reductions for Continuing Education identified with these budget decisions.” This does not mean that other changes won’t occur. It merely means that other changes are not being directed at this moment. The only certainty at this moment is that the campus-based “director” positions will be eliminated, and replaced with four regionally-based full-time directors. The fund 104 support will be re-directed to support these regional full-time positions. Once in place, the regional directors will assess the program, revenue and expense data for each campus program and will make decisions on local staffing. Until then, operations shall continue as they are.

As stated in my last report, I want to thank all of those who have been involved in the various aspects of implementation and planning, as well as the search advisory committees who are committing significant time and serious efforts in making really difficult decisions. My thanks to each of them and all of you for your ongoing support, patience, assistance and work through these difficult times.

Respectfully Submitted,

Joseph J. Foy
Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
Budget Implementation Steering Committee – II (BISC-2)

As described in my September report to the Senate, I was deeply involved in BISC-1 from the end of May through the end of August. On September 8th, BISC-2 was formally charged by Steve Wildeck, Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration and Greg Lampe, Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs. The charge to this group focused exclusively on Round Two, Budget Cut Decision #3, the consolidation and reorganization of a variety of functions currently performed within campus administrative offices. Specifically, BISC-2 is responsible for providing recommendations to the executive sponsors regarding campus-based functional areas including:

- Executive Officer and Dean’s office
- Human Resources
- General Administrative Support
- Business Services
- Marketing and Communications
- Physical Plant
- Continuing Education

BISC-2 will complete this work and submit formal recommendations to the Executive Sponsors by December 15th.

Round One, Budget Cut Decision #1: Student Affairs Budget Implementation

In my September report to the Senate, I described the planning phase of the Student Affairs Task Groups in their efforts to meet the budget reduction to the student affairs operation of $870,000. On September 2nd, Chancellor Sandeen approved the recommendations of the eight operational task groups, two student affairs oversight committees, and the approximately 60 team members from across the institution. Chancellor Sandeen assigned me to lead the student affairs implementation effort. To do so requires that student affairs campus office staffing levels be reduced from a current combined (all 13 campuses) level of 79.88 FTE to 45.78 FTE. The staffing levels for individual campuses’ Solution Centers can be found in the chart on the following page. For detailed information regarding the plan and planning process for the Solution Centers, please refer to the final Solution Center task group report.
In order to effectively pivot from developing implementation plans to performing actual implementation, the task groups were reduced in number and size to create nimble teams of implementers. As in any environment when moving from a plan to the implementation, the student affairs implementation teams have found that adjustments to the original plans have been necessary to ensure viable and sustainable operations. Many of the most observable implementation efforts have been in the posting and hiring of newly created positions.

On September 23rd, I sent an email to all student affairs staff members describing the hiring and implementation sequence for the unit. The email included information regarding when positions would be posted, due dates, and new position start dates. This information can be found below.
Please note that since the time of my September email, some of the dates for the posting of positions have changed. At the time of this writing, the positions for the Solution Center had not been posted (originally set for 10/15).

**Admissions:**
Hiring completed
Three positions began: 9/21
Positions located on local campuses
Internal search was conducted

New UW Colleges Consolidated Admissions Staff:
Robyn French – located at UW-Fond du Lac
Deb Kusick – located at UW-Waukesha
Jennie Strohm – located at UW-Marathon County

**Accessibility Services:**
Position posted: 9/24
Applications Due: 10/5
Position begins: 11/1
- One 0.5 position
- Position located Madison
- Internal search

**Veterans Services:**
Positions posted: 10/1
Applications Due: 10/15
Positions begin: 12/1
- Two 0.75 positions
- Positions located on local campuses
- Internal search

**Recruitment:**
Recruitment Manager
Position posted: 10/1
Applications due: 10/15
Position begins: 11/15
- One position
  - Position located in statewide region (not campus based)
  - Existing vacant position – open search with preference for internal candidates

Statewide Recruiters
Positions posted: 10/8
Applications due: 10/22
Positions begin: 11/30
- Four positions
  - Positions located in statewide regions (not campus based)
  - Preference for internal candidates
**Student Conduct & Compliance:**
Position posted: 10/1
Applications Due: 10/8
Position begins: 11/2
- One position
- Position may be located on a local campus
- Internal search

**Localized Services (One-Stop/Solution Center):**
Positions posted: 10/15
Applications Due: 10/30
Positions begin: 12/14
- Multiple positions located on local campuses
  - Information Specialist(s)
  - Advisor(s)
  - Student Activities Coordinator
  - Events Coordinator
- Some positions may have modifications to responsibilities when implemented

**National One-Stop Conference**
Along with three members of the Solution Center Implementation Team, I attended a national student affairs one-stop conference from Sunday October 10th – Tuesday October 13th at the University of Minnesota-Twin Cities. The conference both confirmed that the implementation team is organizing the implementation correctly and informed us about alternative technologies and typical implementation gaps. A key component highlighted in multiple seminars was the significant role that the existing office culture plays in causing friction and medium-term staff performance issues. It was encouraging to observe that although the UW Colleges is moving to a one-stop system for budgetary reasons, most institutions do so because it is a best practice for improving services to students.

**Student Government Retreat**
On Saturday October 3rd, the UW Colleges hosted the second annual student government retreat at UW-Fox Valley. This year over 60 students and student government advisors were in attendance for the full-day event. The major topics for discussion included shared governance, the segregated fee process and policies, parliamentary procedure, and best practices for recruiting and retaining student leaders. I would like to thank Sue Kalinka, Director of Student Development (UW-Waukesha) and Jeff Kuepper, Senior Student Activities Coordinator (UW-Fox Valley) for organizing and leading the event.

Respectfully submitted,
Rich Barnhouse
Associate Vice Chancellor,
Student Affairs & Enrollment Management
10.29.15
Tenure Policy Language: Madison proposed language to replace/augment the tenure policy shift to Regents policy from statutes: https://www.secfac.wisc.edu/Chapter_10_Proposed.htm. This will be discussed at the November 6 Faculty Reps meeting. The Tenure Task Force is slated to complete its work and report to the Board of Regents in April. There is currently some debate taking place at Madison and with the Tenure Task Force about the degree to which individual institutions will be able to set their own policies. Our representative to the Task Force, Al White, has been sending out updates to faculty.

Assessment of Regionalization and Consolidation: As follow up to the September 18 Senate meeting, I had a chance to meet with Institutional Assessment Coordinator Val Murrenus Pilmaier and AVCAA Joe Foy to talk about moving ahead with a plan for engaging in assessment of the regionalization and consolidation activities in the coming year. We agreed that developing a consistent approach to assessing regionalization of leadership and consolidation of services would be a welcome focus for CACs.

We have been developing a plan for assessing the changes involved in restructuring leadership and consolidating services. Pilmaier has circulated an email with an overview of the process to CACs and I have followed up with an email to Campus Steering Committee chairs to coordinate with their CACs on the process which will include a first step of campus forums or focus groups centered on three key questions.

i. What are your most significant concerns about regionalized leadership?

ii. What are your most significant concerns about consolidated services in the areas of Business Services, Academic Support, and Student Affairs?

iii. What do you see as the most productive opportunities created by regionalization and consolidation?

These will be used to inform development of the overall web survey which will be used to generate a baseline/benchmarks around current operations and attitudes. Follow up discussions will take place at the end of the semester, and the survey and discussions will be conducted again in Spring and next year. We had a Q and A teleconference on Wednesday, October 21 and developed a timeline table to help CACs.

Important items from BoR:

Waiver of Nonresident Enrollment Limits at UW Madison: This was the most controversial item on the agenda. Madison has historically had a cap on the number of nonresident students which was 27.5% of freshmen. The Regents voted with one dissenting vote to allow this change. Concerns and reassurances were offered. Cross and Blank framed it as workforce issue and attracting more workers to Wisconsin. They did not specifically address the attractive
nature of nonresident tuition dollars. Concerns expressed were that this may exclude Wisconsin residents from access to UW Madison and create an "Ann Arbor" problem which relies heavily on nonresident tuition dollars. One regent was concerned that lifting the cap would 'dilute' the quality of student admissions. Madison committed to admitting at least 3600 students though I'm not sure I understand the implications of that if it's not reflective of or part of a larger overall total number reflecting of a percentage of admissions. A report will be submitted in 2017 and 2019 on the impact of the change.

**Chancellor Campus Visits**
In consultation with the Chancellor's Chief of Staff Molly Vidal, I've been working on coordinating a set of campus visits, one to each region, where Chancellor Sandeen can learn more about the range of programs that our campuses provide, including developmental education, learning support services, and campus specific programs like the Wisconsin Institute for Public Policy and Service and the NSF grant at UW Manitowoc. She will meet with the Gender Equity Coordinator, Writing Program Administrator, Developmental Reading and Writing Coordinator, Director of WIIPPS, and Director of the Virtual Teaching and Learning Center to learn more about these core programs that across our institution. She will also meet with senators on those campuses to discuss governance issues. Sandeen is visiting Waukesha on 11/18.

**Concealed Carry Resolution**
With the chair of the UW Stevens Point Faculty Council, I co-authored a resolution on the proposed legislation to allow Concealed Firearms Carry in campus buildings. I also circulated the draft to faculty representatives and am organizing a collective response from campuses. Some campuses are also circulating resolutions independently. I have heard from every campus but Madison and Superior that they are developing a resolution opposing the legislation.

Respectfully submitted,
Holly Hassel
In consultation with the University Staff Council, the Academic Staff Council will be approving changes in ASPP #804 (“Non-Renewal of Fixed-Term Renewable Appointments”) to preserve the layoff and non-renewal rights for those US who will be migrating to AS positions. Additionally, the AS Council has completed its review of the current AS Bylaws and will be sending them out to all academic staff for comments, feedback, and approval.

With regard to Instructional Academic Staff issues, the AS Council will be issuing a statement urging the administration to focus resources on eliminating the “70% tripwire,” thereby addressing a longstanding imbalance in IAS compensation. We will also be examining another longstanding point of contention, the divisor issue.

Finally, the AS Council wishes to recognize the outstanding service and dedication of many Academic Staff employees who will be losing their positions due to absolutely no fault of their own. Current budget cutbacks have fallen disproportionately on Academic Staff. We sincerely hope these actions do not establish a precedent for future budget cuts.

Respectfully Submitted,
Jeff Verona
October 29, 2015
It was a historic meeting to have the Faculty, Academic Staff, University Staff, and Student Representatives all meeting jointly. The joint meeting portion of the day was spent getting updates on Legislative changes, budget updates and human resources updates. There was also discussion about the Accountability dashboard that has now gone live, [https://www.wisconsin.edu/accountability/](https://www.wisconsin.edu/accountability/).

There is concern that with the current structure of 36-21 the “fate” of academic staff is in the hands of Chancellors and Faulty. There have been multiple request to include Academic Staff in the tenure task group. President Cross and David Ward both committed and stated, that administrative code and campus policies include Academic Staff, but it still needs to be changed in statue.

**Academic Staff Professionals Representation Organization**

ASPRO membership has declined so we were asked to talk with our academic staff member and stress the importance of membership. Legislative is new and they do not know what we do, so this is really important.

**Appropriate use of lay-off versus non-renewals**

UW Milwaukee has been having a lot of issues with this. Unemployment benefits is a driver for layoff vs nonrenewal and with nonrenewal you lose the right for recall. With nonrenewal there is no needed justification as to why, with layoff there needs to be justification. Work needs to be done to clearly define what an operational unit is.

Next Academic Staff Representative meeting is scheduled for November 6\(^{th}\). Current agenda items include:

1. Conceal/Carry legislation is one item for discussion
2. Numerous updates on various pieces of legislation (fetal tissue, state insurance board, etc.)
3. Campus budget cut discussions (numbers and amounts from year 1 and plans for year 2 of 2015-17 biennial budget)
4. Titling/Compensation study progress

Respectfully Submitted,

Lucas Dock

October 28, 2016
Senators and Council Representatives
The following are names of the UW Colleges University Staff Council members:
Brust, Rose (MTH); Carter, John (RLN); Larson, Christi (WSH); McGuire, Juli (FOX);
Messerschmidt, Dawn (MSF); Peissig, April; Sacco, Jaci; Sbarbaro, Kay (SHB); Stapleton, Jean
(WAK); Stenstrup, Roseann (MNT); Wilson, Bradley (BRB) The following are the names of the
UW Colleges University Staff Council of Senators; Larson, Christi; McGuire, Juli, Sbarbaro,
Kay; Stenstrup, Roseann; Wilson, Bradley

- **Bylaws.** The University Staff Council continues to work on revisions to its bylaws which
  began before the initiation of regionalization.
- **Non-member Support.** The Council would like to acknowledge non-member support
  by university staff on standing committees, specifically Joyce Bell, Brenda Dugan, Nena
  Beier, Justeen Mallo, and Char Schmidt.
- **Meetings.** The Council’s October 20th meeting which was to be a full day, face-to-face
  meeting was instead rescheduled as a monthly Skype meeting.
- **UPS Policy Work.** The University Staff Personnel Committee is in the process of
  weekly meetings to make progress on local policies, including Performance Management,
  Temporary and Project Appointments, and to resolve conflicting language in the layoff
  policy with UPS GEN13.
- **Statewide Meetings.** The USC System Rep and other Council and non-member reps
  continue to attend meetings via Webex and at the Pyle Center to share information with
  University Staff shared governance reps throughout the state.
- **Elections.** The Council chair recently sent out a call for a third member to the University
  Staff Nominations and Elections committee. One nomination has come out of that call.
- **Representation.** There currently is no University Staff Council representative for UW-
  Fond du Lac, UW-Rock County, UW Central office, and UW Online to complete the
  terms of vacancies or begin this new elections year.
- **Position Reductions.** The USC will be holding its second meeting in the near future
  with the ASC and Human Resources Director Jason Beier to discuss position reductions.
  University Staff are very anxious to receive information and have differing levels of
  understanding at different campuses despite the efforts to keep employees, in general,
  informed.
- **PD.** The Council will be revitalizing its Professional Development standing committee
  in the near future to develop ways to collect information about and encourage university
  staff to engage in ongoing learning opportunities.
- **Kudos.** USC Member-at-Large and unofficial Treasurer Roseann Stenstrup has recently
  been named as a member of the newest UW Colleges and UW-Extension Academy for
  Leadership and Innovation Class IV of 2016.

Respectfully submitted,
Juli McGuire, Chair/Lead Senator
UW Colleges University Staff Council
Over the past two months, SGC has taken action on several issues of importance to students, and succeeded in filling remaining positions on the SGC executive board.

An election was held at the October 10, 2015 meeting, and SGC is happy to introduce Nicolas Calvache (Waukesha) as our new Financial Director. This, along with the election of Lamonte Moore as First Year Officer on September 12, means that all SGC executive board positions are now filled.

At the September 12 meeting, SGC endorsed a statement (also endorsed unanimously by UW System Student Reps on the same day) regarding the UW Colleges-Technical Colleges merger investigation, particularly the process being employed which excludes stakeholders from the discussion.

In another of three statements released in the past two months, SGC requested that UW Colleges student ID cards be made compatible with Wisconsin's Voter Photo ID Law for use at the polls. In a statement approved at the October 10 meeting, SGC recommended to UW Colleges administration that they “begin planning to implement... student ID card features in advance of the upcoming 2016 elections.”

On October 15, SGC released a statement opposing the proposed Campus Carry Act. The position on this contentious issue was carefully considered and debated, and ultimately SGC leadership took this position on the grounds that the bill removes control over campus weapon policy from those responsible for campus safety, instead imposing partisan politics onto a critical issue of student safety and campus climate. This statement, along with the two others mentioned above, are included following this report.

Finally, SGC is in the early stages of forming a committee to investigate any opportunities that may be found through a regional or institution-wide process for any portion of our segregated fee budgeting or allocation. The goal of this committee would be to determine if some parts of our current process would make more sense under a different model in keeping with the other organizational changes occurring in the UW Colleges. This student-led committee will likely be convened in spring of 2016 and work in cooperation with administrators and appropriate experts to produce a set of recommendations.

SGC thanks the Senate for their continued support of student engagement in governance. I look forward to continuing to work with you all for the remainder of my final year in the UW Colleges. As always, my personal thanks to Linda Baum for keeping things on track, and Patrick Neuenfeldt for his valuable advice and assistance.

Respectfully,
Graham Pearce
Student Governance Council President
As students of the UW Colleges, we have a strong interest in the viability of our state access institutions. We recognize the value of the unique mission of the UW Colleges as students who have benefitted from the high-quality, low cost groundwork for a 4-year degree that is offered, and we strongly oppose any proposal that might jeopardize this mission.

Because of this, we have concerns about the process which is reported to be taking place to investigate the merger of the UW Colleges and the Wisconsin Technical College System. These two separate, valued state systems have very different missions and purposes. Forcing them to exist as a single system would almost certainly result in a loss to both.

However, we are not opposed to any reasonable effort to investigate cost-saving efficiency proposals, as long as such investigations are done with the appropriate stakeholders involved in the process. Our concerns stem from the procedure currently being followed, which appears to have been done by design to exclude those from the discussion with an understanding of the existing institutions and the value of their current, distinct models.

In a recent WPR interview, when asked about the logic of having this effort headed by someone with no experience in higher education, Assembly Speaker Robin Vos argued “[this] assumes that only people who have had experience in an area are open minded enough to learn more. And sometimes, the very people who have been involved have their minds closed.” Given the process that was followed by these same elected officials in recent changes to the UW System, this is deeply concerning: it indicates the deliberate exclusion of subject matter experts and stakeholders who have an awareness of the value of existing systems and processes. If this were merely a non-binding working group charged with finding new ideas, which would then be fully vetted by a committee involving subject-matter experts, there would be less of a concern. However, the process as it’s been defined by Assembly leadership is almost guaranteed to ignore swaths of important issues with such a merger, and to prejudice the discussion toward a plan that will cause harm to both the UW Colleges and WTCS.

In light of these issues, on behalf of the more than 14,000 students of the UW Colleges, we strongly oppose the current UW Colleges/WTCS merger investigation process. We invite Wisconsin Assembly leadership to reach out to UW Colleges student leaders, including SGC, and discuss better ways to include students and other stakeholders in discussions that affect the future of our valued institutions.

This statement was endorsed unanimously by the voting membership of Student Governance Council on September 12, 2015, and endorsed unanimously by the voting members of UW System Student Reps on September 13, 2015.

Graham Pearce
UW Colleges Student Governance Council President
Reps pearg9280@students.uwc.edu

Ryan Sorenson
Chair, UW System Student
sorens76@uwmm.edu
October 10, 2015

The Wisconsin legislature passed the Voter Photo ID Law, 2011 Wisconsin Act 23, in May 2011. Due to subsequent court challenges, this law has not been enforced over the past 4 years. However, because these legal challenges have now been exhausted with the US Supreme Court declining to hear an appeal in March 2015, the law will be implemented for elections subsequent to the April 2015 election.

For students lacking another form of acceptable photo ID, 2011 Act 23 provides a mechanism for the use of a student ID card as a voter ID. The relevant section in Wisconsin Statutes, §5.02(6m)(f) reads:

An unexpired identification card issued by a university or college in this state that is accredited, as defined in §39.30(1) (d), that contains the date of issuance and signature of the individual to whom it is issued and that contains an expiration date indicating that the card expires no later than 2 years after the date of issuance if the individual establishes that he or she is enrolled as a student at the university or college on the date that the card is presented.

Based on this statute, the following elements are required for a student ID card to be used as voter ID:

1. Name and photo (required to function as an “identification card”).
2. Date of issuance.
3. Date of expiration no more than 2 years after the date of issuance.
4. Signature of the person to whom it was issued.
5. In addition, a document establishing current enrollment in the issuing college is required in order for a student ID card to be accepted as voter ID.

At present, UW Colleges student ID cards do not comply with this statute, as they lack items #2-#4 above, and thus would not be valid for use as voter ID.

In representing the students of the UW Colleges, SGC has an interest in the ability of students to exercise the basic right to vote. In light of the impending implementation of the voter ID laws, SGC strongly recommends that UW Colleges administration begin planning to implement these additional student ID card features in advance of the upcoming 2016 elections. Rollout of the new card design could be completed over a period of time extending beyond the 2016 elections, as long as the option is available to students to upgrade to a voter ID-compliant card upon request. In addition, we recommend that enrollment documentation meeting the statutory requirement be made readily available to students upon request. Finally, we recommend that information on the updated student ID cards and their use as voter ID be provided to students, both upon the change being implemented and on an ongoing basis through orientation.

Graham Pearce

Pass 10/10/2015

Vote

UW Colleges Student Governance Council
President pearg9280@students.uwc.edu
October 15, 2015
For immediate release

The UW Colleges Student Governance Council opposes the proposed Campus Carry Act, allowing the conceal and carry of weapons on UW campuses. We take the safety of students on our campuses very seriously and are concerned about the unintended effects of this broad mandate.

Current Wisconsin concealed-carry law allows campuses to prohibit weapons in their buildings. Policy decisions such as this will have a profound impact on the safety of students, and should be left to those responsible for the institutions in the UW System, as is currently the case.

We, the UW Colleges Student Governance Council, ask that our state legislators engage with elected student leaders, subject experts, and UW System leaders in a robust conversation about how to best make our campuses safe. We believe that an evidence-based, non-partisan approach will best serve the students who are investing in themselves and the state of Wisconsin to earn their degree.

Graham Pearce
UW Colleges Student Governance Council
President pearg9280@students.uwc.edu
The Senate Academic Policy Committee (SAPC) met the morning of September 18, 2015 prior to the UWC Senate meeting. We discussed and/or acted on the following items:

1) Near the end of the spring semester, 2015, Senate Steering charged SAPC with a review/revision of IP#202, specifically as it concerned drop deadlines for the UWC Flex Program. Steering had already provided interim approval to extend Flex drop and “drop with W” dates, and SAPC was now tasked with a formal introduction of any policy changes. The committee had lengthy discussion of this issue and agreed that Flex drop deadlines should be brought in line with what had been proposed. In addition, SAPC felt that the “drop with W” deadline already approved should be lengthened, bringing it parallel with what is found in other UWC sessions. Caleb Bush, SAPC Chair, agreed to make the necessary changes and prepare IP#202 for introduction at the November Senate meeting.

2) Senate Steering also charged SAPC with a review of UWC Constitution Chapter 2.10 concerning referendums. The referendum held over the summer months had brought forth a number of issues that need to be addressed. After thoughtful discussion, the committee members felt that SAPC lacked the charter to review this issue. The committee felt that the full Faculty Council of Senators might be the proper venue for discussion. Shortly after the meeting, Bush sent this charge back to Senate Steering Chair, Holly Hassel, with this recommendation.

3) An older charge, a review of IP#110, concerning college credit courses offered in high schools, also received lengthy discussion. This dual credit policy remains hopelessly outdated, but SAPC had tabled discussion until the uncertainty around funding these courses cleared. Now that this has happened, Joanne Giordano agreed to return to this policy and prepare IP#110 for introduction at the November Senate meeting.

4) SAPC continues to work toward a revision of Senate Policy #408, adding language to address the possibilities of dissolving, combining, splitting, and/or relocating departments or programs. Much uncertainty continues to surround this charge with SAPC concerned about Academic Affairs and/or the Central office’s support for such changes. Would changes essentially be “dead on arrival” if sent to the Chancellor for adoption? What legal issues, if any, are involved with this policy change? Bush agreed to contact Academic Affairs and begin an inquiry into administrative support and any legal concerns with these changes.

5) The committee also discussed work that may be coming in future weeks and months, especially with the move to regionalization of the Colleges’ campuses. We have little doubt that SAPC will remain at the forefront of many policy and Constitutional changes while also continuing to address a host of other policy needs.
Since the September meeting, SAPC has received additional charges and/or Senate work. The committee will begin work on these charges at the November 13, 2015 meeting with the goal of introducing any changes in the Spring 2016 semester. This work concerned:

1) Senate Steering has asked SAPC to work in conjunction with Faculty Appeals and Grievances to review UWC Constitution Chapter 6 and procedures around processing appeals/grievances. SAPC has had initial conversations around this charge, and we are uncertain SAPC is the appropriate venue for this review (this is ostensibly a Faculty-only concern and NOT an academic policy issue). We are awaiting any action by Appeals and Grievances before moving on this charge in any fashion.

2) Along with a host of other Senate bodies, SAPC was asked to review the petition by American Indian Studies (AIS) faculty for the creation of a new, standalone, AIS Program. Bush asked committee members to review the petition and identify any academic policy concerns. With only a couple, minor issues identified by members, SAPC Chair Bush forwarded the committee’s support for this petition to move forward in the consideration process.

3) Within the past two weeks, SAPC received a new charge from Steering to review UWC Constitution, Chapter 11, along with IP#408. Specifically, SAPC has been asked to create new language addressing a pathway for department-housed programs to petition for standalone status. Additionally, there may be language inconsistencies in Chapter 11 around program jurisdiction that need greater clarity. Bush alerted Steering Chair Hassel that SAPC already had a very similar charge concerning Chapter 11 and had been discussing a path forward on this issue. We will continue discussion of these related charges in future meetings.

4) Only within the last days of October, SAPC received a charge from Steering asking the committee to examine changes to UWC drop deadlines. Specifically, we are being asked to explore pushing the early drop deadline beyond the current, “end of the second week of classes” timeframe. There is concern that the current deadline results in higher numbers of F7-F10 grades than necessary. SAPC will begin discussion of this issue at our November meeting. As Steering pointed out, there are a host of academic issues involved that need to be discussed in administrative circles as well. More to come…

Enough already! The months ahead look busy, indeed, and SAPC continues to work tremendously as a group.

Respectfully submitted,
Caleb M. Bush
Chair, Senate Academic Policy Committee
November 13, 2015
American Indian Studies Feedback to SSC:

SSC asked SBC to assess the budget impact of the American Indian Studies Program’s petition to become a stand-alone program. We discussed this material via email and submitted feedback to SSC on October 23.

IAS 70% Tripwire and Divisor Issue Feedback to SSC:

SSC asked SBC to provide feedback on eliminating the IAS 70% tripwire that is currently in place. The SBC agrees with the Academic Staff Council that the elimination of the tripwire should be a high priority. We are working with ASC on a joint statement communicating this priority to UWC administration.

Charge from SSC to Review IP #320 and #FPP 501:

SSC asked SBC to re-examine some of the travel requirements, particularly for class visits. We will be reviewing IP #320 and FPP #501 and making recommendations as needed regarding class visits and other travel required by our senate policies.

Respectfully submitted,

Margaret Hankenson
Chairperson, Senate Budget Committee
October 30, 2015
Since the last Senate meeting in September the FPSC has worked on several items through email exchanges and conference phone meeting. The committee will introduce revisions to FPP#501.01 and #501.02 regarding due dates. Currently there are specific due dates in both these policies and in some incidences they are different than in FPP#501. The committee decided instead of revising these date to those in #501, it would remove all specific dates and indicate the due dates are in #501. This eliminates any future possible differences in dates if they are changed in #501 and not caught in other policies. It also ensures #501 will be read and the specific requirements for each date are followed.

In conjunction with this due date situation, Senate Steering asked the committee to develop some type of graphic that would better illustrate all the due dates for tenure-track review, promotion and post-tenure review. The committee has developed several tables that might be more ‘user-friendly’ and has submitted them to Senate Steering for review.

The committee will also introduce revisions to IP#320 so IAS will receive the Activity Report form after every semester, that Human Resources will also receive the IAS performance reports, and eliminate the term ‘renewable appointments’ so all IAS are notified of their evaluation and areas of possible improvement.

Senate Steering asked the committee to clarify that notification for first-year retention should be in writing. After reviewing the policy (#501), there is a section in the introduction of the policy that indicates all notifications shall be unalterable copies (such as pdf files). This clarification was submitted to Senate Steering.

A petition by the American Indians Studies to become a program was reviewed by FPSC. Senate Steering asked the committee to provide comments on the petition including its merit and whether there were any concerns regarding the request. The committee has completed this review and submitted to Senate Steering.

As campus-level discussion on the proposed revisions to merit procedures and rankings in FPP#503 has begun, there appeared to be several items faculty either disagreed with (either with the procedures or sections not related to the process) or were confused about. The committee decided to draft a statement providing some clarification and rationale for the proposed changes. This statement was sent to all campus Senators and Steering Chairs for distribution.

The committee is continuing its review of a variety of documents relating to the new UWS policy regarding tenure. It was determined by the committee to gather aspects important to the UW Colleges from these documents to have ready if the Colleges decides it needs to produce some type of statement or white paper regarding tenure.
There appears to be a complex set of issues involving the appeals and grievance process in UW Colleges policy and its Constitution. Although these can eventually be resolved, the current transition to regionalization of the campuses creates a situation where waiting until how this new systems functions to address these issues might be a more productive approach. A current FPSC member (Ron Gulotta) is also on the Faculty Appeals and Grievance Committee and will work as a liaison between the committees and, once a clearer picture of how regionalization will impact these processes emerges the committees will work to revise these.

The Higher Learning Commission (HLC) recently revised its standards on qualifications for faculty. Senate Steering has asked FPSC to review these standards and make recommendations as to how these might impact the Colleges and what, if any revisions we should be making to our standards.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael C. Jurmu

Chairperson, Faculty Professional Standards Committee
Attachment 13

Senate Assessment Committee Chair
Report to the UW Colleges Senate
November 13, 2015

Since the last SAC report to the Senate in September 2015 the Senate Assessment Committee has discussed via email the American Indian Studies petition and forwarded our response to Senate Steering Chair.

Final assessment reports for the 2014-15 year are being received and reviewed by SAC.

The 2015-2016 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 Analytical Skills, Aesthetic Skills or Intercultural Skills.

The Campus Assessment Coordinators will be closing the loop on any open projects and/or completing an assessment of the regionalization/consolidation process.

What will this assessment look like:

Fall 2015

It will be comprised of three parts:

a) The CAC will facilitate focus groups on campus this semester to ascertain from the campus community both the areas of opportunity and the potential challenges we face in all areas that are to be affected from the regionalization. You can use your campus budgets to pay for food for these focus groups. Prior to the focus groups, we will ask that members of the campus community review all of the reports. Be sure to have everyone sign-in to the focus group discussions. The Senate Assessment Committee in collaboration with Senate Steering and Academic Affairs will collaborate to develop some discussion questions as a starting point.

b) CACs will help to craft 1-3 campus-specific questions that can be integrated in to the survey template based on the information shared at the focus groups (Richland may want to add questions about international students, Rock may want to add questions about residence halls, etc). CACs will then pass those questions on to the IAC.

c) A Qualtrics survey will be sent to all members of the campus community regarding fears/concerns/opportunities that may arise as a result of these changes. We would like to send this out in November. This will be a baseline survey.

d) CACs will facilitate debriefing sessions after the survey data has been collected. This can certainly take place in Collegium.

Spring 2016

1. The survey will again be sent out in March.
2. CACs will compare the spring data to the fall data.
3. CACs will discuss the results with the campus community in spring.
4. Discuss campus-specific action steps in relation to the data presented.
We will send out the survey each semester thereafter, at least through the 2016-2017 academic year, but potentially longer.

Next Steps for CACs:
1. The Campus Assessment Plans are due on sharepoint on October 15. Please let us know on your plan if your campus is going to be only participating in the Qualtrics survey, only closing the loop on your current project or doing both.

Submitted by
Kristin Plessel
SAC Chair
October 7, 2015
Overview
The aims of this project are two-fold: to bring our institutional degree standards into line with newly adopted system-level requirements, and to address any curricular needs that arise as a result of changes to our degree framework. This academic year the UWC will focus on the policy alignment piece. The system policy, ACIS 1.3, addresses four major areas we need to consider: (1) Depth requirement, (2) Breadth categories defined in terms of UWS Shared Learning Goals, (3) Three types of degrees that can be conferred, (4) Recommendation of inclusion of HIPs.

Updates
Reimagining Project and the DACs/SAC:
- Assessment Coordinator Valerie Murrenus Pilmaier included me in a discussion of assessment and the degree reimaging project which occurred at the August DAC meeting. The conversation included comments on the role of assessment in connecting various institutional initiatives, AAC&U’s VALUE rubrics, and general brainstorming ideas on degree reform.
- The DACs suggested that their group build expertise in how VALUE rubrics could be used in the UWC assessment program. A sub-set of DACs self-identified to work on that.
- The SAC nominated DACs to attend the UWS LEAP Wisconsin Faculty Collaboratives Conference. (More on this in the section below.)
- I will meet with the DACs again in January for another conversation on assessment and the degree reimaging project.

UWS LEAP Wisconsin Faculty Collaboratives Conference
- On Sept 24-25, each UWS institution sent a team to an AAC&U grant-funded conference focused on student learning in the UW.
- Sessions at the conference addressed: assessment, authentic student work, general education reform, and an introduction to the LEAP Wi HUB- an electronic platform for sharing SoTL work that is being developed at the system level.
- The faculty team representing the UWC at the conference was comprised of members from the degree reimaging leadership team and faculty members with assessment expertise. DACs on the team were nominated by the SAC. These participants reviewed the conference content in the context of the degree reimaging project during scheduled “team time.”
- At the conclusion of the conference, the UWC team unanimously recommended that the degree reimaging leadership team focus on a LEAP-based reform approach. Rationale for this included: influence of LEAP Wi work on general education reforms throughout the UW, the
considerable research that has already been done on the LEAP initiatives at a variety of institutions, and the considerable flexibility of the LEAP framework.

**Depth Requirement & Academic/Program Departments**

- The leadership team is working to frame each of the four issues (listed in the overview, above) for discussion throughout the institution. Academic departments/programs are now working on the depth requirement piece. The system policy states, “Each associate degree must contain a two-course sequence in which the first course provides the foundation for the second.” The Chairs were able to have an initial discussion on this issue, collectively, at their face-to-face meeting on Oct. 23. The discussion included comments on minimum credits, courses with pre-requisites, transferring in credits, and the purpose of a depth requirement.
- Chairs will continue to represent their departments/programs on this issue in consultation with the appropriate department/program committee(s). When a working definition has been agreed upon, departments/programs will identify pairs of courses which will satisfy our interpretation of this requirement.

**Deans/Chairs Meeting**

- In the morning session of the Deans/Chairs meeting on Oct. 23, campus and department leaders were able to ask questions and provide feedback on the degree reimagining project.
- Feedback included comments and questions on degree attainment in light of multiple pathways to the degree, connecting our work to our transfer partners, possibilities for new degree marketing strategies, opportunities to build on past work, and improved alignment of the degree framework with our assessment program.
- A PowerPoint presentation was used during this session and is posted on the project SharePoint site (documents>presentations>reimagining overview at deans chairs).

**Senate Steering**

- On Oct. 26, Senate Steering reviewed and provided feedback on the proposed project timeline. Of particular importance in that conversation was a discussion of the timing and mechanism for bringing recommendations to the Senate. This will occur in the spring with recommendations heading to the Senate in February for consideration at the April meeting.

**Campus Visits**

- The previous Senate report included an offer to visit campuses to discuss the project. I have had the opportunity to speak at FOX’s collegium and am scheduled to visit Marathon and Manitowoc next month.

*Respectfully submitted,*

Caroline Geary

10/30/15
Background and Rationale:
Senate Steering reviewed the committee structure during Spring 2015 and found that the Senate Correspondence Committee (SCoC) had only met once in the last ten years. The committee was called into action this past year to speak on behalf of the Senate, and thus the UW Colleges, on urgent issues surrounding the latest budget. The mechanisms in place were not a useful way to meet that responsibility. Steering members felt that Steering is already assigned that role. Moreover, the Correspondence Committee is explicitly assigned the task of reviewing the Senate Leaders Handbook, but either the SSC Chair or Senate Assistant Linda Baum has been handling that task. It was felt that the Steering Committee could deal with the items SCoC has been charged with and, therefore, Steering proposes to eliminate the Correspondence Committee.

Proposed changes are crossed off in black. (Deletions only.)

### UW Colleges Senate Bylaws

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established</th>
<th>Revised by the Senate (SSC) 3-5-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revised 3/18/95</td>
<td>Revised by the Senate (SSC) 4-23-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised 1/11/96</td>
<td>Revised by the Senate (SIITC) 2010-10-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised 5/4/96</td>
<td>Revised by the Senate (SSC) 2011-01-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised 3/8/97</td>
<td>Revised by the Senate (SSC) 2011-04-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised 4/23/99</td>
<td>Revised by the Senate (SOPC) 2011-10-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised 3/14/03</td>
<td>Revised by the Senate (SSC) 2011-10-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised 5/02/03</td>
<td>Revised by the Senate (SSC) 2012-01-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised 1/21/04</td>
<td>Revised by the Senate (SSC) 2013-01-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised 5/7/04</td>
<td>Revised by the Senate (SSC) 2013-02-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised 4/29/05</td>
<td>Revised by the Senate (SAPC) 2013-03-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised 10/19/07</td>
<td>Revised by the Senate (SSC) 2014-03-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised 1/16/08</td>
<td>Revised by the Senate (SSC) 2014-03-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised by the Senate 3-7-08</td>
<td>Revised by the Senate (SSC) 2014-08-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised by the Senate 1-14-09</td>
<td>Revised by the Senate (SSC) 2014-10-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised by the Senate 4-24-09</td>
<td>Revised by the Senate (SSC) 2015-03-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised by the Senate 10-23-09</td>
<td>Revised by the Senate (SSC) 2015-07-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised by the Senate (SSC) 1-13-10</td>
<td>Revised by the Senate (SSC) 2015-07-01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.0  Appointed Senate Bylaws Committees

5)  Senate Correspondence Committee

Revised 1/14/09

Membership. The Senate Correspondence Committee is composed of the chair or their designees from the following committees: Senate Steering, Senate Academic...
Policy, Senate Budget, Faculty Professional Standards, Faculty Appeals and Grievances, Academic Staff Appeals and Grievances, and Academic Staff Personnel. The committee shall have a majority of faculty senators.

Duties. The Correspondence Committee’s responsibilities shall include reviewing and maintaining the Senate Leaders Handbook on an annual basis and writing regular Senate correspondence as directed by the Chair of Senate Steering with the approval of the Senate Steering Committee.

6) 5) Senate Inclusive Excellence Committee

[...]
Attachment 16

UW Colleges Senate
Adoption: November 13, 2015
Proposed Revision of IP #101
(“Associate of Arts and Science Degree”)

Background and Rationale
When revising the rubrics that are used for assessing this proficiency, the committee and Department Assessment Coordinators felt that the previous language was no longer accurate.

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

UW Colleges Senate Policy
Institutional Curricular Policy #101
Associate of Arts and Science Degree

The Associate of Arts and Science Degree

II. Degree Proficiencies

To fulfill its mission, the UW Colleges has identified the following areas of proficiency to be of primary importance in the education of our students. Assessment methods to determine student acquisition of proficiencies at the course level have been developed. Students may be required to participate in course assessment.

A. Analytical Skills
Students must be able to:
1. Interpret and synthesize information and ideas
2. Analyze and evaluate arguments
3. Construct an argument in support of a conclusion
4. Select and apply scientific and other appropriate methodologies
5. Integrate knowledge and experience to arrive at creative solutions
6. Gather *Locate* and assess information from printed sources, electronic sources, and observation
7. Construct and support hypotheses

[...]
Rationale:
To keep policy language consistent across policies, language changes previously made to FPP 503 need to be included in IPP 320. The first change is to specify that all IAS having taught during an academic term should receive, prior to the end of that term, the forms and instructions for completing the Activity Report which need be completed once a year in January. The second change is to include the director of HR among those to receive the resulting rating scores. The third change is to remove language referring to renewable contracted IAS, as it is good and current practice in the Colleges to provide merit reviews for all IAS.

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

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

I. Instructional Academic Staff (Category B), including Returning Retired Faculty

A. All instructional academic staff, regardless of percentage of appointment, shall be evaluated. The only exception will be instructors paid with one lump sum (i.e. coaches, applied music instructors).

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

C. Evaluation of instructional academic staff is based on the following:

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

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

D. It is the responsibility of the campus to notify the instructional academic staff of the requirement to annually submit the Activity Report form and copies of the class visitation reports to the appropriate campus/department committee chair. Before the end of each academic term, the campus is responsible for the distribution of the activity reports form and instructions to all instructional academic staff who have taught during that term.

II. Departmental and campus responsibilities for instructional academic staff, including Returning Retired Faculty.

Revised 4-24-09
Revised by the Senate (SAPC) 2013-03-15
Revised by the Senate (FPSC) 2013-04-26

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

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

B. Returning instructional academic staff can expect the following:

   1. A departmental visit will occur during the second and third years of employment. Departmental visits during the fourth and fifth years may be conducted at the discretion of the department.

      After the initial five years of employment, departmental visits will occur once every five years. However, departments may request additional visitations, but not to exceed one visitation every two years.

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

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

III. **Implementation**

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

IV. **Performance Evaluation**

Revised by the Senate (FPSC) 2013-04-26

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

   -- "meritorious": exceeding expectations;

   -- "satisfactory": meeting expectations;

   -- "unsatisfactory": failing to fulfill expectations.

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

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

V. **Reconsideration Appeal Process**

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

Charge: to review Chapter 2 of the Constitution 2.10: Referendum for clarity and determine whether changes are needed to spell out criteria for passage of a referendum and voter eligibility.

As a constitutional item affecting faculty, academic staff, and potentially university staff, the Steering Committee formed a subgroup of Steering with two faculty, one academic staff member, and one university staff member. The committee reviewed Chapter 2.10 and arrived at the following points of agreement:

- The subcommittee did not support a precise definition of criteria for passage of a referendum because we believed that the language is purposefully ambiguous in order to accommodate to a wide range of issues, goals, and contexts that might emerge and that call for a referendum. The subcommittee does not believe that providing precise definitions will suit a range of purposes in the future instances of institutional referenda.
- However, the committee does support proposing an additional level of consultation on the powers that are granted to Senate Steering under the current wording, which is to determine procedures for the distribution and tallying of ballots. We believe procedural definitions would be impeded by a full review of all collegium which could take weeks or months; instead, we recommend an additional layer of review and approval by senators of the initiating body (Faculty, staff, etc). In the age of technology, this could easily be done in a way that is compliant with open-meetings and not substantially delay the process.
- Lastly, we have updated referendum language to include the option for initiation by university staff. Since university staff were not included in governance at the time of the writing of this language, we support empowering this group with the capacity to initiate a referendum granted by 2.10.
- We have clarified that only voting members of collegia may support the initiation of a referendum, not just members.

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

UW Colleges Constitution
Chapter 2 - UW Colleges Governance

Approved by the UW Board of Regents 9/10/93
Revision adopted by the Senate 11/12/94
Revision adopted by the Senate 5/5/95
Revision adopted by the Senate 9/20/97
Revision adopted by the Senate 4/23/99
Revision adopted by the Senate 10/17/08
Revision adopted by the Senate 2012-01-11
2.10 Referendum

The Senate, through its Steering Committee, may determine that a particular issue is of such importance that a referendum is the only appropriate manner to arrive at a determination of opinion. A referendum may also be initiated by a petition to the Chancellor of 10 percent of the voting members of collegia from each of at least one-half of the campuses of the UW Colleges. The Chancellor may also initiate a referendum at his/her own discretion. A separate referendum of either faculty or academic staff or university staff may be initiated by the Chancellor. A faculty referendum may also be initiated by the faculty members of the Senate Steering Committee or at the request of five department chairs; an academic staff referendum may be initiated by the academic staff senators. A university staff referendum may be initiated by the university staff senators. In any of these instances, the Steering Committee of the Senate will establish procedures for the distribution and tallying of the ballots, including the criteria for passage. For any specific referendum, a confirmation vote of the procedures developed by Steering shall be secured from a majority of all the member senators from the initiating group (faculty, academic staff, university staff) prior to implementing the referendum.

[End]
Rationale:
This proposed change will serve to simplify the appointment process for students in these two committee positions (on SIITC and SIEC), standardizing their procedures to follow the method used in the other 6 Senate committees with student membership, and will ensure that the student rights to appoint students to committees outlined in Wisconsin law are respected in the process.

Student Governance Council serves as the sole exercising body of powers, duties, and responsibilities under Wis. Stats. 36.09(5) in institutional governance for the UW Colleges, as recognized by the standing Shared Governance Agreement between SGC and the UW Colleges. Thus, SGC is responsible for any appointment of students to institutional shared governance committees, as indicated in the statute: "The students of each institution [...] [shall] select their representatives to participate in institutional governance." While this does not preclude having another, non-student-majority committee such as Senate Steering serve as an intermediary in performing the actual appointments from a "slate" provided by elected student government, as is currently the case, it does create an unnecessary step in this process.

It also creates a potential pitfall for future Senate Steering committees through the implication that Steering has final say over the appointment, and could thus reject a student appointment or require a slate of more than one candidate. In fact, for Senate Steering to take any of those actions would violate of 36.09(5) as determined by the Wisconsin Supreme Court. From Regent Policy 30-3 (emphasis added):

Selection of student representatives: Section 36.09(5) provides that students “shall have the right to organize themselves in a manner they determine and to select their representatives to participate in institutional governance.” This language was interpreted by the Wisconsin Supreme Court to mean that the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee Student Association, under its constitution, had the right to select representatives to institution-wide committees as the “students” in § 36.09(5). UW-Milwaukee Student Association v. Baum (1976) 74 Wis. 2d 283. While this case is subject to various interpretations where the students have chosen forms of organization that differ from that at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, it is clear from the decision that the choice of representatives must rest with the students under a structure determined by and agreed to by the students. The statute was interpreted further by the Wisconsin Court of Appeals to mean that students cannot be required to submit more names into nomination than there are student positions to fill on committees. UW-Oshkosh Student Association v. Board of Regents (App. 1979) 90 Wis. 2d 79.

At best, the existing process for student appointment to these two committees, which requires that they go through Senate Steering, is superfluous and confusing. At worst, it could raise legal questions in the future. This is a simple fix that removes those issues and standardizes the process of student appointment.

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


7.0  Appointed Senate Bylaws Committees

2) Senate Informational and Instructional Technology Committee

The Senate Informational and Instructional Technology Committee shall consist of eleven voting members and three non-voting members: three faculty members, one from each division, nominated by faculty, one at-large faculty nominated by faculty, one department chair nominated by department chairs, one representative from business services nominated by business services personnel, one representative from library services nominated by library services personnel, one representative from instructional technology nominated by instructional technology personnel, one representative from network administrators nominated by network administrators, one representative from student affairs nominated by student affairs personnel, one student nominated appointed by the Student Governance Council; one dean nominated by the deans, the Vice Chancellor for Administrative and Financial Services, and the Chief Information Officer shall serve as ex-officio non-voting members of the committee.

The Senate Steering Committee shall appoint the faculty and academic staff members of the Committee from among the nominees they receive. The student shall serve a one year term and be appointed annually. Faculty and academic staff shall serve staggered three year terms.

Revised by the Senate (SSC) 3-5-10
Revised by the Senate (SSC) 4-23-10
Revised by the Senate (SIITC) 2010-10-22
Revised by the Senate (SSC) 2011-01-12
Revised by the Senate (SSC) 2011-04-29
Revised by the Senate (SOPC) 2011-10-21
Revised by the Senate (SSC) 2012-01-11
Revised by the Senate (SSC) 2013-01-09
Revised by the SSC 2013-02-25
Revised by the Senate (SAPC) 2013-03-15
Revised by the Senate (SSSC) 2013-02-25
Revised by the Senate (SSSC) 2013-03-14
Revised by the Senate (SSSC) 2013-04-29
Revised by the SSC (2013-12) 2015-07-01

The responsibility of the SIITC shall be to make recommendations to the Senate and to the Chancellor regarding all aspects of information and instructional technology, including (but not limited to) acquisitions, expenditures, policies, procedures, and user support. In making its recommendations, the SIITC shall consult broadly with UW Colleges constituencies. The SIITC shall maintain regular and frequent communication with campus and with department IITC’s and shall notify those committees of pending issues and shall solicit their input. The SIITC shall also function as an information clearing house for news about information and instructional technology. In serving the latter function, the Chief Information Officer shall be invited to provide a report to Senate at the fall meeting. The Committee shall send an annual reminder regarding the use of social networking to all UWC faculty, staff and students. As necessary to study specific issues and problems, the SIITC shall be empowered to create ad hoc subcommittees chaired by members of the SIITC whose members may come from outside the SIITC as well as outside the UW Colleges. The Chair of the SIITC shall notify the Senate Steering Committee Chair and the Provost of the subcommittees formed for these purposes.

[...]

6) Senate Inclusive Excellence Committee
Added by the Senate January 12, 2011
Revised by the SSC 2013-02-25
Revised by the SSC 2014-03-24

The Inclusive Excellence Committee shall consist of eight voting members: three faculty (one from each academic division), an instructional academic staff representative, a non-instructional academic staff representative, a university staff representative, a department chairs’ representative, a student representative, and three non-voting ex-officio members: a campus deans’ representative, the Chief Diversity Officer, and a member of the Office of Academic and Student Affairs. Committee members shall be appointed by the Senate Steering Committee from slates submitted by the appropriate group or office (nominations for faculty and staff members shall be solicited from the UW Colleges at large; nominations for the student member shall be solicited from the Student Governance Council; nominations for the department chairs’ representative shall be solicited from the Chair of Chairs; nominations for the deans’ representative shall be solicited from the chancellor). The student member will be appointed by the Student Governance Council. Committee members shall serve staggered two-year terms, with the exception of the student member, who shall serve a one-year term. The committee will report to Senate Steering and may bring action items to the Senate floor.

Working in close coordination with the UW Colleges/UW-Extension Chief Diversity Officer and with the Academic and Student Affairs representative, the Inclusive Excellence Committee shall provide leadership in identifying and supporting efforts to expand institutional understanding of and work on the intersection between inclusion, diversity, and excellence. This may include the following activities: facilitate and coordinate the institutional Inclusive Excellence plan, provide support
to campus and department-based groups working on inclusion and diversity, help build institutional capacity in order to reach UW Colleges Inclusive Excellence goals, monitor progress on the institution’s Inclusive Excellence goals, disseminate reports on Inclusive Excellence and diversity issues, ensure Inclusive Excellence goals match the UW Colleges Strategic Plan, and issue an annual report for the institution on the work of the committee.

The committee will work with various committees, functional units (for example, UW Colleges Libraries, the Office of Academic and Student Affairs, and the Chancellor’s Office), programs (for example, Engaging Student in the First Year and the UW Colleges Assessment Program), and campuses in order to develop specific goals and action steps on issues like equitable student access, campus climate, curriculum, faculty and staff retention and recruitment, and others. The committee will also help to synthesize these efforts into an institution-wide Inclusive Excellence plan.

[End]
Rationale:
In May 2015, Senate Steering approved, on a provisional basis, changes to Institutional Policy #202, creating different drop and “drop with W” deadlines for UWC Flexible Option students. Steering then charged Senate Academic Policy Committee to consider making these changes permanent. Of particular note, both changes would bring UWC Flexible Option drop dates in line with practice for other UWC sessions and closer to deadlines used by UW Flexible Option partners, UW Milwaukee and UW Parkside. First, UWC Flex’s current drop deadline (9 days or 10% of subscription period) is close to that for other UWC sessions (e.g. 8-week and 16-week) but on the low end for comparable Flex programs. The drop date change extends that deadline for Flexible Option students to match UWS Flex partner campuses (23rd day or roughly 25% of subscription period). Bringing drop deadlines to a common date facilitates communication for students co-enrolled at UWC and Flex partners. Second, the “drop with W” policy has been interpreted for UWC Flex to be 31-34 days into the subscription period. This gives Flex students about half as many days in the term to “drop with W” compared to other UWC sessions, creating a potential hardship for Flex students. This change extends the UWC “drop with W” deadline to match other UWC sessions (60th day or roughly 67% of subscription period). This change is more generous than Flex partners (41-43 days or roughly 50% of subscription period) but recognizes the unique challenges that UWC students, including Flex students, often face.

Proposed changes are in bold, red, italicized and underlined font. Notations regarding earlier SSC approved language (not shown) included in light blue.
III. Registration

A. Calendar Week. The beginning of the calendar week to which certain academic regulations refer is determined by the day of the week upon which first classes begin.

B. Adding Courses. A student may add a course(s) by completing the appropriate Change of Program (Add/Drop) form during the first two weeks of a semester, the first week of an eight-week course, and during a proportionate time for shorter courses. A campus may require the student to obtain advisor and/or instructor signatures to make such a change official. The completed Change of Program form must be returned to the appropriate campus office.

A course may be added after the second week of classes of a semester if the change of program is necessitated by dropping a course and substituting a lower-level course in the same discipline.

Exceptions to the time limit may be made only with the written consent of the instructor concerned.

C. Late registration. The student may register late under the same regulations as for adding courses, subject to any fine for late registration which is in effect under Regent policy.

D. Dropping Courses. A student may drop a course(s) by completing the Change of Program (Add/Drop) form during the first ten weeks of a semester-long course, during the first five weeks of an eight-week course, and proportionate time for shorter courses. Students enrolled in the UW Colleges Flexible Option may drop a competency set within the first 23 days of the three-month subscription period. [Change approved by SSC in May.] A UW Colleges campus may require the student to obtain advisor and/or instructor signatures. Merely discontinuing attendance in a
course or courses may result in an official grade of F being recorded for that course(s).

An appeal to withdraw from a course after the reporting of final grades requires the approval of the campus academic actions committee. Any such appeal should be approved only for cases in which the course instructor was consulted (when reasonably possible), and it was substantiated that the failure to drop the course was beyond the student’s control.

A grade of W (Withdraw) will be recorded for courses officially dropped (as described above) after the end of the second week of classes for a semester course and after the end of the first week for courses less than 12 weeks in length, but prior to the deadline for dropping the courses. Students enrolled in the UW Colleges Flexible Option program may withdraw from a competency set with a grade of W after the 23rd day and no later than the 60th day of the three-month subscription period. [SSC had approved language withdrawing by the midpoint.]

Refund of student tuition is governed by the Regent Fee Schedule which is issued on an annual basis. The date upon which a student returns the completed Change of Program form to the appropriate UW Colleges office is the date used to determine any applicable refund of fees.

UW Colleges may establish procedures for administratively dropping students who do not attend 1 or more of the first class sessions in a semester. The number of class sessions missed before the implementation of an administrative drop is at the discretion of the campus. UW Colleges choosing to implement this administrative drop policy must provide students with adequate notice of the policy.

E. Complete Withdrawals. Students may completely and officially withdraw from school by completing the Withdrawal form during the first ten weeks of a semester or the first five weeks of an eight-week session or the proportionate time for shorter sessions. Students enrolled in the UW Colleges Flexible Option may completely and officially withdraw from their competency sets by the 60th day of the three-month subscription period. [SSC had approved language withdrawing by the midpoint.]

The Withdrawal form must be signed by the student and other appropriate persons as determined by each UW Colleges campus, and returned to the appropriate campus office.

Students who do not complete the Withdrawal form within the established deadline [Approved by SSC in May.] and obtain the required signatures may receive grades of F in all courses for which they are registered.

Refund of student tuition is governed by the Regent Fee Schedule which is issued on an annual basis. The date upon which a student returns the completed Withdrawal form to the appropriate campus office is the date used to determine any applicable
refund of tuition.

Any student who withdraws from two consecutive semesters will not be eligible to enroll without seeking readmission. (This does not affect students who enroll for an original credit load of less than 6 credits in each of the two consecutive semesters.) Students should be aware that any semester in which a withdrawal is made after the end of the time allowed for adding courses will count as a semester of enrollment for academic progress standards and may result in a probation action. If a student can provide evidence that a withdrawal is necessary due to unforeseeable, extenuating circumstances, he/she may be allowed to withdraw without a probation action if such evidence is provided at the time of withdrawal. A student who believes he/she may have extenuating circumstances should consult the Office of Student Affairs.

[...]
Rationale:
UW System General Administrative Policy G36: College Credit in High Schools establishes guidelines for offering college credit courses in high schools through credentialed high school teachers. Institutional Curricular Policy #110 outlines UW Colleges guidelines for implementing UW System policy. The UWC policy hasn’t been updated since it was written more than 20 years ago. Subsequently, the UW System updated its college credit in high schools policy, and the way that UW Colleges campuses offer dual credit courses has changed substantially over the past two decades. Until recently, the UW Colleges did not offer many college courses through high school instructors, but these programs are increasing rapidly on some campuses. The proposed changes are designed to align policy with existing practices for determining student eligibility, enrolling students in dual credit courses, approving instructor credentials, and overseeing instruction. Parts of the existing policy (for example, a review of student transcripts by an admissions specialist) are not practical to follow with consolidated services and regional administration or with increased numbers of UW Colleges courses offered in high schools. A section on high school service areas has been updated to refer more directly to UW System policy rather than stating a specific (and outdated) process for working with schools outside of a campus’s primary service area. Instructor credentialing guidelines have been updated to refer directly to accreditation standards to comply with recent HLC credentialing guidelines that apply to dual credit courses; the language refers to accreditation criteria without stating specific HLC guidelines to avoid a need to update this policy whenever there is a change to HLC criteria. Finally, the name of the policy has been changed to reflect the topic of the policy so that UW Colleges employees who are not familiar with the UW System policy number can more easily find it online through the official Senate website.

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

UW Colleges Senate Policy
Institutional Curricular Policy #110
UW Colleges Implementation of GAPP#36
College Credit Courses Offered in High Schools

Adopted by the Senate on March 2, 1991, pg. 2, App. 8

This policy statement deals specifically with college credit courses offered in high schools by UW-approved high school teachers (CCOHS courses), as implemented by the UW Colleges.

High School students desiring college level courses should, if at all possible, enroll at a UW Colleges campus. However, for large numbers of students, the UW Colleges may wish to offer courses in the high schools taught by UW Colleges faculty.
When possible, UW Colleges instructors should teach dual credit courses. In cases of sufficient demand and no available UW Colleges faculty, However, well-qualified high school teachers may be employed in conjunction with the UW Colleges to teach the course. In such cases all of the following conditions must be met.

I. **Students**

Students eligible for CCOHS courses should meet the following criteria and be subject to the following limitations:

A. To be eligible for enrollment in a CCOHS course, high school students must rank in the upper 25% of their high school class and ordinarily must be seniors seeking college credit. Students must meet placement and prerequisite requirements for each course. Academic departments and programs may establish criteria for enrolling high school juniors and students who fall below the 25% class rank but demonstrate readiness for college coursework in a discipline through measures other than rank (for example, grades in discipline-specific courses, high school GPA, standardized test scores, etc). The UW Colleges academic department or its designee responsible for the course, together with the Director of Admissions or his/her designee, will review current transcripts of students’ high school records to determine eligibility for enrollment in the course.

B. Students may enroll in no more than one CCOHS course per semester. If those students who have completed CCOHS courses apply for admission to a UW institution, they will be considered for admission on the basis of the same criteria as other high school students and will be considered to be beginning freshmen for placement purposes.

Credit received for CCOHS courses will be subject to the transfer policy of the institution where the student enrolls.

II. **High School Faculty**

High School teachers who teach UW Colleges courses in high school must:

A. Have at least a master’s degree in the discipline in which the course is offered, and have at least the minimal qualifications required by the academic department responsible for the course. That department may make an exception on the master’s degree requirement if the teachers’ master’s degree is in another, related discipline. Instructors must meet all credentialing guidelines and standards that the UW Colleges is required to follow for accreditation.

B. Receive both departmental and campus approval to teach each specific course offered through the dual credit program, following the credentialing processes used to hire instructional academic staff who teach on campuses. Submit credentials and qualifications to the academic department responsible for the course, have an interview with the campus dean and the department chair or a designee if that is desired, and must obtain their specific approval.
Before the course is advertised or students are permitted to enroll, the provost must approve the course as a dual credit course offering, and the department chair and the dean (or campus designee) must approve the high school teacher.

III. Program Service Areas

A UW institution may consider offering courses in high schools only upon request of the school and only in high schools where appropriate monitoring of course offerings is possible.

Each UW campus has a primary service area, as defined in Appendix A of the GAPP #36 document, which is available on each UW campus by UW System Policy G36: College Credit in High Schools. Campuses must follow all UW System policies for developing dual credit partnerships with high schools, including receiving required permissions before offering courses in service areas for other UW System institutions. UW Colleges campuses may not offer dual credit courses at high schools within a service area that belongs to another UW Colleges campus without first receiving permission from the regional dean for the other campus.

In accordance with GAPP #36, a school district may only request another UW institution to offer CCOHS courses if the nearest institution within the relevant primary service area declines a request for service. Any UW institution which offers courses in a school district outside its primary service area must, on a yearly basis, first get the clearance of the vice chancellor of the UW institution which is closest to the school district and which has that school district in its primary service area, then get the clearance of the UWS Office of Academic Affairs. This must all be done prior to providing the requested service.

If a UW Colleges campus has a high school requesting CCOHS services in its primary service area and is the nearest UW institution to that school, the UW Colleges campus should try to meet the needs of that high school if it would help produce higher-quality instruction than would a more distant institution, or if such cooperation would lead to better education for students in the area. Meeting those needs might mean helping high school students attend classes on the UW Colleges campus or offering college classes at the high school taught by UW Colleges faculty or providing CCOHS services.

IV. Maintenance of College Standards

UW Colleges administrative staff and faculty who oversee dual credit partnership programs and courses must make every effort to insure that college standards are maintained and that each college course offered in a high school is equivalent to the same course offered on UW Colleges campus. Development of course curriculum, learning objectives, tests, assignments, and grading standards must be comparable to those courses offered on campus. No CCOHS course shall be offered which primarily consists of material normally taught in high schools. CCOHS courses shall be completed in one semester. Implementation of course standards should include at least the following:
A. Course Syllabus
   1. The same syllabus as that used for the course on a UW Colleges campus or online course shall be used, or:
   2. Each semester, the high school instructor must submit a syllabus for each dual credit course to the appropriate department or program chair (or designee) for approval. The syllabus for each course, each semester, as prepared by the visiting instructor shall be approved by the appropriate academic department.
   3. Syllabi must follow the same institutional policies and departmental guidelines for syllabi that are used for UW Colleges courses.

B. In-term Examinations Assessments of Student Learning
   1. Common in-term examinations, assignments, or other assessments of student learning that are used on a UW Colleges campus or online course shall be used, or:
   2. The appropriate academic department will review such exams—measures used to assess student learning and grading practices each semester. The high school adjunct instructor will submit exams, assignments, or other assessments of student learning to the appropriate department or program chair (or designee) for evaluation. Academic departments and programs will determine the materials required for reviewing assessments and grading for their dual credit courses.

C. Final Examinations or Other Equivalent Final Assessments of Student Learning
   1. A common final examination shall be given, or:
   2. The final examination (or other assessment of student learning that meets the requirements for the department’s final exam policy) shall be developed in close consultation with the appropriate academic department and a copy placed on file in the department.

D. Evaluation of Instruction
   High school instructors who teach dual credit college courses should receive regular formal class visits. Academic departments and programs should oversee and evaluate instruction for CCOHS courses, following the course observation schedule, mentoring processes, and policies that they normally use for evaluating teaching for instructional academic staff. Because of the unique nature of dual credit courses, campuses, departments, and academic programs may develop additional program and course assessment measures to ensure that students in dual credit courses receive high quality college-level instruction that is equivalent to instruction in regular UW Colleges courses.

A faculty member in the department responsible for the course, from a nearby UW Colleges campus, shall be chosen to supervise the course. That faculty member shall conduct on-site visits to talk with teachers and students about the course work, examine papers and texts, and determine that courses and grading are consistent with those courses taught at the UW Colleges campus. That faculty member may also be called upon to give a few lectures. The first time a high school teacher teaches a course, these visits should occur at least once every month. A high school teacher who has previously taught the course may be visited less often.

The responsible UW Colleges faculty member will submit a written report on the course to the appropriate department chair and dean upon completion of the course. Based on this and other
evidence, the chair and dean shall determine whether the high school teacher may teach the course again. Each department will determine the nature of the reports their faculty members will submit.

The dean of each participating UW Colleges campus must submit to the provost an annual report evaluating the UW Colleges campus’s experience with the program.

Faculty members who supervise CCOHS courses shall normally receive one credit of released time for each three credits supervised. The credits of released time for a particular course will be determined by the faculty member, dean, and department chair in such a manner as to reflect the amount of involvement of the faculty member.

V. Additional Considerations

Each UW Colleges campus offering courses taught in a high school by high school teachers should develop specific procedures and programs in conjunction with the local high school district and in compliance with the school district’s policies, procedures, and contractual arrangements. The Campus will work through the school district for in-service training of teachers before the program begins, instructional materials, and laboratory resources.

Deans and department chairs considering participation in such courses need to familiarize themselves with the entire GAPP #36 document.

[End]
Background and Rationale

The revision of FPP#503, the Faculty Merit Policy, aims to align merit considerations with our institutional priorities (placing teaching as primary focus of merit rankings), address gender biases in the evaluation process (by equalizing consideration of service work to professional development work, and by lowering importance of SSI data as secondary to data presented in one’s AR), and reflect the high levels of achievement performed by a great number of our faculty (by creating a new merit rank below Meritorious and by eliminating the percentage restrictions from the past). The revision also serves to make the process more transparent and to increase the ease, consistency, and fairness of both preparing and evaluating ARs; it does so by requiring the development of a set of standards that will be individualized to best serve the unique nature of differing departments and campuses, yet universal enough to not create burdensome differences between department and campus standards. This revision adds a new rank for merit ranking and eliminates the current percentage restrictions for awards to each merit rank.

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

UW Colleges Senate Policy

Faculty Personnel Policy #503

Faculty Merit Policy and Procedures

Adopted by the Senate, May 9, 1992, p.4, app. 7
Revision adopted by the Senate, November 13, 1993, p.6, app. 5
Revision adopted by the Senate, March 9, 1996, p.4; att. 5
Revision adopted by the Senate, January 14, 2000, p. 9
Revision adopted by the Senate, January 10, 2001, p. 26
Revision adopted by the Senate, March 2, 2001, p. 37
Reorganized and Renumbered, March 15, 2002
Revised by the Senate, October 15, 2004
Revised by the Senate, April 29, 2005
Revised by the Senate January 13, 2010
Revised by the Faculty Council (FPSC) 2014-03-14

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 performed by academic departments and campuses in alternate years, with each committee reviewing Activity Reports, student evaluations, and
any other evidence of achievement submitted by the faculty member, 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. Merit evaluations shall be conducted between January 5th and March 30. All due dates within this policy shall move to the next available business day, if the due date falls on a non-business day.

B. Merit Determination 1. Each year, the relevant committee will commence with 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.

C. 2. All faculty performing satisfactorily will then be separated into three categories: Satisfactory, 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 Exceptionally Meritorious 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.

D. 3. Individual Performance Evaluation - Each faculty member will be provided with a written individual performance evaluation, by April 15, indicating areas of achievement as well as areas of possible concern, and including suggestions for improvement or further development if relevant. This individual performance evaluation letter will convey the assigned merit ranking and express committee rationale for the ranking.

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

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

3. c. 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.

E. 5. Merit Ranking Criteria - The appropriate campus or departmental merit committee will determine merit rankings based on committee members' assessment of faculty members' achievement of standards provided by the evaluating unit (campus or department); these standards will state criteria for Satisfactory, Meritorious, Highly Meritorious, or Exceptionally Meritorious performance in teaching, professional
development, and service. Evidence used in reaching these merit rankings is specified in section I.F of this policy.

1. The UW Colleges Senate will produce and share a template set of standards for performance at each ranking from Satisfactory through Exceptionally Meritorious. Each ranking unit (campus or department) shall publish specific standards, modified from the senate templates, separating Satisfactory, Meritorious, Highly Meritorious, and Exceptionally Meritorious faculty performance. These standards shall give majority weight to teaching performance and weight professional development work and service work equally. Professional development work is broadly defined to include active participation in professional societies, progress toward or attainment of a terminal degree, scholarly or professional publication or research, course development, discipline related performance, or other types of professional creativity or enrichment. Service work is broadly defined as non-teaching University service at the campus, department, UW Colleges, or UW System levels and as public service to the community in areas related to the faculty member's academic expertise or professional competence. Participation in Colleges-wide and department assessment activities will be expected. Note: Data from assessment activities may not be used when considering merit or promotion.

2. The committee of each unit assigned to perform merit rankings shall review the standards for its unit, and may update their standards, if desired. Revised standards would need to be published by April 30 of the year in which a unit conducted merit reviews. These revised standards shall remain in effect until completion of the next round of merit rankings performed at this unit’s level.

3. All department chairs and campus deans shall provide copies of their unit's criteria standards for merit evaluation, whether revised, or not, to all department or campus members, by May 10. New hires shall receive copies of both sets of standards as part of new faculty orientation. Campus or departmental policies must adhere to the general guidelines in this policy, although they may include additional specific criteria.

(Segments of sections I.B.5.a, and I.B.5.b from the prior version of FPP#503, struck out below, were moved to other existing and new sections of this proposed revision of FPP503.)

a. Teaching effectiveness shall be given primary consideration. Student evaluations shall be considered as part of the evaluation process, in addition to peer reviews where available and other information provided by the faculty members. Participation in Colleges-wide and department assessment activities will be expected. Note: Data from assessment activities may not be used when considering merit or promotion.

b. Other areas to be considered include:
   1. Professional growth, such as active participation in professional societies, progress toward or attainment of a terminal degree, scholarly or professional
publication or research, course development, discipline related performance, or other types of professional creativity;

2. Non-teaching University service at the campus, department, UW Colleges, or UW System levels;

3. Public service to the community in areas related to the faculty member’s academic expertise or professional competence.

E.4. Evidence - b. Committees shall primarily consider an Activity Report covering the preceding two years. Within the Activity Report, faculty members shall document their achievements of the published standards, of the unit performing merit rankings for that year, for teaching, for professional development and for service. Faculty shall submit their reports to the relevant committee each year by January 4.

1. Any faculty member not submitting an Activity Report shall not be eligible for merit consideration. (This statement was originally part of I.B.4.a of FPP#503)

2. a. Committees shall also consider, at a level of secondary importance, the results of any student evaluations, required and voluntary, during the two-year period. Student evaluation results shall be the only data a ranking committee may consider which has not been submitted by the faculty member. Student evaluations for merit purposes will be scheduled in all UW Colleges classes at least every third semester.

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

G.6. Special Circumstances
(Revisions adopted by the Senate 1/14/00 and 1/10/01)

1. 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.

2. 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 majority of a faculty workload for merit consideration, faculty on professional leave shall have their teaching component of the merit ranking based on teaching materials provided in the previous two years of activity. 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.)

H.5. 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.
II. 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 Satisfactory.

   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
   Revised by the Faculty Council (FPSC) 2014-03-14

   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 for Academic and Student Affairs 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 and merit letters shall be forwarded to the Director of Human
      Resources by the department or campus dean in the appropriate year.

   D. The Senate shall produce and approve a set of template standards for merit reviews by
      Feb. 1, 2016. Merit Ranking Units shall produce their specific unit standards for merit
      rankings, based on the senate templates, by Sept. 1, 2016, and the merit rankings of
      2016-2017 shall be the first to use this new policy and the newly established standards.
      Given that 2016-17 merit rankings are to be performed by department units,
      departmental merit committees will then have the first opportunity to adjust its
      standards following completion of ranking of its faculty for the 2016-17 cycle.

[End]
Additional Rationale:
The revision of FPP#503, the Merit Policy, strives to accomplish several goals. First, it is the intent that this revision promotes exceptional work in teaching as the majority of merit considerations. The UWC Mission clearly states that we are primarily a teaching institution. Therefore, rewarding exceptional efforts towards teaching should be the primary purpose of a merit ranking exercise. In addition to stressing the high value of work in the area of teaching, this policy revision seeks to equalize consideration of two other areas of work: professional development and service. It is particularly important that service work be valued and rewarded as equal to the work of professional development. As an institution of higher education, we continue to value the work faculty members perform to enrich their academic fields, especially as this work also enriches their teaching. This policy revision continues to reward work in the area of professional development. In light of the increasing need for a dwindling faculty to complete a growing segment of institutional work, labeled as service to the campus, department, the UW Colleges, and/or the UW System, while maintaining service work to the local community, such work needs to be valued and rewarded. Also, a strong body of research indicates that, across American faculty, female faculty carry a heavier load of service work; therefore equalizing the value of work for professional development with the work of service is a matter of gender equity in the merit reward system. This revision, while specifying that teaching receive primary and majority consideration in merit ranking of faculty, and specifying that professional development be equally considered alongside of service work, does not dictate the exact levels of consideration any ranking unit must use for each area. This is left to the merit ranking units (departments and campuses) to specify.

A second goal of this policy revision is to improve the ability of the merit rankings to accurately reflect the high levels of work performed by many members of our faculty. The old policy required limitations on the number of faculty members of a ranked group who could receive merit rankings of Highly Meritorious and Exceptionally Meritorious. It also resulted in 60% of those ranked receiving the same ranking of Meritorious, regardless of levels of differentiation in work product produced. These limits have frustrated a majority of faculty who served as merit reviewers. To correct these limits, this revision begins by creating an additional merit ranking, below the level of Meritorious and above the level of Unsatisfactory. This new ranking, Satisfactory, is to be awarded to all faculty judged to be performing in the range from minimally satisfactory to just below a set standard of Meritorious work performance. Satisfactory ranking indicates a faculty member is performing his/her job adequately, yet not at a standardized level above minimal work expectations. Such a ranked faculty member, should merit pay increases be available, would remain eligible for the 70% of raise pool distributed as Across-the-Board raises, but would not receive any of the fixed merit pay increases divided from the 30% of raise pool set aside for merit raises. Further, this policy revision has eliminated the percentage limits on those who can be ranked as Highly Meritorious or Exceptionally Meritorious. Evidence has clearly shown that faculty members prefer the freedom to recognize above average performance by way of rating more faculty members Highly Meritorious or above, even if this should result in smaller merit raises for all so ranked.

The third goal in this policy revision has been to improve the discernment processes, making it easier for faculty to seek desired merit ranks and, for those performing the rankings, to reach ranking decisions with greater ease, consistency, and fairness. This set of goals is actually a mere extension of the goals of the original policy, with an improved set of policies to aid in
better meeting this set of goals. One area of revisions is a clearer requirement that the most important piece of evidence to be considered in determining merit rankings is to be the annual Activity Report (AR). The AR should be the document considered for evidence of teaching performance, professional development performance, and service performance. This revision allows for consideration of data from Student Survey of Instruction summaries, but this consideration should be secondary to consideration of information provided in the AR. The principle reason for this adjustment in the policy is the growing body of research indicating that SSI data, both quantitative averages and individual qualitative comments from students, is impacted by gender of the instructor and gender of the individual students completing the survey. The evidence points to women instructors, on average, receiving significantly lower SSI ratings. The additional fact that this gender difference can hurt a few male instructors and aid a few female instructors, further questions the fair use of SSI data in making merit ranking distinctions. Additional sources of data regarding the work performance level of a faculty member, to include class visitation letters, should they be available, are allowed, as a ranking unit deems it reasonable to accept such evidence. Only evidence submitted by the faculty member herself/himself should be used in ranking deliberations. It was felt it would be most fair that only materials submitted by a faculty member be considered. Since some faculty members may not be as well known by those comprising the merit ranking committee of a department or campus unit, use of evidence supplied by an evaluator, or other source, might give unfair advantage to more well-known faculty members.

As part of the goal of improving the discernment process, it was decided that the old language requiring that merit ranking criteria be shared with faculty prior to submissions of AR be further specified. This revision requires ranking units (departments and campuses) to create and update clear standards for teaching, for service, and for professional development at each level of merit rank. These standards are to be guided by a senate template set of standards, individualized to best serve the unique nature of differing departments and campuses, yet universal enough to not create burdensome differences between department and campus standards. These standards are designed to serve both the individual faculty members preparing materials for the merit review process and for the members of merit ranking committees. Individual faculty members should find the standards instructive of evidence to include in the AR and other documents, and of performance expectations for those seeking highest merit ranking considerations. Members of ranking committees should find the standards helpful in reaching decisive, consistent, and unbiased ranking decisions for each faculty member evaluated. The new requirement that these standards be updated and published to faculty members bi-annually and nearly two years prior to the deadline for submitting materials for the next round of merit rankings by this departmental or campus unit is intended to further aid faculty with knowledge of the standards of performance expected for each rank of merit.

Following the approval of this policy revision, it is the intent of the Senate Faculty Professional Standards Committee to next address updating the Activity Report forms and processes for completion and submission. We intend to more clearly specify what materials to include in each section of the report, and we intend to use current technologies to streamline the production of the AR, the submission of the AR and the review of the AR.

[End]
UW Colleges Faculty Council of Senators
Introduction: November 13, 2015
Proposed Revision of FPP #501.01
(“Promotion, Tenure, and Third-Year Tenure Progress and Retention Review Dossier Format”)

Rationale:
Currently deadline dates for the various stages of retention, tenure and promotion review exist in several policies (FPP #501, #501.01 and #501.02). It was brought to the attention of FPSC that some dates differ between the policies. This situation can occur when a deadline is revised in one policy but not in the other. To avoid such situations in the future the proposed revisions would eliminate specific dates in the policies relating to dossier format and direct the reader to the main policy on review procedures (FPP #501).

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

UW Colleges Senate Policy
Faculty Personnel Policy #501.01
Promotion, Tenure, and Third-Year Tenure Progress and Retention Review
Dossier Format
Implementation: September 1994
Revision: March 1, 1998
Reorganized and Renumbered: March 15, 2002
Revised by the Senate: May 7, 2004
Revised by the Senate: October 15, 2004
Revised by the Senate: March 4, 2005
Revised by the Senate March 6, 2009
Revised by the Senate (FPSC) 2010-10-22
Revised by the SSC 2010-11-15
Revised by the Faculty Council (FPSC) 2013-03-15
Revised by the Faculty Council (FPSC) 2014-03-14

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

I. Preparation and Funding
Revised by the Senate March 6, 2009
Revised by the Faculty Council (FPSC) 2013-03-15
Revised by the Faculty Council (FPSC) 2014-03-14

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

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

C. Dossiers received by the department will be forwarded to the campus evaluation committee by January 25th, the date indicated in FPP #501.

D. The campus evaluation committee will forward a copy to the campus dean to place in the candidate’s campus file. The dean’s office will forward a copy of the dossier to the provost in support of department/campus/dean recommendations.

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

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

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

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

A. Teaching
  1. Lists (may include a brief annotation that assesses the relationship and value of the activity to your teaching effectiveness)
     a) Summary of courses taught and enrollments
     b) Grading/assessment procedures and results
     c) New course preparations
     d) Assessment procedures (as used for assessing student learning for improvement of teaching)
  
  2. Evaluations
     a) Evaluations of teaching by former students when mandated by FPP #501 for promotion to tenure
     b) From the most recent two semesters available: 1) Student Survey of Instruction Reports as received from the UWC Office of Student Affairs and 2) Copies or transcriptions of written comment sections from Student Survey of Instruction (per Senate policy; originals should be available if a committee requests during the process)
     c) Results of colleague visitations
3. Materials
   a) Selected samples of course syllabi, examinations, and course materials (two currently taught courses)
   b) Selected samples of innovations in course development and/or teaching practices
   c) Selected samples of grading (assessment of student learning limited to the course)
   d) Selected samples of assessment activities (assessment of student learning for use for improvement of teaching)
   e) Other

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

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

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

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

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

IV. Format
Revised by the Senate March 6, 2009
Revised by the Faculty Council (FPSC) 2013-03-15

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

V. Senate Policy Deadlines (may vary given Board of Regents schedule)

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

All faculty dossier shall be submitted to the appropriate entity by the deadline dates indicated in FPP #501.

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

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

[End]
Rationale:
Currently, deadline dates for various stages of retention, tenure, and promotion review exist in several policies (FPP #501, #501.01, and #501.02). It was brought to the attention of FPSC that some dates differ between the policies. This situation can occur when a deadline is revised in one policy but not in the other. To avoid such situations in the future, the proposed revisions would eliminate specific dates in the policies relating to dossier format and direct the reader to the main policy on review procedures (FPP #501).

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

UW Colleges Senate Policy
Faculty Personnel Policy #501.02
Probationary Faculty Retention Review Dossiers

I. Preparation and Funding

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

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

C. Candidates shall submit the retention dossiers to the department appropriate entity according to the deadline dates indicated in FPP #501, following timetable:

1. First year probationary faculty by January 4.
2. Second-year probationary faculty by November 7.


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

D. Dossiers received by the department for consideration of first year probationary faculty will be forwarded to the campus evaluation committee by February 1. For consideration of second-year probationary faculty will be forwarded to the campus evaluation committee by December 1. For consideration of fourth- and fifth-year probationary faculty will be forwarded to the campus evaluation committee by April 15.

E. The campus evaluation committee will forward a copy to the campus dean, to place in the candidate’s campus file.

F. Faculty are expected to keep their dossiers up to date. That is, they build their tenure and/or promotion dossiers year by year, starting from the first year. However, the submitted retention review dossiers for each year shall include only those materials required for the specific year as listed below.

II. Materials
Revised by the Senate March 6, 2009

A. First-year probationary faculty shall include the following in the retention dossier:

1. A copy of the candidate’s Activity Report;
2. Copies of the candidate’s Faculty Visitation Reports;
3. From Fall semester: 1) Student Survey of Instruction Reports as received from the UWC Office of Student Affairs and 2) Copies or transcriptions of written comment sections from Student Survey of Instruction;
4. Any additional materials that may be requested by individual departments. It is the responsibility of the department chair to inform probationary faculty of any additional departmental requirements.

B. Second-year probationary faculty shall include the following in the retention dossier:

1. Copies of the candidate’s Activity Report for the first and second year (though the second year report must be prepared earlier than usual);
2. Copies of the candidate’s Faculty Visitation Reports for the first and second years;
3. From the first year: 1) Student Survey of Instruction Reports as received from the UWC Office of Student Affairs and 2) Copies or transcriptions of written comment sections from Student Survey of Instruction;
4. Copies of first year retention letters (both campus and departmental);
5. Any additional materials that may be requested by individual departments. It is the responsibility of the department chair to inform probationary faculty of any additional departmental requirements.

C. Third-year probationary faculty shall prepare a dossier in accordance with Faculty Personnel Policy #501.01.

D. Fourth-year probationary faculty shall include the following in the retention dossier:

1. Copies of the candidate’s Activity Reports from the third and fourth years;
2. Copies of the candidate’s Faculty Visitation Reports from the third and if applicable, the fourth years;
3. From the most recent semester available: 1) Student Survey of Instruction Reports as received from the UWC Office of Student Affairs and 2) Copies or transcriptions of written comment sections from Student Survey of Instruction;
4. Copies of all retention letters (both campus and departmental) from the first, second, and third years;
5. Any additional materials that may be requested by individual departments. It is the responsibility of the department chair to inform probationary faculty of any additional departmental requirements.

E. Fifth-year probationary faculty shall include the following in the retention dossier:

1. Copies of the candidate’s Activity Reports from the fourth and fifth years;
2. Copies of the candidate’s Faculty Visitation Reports from the fourth and fifth years, if applicable;
3. From the most recent semester available: 1) Student Survey of Instruction Reports as received from the UWC Office of Student Affairs and 2) Copies or transcriptions of written comment sections from Student Survey of Instruction;
4. Copies of all retention letters (both campus and departmental) from the first, second, third and fourth years;
5. Any additional materials that may be requested by individual departments. It is the responsibility of the department chair to inform probationary faculty of any additional departmental requirements.

[End]
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Proposed Revision of ASPP #804
(“Non-renewal of Fixed-Term Renewable Appointments”)

**Background and Rationale**

With the ongoing reorganization of UW Colleges, approximately three dozen employees who were previously classified as University Staff have the opportunity to be reclassified as Academic Staff. These employees belong to the category “FLSA-exempt” and are primarily managers and supervisors. Should the employees become Academic Staff, they will then fall under ASPP #804 when it comes to determining the required notice period for layoffs and non-renewal notices. A strict reading of ASPP #804 would effectively reset the seniority clock for those employees to zero. In order to give proper seniority to those employees, ASPP #804 needs to be revised as follows.

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

**UW Colleges Academic Staff Personnel Policy**

**General Institutional Policy #804**

Non-renewal of Fixed-Term Renewable Appointments

Adopted: April 29, 2005
Revised by the Academic Staff Council 2012-01-11

Reference: UW Colleges Constitution Chapter 8
Wisconsin Administrative Code Chapter 10

0.30 Notice

Prior to issuing a non-renewal notice, the employing unit must obtain the approval of the dean, director, or designee. Prior to the expiration of the current appointment, and in accord with the table below, the employee shall be given a written notice of non-renewal, including a statement of the reasons, notification of his or her right to appeal, and a copy of UWC Constitution Chapter 8 (Appointments and Promotion of Academic Staff). At the same time, copies of this nonrenewal notice shall be sent to the department chair or unit head, the dean or director, and the Office of Human Resources. If proper notice in advance of the expiration date is not given, either the appointment shall be extended to provide the requisite non-renewal notice in accord with UWS Chapter 10.05(2) or a layoff decision shall be made in accord with ASPP #802.

Minimum Notice Period for
Non-renewal of Fixed-Term Renewable Appointments
Years of UW Colleges Service Minimum Notice
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Staff Service*</th>
<th>Period in Months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fewer than 2 years</td>
<td>3 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 2 years but fewer than 6 years</td>
<td>6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 6 years</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Rolling-horizon appointments require additional action and may require additional notice (see ASPP #702).

*Academic staff service is defined as continuous years of paid UW Colleges academic staff *(and FLSA-exempt)* employment without regard to percent of appointment. For purposes of determining the required notice periods, an appointment of one or both semesters of an academic year shall count as one year of service. A leave of absence of any length or a break in academic staff service of three years or less shall not result in loss of prior years’ employment credit.
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UW COLLEGES
ACADEMIC STAFF COUNCIL OF SENATORS

BYLAWS

(proposed deletions and additions)

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 is a member 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 a vote of the Academic Staff Council of Senators.

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 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.