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UW COLLEGES
Senate
Friday, February 19, 2016
UW-Fond du Lac
1:15 p.m.

MINUTES

2015-2016 Senators Present: Annette Kuhlmann and Brad Wilson, UW-Baraboo/Sauk County; Troy Kozma, UW-Barron County; Luke Dock, UW Colleges; Melissa Smiley, UW Colleges Online; Mike Winkler, UW-Fond du Lac; Kathy Immel, Evan Kreider, and Juli McGuire, UW-Fox Valley; Jessica Van Slooten, UW-Manitowoc; Joanne Giordano and Holly Hassel, UW-Marathon County; Mark Klemp, UW-Marinette; Caleb Bush, UW-Marshfield/Wood County; Marnie Dresser, UW-Richland; Ken Brosky and 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; Marly Harmeling and Graham Pearce, Student Senators

2015-2016 Senators Absent: Mike Jurmu, UW-Fond du Lac; Penny Workman, UW-Marathon County; Roseann Stenstrup, UW-Marinette; Steve Kaiser and Jeff Verona, UW-Marshfield/Wood County; Tony Landowski, UW-Waukesha; Martin Sandberg, Student Senator

2015-2016 Alternates Present: Paisley Harris, UW-Fond du Lac (Jurmu); Bethany Reilly, UW-Fox Valley (Kaiser)

Others Present: Greg Ahrenhoerster, Chairs’ Representative; Cody Baierl, UW-Fond du Lac; Rich Barnhouse, Associate Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management; Renee Gralewicz, UW-Fox Valley; Greg Lampe, Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs; Keith Montgomery, Deans’ Representative; Carey Woodward, UW-Fond du Lac; Linda Baum, Assistant to the Senate

Others Absent: Joe Foy, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs; Colleen Godfriaux, Associate Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance; Cathy Sandeen, Chancellor, UW Colleges and UW-Extension; Steve Wildeck, Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance, UW Colleges and UW-Extension

1) The February 19, 2016 meeting of the UW Colleges Senate was called to order at 1:15 p.m. by UW Colleges Senate Steering Committee Chair Holly Hassel.

2) UW-Fond du Lac Campus Administrator Bethany Rusch (Regional Associate Dean for Administration and Finance, Northeast Region) greeted the assembly. She pointed out that the group was in a great room to enjoy the view, and thanked the Senate for their work dissecting and discussing policy on a Friday. Discussing the heavy lifting being done in the
Senate, on the campuses, and in the institutional offices redesigning UW Colleges on paper and now bringing the vision to reality, RADAF Rusch held a silver bucket and said she wanted to add a giant bucket full of patience to the load already being carried. Everyone should find understanding and a lot of grace to extend to colleagues and to themselves in that bucket. Everyone cares deeply about the mission and the success of UWC students she said, so she encouraged everyone to keep going. RADAF Rusch finished by thanking the Senate again for their work, and reminding everyone that if all else fails chocolate might help—and then handed out the silver bucket of chocolate candy to the applause of the Senate.

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 Holly Hassel introduced the new faculty senator from UW-Rock County, Ken Brosky (Assistant Professor, English), and Marly Harmeling, the new student senator and SGC Financial Director from UW-Sheboygan. Chair Hassel pointed out that Paisley Harris, UW-Fond du Lac was serving as alternate for Mike Jurmu, and Bethany Reilly was serving as an alternate academic staff senator for Steve Kaiser. There were guests attending the Senate meeting: Cody Baierl, a student from UW-Fond du Lac; Carey Woodward, Associate Professor, UW-Fond du Lac; and Renee Gralewicz, Associate Professor, UW-Fox Valley.

4) The agenda (Attachment 1) of the February 19, 2016 meeting of the UW Colleges Senate was unanimously approved [Van Slooten/Gorman].

5) The minutes of the November 13, 2015 UW Colleges Senate meeting held at UW-Marathon County (posted in Public Folders and at http://www.uwc.edu/employees/senate/meetings) were given unanimous approval [Kozma/Raunio].

6) Reports

   a) Chancellor Cathy Sandeen sent her regrets, said Provost Lampe, as she was out of the office this week and therefore unable to attend.

   b) Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs Greg Lampe noted the location of his report (Attachment 2) in the written materials. He stated that he and Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance Steve Wildeck have traveled to nine campuses to date and will visit the four remaining campuses in the next two to three weeks. The purpose of these campus visits is to give brief updates on regionalization and consolidation activities and to take time to listen to questions, concerns, and feedback about those activities. Provost Lampe related that he makes himself available for additional time to anyone who wants to speak to him, and often hears from staff losing their positions which has been very impactful. During the one hour conversations that he and Vice Chancellor Wildeck have with faculty and staff members, and students, and open to all, the discussions have run the gamut from supportive of the new administrative structures to frustrated and angry at the current situation. He feels they have been productive, and takes all feedback to the institutional office’s implementation meeting each week. The provost updated the Senate regarding moving the Non Online Distance Education (NODE) program out of UW Colleges Online and into the Office of Academic
and Student Affairs. Scott Bouffleur, Director of NODE, will report to the provost, and his position description has been revised to reflect his new duties working with others in that office. Provost Lampe concluded with the news that the UW Colleges has passed the first round of review for the U.S. Department of Education Second Chance Pell for Students who are Incarcerated experiment. The second, final phase of the process will require that the provost complete and submit a questionnaire by March 20, 2016. Provost Lampe announced that he would keep the Senate informed of the outcome.

c) Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Joe Foy had submitted a written report (Attachment 3), which was found in the Senate materials.

d) Associate Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management Rich Barnhouse detailed the location of his report (Attachment 4) and reminded people that as of March 18 layoffs in student affairs/Solution Centers are going to impact offices Colleges-wide. Thirty-nine people in those areas will not return as the regionalization and consolidation process that Associate Vice Chancellor Barnhouse explained began almost a year ago continues to become more real. Senate Steering Committee Chair Hassel asked the associate vice chancellor about his testimony at the state capitol and the status of the bill on emergency grants. SGC President Pearce answered that the Assembly had passed it Monday or Tuesday night. It is expected that the amount of money provided will be scaled back significantly when it goes to the Senate, where it is hoped that it will also pass. It was further explained that the bill provides emergency grants for students in UW Colleges or the Wisconsin Technical College System who have a sudden financial emergency and would otherwise drop out.

e) Senate Steering Committee Chair & UWC Faculty Representative Holly Hassel related where her submitted report (Attachment 5) was found in the Senate materials and handed out an update, explaining that there was a meeting of the Senate Steering Committee (SSC) on February 8 which was followed by a lot of activity around the tenure documents put forth by the Board of Regents. She reported that the SSI revision group had been charged and has been working diligently to gather and study information regarding the form and questions. The SSC has also charged one group and will charge another that resulted from the work of the Virtual Campus Investigative Committee. The Online Curriculum Task Force is looking at best practices for delivering, maintaining, and evaluating online courses. The Online Evaluation Working Group will get started later this semester looking into how the Online program fits with retention, tenure, and promotion for faculty and IAS. The Constitutional and Senate policy review plan was discussed this morning in Steering. SSC Chair Hassel explained that it is a plan for governance based bodies to review Senate policies and the UW Colleges Constitution, noting where revisions will need to be made in light of regionalization/consolidation, Online changes, and BOR tenure policies, and offering a possible priority list for the revisions. The plan calls for one faculty member of each of the standing committees who are willing to serve on the same committee next year to work on the review over the summer. Senator Giordano asked what would be done if there was not a returning faculty member on a committee. Chair Hassel replied that anyone would be eligible to serve. The proposed membership of the two review groups was pointed out in the materials. UW-
Fond du Lac Alternate Senator Harris expressed that it was an aggressive schedule for summer. Hassel replied that since reviewing the Colleges’ governing documents is a common concern raised by campuses, it is important to move ahead. Senator Kozma asked about campus constitutions being revised. SSC Chair Hassel and Provost Lampe both expressed that such work would naturally follow after the revision of the UW Colleges Constitution.

f) Academic Staff Lead Senator Jeff Verona’s report (Attachment 6) was found in the Senate binder.

g) UW Colleges Academic Staff Representative Luke Dock pointed out his report (Attachment 7) in the provided materials and asked if there were any questions. There were none.

h) University Staff Lead Senator Juli McGuire called attention to her written report (Attachment 8) and noted that there was one change to be made. Kay Sbabaro should still be listed as a member, she is not among those laid off. SSC Chair Hassel thanked her for the report and said it illustrated the question and the concern of just how governance will operate going forward.

i) Student Governance Council President Graham Pearce shared the page of his report in the binder (Attachment 9). He reported that he hopes to have members of SGC at the April meeting who will be continuing into next year. He will be transferring in the Fall.

j) Senate Academic Policy Committee Chair Caleb Bush noted his report (Attachment 10) in the materials. The Senate Academic Policy Committee (SAPC) has been working on the charges they have been given by Steering as detailed in the submitted report. The committee has items coming up for adoption and will also be proposing amendments to the Constitution later in the agenda.

k) Senate Budget Committee Chair Margaret Hankenson stated she had nothing to add to her written report (Attachment 11) as the majority of the meeting held earlier in the day had been around a presentation from Associate Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance Colleen Godfriaux concerning the shortfall as it related to enrollment trends. Hankenson expects the divisor issue to be discussed at the April Senate meeting. She asked if anyone knew of a decision concerning the $200,000 from UW System that had been proposed to be used to fix the 70% tripwire. Chair Hassel responded that the very informal answer she had heard was yes, that was the plan for the money, possibly along with helping university staff with increased health plan payments.

l) Faculty Professional Standards Committee Chair Mike Jurmu had sent a written report (Attachment 12) which was called attention to by Faculty Professional Standards Committee (FPSC) member Ron Gulotta in the materials. It was noted that the Faculty Appeals and Grievances Committee is about two-thirds of the way through their work on procedural guidelines, and there should be something to bring to the Senate in April.
m) Senate Assessment Committee Chair Kristin Plessel’s report (*Attachment 13*) was pointed out in the provided collection of materials.

n) UWC Associate Degree & Curricular Reimagining Project Faculty Coordinator Caroline Geary had submitted a report (*Attachment 14*) on the progress of the reimagining work prior to the Senate meeting.

7) Old Institutional Business

a) Adoption: 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 15*). The adoption was moved and carried unanimously [Kozma/Peterson].

b) Adoption: 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 16*). The proposed revisions to the Bylaws were unanimously approved [Pearce/Van Slooten].

c) Adoption: Proposed Revision of IP #202 (“Academic Procedures and Regulations”) [SAPC] modifying drop deadlines for Flex (*Attachment 17*). The motion to adopt the policy revision carried unanimously [Alitto/Peterson].

d) Adoption: Proposed Revision of IP #110 (“UW Colleges Implementation of GAPP #36”) [SAPC] update and rename policy for offering Colleges credits in high schools (*Attachment 18*). It was questioned if the SSI is implied in the list in IV.D. In response it was pointed out that high school instructors are to be evaluated using the same methods as instructional academic staff members are evaluated. If the SSI is used for IAS, it must be utilized for high school instructors. Chair of Chairs Ahrenhoerster expressed that including it in the list would still be a good idea. One of the introductory sentences was modified to be more grammatically correct in a housekeeping move (“When possible, UW Colleges instructors should teach dual credit courses.” was changed to “When possible, dual credit courses should be taught by UW Colleges instructors.”). While there was concern about additional faculty workload and the viability of the program itself, it was pointed out that this was updating a UW System based policy. The motion carried with one opposed [Klemp/Kreider].

e) Other. There was no other Old Institutional Business on the agenda.

8) New Institutional Business

a) Introduction: American Indian Studies Program Petition for Freestanding Status [Renee Gralewicz] (*Attachment 19*). SSC Chair Hassel described the background leading up to the petition from American Indian Studies (AIS), its circulation, and the gathering of feedback. Renee Gralewicz explained that AIS was asking for standalone status in order to assure growth of the program. Noting that there is no new curriculum right now, she
pointed out the growth potential possible if courses were offered that reflect the current political, economic, and environmental situations and interests of tribal nations, for example. Gralewicz spoke of various collaborations with tribes (environmental sciences courses, service learning projects, and UWC student tutors) to ensure that needs are being met on all sides. Gralewicz was asked if AIS had discussed moving to Anthropology-Sociology, to which she replied that they had not. AIS had composed bylaws and the bylaws were approved for AIS to be freestanding, not to be housed somewhere; being housed elsewhere would require determining where, rewriting the bylaws, and going through the entire application process again. There was debate over UW Colleges Constitution Chapter 11.08 and whether new language proposed for the section detailed or blocked the possible procedure for the AIS petition. Senate Academic Policy Committee Chair Caleb Bush reported that the committee had already ruled that there was no policy block to the petition going forward. When asked if funds for the program have been secured, Associate Professor Gralewicz replied that there is an estimate of $14,000 in new funds for the program coordinator release and summer stipend, an amount she feels is inflated. Senator Marnie Dresser asked if English would lose professional development money since she also teaches AIS. The response was that no, those funds go to AIS and will continue to do so; however, if AIS if freestanding they will be able to determine how the money is spent rather than Political Science having that control. Chairs’ Rep Greg Ahrenhoerster said six chairs had replied to his query on the subject, five of them negatively due to budgetary concerns. Senator Bush pointed out that left 2/3 of the chairs unheard from. When it was asked how it could be justified to move a program forward when the department chairs had not consolidated the departments as part of the recent budget reduction measures as they had been charged to examine, Senator Annette Kuhlmann replied that AIS was being kept from receiving its own share of resources and thus suffocated where it was. Provost Lampe said that budget follows program; if a program is advanced and he is directed by the chancellor, budgets will be adjusted accordingly. Chair of Chairs Ahrenhoerster said it would be useful to know how it would be paid for before the Senate meeting in April, but he thought the petition should be sent to collegia for discussion. With two senators abstaining, the motion to send the item to the campus collegiums for discussion passed [Van Slooten/Kuhlmann].

b) Introduction: Proposed Amendment of UW Colleges Constitution Chapter 11 (“Academic Programs”) [SAPC] clarifying language around jurisdiction of housed academic programs (Attachment 20). SAPC Chair Bush explained the background of the Chapter, saying that the revision was an effort to eliminate confusion around issues of housed programs and jurisdiction. Senator Troy Kozma again expressed that new language in 11.08 would create problems for the AIS petition. SAPC Chair Bush replied that there would be no impact because the items were going forward at the same time and what was in place at the time is the only policy that could impact the AIS petition, not these changes. Kozma argued that the language is specifically about AIS, but others promptly noted that there are other housed programs. A motion was made and carried to amend the proposed introduction by removing the proposed new language in 11.08 [Kozma/Klemp]. Alternate Senator Paisley Harris expressed that in that language, “creation” and “new” did not go together if the program existed already somewhere; there was a contradiction. Discussion centered on the word “new” in proposed substitute
language. Senator Kozma argued that if language is added explicitly around standalone programs, it will seem to signify that AIS does not have the right to move because it is not yet covered in policy. He feels the best interpretation of “new” refers to both “brand new” and to “new status.” Senator Margaret Hankenson suggested “An academic program can be created or relocated upon identification by the faculty, Senate and chancellor of the need to…” Chair of Chairs Ahrenhoerster agreed with Hankenson’s language, saying that it also clarified language in 11.03. It was further decided that “relocation” should be in the title of the section. Senator Kozma asked that the rationale be revised to explain the reasons for the additional changes in 11.08. The revised heading for 11.08 and the first sentence proposed by Senator Hankenson were moved and carried with one abstention [Gulotta/Harris]. The proposed amendment as revised was unanimously carried [Dresser/Kuhlmann].

c) Introduction: Proposed Amendment of UW Colleges Constitution Chapter 3 (“Campus Governance”) [SAPC] change so collegium presiding officer reflects Senate; add language to address campus administrators and regional deans (Attachment 21). SAPC Chair Caleb Bush summarized the included rationale, noting that the Senate had made the change to having the SSC Chair serve as presiding officer, thus having the campus steering chair preside over collegium would parallel that move. It was questioned why the committee was including changes from dean to regional associate dean for academic affairs, why just this one policy was being modified when so many would be reviewed and changed in the process discussed earlier in the day. Bush explained that the revisions are around collegium, and since campus collegia are working now, it is important that a process be in place if possible. Alternate Senator Harris replied that as a campus steering chair she thought it would be helpful. The motion carried by unanimous vote [Kozma/Raunio].

9) Other Institutional Business

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

10) Adjournment. The February 29, 2016 meeting of the UW Colleges Senate held at UW-Fond du Lac was adjourned at 3:20 p.m. when all business was concluded.
2015-2016 Faculty Senators Present: Annette Kuhlmann, UW-Baraboo/Sauk County; Troy Kozma, UW-Barron County; Kathy Inmmel and Evan Kreider, UW-Fox Valley; Jessica Van Slooten, UW-Manitowoc; Holly Hassel, UW-Marathon County; Mark Klemp, UW-Marinette; Caleb Bush, UW-Marshfield/Wood County; Marnie Dresser UW-Richland; Ken Brosky, UW-Rock County; Matt Raunio, UW-Sheboygan; Mark Peterson, UW-Washington County; Julianna Alitto, Ron Gulotta, and Margaret Hankens, UW-Waukesha

2015-2016 Faculty Senators Absent: Mike Jurmu, UW-Fond du Lac; Penny Workman, UW-Marathon County

2015-2016 Faculty Alternates Present: Paisley Harris, UW-Fond du Lac (Jurmu)

Others Present: Greg Ahrenhoerster, Chairs’ Representative; Carey Woodward, UW-Fond du Lac; 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 3:34 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 February 29, 2016 meeting of the Faculty Council at UW-Fond du Lac was unanimously approved [Kozma/Peterson].

4. The minutes of the November 13, 2015 meeting of the FCS held at UW-Marathon County (posted in Public Folders and at http://uwc.edu/employees/senate/meetings) were approved by unanimous vote [Kozma/Peterson].

5. Reports

   a) Chair Holly Hassel’s circulated report regarding the latest on the Regent Policy Documents (RPDs) “Faculty Tenure,” “Periodic Post-Tenure Review in Support of Tenured Faculty Development,” and “Procedures Relating to Financial Emergency or Program Discontinuance Requiring Faculty Layoff and Termination” was discussed. She said that the three policies weakened traditional tenure standards. The Board of Regents Education Committee approved the three RPDs on February 5, 2016, but they are still problematic. A group of faculty representatives began putting together a document of key
points after speaking with Regent Mark Bradley after the February 5 meeting. The main emphases of the representatives’ work were summarized as follows: a) educational considerations must top market demands/financial considerations, distinguish more between them; b) greater protections for tenured faculty in case of program discontinuance to remove purely financial reasons for discontinuance; not in line with peer institutions as claimed; c) reaffirm the use of existing shared governance structures to deal with any reviews. The faculty reps did not include in their document: a) mention of faculty layoff for reasons beyond discontinuance—mentioned in statute but not in RPD; b) post-tenure review had a remediation plan timeline of eighteen months that was changed to three semesters—individual institutions will set these plans, so there is flexibility in determining what must be completed in eighteen months; c) language guaranteeing a merit pay raise—this is handled institutionally, rather than at System level; d) no language in RPD allowing faculty review of negative post-tenure review—determining if institutions can include in their own policies. Faculty Rep Hassel went on to explain that the faculty reps are meeting with their institutional chancellors and asking for support, as well as meeting with various Regents. Faculty expressed approval of the idea and of the document.

b) Faculty Professional Standards Committee Chair Mike Jurmu was not in attendance.

6. Old Business

a) Adoption: Proposed Revision of FPP #501.01 (“Promotion, Tenure, and Third-year Tenure Progress and retention Review Dossier Format”) [FPSC] eliminate specific due dates (Attachment 22). Faculty Professional Standards Committee (FPSC) representative Ron Gulotta explained that the two adoption proposals remove specific references to due dates and refer people to FPP #501 in order to eliminate the possibility of dates being missed when policy revisions are made. A misspelling was pointed out to be fixed in V (“dossier” should be “dossiers”). The motion carried unanimously [Peterson/Raunio].

b) Adoption: Proposed Revision of FPP #501.02 (“Probationary Faculty Retention Review Dossier”) [FPSC] eliminate specific due dates (Attachment 23). The motion was made and carried by unanimous voice vote [Peterson/Raunio].

c) Other. There was no additional Old Business on the agenda.

7. New Business

a) Introduction: Proposed Revision of FPP #503 (“Faculty Merit Policy and Procedures”) [FPSC] clarify ranking procedure and add template of ranking criteria (Attachment 24). FPSC’s Ron Gulotta informed the Faculty Council that the committee had worked on this introduction further during their earlier meeting. It was decided that references to the campus dean should remain for the time being. In I.D.3: “The follow up meeting is not a formal appeal of a merit ranking,” will be added after the first sentence. The next to the last sentence shall be struck in I.E 1: “Participation in Colleges-wide and department assessment activities will be expected.” The last sentence of I.E.3 will be struck:
“Campus or departmental policies must adhere to the general guidelines in this policy, although they may include additional specific criteria.” The second sentence of I.F, after additions and strikeouts, will read: “Within the Activity Report, faculty members shall document their achievements of both the campus and department criteria for teaching, for professional development, and for service.” In I.F.1, “shall” will be replaced with “may.” I.F.3 after changes will read: “With the exception of student evaluation data as specified in I.F.2, the committees may, in the course of their evaluations, use only information provided by the faculty member, within the limits of the activity report.” Gulotta will send a revised copy to Senate Assistant Linda Baum and the FCS. There was some confusion around the criteria template. It was in the format of a rubric, but faculty senators felt it was not really a rubric. Gulotta explained that it was meant to be general so campuses and departments can put their own quantifiers in that are specific to themselves. It was argued that the lists were biased and interpretive and not a rubric that those doing evaluations could follow. Senator Troy Kozma said it was a standardized set of assessments that would not be standard. Hassel responded that the criteria would be transparent and articulated to all involved. Gulotta agreed, he said that the criteria are required to be published and with this everyone would know what they were being judged on; it is a move in the right direction. Senators agreed that it was a move in the right direction and that transparency is very important, but several said that a list of the criteria might work better. There were also expressions of hope for consistency someday. The table at the end of the policy will also be revised in the copy Gulotta distributes.

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

8. Other Business

   a) Discussion: Tenure, Discontinuing Programs, and Post-Tenure Review Policies; Possible Response to Board of Regents [Hassel] (Attachment 25). The Board of Regents tenure documents had been discussed during Faculty Representative Hassel’s report at the beginning of the meeting.

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

9. Adjournment. The February 19, 2016 meeting of the UWC Faculty Council of Senators was adjourned at 4:47 p.m. by UW Colleges Faculty Representative Holly Hassel.
UW COLLEGES  
Academic Staff Council of Senators  
Friday, February 19, 2016  
UW-Fond du Lac  

MINUTES  

Attending: Lucas Dock, Joanne Giordano, Mike Winkler, Michael Gorman, Melissa Smiley, Bethany Riley (alternate)  

Order 3:58  

Approve Agenda  
Move: Gorman  
Second: Giordano  
Motion passed unanimously  

Approve Minutes  
Moved: Dock  
Second: Winkler  
Motion passed unanimously  

Introduction of Bylaws (Attachment 26)  
Moved: Gorman  
Seconded: Giordano  
Ready for submission to academic staff for comments.  

(Attachment 27)  

ASPP #804  
Language ready to be forwarded to Dianne Lund to insure that it meets needs / complies with statute.  

Elections:  
Who still has the classes to vote:  
Gorman, Dock Giordano, Smiley, Verona  
Winkler has lost classes  
Smiley will not be continuing  
Need people, they should contact Dave Carlson
Policy Reviews passed to us be Steering Review and determine if changes are needed
Focus on language changes for regionalization
Does it need to change fundamentally?
Have review prepped for April meeting

Smiley: 704, 705
Winkler: 701 – 703
Giordano: 706 - 708
Gorman: 320, 323
Dock: 801-802
Verona: 803-804

Suggestion from Chair of Chairs
Suggestion is that IAS merit be decided by departments at all time and not switch back and forth
Inconsistent with push from merit committees to standardize process between faculty and IAS.
Would potentially impact promotion
Pretends that IAS don’t do service, which they do.

Our response – No. This is not a good idea and does not fit the direction merit policies are moving in.

Chancellor updates:
Accepted recommendation on handling of appeals of layoffs through academic staff appeals and grievances

No decisions on tripwire removal have been made

Meeting adjourned

Respectfully submitted, Michael Gorman
Present: Christi Larson (WSH), Juli McGuire (FOX), Kay Sbarbaro (SHB), Bradley Wilson (BRB)

Not Present: Chee Lee (Central), Roseann Stenstrup (MNT)

Guests: None

1. Call to order: Chair Juli McGuire
2. Roll call for USC Executive Committee & Senators-C. Larson
4. Approval of the January 12th 2016 Minutes: Sent out electronically. Motion: Sbarbaro/McGuire. Carried
5. HR Update: No Update at this time due to no HR staff in attendance.
6. Other: Discussed ideas of how to structure the council going forward after the regionalization implementation. Need to continue to have one representative from each campus vs. a “regional” rep. Council members agreed that it would be best to have a rep from each campus even if the position is vacant.
7. Elections: How will we proceed with elections? Is there anyone left on the elections committee? Brad Wilson volunteered to assist with the elections in March.
8. Face to Face Meeting in March: Discussed where or not to have a face to face meeting in March. Council decided this would be a good idea to get together for elections and possibly invite individuals who may be interested in the council and the work that is performed. Wilson volunteered to host at Baraboo.
9. 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, February 19, 2016
UW–Fond du Lac
9:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Coffee and Collegiality 9:00 a.m. - 9:30 a.m.
A-219 Henken Room

Committee Meetings 9:30 a.m. - 11:25 a.m.
- Senate Academic Policy Committee A-216
- Senate Budget Committee A-210
- Faculty Professional Standards Committee A-211
- Senate Steering Committee A-219 Henken Room

Presentation 11:30 a.m. - 12:20 p.m.
Discussion of Senate Policy Revision Proposal
Campus Reports (please bring a short update on governance problems, solutions, or questions at your campus or within your constituency group)

Lunch 12:25 p.m. - 1:10 p.m.
A-219 Henken Room

UW Colleges Senate 1:15 p.m.
A-219 Henken Room

Council Meetings following Senate
- Academic Staff Council of Senators AE-136
- University Staff Council Senators A-216
- Faculty Council of Senators A-219 Henken Room
Draft Agenda
UW COLLEGES
Senate
Friday, February 19, 2016
UW-Fond du Lac
1:15 p.m.

1) Call to Order of 2015-2016 Senate

2) Welcome by UW-Fond du Lac Campus Administrator Bethany Rusch

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

4) Approval of Agenda

5) Approval of Minutes: November 13, 2015, UW-Marathon 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 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) Adoption: Proposed Revision of UW Colleges Senate Bylaws 7.0 (“Appointed Senate Bylaws Committees”) [SGC] standardize procedure for appointing students as outlined in WI law
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c) Adoption: Proposed Revision of IP #202 (“Academic Procedures and Regulations”) [SAPC] modifying drop deadlines for Flex

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

e) Other

8) New Institutional Business

a) Introduction: American Indian Studies Program Petition for Freestanding Status [Renee Gralewicz]

b) Introduction: Proposed Amendment of UW Colleges Constitution Chapter 11 (“Academic Programs”) [SAPC] clarifying language around jurisdiction of housed academic programs

c) Introduction: Proposed Amendment of UW Colleges Constitution Chapter 3 (“Campus Governance”) [SAPC] change so collegium presiding officer reflects Senate; add language to address campus administrators and regional deans

d) Other

9) Other Institutional Business

a) Other

10) Adjournment
Draft Agenda
UW COLLEGES
Faculty Council of Senators
Friday, February 19, 2016
UW-Fond du Lac

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: November 13, 2015, UW-Marathon 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 #501.01 (“Promotion, Tenure, and Third-year Tenure Progress and retention Review Dossier Format”) [FPSC] eliminate specific due dates
   b) Adoption: Proposed Revision of FPP #501.02 (“Probationary Faculty Retention Review Dossier”) [FPSC] eliminate specific due dates
   c) Other

7. New Business
   a) Introduction: Proposed Revision of FPP #503 (“Faculty Merit Policy and Procedures”) [FPSC] clarify ranking procedure and add template of ranking criteria
   b) Other

8. Other Business
   a) Discussion: Tenure, Discontinuing Programs, and Post-Tenure Review Policies; Possible Response to Board of Regents [Hassel]
   b) Other

9. Adjournment
Roll Call

Select Recorder

Approve Agenda

Approval of Minutes from ASCS meeting of November 13, 2015

I. Introduction
   • Revised ASCS Bylaws

II. Old Business
   • Revision of ASPP #804 (“Non-Renewal of Fixed-Term Renewable Appointments”) to include language which addresses FLSA-exempt employees

III. Other business
   • Elections
   • Need for review of the following policies affecting academic staff: 320; 323; 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 801, 802, 803, 804
   • Updates

IV. Adjourn
1. Call to order

2. Approval of agenda

3. Approval of prior meeting minutes

4. Continue discussion of revision of bylaws

5. Continue discussion of elections

6. Other discussion items as needed

7. Adjourn
**Attachment 2**

**UW Colleges Provost & Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs**

**Report to the UW Colleges Senate**

**February 19, 2016**

**Campus Visits:** Since the last week of January 2016, UW Colleges-UW-Extension Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance Steve Wildeck and I have been traveling to our campuses to hold noon-time, one-hour meetings. The one-hour meetings are open to all members of the campus community and are intended to provide participants with a very brief update on our regional and consolidation activities, and to offer time for questions and feedback on those activities. To date, we have traveled to nine of our campuses: UW-Marathon County, UW-Marshfield/Wood County, UW-Barron County, UW-Waukesha, UW-Fond du Lac, UW-Baraboo/Sauk County, UW-Manitowoc, and UW-Fox Valley. By the middle of March, Steve and I will have traveled to all 13 of our campuses and UW Colleges Online.

Participation on the campuses has been excellent. Our colleagues have been candid and open about expressing their questions and perspectives on the regional and consolidated models that are currently being implemented UW Colleges-wide. We have engaged in discussions about the models and responded to the many questions we receive as best we can. As we all knew coming into this period of full implementation, things would be “clunky.” With each passing day, we are learning more about where the consolidated and regional models are working and where there are challenges.

Throughout our one-hour noon-time meetings, several issues have consistently emerged. Our colleagues have asked questions and shared concerns about the role of shared governance in the regional and consolidated models, the timing of Senate policy revisions, the planning for UW Colleges Constitution and campus constitution revisions, the role of the regional executive officers and deans, and the new marketing and student recruiting models.

While on each campus, I have reserved time to make myself available to meet with our campus colleagues. I typically situate myself in a campus high traffic area and meet with faculty and staff members, administrators, and students over a 90 minute period. Consequently, I have been able to have informal conversations with many of our colleagues and have been able to learn about issues related and not related to our consolidation and regionalization activities. Most importantly, these meetings have added greatly to my understanding of the personal and professional impacts of the many changes being experienced across our institution.
Steve Wildeck and I are grateful for the friendly reception we have received on the campuses and for the willingness of our colleagues to share their views and questions with us. I believe these open campus dialogues have been mutually beneficial. I will provide you with another update at our April Senate meeting.

**Budget Activities:** In addition to visiting the campuses and discussing the consolidation and regionalization budget reduction activities and implementation, I have been investing a great deal of time in a number of budget-related meetings. What follows is a short list of the implementation-related meetings that are being convened on a routine basis:

- Each Wednesday afternoon from 4:00 to 5:30 p.m., UW Colleges’ administrative leaders meet to address emerging implementation issues. These meetings are attended by Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance Steve Wildeck, Associate Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management Rich Barnhouse, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Joe Foy, Associate Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance Colleen Godfriaux, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Human Resources Jason Beier, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Information Technology Werner Gade, and me. During this meeting, each member of the committee provides a list of implementation issues that have come to their attention since the last implementation meeting. Each of these issues are then discussed and resolved or next steps are identified.

- Every Friday morning from 8:00 to 9:00 a.m., a meeting is held between campus administrators and the implementation committee members identified above. Regional executive officers and deans are also invited to attend. These meetings are designed to provide an opportunity for campus administrators to receive updates from administrative leadership and for campus administrators to share concerns and perspectives about what they are experiencing on their respective campuses.

- Every other Wednesday morning from 7:30 to 8:30 a.m. the Regional Executive Officers and Deans meet with Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance Steve Wildeck and me to discuss challenges and issues they are facing as they work to build external relationships in their regions. In addition, we discuss their roles and relationships with campus-based regional administrators, and faculty and staff members.

Additionally, Associate Vice Chancellors Barnhouse, Foy, and Godfriaux are meeting with their respective regional associate dean operational teams weekly.

All of these meetings are designed to keep the communication lines open between campus-based, region-based, and Madison-based administrators. Through these meetings, issues emerge that need immediate attention, questions are raised, and day-to-day and longer term challenges are addressed.
Non Online Distance Education (NODE) Program Update: Over the past several months, I have been working with Scott Bouffleur, Director of NODE, Mike Bartlett, Dean of UW Colleges Online, and Associate Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance Colleen Godfriaux to plan a smooth transition for moving the NODE program out of UW Colleges Online and into the Office of Academic and Student Affairs. On February 22, the NODE program (now named the Office of Distance Learning) will be moved to the Office of Academic and Student Affairs and will be under the supervision of the provost. For clarity, the distance learning program includes courses delivered by WisLine Video, WisLine Web, Streaming Video, Compressed Video, Point to Point, high school collaborations via distance education, other higher education collaborations, and coordinating and supporting WisLine Web/compressed video events, and videoconference support.

The move of the Office of Distance Learning from UW Colleges Online to the Office of Academic and Student Affairs was recommended by the Instructional Technology Consolidated Work Group in their final report to the Budget Implementation Steering Committee in August 2015. In preparation for the move and with the increased responsibilities of the director responsibilities, the director’s position description was revised so that it reflects the new duties and the new reporting relationship to the provost as recommended within the Instructional Technology Consolidated Work Group final report. Director Scott Bouffleur’s principle responsibilities include:

- Serving as the intellectual and academic leader of the Office of Distance Learning
- Managing the academic and administrative affairs of the Office of Distance Learning
- Supervising the 13 campus-located UW Colleges Academic Technology Staff (ATS) members and the Office of Distance Learning Project Specialist
- Coordinating and managing NODE facilities and technology administration
- Managing NODE curriculum development and general administration
- Providing administrative support for the UW Colleges Bachelor of Applied Arts and Sciences (BAAS) degree completion program
- Coordinating and managing campus-to-campus Point to Point (P2P) course administration

Positioning the Office of Distance Learning within the Office of Academic and Student Affairs will facilitate a stronger relationship between distance education and curriculum and staffing planning for the Associate of Arts and Science degree and the Bachelor of Applied Arts and Science degree completion program. Additionally, the new structure will allow the Office of Distance Learning director to build relationships across student affairs, academic affairs, and its multiple program operations and functions.

U.S. Department of Education Second Chance Pell Experiment Update: As you might recall, in early October 2015 I submitted a letter of application to the U.S. Department of Education for
the UW Colleges to become an experimental site for the Second Chance Pell Pilot Program for Incarcerated Individuals. In late January, I received word from the U.S. Department of Education about our participation status in the Second Chance Pell experiment. I learned that the UW Colleges has successfully passed the first phase of the review process.

Through the Pell for Students who are Incarcerated experiment, the Department of Education will provide a limited waiver of the statutory ban on individuals incarcerated in Federal or State penal institutions from receiving Federal Pell Grants to pay for postsecondary education and/or training programs. The Department of Education will select a limited number of postsecondary educational institutions to participate in this experiment.

The second and final phase of the review process requires that I complete and submit a questionnaire to the Department of Education no later than March 20, 2016. The questionnaire will collect information that will be used by the Department of Education in selecting a diverse set of qualified institutions for participation in the experiment. I plan to take the lead with responding to the questions included in the document. As I work with our colleagues in the UW Colleges to draft our responses to the questions, I will solicit assistance from the Wisconsin Department of Corrections. Their support will be crucial as our institution enters into the final phase of the review process.

I am very pleased and excited that the UW Colleges was successful with the first phase and are now on to phase two of the review and selection process. I will keep you informed of our progress and the outcome of this final phase of the review and selection process.

Respectfully submitted,

Greg Lampe, Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs
2.15.2016
Implementation of the regionalization and consolidated services operations for the UW Colleges remains the highest priority within the Office of Academic Affairs. I want to extend a sincere thanks to everyone who is living in the ambiguity and doing everything possible to make sure that we are serving our students and communities. There are a lot of questions that everyone is still working through, which adds to the already tremendous stress that goes with the work that folks are traditionally engaged in. I am grateful that we have such a strong community of people working together in our institution to make this work. Thank you.

A few items by way of update:

**Center for Academic Success and Engagement (CASE)** What’s in the CASE? The CASE serves as the hub for student academic support services. The core services provided within the umbrella of the CASE are IT and Distance Education, library, accessibilities proctoring, and tutoring and writing and math support. While the degree of integration of services may vary across campuses during the early stages of implementation, the core services are minimally integrated through directional and scheduling support provided at the Answer Desk.

**Answer Desk**
- Basic IT support and troubleshooting
- Scheduling of support services (tutoring, accessibility proctoring, library instruction and research help)
- Circulation of library materials
- Support with accessibilities proctoring (scheduling exam times and informing instructors, helping to find readers/scribes, receiving and returning exams from instructors, providing back-up to proctoring on emergency basis)
- Student/Staff/Faculty IDs
- Directional support for campus services (ex., classroom AV or IT problems, call Answer Desk and they will route)

**Librarian**
- Teach Information Literacy skills either in classrooms or one-on-one with students, staff and faculty
- Develop electronic or print instructional materials including learning objects, research guides, or other tools to enhance learning
- Train faculty and staff in the use of new information tools and resources
- Assist students, faculty, and staff in person and online with reference needs
- Consult on complicated citation questions
- Consult on copyright questions
- Manage print and electronic library collections. Purchase materials requested by faculty that align with campus collection development policies
• Provide outreach programming such as book discussion, lectures, poetry events, finals week activities, displays, etc.
• Manage library services assistant

Library Services Assistant
• Secure needed materials through interlibrary loan and UW System borrowing
• Circulate materials
• Place items on reserve
• Process new materials
• Train student library staff members
• Proctor tests for students with documented accommodation plans

Academic Technology Specialists
• Support the Distance Education programs (NODE and non-NODE)
• Be the primary contact for Distance Education media equipment, facilities, and logistic program information
• Communicate and disseminate official information regarding Distance Education
• Schedule/Manage and coordinate Distance Education rooms/usage
• Administer and track billing of users for videoconference room rentals
• Coordinate cross-institution/cross-system collaborative programs
• Provide media and logistic support for media equipment and Distance Education rooms
• Provide support for audio/visual equipment in the classrooms
• Support Distance Education technology (WisLine Web, WisLine Video)
• Train faculty, students, and supplemental local support staff in the use of Distance Education technology
• Provide active professional development experiences/opportunities for faculty to learn technology
• Assist faculty in learning and using technology in the classroom
• Assist faculty and students with Distance Education class presentations

Tutoring and Other Academic Support Services
• Vary across campuses (unchanged through implementation planning and implementation process)

Course Options/Dual and Concurrent Enrollment/Youth Options: MOU templates have been developed for Course Options/Dual and Concurrent Enrollment agreements that are being reviewed to ensure they meet institutional and local campus needs. Developed in the Office of Academic Affairs, the MOU templates were reviewed by the Offices of the UWC Controller and UWC Registrar before being distributed for review by regional administration. These MOUs will represent a standardized approach in how agreements are determined and the framework under which we will operate as an institution while maintaining an ability to meet localized needs whenever practicable. It should be noted that academic departments will continue to have credentialing and oversight authority related to all credit-bearing instruction incorporated into these agreements. I also want to note that traditional Youth Options remains unchanged by the
developments in Course Options legislation over the past several years and remains available to high school students who are eligible through their district to enroll for college courses offered on our campuses.

**Undergraduate Research and Creative Activity:**

- Posters in the Rotunda: The UW Colleges has selected the fifteen projects that will represent the institution at the 13th annual Posters in the Rotunda event to be held at the Capitol Building in Madison on April 13, 2016. The complete listing of projects and participants is listed at the end of this report. I want to thank the members of the Senate Professional Development Committee (SPDC), in particular co-chairs Jennifer Heinert and Eduardo Gregori, for their efforts in gathering and nominating from the atypically large pool of truly outstanding submissions. My thanks also to all of the students and faculty who engage in the high impact practice of undergraduate research. You are creating experiences and opportunities that are very uncommon in the first two-years of higher education, and your work stands out even next to the work being done at our four-year System institutions. You do us all proud!

- Registration for the 15th Annual UW System Symposium for Undergraduate Research and Creative Activity, to be held this year at UW-Stevens Point, will continue through February 29, 2016. Information and registration materials can be found at: [https://www.uwsp.edu/ursca/Pages/symposium/default.aspx](https://www.uwsp.edu/ursca/Pages/symposium/default.aspx).

**Multicultural Awareness Program:** Staff, faculty and administration throughout the UW Colleges are encouraged to participate in the Multicultural Awareness Program (MAP). Details of the program are available through the Office of Equity Diversity and Inclusion (OEDI): [http://inclusion.uwex.uwc.edu/content/multicultural-awareness-program](http://inclusion.uwex.uwc.edu/content/multicultural-awareness-program). Registration is free and there are currently still spots available for the May 5-6, 2016 two-day program to be held at the Pyle Center in Madison.

**ESL Task Force:** The task force that was charged with making recommendations regarding institutional ESL programming for the UW Colleges International Education Program completed its work in late November. After receiving the report and recommendations, Provost Lampe and I met twice with the chair of the task group and the Director of International Education before summarizing institutional decision points related to each of the recommendations in the report. Prior to publicly releasing those decisions, a copy of the decision points was provided in advance to members of the committee for comment. Subsequent meetings with members of the ESL task force were held to address questions and concerns prior to release to the institution. My sincere thanks for the time and diligence with which each member of the task force went about their work.

Respectfully Submitted,
Joseph J. Foy
UW Colleges Participants
13th Annual Posters in the Rotunda (April 13, 2016)

Title: Examining Costal Beach Sands in North America
Student(s): Ashley Thompson
Faculty/IAS Advisor(s): Norlene Emerson (GEO/GLG)
Campus: UW-Richland

Title: Monitoring Carbon Dioxide and Methane Levels Above Active Landfill, Retired Landfill, and Forest Control Sites in the Fox Cities Area of Wisconsin with a Tethered Aerostat to Determine Remediation Effectiveness
Student(s): Jesse L. Banick, Kathryn E. Lenz, Jeshanah Zolkowski, Jonathan J. Sanders
Faculty/IAS Advisor(s): Beth A. Johnson (GEO/GLG)
Campus: UW-Fox Valley

Title: Allelopathic Potential of Garlic Mustard
Student(s): Emily Belling, Jade Roth
Faculty/IAS Advisor(s): David Demezas (BIO)
Campus: UW-Fond du Lac

Title: Following Nuclear Fallout: The Ongoing Effects of Fukushima Nuclear Disaster
Student(s): Ciera Griepentrog
Faculty/IAS Advisor(s): Caleb Bush (ANT/SOC)
Campus: UW-Marshfield/Wood County

Title: Water Pollution and Regulation in Wisconsin
Student(s): Ryan Kizer
Faculty/IAS Advisor(s): Caleb Bush (ANT/SOC)
Campus: UW-Marshfield/Wood County

Title: Mogollon Ceramic Analysis: From Pots to People
Student(s): Drew Hraban, Melanie Gruenstern
Faculty/IAS Advisor(s): Gregg Jamison (ANT/SOC)
Campus: UW-Fond du Lac

Title: Peeling Back Layers of Truth: A Fresh Exploration of “The Yellow Wallpaper” by Charlotte Perkins Gilman
Student(s): Corbach Toolis, Erika Traver
Faculty/IAS Advisor(s): Marc Seals (ENG)
Campus: UW-Baraboo/Sauk County

Title: Asking the Tough Questions: How to Create an Effective Survey
Student(s): Rachel Lizzardo-McPherson
Faculty/IAS Advisor(s): Melissa Hage (GEO/GLG)
Campus: UW-Baraboo/Sauk County
Title: Economic Analysis of Winter Greenhouse Production in Baraboo  
Student(s): Malachi Persche  
Faculty/IAS Advisor(s): Musa Ayar (BUS/ECO)  
Campus: UW-Baraboo/Sauk County

Title: From Spring City to Dry City  
Student(s): Mariah Ehmcke  
Faculty/IAS Advisor(s): Quintin Bendixen (GEO/GLG)  
Campus: UW-Waukesha

Title: Impact of Rainfall on the Water Quality of the Tributary Creeks of Lake Michigan in Manitowoc, Wisconsin  
Student(s): Mallary Schenian, Aubri Urbanek, Chelsy Coutermarsh, Paige Arenson  
Faculty/IAS Advisor(s): Rick Hein (BIO), Rebecca Abler (BIO)  
Campus: UW-Manitowoc

Title: Hydraulic Fracturing and Its Effects on the Environment  
Student(s): John William Wsha  
Faculty/IAS Advisor(s): Tom Neal (CHE)  
Campus: UW-Baraboo/Sauk County

Title: Nonconventional Hydrogen Bonding: Natural Bond Orbital Study  
Student(s): Tyler Ross, Morgan Vanderschaegen, Ross Kluczinske, Patrick Leonard  
Faculty/IAS Advisor(s): Mohamed Ayoub (CHE)  
Campus: UW-Washington County

Title: Growth Performance of 4 Varieties of Sweet Bail Grown in a Greenhouse with Both Aquaponics Effluent and Soil  
Student(s): Amanda Drews  
Faculty/IAS Advisor(s): Mark Schmitz (BIO)  
Campus: UW-Sheboygan

Title: Evolution of a Trophic Polymorphism Between Blue and Gold Walleye (Sander vitreus) in Ontario, Canada by Gut Content and Stable Isotope Analysis  
Student(s): Ryan Kisiolek, Amy Kretlow, Jason Karls (UW-Milwaukee)  
Faculty/IAS Advisor(s): Mark Schmitz (BIO)  
Campus: UW-Sheboygan
On January 21, I was invited by the Assembly Committee on Colleges and Universities to testify before members at the capitol regarding Assembly Bill 741 (AB741). AB741 seeks to provide state funding for emergency grants specifically to students in the UW Colleges and the Technical Colleges who find themselves having to choose between addressing a personal financial emergency and remaining enrolled in college. Parts of my testimony included:

I have a unique perspective to offer regarding proposed Assembly Bill 741. I have served in both the technical college system as a Dean of Students, and currently in the UW Colleges as Associate Vice Chancellor. During my time in both two-year systems, I have personally observed and worked with students who for financial emergencies have stopped-out, dropped-out, or reduced their credit load, thereby, increasing their time to degree and decreasing their likelihood of obtaining a degree.

In my former capacity as a Dean of Students, I was responsible for administrating an emergency funding program on three technical college campuses. My firsthand experience crystalized my view of the overwhelming need for emergency funding for collegiate students in a two-year setting. During my time in both systems, I have observed that it is not uncommon for college students to drop classes or drop out completely over the sum of $50 to $100. Although this may appear to be a small sum for such a drastic measure, for many of our two-year UW Colleges and technical college students, this small amount forces a student to decide between crucial life expenses and a college education. Education will lose this battle every time.

Thus, the proposed legislation is an excellent approach to supporting the needs of the students, that we as a state need the most. Limited access to resources is a very expensive proposition, often separating educational opportunity from basic daily needs. I support this legislation and ask that you support those of your constituents that need your educational assistance the most. This is not about the University of Wisconsin Colleges or the Wisconsin Technical Colleges. It is simply about the hope and opportunity that you can provide for the residence of Wisconsin that need access and opportunity the most.

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

In my September and November reports 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. In these reports, I indicated that Chancellor Sandeen approved the plans developed by the planning teams and that Chancellor Sandeen assigned me to lead the student affairs implementation effort. As I described in my November report, in order to adhere to the
approved implementation plans required a significant reduction in the level of campus based
student affairs staff, from a combined level of 79.88 FTE to 45.78 FTE. To meet the 45.78 FTE
budgetary requirement, 39 student affairs staff members were notified both verbally and later by
official letter, that they had not been selected for a position in a campus Student Affairs
Office/Solution Center and were therefore, being laid-off. The last day for all 39 staff members is
March 17, 2016.

On December 9, 2015, I met with the governance groups for academic staff and university staff
to disclose the number of layoffs per campus, classification type, and my employee notification
plan. On December 10 and December 11, 2015, I informed each person in the student affairs unit
being impacted by layoff. When including the former Assistant Campus Deans for Student
Affairs, the student affairs and enrollment management unit has seen a reduction of 47 positions
or 42.1 FTE. I personally notified each person by phone and I am deeply grateful for their grace
and collegiality when speaking with me under unbelievable pressure and significant
disappointment.

The training for all staff members selected for campus Student Affairs/Solution Center positions
occurred from December 16-18 in Wausau. The five Regional Associate Deans for Student
Affairs developed and facilitated an outstanding three-day training program. The program
included: veterans benefits, knowledge base, financial aid, admissions, accessibility services,
recruitment, UW Colleges based solution center, Hobson’s connect and retain, student conduct
and compliance, advising, student life and events, information specialist, and regional functions
and operations.

By January 4, 2016 the student affairs and enrollment management unit had transitioned to a
fully consolidated operation with campus based Student Affairs/Solution Centers, Regional
Associate Deans for Student Affairs, and a UW Colleges Solution Center supporting all
campuses. The final scheduled step in the round one, budget cut decision #1 occurs on March 17,
2016, when the 90 day notice period for student affairs staff being laid-off ends. On March 18,
2016 only the staff members selected for new positions will remain in campus student
affairs/Solution Centers.

Respectfully submitted,

Rich Barnhouse
Associate Vice Chancellor,
Student Affairs & Enrollment Management 02.04.16
Attachment 5

Senate Steering Committee Chair
UW Colleges Faculty Representative to UW System Administration
Report to the UW Colleges Senate
February 19, 2016

Jan 29: Faculty Representatives Meeting: The primary outcome of this meeting of the faculty, staff, and student representatives was talking with Regent Millner about the tenure and post-tenure review policies. She was unresponsive to the notion of expanding the timeline—though UWW proposed extending it for greater deliberation, since there was really less than 2 weeks for faculty to discuss it. Madison does not support timeline extension because they believe it’s hurting their recruitment of faculty.

A couple of notable things that stood out to me—first, one of the system legislative liaisons reported on bills that are under consideration at the legislature that may have impact for UW. He believed that the proposal to prohibit UW campuses from banning concealed carry in campus buildings was not going to move forward. He attributed the lack of traction on this bill to the multiple statements from staff, student, and faculty governance groups opposing the bill.

Tenure, Post-Tenure Review, and Program Discontinuance Actions at BoR (linked here) https://www.wisconsin.edu/regents/draft-tenure-policies/

As Faculty Council senators are aware, I circulated a statement indicating support for the Madison policies and for UW Whitewater’s feedback statement requesting additional time for review and outlining issues with several aspects of the program discontinuance policy. Eleven of 13 campuses were able to get me their formal support before I needed to send it along to Regents; a system representative personally thanked us for sending it as did a regent. I think it’s important that we be on record with our positions on these issues and I am very appreciative to all the faculty senators who worked to gather their campus support through email or specially-called campus meetings of faculty.

Improvements: One of the improvements to the policies approved by the Education Committee of the Board was the removal of expansive language that gave Chancellor’s relatively broad say over program discontinuance as well as modification, curtailment, or redirection. The implication here was that there were a wide range of reasons why a program (or academic department) could be slated for elimination, resulting in the layoff of tenured or tenure-track faculty, whereas previously such action required that the Chancellor request and receive approval from the Board of Regents to declare the campus in “fiscal emergency” (not just the program).

Changes that are still problematic and that we hope to effect some change on yet:

- The language around program discontinuance currently still blurs ‘educational considerations’ and financial reasons in making determinations of eliminating a program. We want more precise language, distinctions, and rationale here.
- Right now language states that ‘all other options must have been considered,’ should a chancellor decide to override a faulty committee’s recommendations about whether or not to discontinue a program. We would like to see the language say ‘pursued’ or ‘exhausted’ instead of ‘considered.’
- There is no layer of appeal in the case of a negative post-tenure review: should a faculty member be found ‘deficient,’ then that finding cannot be appealed as the language stands to another faculty review group—only to a dean, provost, and
chancellor. There are concerns that this means that there is an erosion of the traditional values of academic as a peer-review profession wherein a remediation plan would be developed--and evaluated--by disciplinary experts.

- There was one change from 18 months for the timeline of the remediation plan to "three semesters" which is kind of just wordsmithing. There was an extension option added that when the deficient area is research, a one-semester extension could be granted but only with the approval of the Chancellor.
- There is a desire to add some kind of guaranteed 'carrot' to the PTR process and not just a 'stick.'

**What it means for us:** If all of these policies are passed in March, each institution has a 9-month window to revise/update its policies to be in compliance with system policy, which brings me to the next item....

**Policy Review Plan:** Provost Lampe and I have been meeting regularly to talk over and strategize for the needed changes to senate policy and bylaws, the Colleges Constitution, and the campus constitutions. We've sketched out a plan that will allow us to put together a working group of faculty senators and a second working group made up of representatives from academic staff, university staff, faculty, and administration.

The first group will undertake responsibility for reviewing and assessing all senate policy over the summer of 2016 (this will be compensated work). Each policy will be reviewed by a team of faculty in light of the following big three changes: a) restructuring/regionalization/consolidation of services, b) virtual campus status, c) system-level changes to tenure, post-tenure review, and program discontinuance.

The second group will be charged with reviewing the UWC Constitution in light of the above changes as well. My thinking is that we will then make a set of recommended options or approaches including prioritizing which policies need to be addressed soonest which will give us a head start on the 2016-2017 academic year's work.

I have a proposal with a timeline for the work in process and will send that out in draft form for discussion at our February Senate meeting.

**UW Blackout Movement, President Cross's Comments:**

At the Regents' meeting, President Cross read a statement reporting on the meeting he had with UW students of color working through United Council. He stated, "we're working on a plan to expand the conversations across the UW system to engage more students including students of color and elected student leaders directly; chancellors and members of the board will make the time and space necessary to facilitate this dialogue. Chancellors met with them last week and they are getting started on this work." I'm appending pictures of the students' demands, but briefly, I think it would be good for us to start thinking about how to initiate campus-based dialogues that would address some of these issues, and how our built-in system of governance (senators) might be part of facilitating those or at least serving as campus contact people to move conversations forward. Chancellor Sandeen also plans to speak to these points at Monday's SSC meeting

More as I know it!

Holly Hassel
Over the next month, the full impact of the budget cuts will be felt among the academic staff. Many AS with years (or decades) of service will be leaving the UW Colleges, and they will be sorely missed. I would like to thank the departing AS for their time and talents, and I wish them well in their future endeavors. Of the remaining AS, many will be moving into new roles, which will require a time of adjustment – both for them and for their colleagues. Finally, some members of the University Staff will be transitioning into Academic Staff positions. They, too, will need time to settle into the new environment. This spring promises to be a challenging one, and we all will need patience and good humor.

The AS Council is in the process of approving revisions to its bylaws and should have the new bylaws in place by the end of the academic year. We will be examining our policies and revising their language to bring them in line with the new regional model.

As UW Colleges Online assumes campus status, several issues of importance to AS, particularly instructional AS, need to be addressed. What role will the Online “campus” play in determining IAS merit? How will IAS whose appointment is primarily or exclusively online be represented in shared governance? What provisions for office space and support (particularly technical support) need to be made for IAS who primarily or exclusively teach online? In conjunction with the Senate and its various committees, the Council will work to address these issues.

Finally, the Council encourages the Chancellor to consider the statements issued by the Council, the Department Chairs, and Senate Steering regarding the use of funds to reduce or eliminate the “70% tripwire” many IAS face.

Jeff Verona
February 4, 2016
During the last two Academic Staff Reps meetings (12/4 & 1/29) there has been a lot of discussions around the new structure and overall policy, procedure and practices of campus.

1. Discussion on academic staff probationary/ indefinite contracts
   - Madison: most or all indefinite appointments are clinical professor positions.
   - Milwaukee: all non-instructional academic staff are probationary/indefinite appointments.
   - Most comprehensive campuses have stopped offering indefinite status. Stevens Point being the most recent with 1-year suspension of offering probationary contracts.
   - Some campus councils are requesting a list of Academic Staff hired as fixed term that should have been hired as probationary under the handbook policy/guidelines.
   - Indefinites are out, will rolling horizon appointments be eroded next? We are seeing this on different campuses. It is one of the few perks we have left for the preservation of our morale as employees of the institutions. Shenita – will look into this issue and get back to reps.

2. Discussion on layoff versus non-renewals
   - Superior - faculty held harmless in reduction is a common theme.
   - Madison - Outreach is being hit the hardest due to not being teaching related.
   - La Crosse - Academic Staff hit hardest. Now started a strategic planning process that hasn’t been done since 2003.
   - Eau Claire - Restructuring being done in Advising/Student Services
   - UW Colleges – Made all academic and university staff re-apply for reduced number of positions in Student Services.
   - There are concerns on some campuses that restructuring allows positions to be filled without an appropriate search and screen process.

3. Titling and Compensation Study
   - UW-System with UW-Madison will do this study. Purpose is for a comprehensive review of job title study, create a market-informed titling structure in line with market, and conduct comparative analysis of compensation (local, national). Advisory group will be appointed – 6 from Madison, 6 from other institutions. Recommendations are with Cross and Blank. Next steps: convene advisory group, issue charge, develop RFP for consulting, and finalize approach for moving forward. The main focus is job title structure. We have 1800 titles across the System and we need to reduce it by at least 1000 titles. It is a monumental effort with a kick off in March or April and will last 18 or 24+ months.

4. Legislative Update
   - Jeff Schoenfeldt, Director of State Relations 400 new pieces of legislation introduced in the last 4 weeks. Things are moving through at breakneck speeds. Speaker Vos –
the Assembly will only meet 3 more days and will conclude on February 18. The Senate might come in one day in March but there is no way they will be in past the middle of March. The Legislative Fiscal Bureau adjusted their estimates so that only $135 million of a “surplus” is projected, which is about half of what was previously estimated. College Affordability Package – student loan tax deduction (gets rid of the tuition limit you can claim on your income taxes), emergency funds, internship program, and increased financial aid counseling (modeled after the “Indiana Letter”). Distance education bill – held joint public hearing and was moved to the next level. Academic Excellence scholarships – substantive changes proposed. Objective is to increase the number of these students entering our System schools. It is doubtful that this will pass, as it will be a $1 million price tag. Concealed carry – Speaker Vos will not carry this forward for a vote because there is not a public outcry for it. It is unlikely there will be action on this. Fetal tissue legislation – Speaker Vos expects a vote on this bill during this session, but there could be an amendment to protect the research component. Clean-up bill for academic staff language in 36.21 – will wait until next legislative session to introduce a clean-up bill through the budget. (This last issue is in regards to Chapter 36.21 that indicates that chancellors and faculty will be consulted in situations of layoffs for academic staff. System administrators believe this is a mistake and that academic staff should have been listed as consultants in that situation.)

5. Health insurance
   • Currently, state workers and family members (250,000 people) obtained healthcare through current system. 14% of entire state’s commercially-insured market is generated from these workers. Governor Walker suggested moving to a self-insured model. That means the state assumes financial risks and benefits of that system. Walker is saying that there would be big savings from this program and that the savings could be invested into the K-12 system. 2 different studies had very different results – one said there would be a savings of $100 million or more, one said there would be a cost of $100 million or more. 18 months minimum to do an RFP for self-insurance program. GIB would need to award the contract to the successful RFP. It could be included in the next budget process.

Discussion regarding what would happen if a Regent policy were in contradiction to a local campus policy.

Request was made to AS Reps to collect information on layoffs/non-renewals from their campus. Also data related to cuts – areas/personnel group.

Discussion of tenure task force language and concerns that the language is vague in reference to “staff” instead of “academic staff”. The group agreed that we should advocate for A.S. to be included explicitly in the tenure documents regarding program discontinuance/modification.

Respectfully Submitted,
Lucas Dock
February 5, 2016
Since our last meeting

- The Executive Committee, Bylaws Committee and Council have met several times. The Bylaws Committee has suggested that University Staff campus representatives be elected during campus collegium meetings to be in compliance with open meetings laws. That is currently being considered by the Council and if approved will require a notation to indicate this is how we will proceed until the next revision of the USC Bylaws and UW Colleges Constitution.
- The Professional Development Committee conducted a survey regarding interest among University Staff for professional development. There were 62 respondents from every location made of 52 permanent employees and 10 temporary employees. Some highlights of responses:
  - At the start of the survey 85% indicate they are interested to very interested in professional development.
  - 69% (43) indicated they have not requested professional development funds over the last 5 years.
  - Of the 19 respondents who indicated they asked for professional development funds over the last 5 years, 17 were awarded partial or full funding of their requests.
  - Of the 62 respondents, a total of $14,501 in professional development funding over the last 5 years was reported, including a few campus-wide University Staff initiatives.
  - When asked about PD funding over the last 5 years, 94% of respondents indicated they would like the USC Professional Development Committee to pursue professional development funding/opportunities to share PD ideas throughout the year.
  - At the conclusion of the survey, no one indicated a lack of interest in professional development; 91% indicated they are interested to very interested in professional development.
  - This may tie in with a meeting I had with campus University Staff who expressed the desire for the UW Colleges to provide a path for career advancement. This topic has been brought to HR at a recent Council meeting; however it was noted this involves awareness and support from local supervisors and campus/institutional leadership.
  - Suggestions for possible professional development from the survey:
    - Computer software
- Site visits to see how other locations do things; share best practices
- VTCL reading circle.
- Attend Annual University Staff Conference in Green Bay or Madison
- Attend conferences related to job area such as WAAL or WLA
- Encourage peer conference/mentoring
- I do not expect to be hired with the reorganization, so there doesn't seem to be any purpose for an employee like me.
- None at this time.
- Many University Staff are denied PD funds or do not apply because the campus committee is made up of non-University Staff who believe funds are reserved for others.
- Implement standard of training through CRLA. This would provide consistency for students when they transfer and give tutors a 'real world' certification that can transfer.
- Information on how to write a good PD proposal so that it gets funded.
- Many are not willing to take time for PD because of work demands.
- Many are not willing to show vulnerability by attending PD where they are not comfortable.
- I would need to know what level of funding is available before I can suggest an idea for professional development.
- PC Circuit board trouble shooting.
- Social Media and Technology training— to keep up with younger peers and students.
- Cross-train in various positions. This would also allow for professional growth within the organization.
- Perhaps more opportunities through CE and regular courses on campus (Computers, Microsoft applications, PeopleSoft, Communications, and Business courses).
- PRISM training. Online library courses.
- I don't know what to ask for. Most of the time I'm covering for others who go to meetings, events, or professional development.
- A group subscription to Fred Pryor Training Rewards program (in person and online).
- Training in understanding the structural challenges of the campus; maintenance schedules; products necessary to perform routine maintenance.
- Training to bring staff up to speed on Microsoft Office, WISDM, Oracle and other programs used by UW personnel.
• The Council’s next challenges to tackle include filling all the vacant Senate seats; working with HR to document and track laid off positions, especially important to University Staff wishing to be rehired within 3 years.
• The Council is comprised of 15 University Staff positions. Below is a chart showing what is happening to the Council membership since January 1.

Respectfully submitted,

Juli McGuire, Chair/Lead Senator
UW Colleges University Staff Council
### Members as of January 1, 2016
- Brust, Rose – UW-Marathon County
- Carter, John – UW-Richland
- Larson, Christi – UW-Washington County (Secretary)¹
- McGuire, Juli – UW-Fox Valley (Chair)¹²
- Messerschmidt, Dawn – (Member At Large) – UW-Marshfield
- Peissig, April – UW-Manitowoc
- Sbarbaro, Kay – UW-Sheboygan¹³
- Stapleton, Jean – UW-Waukesha
- Stenstrup, Roseann – UW-Marinette¹
- Wilson, Bradley (US-Temp) – UW-Baraboo/Sauk County¹⁵

### Vacant-USC Representative Positions
- Vacant UW-Barron County
- Vacant UW Colleges Central Office
- Vacant UW Colleges Online
- Vacant UW Fond du Lac
- Vacant UW-Rock County

### Members as of March 19, 2016
- Brust, Rose – UW-Marathon County
- Carter, John – UW-Richland
- Larson, Christi – UW-Washington County (Secretary)¹
- Peissig, April – UW-Manitowoc
- Stapleton, Jean – UW-Waukesha
- Wilson, Bradley (US-Temp) – UW-Baraboo/Sauk County¹⁵

### Vacant-Representative Positions
- Vacant UW-Barron County
- Vacant UW Colleges Central Office
- Vacant UW Colleges Online
- Vacant UW Fond du Lac
- Vacant UW Fox Valley
- Vacant UW Fox Valley
- Vacant UW-Marinette
- Vacant UW-Rock County
- Vacant UW-Sheboygan

### Vacant-Council/Senate Positions
- Vacant Senator (Lead), USC Chair, Senate Steering (voting member)
- Vacant Senator
- Vacant Senator
- Vacant Senate Budget Committee rep
- Vacant USC (Member At Large)
- Vacant Senator
- Vacant Senate Inclusive Excellence Committee rep

### Eliminated Positions by Campus
**Fox Valley*:
**11 University Staff-Permanent positions eliminated → 6 US laid off permanently; 4 rehired as academic staff; 1 rehired in a new University Staff position; +more University Staff-Temporary positions eliminated.**
- Vacant US representative on Steering Committee
- Lost US representative on Budget Committee
- Vacant US representative on Scholarship & Academic Actions Committee
- Vacant US representative on Staffing Prioritization Committee

*Only one campus reporting in so far. Pending additional information from HR and campus governance committees.

---

**Key:** ¹Senator, ²Lead Senator, ³Senate Budget Cte, ⁴Senate Steering (voting member), ⁵Rep to System & Senate Steering (non-voting member on Steering)
Since the last Senate meeting in November, SGC has moved forward with a number of initiatives, including lobbying efforts and student experience assessment, and is working toward the upcoming transition into a new elected board this spring.

During the winter break, SGC sponsored two members of the executive board to take part in a UW System Student Reps trip to Washington, DC, for the purpose of advocating for student interests at the federal level. I, along with SGC VP Martin Sandberg, joined around 20 other UW System students in DC from Jan 10-13. The trip was a success, and provided us opportunities to have many substantial and in-depth conversations with legislative offices, including Senators and Representatives from Wisconsin and from the key education committees, as well as meetings with federal agencies and national organizations. Our primary areas of focus were in financial aid & college affordability, student debt, and campus safety/sexual assault policy.

Discussions about campus diversity and climate have been an important topic recently, particularly since the recent protests by students of color at the Board of Regents meetings in December and February. UW System leadership has asked for these concerns to be looked at first at the campus/institutional level, and that they be brought to the existing shared governance structure first. SGC hopes to play a role in these discussions for the UW Colleges wherever possible.

SGC plans to initiate a survey to assess student experiences surrounding the UW Colleges reorganization. This was initially discussed last fall but was delayed in order to be closer to the actual implementation of the changes students will notice. We are in the process of seeking assistance from the Senate Assessment Committee in constructing this survey, and hope to open it for responses by sometime in March in conjunction with participating campus student governments.

SGC is interested in promoting and sharing information on implementing food pantries at our UW Colleges campuses. Some of our campuses already have programs for this, and a number of other student governments have expressed interest already. SGC hopes to serve as a forum for students to exchange information on these initiatives and help to connect them with any appropriate community or institutional resources, such as existing UW-Extension programs & subject-matter experts.

SGC held an election for the vacant Financial Director position at a meeting on February 6th, and Marly Harmeling, our former Executive Director and Interim Financial Director, was elected to the position of Financial Director. This follows the resignation of Nic Calvache, our former Financial Director, after his transfer to another institution. The move is part of a rearrangement of roles during these last few months of the current term to try to ensure we will have consistent Senate representation, as well as working to incorporate some new people who plan to be part of
SGC for next year. Over the next month, the SGC board will be focused on finding students to take over leadership roles in SGC and to provide an effective hand-off. An election for next year's executive board is currently planned for March 31, 2016, with a transition period to follow.

Finally, the position of SGC Advisor is currently vacant. Our previous advisor, Patrick Neuenfeldt, left the UW Colleges this past November for another opportunity, and SGC would like to extend sincere thanks to Patrick for his service and his passion for student involvement. Filling this SGC Advisor role is a high priority for us to ensure continuity in advising through the upcoming election and into the term of the next SGC executive board. Any inquiries about this position may be directed to Rich Barnhouse.

SGC thanks the Senate for their support of institutional student governance and involvement. I look forward to continuing to work with you all for what will be my final semester in the UW Colleges. Special thanks to Linda Baum, Holly Hassel, Rich Barnhouse, Greg Lampe, and Chancellor Cathy Sandeen for their support.

Respectfully,
Graham Pearce
The Senate Academic Policy Committee (SAPC) met the morning of November 13, 2015 prior to the UWC Senate meeting. We discussed and/or acted on the following items:

1) SAPC had been charged with a review of UWC Constitution, Chapter 11, along with IP#408. IP#408 has been on the committee’s radar for some time, since late spring, 2015, as we looked for ways to modify policy to allow for departments to dissolve, merge, or be modified in other ways. SAPC has also been tasked, under this additional charge, to add language creating a pathway for department-housed programs to petition for standalone status. Additionally, Senate Steering felt language inconsistencies in Chapter 11 around program jurisdiction need greater clarity.

In short, the work SAPC had previously done – creating policies and amending the Constitution for academic programs – needs significant, additional work. The committee spoke at length about these charges. Work on Chapter 11 seemed straightforward, and SAPC Chair, Bush, agreed to proceed with a revision. The committee felt IP#408 was less clear in terms of moving ahead, and discussion was tabled pending additional guidance from Steering.

2) In October, SAPC received a charge from Steering asking the committee to examine changes to UWC drop deadlines. Specifically, we were asked to explore pushing the early drop deadline beyond the current, “end of the second week of classes” timeframe – that the current deadline results in higher numbers of F7-F10 grades than necessary. SAPC discussed this matter at length, agreeing that the drop deadlines might be changed to benefit students’ academic success. SAPC members, Steve Kaiser and Joanne Giordano, agreed to work together to review current policy and begin to draft preliminary changes.

3) SAPC Chair, Bush, brought up a campus governance issue that had come up in a recent UW-Marshfield/Wood County Collegium. Constitution Chapter 3 clearly states that the campus dean is the presiding officer of Collegium, but that practice was already dated (Marshfield/Wood County and Marathon County were already sharing Dean Montgomery at the time) and would soon be impossible across the Colleges under regional leadership. SAPC discussed this issue and agreed a preliminary change to the language made sense and could be done easily. Mirroring the Senate, it seemed to make sense to have campus steering chairs serve as presiding officers (retaining their vote). SAPC Chair agreed to forward draft changes to Senate Steering Chair, Hassel, for input and possible introduction.

4) Finally, and briefly, SAPC discussed the charge regarding a (joint) review of Constitution Chapter 6 regarding faculty appeals and grievances. SAPC members agreed that most (all?) of this work rests outside the oversight of our committee, and we would provide input into any policy changes proposed by Senate Appeals and/or
FPSC only as needed. To date, we had not (and still have not) been asked to provide any assistance on work for the potential change. SAPC Chair, Bush, also communicated this “lack of oversight” with Senate Steering after the meeting.

Since the November meeting, SAPC has received no new charges. Senate Steering has asked for SAPC’s view of any IP#408 and/or Chapter 11 issues potentially hindering the American Indian Studies program petition. SAPC Chair, Bush, confirmed that any changes do not impact the petition process, and the work in that regard had appeared to be done in good faith regarding existing policies/procedures. Beyond this, the committee has moved ahead with other policies. This work involved:

1) SAPC Chair has forwarded revised versions of Constitution Chapter 3 and Chapter 11 for introduction at the February Senate meeting. Given the “take it slow/cautious” approach to policy changes in light of the regionalization work to come, Chapter 3 may be premature. However, the committee hopes the work on Chapter 11 makes changes that clarify any inconsistencies/contradictions in current language.

2) SAPC Chair sent the charge(s) regarding IP#408 back to Senate Steering for clarification/guidance. This decision came out of committee discussions in the fall, as members did not see a clear way forward. This has become especially true in light of the uncertainty around pending Regents’ Policy regarding tenure/post-tenure review. The new Regents’ Policy promises to change the legal landscape when it comes to program discontinuation, and changes to IP#408 rest on unstable ground as a result. Until internal and external factors gain clarity, SAPC does not see a way to change IP#408 without the risk of legal issues.

3) SAPC lost Steve Kaiser when he accepted a new position outside the Colleges (he was proactive in light of looming staff reductions), and Joanne Giordano graciously agreed to continue working on the drop deadlines work on her own. The committee is hoping to have changes some time this spring, and we will continue to discuss this charge as needed.

4) With the loss of Steve Kaiser, SAPC has gained a new member, Troy Schoultz. We look forward to welcoming Troy at his first meeting at Fond du Lac in February.

5) Lastly, the committee anticipates few, additional charges this spring as the Senate plans for the massive task of revising the Constitution and Bylaws to reflect our new, regional structure. SAPC Chair, Bush, has participated in discussions of how we should approach policy work in the interim, and the committee remains prepared to tackle any work that makes sense beyond the bounds of regionalization.

Interestingly, SAPC has cleared out many existing charges this academic year, but we anticipate an abundance of work, if not this spring, in the near future.

Respectfully submitted,
Caleb M. Bush
Chair, Senate Academic Policy Committee
February 19, 2016
Support for eliminating the IAS 70% Tripwire:

At our last SBC meeting, we listened to a presentation from Colleen Godfriaux about the budgetary implications of ending the tripwire. After discussion, the SBC voted unanimously to strongly support the Academic Staff Council’s proposal to eliminate the tripwire and to make eliminating the tripwire an institutional priority. Prior to the meeting, we learned that the UW Colleges was allocated approximately $200,000 for salary base funding from the UW System. We discussed the possibility of using this money to cover the cost associated with ending the tripwire. The SBC is supportive of using this money in this way, if such use is permitted by state statute.

Review of IP #320 and #FPP 501:

SSC asked SBC to re-examine some of the travel requirements, particularly for class visitations, in effort to identify cost savings. At our last SBC meeting, we listened to a presentation from Colleen Godfriaux on costs associated with class visitations. After discussion, we decided that SBC is not comfortable recommending changes to IP #320 and #FPP 501. We felt that since this an academic issue first (i.e. how frequently instructors should be visited), it is better addressed by other shared governance bodies. If others decide changes cannot be made to the policies, SBC would be willing to help figure out where the money should come from to cover the increased costs of travel.

We recommend that departments or other Senate committees consider:

- Visiting IAS less if they're part-time rather than full-time
- Examine the way visits are done to see if remote visits or use of technology are possible
- Examine practice of IAS visits to see if policy is currently being followed; if not, change policy
- Overall—discuss whether it is academically responsible to lower the number of visits.

Divisor Issue:

We continue to work on the Divisor issue and agree that paying instructors differently for teaching a course with the same credit load is unfair. Instructors at the same rank that teach a 3 credit/3 contact hour lecture-discussion course should be paid the same rate regardless of academic discipline. We also understand that remedying this issue has significant budgetary
implications, and are at this point exploring the extent of the problem as well as getting a firmer grasp on the cost of addressing the problem.

Respectfully submitted,

Margaret Hankenson

Chairperson, Senate Budget Committee

February 5, 2016
The Faculty Professional Standards Committee (FPSC) has continued to work on several items since the last Senate meeting in November.

Although revisions to FPP#503 was recently passed, the committee will introduce further revisions to this policy based upon input during discussion on this policy. These updated revisions will also include the sample criteria template indicated in the recently revised version of #503.

FPSC was asked to review the wording in FPP#603 regarding faculty reassignment. In light of the recent regionalization and uncertainty surrounding how this realignment might impact faculty, the committee will exam current procedures to determine if they are adequate and fair IF such situation occurs where reassigned faculty is being considered.

The committee is continuing its review of the hiring criteria of departments to determine if these are in line with recent revisions to the Higher Learning Commission’s revised standards regarding minimum qualifications of instructors. FPSC will then make policy recommendations needed so the UW Colleges are in full compliance with these standards.

The FPSC submitted sample tables to Senate Steering that show deadlines for the various dates in the tenure-track and promotion process and received Steering’s recommendation for inclusion in policy. Given that regionalization has eliminated the “campus Dean” position and the Provost has indicated for this year exactly who will receive the retention and promotion recommendations, the committee would like to wait until a definite acceptable reporting sequence has been established before introducing any revisions to FPP#501.

The issues of the current appeals and grievance process in the UW Colleges and revisions to aspects of tenure at the UW System level are also on the FPSC agenda along with possibly reviewing IAS merit ranking based upon recent revisions to faculty ranking.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael C. Jurmu

Chairperson, Faculty Professional Standards Committee
Since the last SAC report to the Senate in September 2015 the committee has met via Wisline to review new Campus Assessment Plans for the 2015-2016 assessment cycle, via Wisline to discuss Associate’s Degree Reimagining with Caroline Geary, via Wisline to discuss FLEX assessment, and held an in-person meeting at UW Fond du lac with the Department Assessment Coordinators (DACs) and the Campus Assessment Coordinators (CACs).

On November 11, 2015, SAC held a Wisline meeting with all of the CACs (Campus Assessment Coordinators) to discuss the Campus Assessment plans for the 2015-2016 cycle. A summary of plan highlights from each campus had been distributed earlier to the group by Institutional Assessment Coordinator Valerie Murrenus Pilmaier. Also discussed were the focus groups the CACs were asked to hold to inform a survey to assess the regionalization and consolidation process and identify key areas.

On December 1, 2015, SAC held a Wisline meeting with the DACs (Department Assessment Coordinators). Caroline Geary informed us about the reimagining project. The group was interested in hearing how BAAS is using the VALUE Rubrics in their assessment project. Right now we are exploring moving towards it, but not necessarily moving towards it right now.

Kim Kostka requested guidance from SAC for assessment within FLEX. After a Wisline meeting on December 3, 2015, SAC suggested that Kim work with Valerie to get a ‘CAC” for the program. The FLEX assessment coordinator could follow that timeline for support from SAC.

Following are the topics discussed at the January 23 Waukesha meeting.

CAC regionalization/consolidation focus groups and survey
BAAS Assessment process
Supporting the Degree Reimagining process and assessment’s role
DACs are exploring the AAC&U VALUE rubrics through departmental assessment but no policy change is being suggested at this time.
Reviewing fall assessment

Submitted by
Kristin Plessel
SAC Chair
January 21, 2016
Attachment 14

UW Colleges Associate Degree & Curricular Reimagining Project Faculty Coordinator
Report to the UW Colleges Senate
February 19, 2016

Overview
Work is continuing on our alignment with ACIS 1.3 UW System Associate Degree standards. The policy 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
Senate Steering and timeline change: Senate Steering met on Dec. 14, 2015 to discuss the degree reimagining project. It was proposed that the reimagining recommendations come before the UWC Senate in the fall of 2016 rather than the spring of 2016 as previously discussed. All parties agreed to the changed timeline.

Reimagining Project and the DACs/SAC: Assessment Coordinator Valerie Murrenus Pilmaier invited me to the winter assessment meeting at UW-Fond du Lac to continue discussing the reimagining project with the assessment coordinators. DACs discussed the pilot projects using AAC&U VALUE rubrics in Fall 2015 (MUS, PHI, CHE). There was also a broad discussion of VALUE rubrics and their use within and across disciplines as well as a general discussion on the degree reimagining project. The VALUE rubrics can be downloaded from the degree reimagining SharePoint site (see AAC&U Resources section).

Depth Requirement: Academic departments/programs continue their work by identifying courses which meet the depth sequence requirement: “Each associate degree must contain a two-course sequence in which the first course provides the foundation for the second.” A few departments have asked for some guidance on this and degree reimagining team member, Jennifer Heinert (VTLC director) will help us address that request.

Breadth Categories: ACIS 1.3 identifies general education breadth categories based on the UWS Shared Learning Goals: Knowledge of Human Cultures and the Natural World, Critical and Creative Thinking, Effective Communication, Intercultural Knowledge and Competence, Individual, Social, and Environmental Responsibility. The degree reimagining leadership team is developing draft descriptions for each category which adhere to the language of ACIS 1.3 and provide additional information for what students will do and at what level of proficiency for courses in a given category. These drafts will be the next piece academic departments/programs will be asked to review.

AAC&U Faculty Collaboratives Conference: The UWC is sponsoring a team to attend AAC&U’s “General Education and Assessment Conference: From My Work to Our Work.” Team members
include: Bill Bultman, Tim Dunn, Joe Foy, Caroline Geary, Kim Kostka, Carrie Tirel, and Gillian Van Treese. This event provides an opportunity for the institution to gain knowledge and to contribute to the national conversation on general education reform.

Respectfully submitted,

Caroline Geary

2/5/2016
Attachment 15

UW Colleges Senate
Adoption: February 19, 2016
Proposed Revision of IPP #320
(“Policy on Evaluation – Instructional Academic Staff (Category B), including Returning Retired Faculty”)

Background and 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

Policy Effective November 20, 1995
Amended, January 16, 2002
Reorganized and Renumbered, March 15, 2002
Amended by the Senate, May 2, 2003
Revised by the Senate, May 7, 2004
Revised by the Senate April 24, 2009
Revised by the Senate (SAPC) 2013-03-15
Revised by the Senate (FPSC) 2013-0Policy4-26

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. **Annual** 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.

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.

[End]
Background and 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.

UW Colleges Senate Bylaws

Established 11/12/94
Revised 3/18/95
Revised 1/11/96
Revised 5/4/96
Revised 3/8/97
Revised 4/23/99
Revised 3/14/03
Revised 5/02/03
Revised 1/21/04
Revised 5/7/04
Revised 4/29/05
Revised 10/19/07
Revised by the Senate 3-7-08
Revised by the Senate 1-14-09
Revised by the Senate 4-24-09
Revised by the Senate 10-23-09
Revised by the Senate (SSC) 1-13-10

Revised by the Senate (SSC) 3-5-10
Revised by the Senate (SSC) 4-23-10
Revised by the Senate (SIITC) 2010-10-22
Revised by the Senate (SSC) 2011-01-12
Revised by the Senate (SSC) 2011-04-29
Revised by the Senate (SSC) 2011-10-21
Revised by the Senate (SSC) 2012-01-11
Revised by the Senate (SSC) 2013-01-09
Revised by the Senate (SSC) 2013-02-25
Revised by the Senate (SAPC) 2013-03-15
Revised by the Senate (SSC) 2013-03-14
Revised by the Senate (SSC) 2014-03-28
Revised by the Senate (SSC) 2014-03-14
Revised by the Senate (SSC) 2014-10-24
Revised by the Senate (SSC) 2015-03-20
Revised by the Senate (SSC) 2015-07-01

7.0 Appointed Senate Bylaws Committees

2) Senate Informational and Instructional Technology Committee
Revised 4-24-09
Revised 10-22-2010
Revised by the SSC 2013-02-25
Revised by the SSC 2014-03-24

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 be appointed annually. Faculty and academic staff shall serve staggered three year terms.

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 will be appointed by 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.
Background and 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.

UW Colleges Senate
Institutional Policy Regarding Students #202
Academic Procedures and Regulations

Ratified by the Senate - February 2, 1980: pages 2-3, Appendix 3
Amended, November 13, 1982, p.6; September 17, 1983, p.5
Amended, November 12, 1983, p.5
Amended, January 9, 1985, p.5
Amended, March 15, 1986, p.8
Amended, May 14, 1988, p.13, App.14
Revision Adopted by the Senate, May 14, 1989, p.14, App.21
Revision Ratified by the Senate, Oct. 7, 1989, p.8, App.16
Revision Adopted by the Senate, Jan. 17, 1992, p.4.
Revision Initiated by the Senate, May 7, 1994, p.8, App.11 and 12
Revision Adopted by the Senate, Oct. 1, 1994, p.8; see May 7, 1994, p. 8, App.11 and 12
Revision Adopted by the Senate, Mar. 18, 1995, p.4; att.2
Revision Adopted by the Senate, Mar. 7, 1998, pages 1,3,6,7, Att.2
Revision Adopted by the Senate, May 2, 1998, p.6
Revision Adopted by the Senate, April 23, 1999, p.5
Revision Adopted by the Senate, January 14, 2000, p.8, App. 7
Revision Adopted by the Senate, January 16, 2002, p.__, App. ____
Reorganized and Renumbered March 15, 2002
III. Registration

Revised 2012-04-27
Revised by the SSC 2013-02-25
Interim Adoption by the SSC (Flexible Option) 2015-05-06

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 between the 23rd day and 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.

[End]
attachment 18

UW Colleges Senate
Adoption: February 19, 2016
Proposed Revision of Institutional Curricular Policy #110
(“UW Colleges Implementation of GAPP #36”)

Background and 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]
Vision: Growth through Collaborations within an AIS Program, A Proposal

Among the goals set by the UW – Colleges, it is our mission to provide quality educational experiences to the public. Our charge is to serve “the people of Wisconsin by promoting continuing education and outreach in Wisconsin communities.” In doing so, we are “To make available as a service to business, industry and the general public, the unique professional expertise of the faculty and staff,” and “provide opportunities for civic and cultural enrichment in the communities that support its campuses.” Therefore, within this context, we, the members of the American Indian Studies Program (AIS) (Table 1) which is currently housed within the Political Science Department, are petitioning the Senate Steering Committee to be established as a standalone Program with department status. Current AIS members – which includes anyone who has taught an AIS course within the past two years – include 13 individuals representing five departments and eight campuses. Of those listed, two (Carolyn Polodna and George Wall) have not participated in the creation of the proposed bylaws.

There are numerous benefits to allowing the AIS Program to grow into a freestanding program. As a standalone entity we will invigorate the Program by creating the long dreamed of AIS 102 course which will be an Introduction to American Indian Studies via humanities and fine arts (with IS designation). We will add to our course base by increasing our cross-listed courses beginning with ANT 260, HIS 277 and PHI 203 by collaborating with their respective departments. We hope to increase student AIS Certificate completion through working with departments, faculty, the online program, and more importantly, by making the certificate and area of study more relevant and accessible to our students.

We can tap into the growing political and economic force of Wisconsin Indian tribes and nations (not to mention those across North America) by creating new courses that reflect our changing political, economic, and environmental situations. An American Indian Film Studies course would excite our student body as well as increase faculty interest in joining and supporting the AIS Program. We hope to generate an environmental studies course focusing on Native ideologies and philosophies regarding human relationship with the Earth and all its other inhabitants. Given the past few years of mining issues in the news we could collaborate with the Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Commission creating internships and service learning projects which could readily involve many different UW Colleges academic departments. These courses could be done in collaboration with Wisconsin tribes ensuring that we, UW Colleges, are meeting tribal needs as well as student and institutional needs. An additional idea is to propose some AIS courses as Global Studies as many of us include Canadian First Nations and South American indigenous peoples in our courses.
The AIS Program can help preserve the past and promote preservation of Native American culture and artifacts through collaborations across the nation. Cultural heritage sites (in Wisconsin and beyond) are being destroyed at an unprecedented rate, by both public and private interests, in spite of federal and state laws designed to protect them. AIS courses (particularly those in anthropology, political science, and environmental studies, if the latter are incorporated into the curriculum), may help foster responsible economic development by promoting an awareness of American Indian cultural heritage sites, in Wisconsin and beyond.

Can you envision an AIS course as part of Flex? We can. AIS Flex courses could enhance the IS availability as well as adding service learning components, engaging more Flex students with timely subjects such as gaming, mining, and other Native business ventures.

There is an increasing need of our Wisconsin tribes to complete a “needs assessment study” as they grow and our students can assist in those assessments via internships, service learning projects, and independent studies. Additionally, some of the tribes such as the Ho-Chunk have inquired about having UW Colleges students as tutors. Tribal collaborations will be made easier by having an identified Program with dedicated individuals they know will assist them in meeting their tribal education needs. These collaborations will also make UW Colleges a more welcoming place for Native students.

As our UW – Colleges faculty, staff, and students become more engaged with American Indian issues and peoples through collaborative research and internships, perhaps more American Indians will enroll in our institutions.

History: Over the Past Decade

The AIS Program has been in existence for about a decade and is presently housed within the Political Science Department. It was created primarily by Roger (AKA George) Wall (POL/FDL) along with Carolyn Polodna (BUS/FDL). Through their efforts the UW Colleges joined the Wisconsin American Indian Studies Consortium and AIS 101 “Introduction to American Indian Studies” (SS/ES/IS ONL) was created. There were five involved with the creation of the course not including the many ONL designers and the ONL administration: Roger Wall, Carolyn Polodna, Jeffrey Kleiman (HIS/MSF), Renee Gralewicz (ANT/SOC/FOX), and a librarian whose name Renee cannot remember (so very sorry). Of the five members four still teach the online course though some more often than others due to faculty obligations. Roger has been retired for a number of years and has been able to teach additional sections as the need arose.

The Need

Over the past decade, there has been little progress in building the program. Few new courses have been cross-listed or approved and no new faculty have joined. We feel that this is primarily due to the fact that the Political Science Department has been more focused on department and discipline specific issues. We understand this but this is one of our main reasons for asking for the Program to stand alone. Being housed within a single department necessarily sets the Program as secondary and subservient to department needs and resources.
Our second reason for requesting a standalone Program is the interdisciplinary nature of American Indian Studies as the AIS Certificate declares:

“The American Indian Studies program is interdisciplinary, exploring a plethora of issues surrounding American Indians past and present. It is particularly concerned with increasing the level of knowledge and consciousness of Wisconsin Indian history, culture, and tribal sovereignty, as required by the Wisconsin Legislature’s 1989 Act 31.

A certificate in American Indian Studies provides a student the opportunity to explore in depth the history, culture, and sovereignty of Wisconsin and American Indians. It will prepare future teachers to meet the requirements of Act 31 as well as those who wish to pursue a minor or major in American Indian Studies or Ethnic Studies at other UW institutions.”

While there have been historically great collaborations and cooperation between departments throughout UW Colleges’ history, departments cannot help but put their department and more specifically, disciplinary needs ahead of smaller programs. Additionally, department resources (especially time) are becoming more scarce and a department’s curriculum committee would have to become familiar with AIS Program standards (please be sure to read the Appendix “Wisconsin Indian Studies Consortium Standards” to the recently approved Bylaws) and curricular needs. They would have to have the time and inclination to explore new courses and collaborations, much less to stay atop AIS major/minor programs in the System and negotiate and transfer so that courses transfer well for both majors and non-majors. They could and should contact Program members to assist with the workload in any case. As the structure of our departments remains in flux, we hope that the AIS Program request to become standalone becomes part of the flux and discussions.

Table 2 is a list of courses that have been taught within the past six semesters that meet (or could meet) AIS Program requirements. There is only one course, BUS 227 “Multicultural Business,” that is currently cross-listed as AIS, but has not been taught in the past six semesters. It is our understanding that the Business/Economics Department has requested that the Senate Curriculum Committee decouple this course from AIS, but that this request has been tabled during the process of creating the AIS Program Bylaws.

Present: Untapped Opportunities

Strengthening the AIS certificate
The AIS Certificate lists an array of courses that have potential for American Indian Studies content (Table 3). While the potential is there, it does not necessarily mean that the course would meet AIS Program standards as detailed in the proposed bylaws. Individual instructors would need to petition the AIS Program to have their class included as part of the certificate in addition to the student petitioning to have their class included. By the way, as of Spring 2015, no student has acquired the certificate and we assume that part of the problem is that there has not been a single point of contact listed and a process in place where staff and students could send their inquiries.

While we do not want your work to be redundant, we extrapolated portions of the American Indian Studies Bylaws that we believe highlight the necessity of a standalone Program.
The American Indian Studies Program is an interdisciplinary program that reflects the holistic worldview of the indigenous peoples of Turtle Island (North America). The Program works to foster an environment in which the university community can discover, examine, and appreciate the cultures, traditions, and values that reflect the many American Indian nations, tribes, bands, and peoples and their contributions to our contemporary society. Additionally the Program offers a way to share these cultures and bridge the communications gap among the peoples of Wisconsin. The Program is designed to preserve and promote the identity and sovereign status of indigenous people through the study and practice of decolonization. Key to this program is that the American Indian perspective is present in the courses offered.

The Program offers a certificate. Certificate attainment strengthens numerous degrees including those in Anthropology, Art, Business, History, Education, Literature, Political Science, Social Work, and Sociology to name a few. American Indian Studies courses prepare students to live and work in an increasingly diverse community and also equip students with skills to work cooperatively and effectively with tribal governments and businesses. Although interdisciplinary, American Indian Studies encompasses a distinct body of knowledge. The program’s faculty and staff members are encouraged to continue ongoing research into American Indian issues.

While the United States has a diverse population, much of Wisconsin is still very homogeneous. Our Wisconsin American Indian population is about 1% of the total and about half of all self-identified Indians live in urban areas. There is a very good chance that many of our students have had little or no interaction with an American Indian. Most of our students will only know about American Indians by what they remember from K12 or mass media. A strong AIS Program will enhance our students’ intercultural skills by exposing them to new philosophies regarding human–environment relationships. They may generate new ways of looking at old problems as well as perhaps developing new solutions. Additionally they will become aware of American Indian self-awareness of their culture, beliefs and values. They will discover that there is no one clear American Indian identity, that American Indian identity is complex and varied. In other words, students will obtain a clearer picture of what it means to be an American.

This understanding of American Indians and their relationships to the sociopolitical and natural environments are key enhancers to many career fields. All occupations that offer services to humans (e.g. criminal justice, policy making, health care, education, business) require intercultural skills. A strong and available AIS Program will allow students to have more choices for the ethnic studies courses and let them demonstrate mastery of intercultural skills upon earning the AIS Certificate.

Strengthening connections to AIS programs in the UW System
Our AIS Program has produced a few students who have gone on to a four year comprehensive to continue their studies in this field. We know of two individuals but given that this has not been tracked, these are only anecdotally reliable. We want to change this pattern.

As part of the Wisconsin AIS Consortium individually our members have maintained our relationships with our transfer institutions and the individuals who maintain their programs. Currently there are three institutions (UW – Eau Claire, UW – Green Bay, and UW – Milwaukee) who offer a major and minor and another two that only offer a minor (UW – Stevens Point and UW – Superior). UW – Madison offers an AIS certificate and UW – Platteville offers
an Ethnic Studies minor and certificate where the student could concentrate in American Indian courses.

To date, this work has been ad hoc. Wisconsin AIS Consortium members, for instance, are working to offer courses across institutions so that students can access courses that meet their educational needs. For example, UW – Milwaukee, UW – Superior and UW – Eau Claire (just this fall!) offer Ojibwe language and culture courses and UW – Green Bay offers Oneida. Needless to say, many who would like to take these courses are enrolled elsewhere. We, Wisconsin AIS Consortium members continue the dialog, thinking of ways to connect our institutions for the benefit of the students.

These programs and offerings, however, are evolving rapidly. Standalone program status, with a program coordinator, will allow the program to navigate this changing curricular landscape for the benefit of students and the institution.

Future Without Conclusions

Building on existing strengths and growing others

The AIS Program Cost Analysis provided shows that a standalone Program would increase the overall Program budget by $14,182 due to Coordinator course release and summer stipend. Again, as the structure of departments is in flux, these figures are also liable to shift. The Analysis also shows that $6,699 will be shifted from other department lines, adding to the pending structural change possibilities.

The professional development funds would offer Program members encouragement to expand their knowledge and experiences within American Indian culture, history, and sovereignty. Events could include conference attendance within members’ own disciplines as well as attendance at the many American Indian Studies type conferences such as the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction’s annual Wisconsin American Indian Studies Summer Institute (http://dpi.wi.gov/amind/summer-institute) which focuses on the history of Wisconsin Act 31 and its requirements. [Act 31 was a statute embedded in the 1989 – 1991 Biennial Budget Act. It directed public K12 institutions to instruct students in the “history, culture, and tribal sovereignty of the federally recognized tribes and bands in the state.”] Part of the statute requires potential Wisconsin public school teachers to have instruction in these topics as well, which was a primary motivation for the creation of our AIS 101 course. Our college students who major in education need courses like it to be certified teachers in Wisconsin.

Other conferences or areas for professional development include

- Native American and Indigenous Studies Association (http://www.naisa.org/about-naisa.html) whose conference tends to include discussions regarding indigenous peoples around the world, not just North America.
- There is a history conference dedicated to the Great Plains funny enough called, the Northern Great Plains History Conference (http://www.history.nd.gov/ngphc2015/).
- World Indigenous Peoples Conference on Education (http://www.wipce2017.com/) covers many topics associated with educating American Indians as well as educating the world about indigenous peoples, their histories and struggles.
The National Indian Education Association ([http://www.niea.org/](http://www.niea.org/)) conferences include various topics which may appeal to our Program members.

AIS Conference at Arizona State University is one of the largest in the United States ([https://americanindianclas.asu.edu/news-and-events/aisa-conference](https://americanindianclas.asu.edu/news-and-events/aisa-conference)).

For those interested in legal studies there are specialized conferences offered by the National Tribal Justice Center ([http://www.judges.org/ntjc/](http://www.judges.org/ntjc/)) and the Native American Rights Fund ([http://www.narf.org/](http://www.narf.org/)).

Language preservation has become a primary objective for many Indian tribes and nations. In Wisconsin the Stockbridge-Munsee Band of Mohican Indians as adopted the Munsee language as their original Mohican language has been dead for quite a while. There is opportunity for linguistic internships across the state.

It is important to note that there are no members dedicated as American Indian Studies faculty or staff. While there are some members who teach two or more AIS classes an academic year, there is only one member who tends to teach two different AIS courses a year. By becoming a standalone program we can coordinate our course offerings so as to make the courses more available to students across UW Colleges throughout their matriculation thus making the Certificate more available.

In sum, it is our position that the establishment of a standalone AIS program will not only result in stronger cooperation and coordination with departments that currently offer cross-listed courses, but it will also encourage development of cross-listed courses with departments that do not currently offer an AIS component in their curriculum. By offering students more opportunities to obtain the AIS Certificate, more of our graduates will have demonstrated skills necessary for our diverse society. Having identified faculty and staff who are dedicated to a viable American Indian Studies Program will lead to positive growth.

**TABLES**

**Table 1: Current UW Colleges AIS Members**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Birmingham, Robert</td>
<td>ANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Christiansen, George</td>
<td>ANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gralewicz, Renee</td>
<td>ANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hays, Christopher</td>
<td>ANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Jamison, Gregg</td>
<td>ANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Kuhlmann, Annette</td>
<td>ANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Rodell, Roland</td>
<td>ANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Polodna, Carolyn</td>
<td>BUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Labrie, Janet</td>
<td>ENG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Tharp, Julie</td>
<td>ENG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Dresser, Marne</td>
<td>ENG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Kleiman, Jeffrey</td>
<td>HIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Wall, George</td>
<td>POL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Current AIS & AIS Potential Courses Offered in the Past Six Semesters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses offered past six semesters</th>
<th>NOT currently cross-listed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIS 101</td>
<td>Introduction to American Indian Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANT 260</td>
<td>American Indian Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANT 302</td>
<td>Archaeology of Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANT 308</td>
<td>Archaeology of North America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANT 314</td>
<td>Indians of North America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 242</td>
<td>The American Indian in Literature &amp; Film</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIS 277</td>
<td>Indians in American History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHI 203</td>
<td>American Indian Philosophies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Course that have Potential AIS Content and are Listed as Part of AIS Certificate

**Anthropology**
- ANT 104 — Cultural Anthropology
- ANT 260 — American Indian Art (Could be AIS 260)

**Art**
- ART 175 — Worlds of Art — General

**Communication and Theatre Arts**
- CTA 210 — Introduction to Intercultural Communication

**Education**
- EDU 220 — Education in a Pluralistic Society

**English**
- ENG 278 — Multicultural Literature in America

**Geography**
- GEO 102 — Roots and Diversity — General

**History**
- HIS 211 — History of the American Frontier
- HIS 262 — The Sources of Racist Thinking in Western Civilization and its Impact on the World of the Americas
- HIS 277 — Indians in American History (Could be AIS 277)
- HIS 278 — History of Minorities in America

**Philosophy**
- PHI/REL 203 — American Indian Philosophies (Could be AIS 203)
- PHI 259 — Philosophy and Racism

**Political Science**
- POL 235 — Politics of Minorities

**Psychology**
- PSY 270 — Psychological Approaches to Minority Issues

**Sociology**
- SOC 234 — Sociology of Race and Ethnicity
# Estimated Cost for American Indian Studies Program

**DRAFT: For Discussion Only**

## Assumptions

- Similar to Gender, Sexuality and Women's Studies (GSW), this would be a stand-alone program.
- All departmental S&E, professional development and assessment budgets are fixed.
- Chair would receive 1 course release and 1 summer stipend.
- Share of Online year-end revenue sharing would be prorated like all other departments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Expense</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>New</th>
<th>Shift from other Depts</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair's Course Release</td>
<td>$5,695</td>
<td>$6,695</td>
<td>Salary and 40% fringe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Stipend</td>
<td>$6,487</td>
<td>$6,487</td>
<td>Salary and 40% fringe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department S&amp;E</td>
<td>$1,300</td>
<td>$1,300</td>
<td>Fixed cost, comparative to GSW Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Professional Development</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>Fixed cost, comparative to GSW Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Assessments</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>Fixed cost for all departments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation from Online Revenue Sharing</td>
<td>$2,599</td>
<td>$2,599</td>
<td>Based on FY15 year-end net of $87,922 shared among departments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Estimated Program Costs $20,881 $14,182 $6,699

---

## UWC Online Year End Net (YEN)

### FY15 Summary

- **Beginning Balance** $1,048,597
- **Revenue** $7,500,530
- **Expenses** $5,432,548
- **Reserve** $1,358,137

**YEN FY15** $1,758,442

### Campus Share

- 50% based on seat count
- 50% based on instructor count

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Revenue to be Shared</th>
<th>$1,758,442</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Est Department Share</td>
<td>($87,922)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est Campus Share</td>
<td>($1,142,987)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est Institutional Reserve</td>
<td>($527,533)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remaining Shared Revenue $0
### Revenue Amounts to Campuses, based on Seat Count & Instructor Count (weighted 50/50)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Total 14/15 Seat Count (including summer)</th>
<th>% of Total Campus SC</th>
<th>$ of Rev Share - SC</th>
<th># of 14/15 Instructor Section Count</th>
<th>% of Total Campus Inst</th>
<th>$ of Rev Share-Instr</th>
<th>Total $ Rev Share per campus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRB</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>6.36%</td>
<td>$36,338</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.80%</td>
<td>$4,572</td>
<td>$40,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRN</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>4.53%</td>
<td>$25,877</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10.80%</td>
<td>$61,721</td>
<td>$87,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDL</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>6.01%</td>
<td>$34,356</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10.40%</td>
<td>$59,435</td>
<td>$93,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOX</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>15.05%</td>
<td>$85,999</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>28.40%</td>
<td>$162,304</td>
<td>$248,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAN</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
<td>$20,591</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8.40%</td>
<td>$48,005</td>
<td>$68,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTH</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>6.82%</td>
<td>$38,980</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>17.60%</td>
<td>$100,383</td>
<td>$135,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNT</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>3.87%</td>
<td>$22,133</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.20%</td>
<td>$6,856</td>
<td>$26,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSF</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>4.63%</td>
<td>$25,056</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.60%</td>
<td>$32,004</td>
<td>$57,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLY</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>2.37%</td>
<td>$13,544</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.80%</td>
<td>$4,572</td>
<td>$18,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCK</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>8.84%</td>
<td>$50,452</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
<td>$45,715</td>
<td>$96,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHB</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>5.78%</td>
<td>$33,034</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.20%</td>
<td>$18,286</td>
<td>$51,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSH</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>10.23%</td>
<td>$58,471</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.60%</td>
<td>$9,144</td>
<td>$67,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAK</td>
<td>1,059</td>
<td>20.40%</td>
<td>$116,611</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.20%</td>
<td>$18,286</td>
<td>$134,899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$571,404</strong></td>
<td><strong>250</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$571,404</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,142,087</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **$ Per Seat** $110.11
- **$ Per Instructor** $2,285.97

**Department Share**: Base amount based on HC + % of total sections

$69,922

---

### Revenue Amounts to Departments, using Base Amount & Section Count

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty &amp; IAS Headcount</th>
<th>% of Total Headcount</th>
<th>Base Amount to Each Dept.</th>
<th># of 14-15 Course Sections</th>
<th>% of Total Course Sections</th>
<th>$ of Rev Share, based on Sections</th>
<th>Total $ Rev Share per Dept.</th>
<th>Difference when AIS is Added</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology &amp; Sociology</td>
<td>4.24%</td>
<td>$764</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>2.47%</td>
<td>$1,726</td>
<td>$2,490</td>
<td>$2,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian Studies</td>
<td>4.85%</td>
<td>$873</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>2.47%</td>
<td>$1,726</td>
<td>$2,599</td>
<td>$2,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>1.21%</td>
<td>$218</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
<td>$432</td>
<td>$650</td>
<td>$681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>4.24%</td>
<td>$764</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>4.32%</td>
<td>$5,021</td>
<td>$3,785</td>
<td>$5,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; Economics</td>
<td>9.70%</td>
<td>$1,745</td>
<td>16.50</td>
<td>5.09%</td>
<td>$3,564</td>
<td>$6,286</td>
<td>$5,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>4.85%</td>
<td>$873</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>3.70%</td>
<td>$2,990</td>
<td>$3,461</td>
<td>$5,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication &amp; Theatre Arts</td>
<td>1.82%</td>
<td>$127</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.23%</td>
<td>$963</td>
<td>$1,136</td>
<td>$2,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSEPA</td>
<td>5.45%</td>
<td>$982</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>5.25%</td>
<td>$5,669</td>
<td>$8,651</td>
<td>$4,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>14.55%</td>
<td>$2,618</td>
<td>52.50</td>
<td>16.20%</td>
<td>$11,330</td>
<td>$13,948</td>
<td>$14,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography &amp; Geology</td>
<td>4.85%</td>
<td>$873</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>5.56%</td>
<td>$3,883</td>
<td>$4,758</td>
<td>$4,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health, Exercise Science, &amp; Athletics</td>
<td>5.45%</td>
<td>$982</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>5.25%</td>
<td>$5,669</td>
<td>$8,651</td>
<td>$4,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>2.42%</td>
<td>$436</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>14.20%</td>
<td>$9,927</td>
<td>$10,383</td>
<td>$10,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>12.73%</td>
<td>$2,291</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>7.41%</td>
<td>$5,179</td>
<td>$7,470</td>
<td>$7,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>3.93%</td>
<td>$545</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>7.72%</td>
<td>$5,395</td>
<td>$5,940</td>
<td>$5,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>4.85%</td>
<td>$873</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>3.80%</td>
<td>$2,698</td>
<td>$3,571</td>
<td>$3,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>4.85%</td>
<td>$873</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>2.78%</td>
<td>$1,942</td>
<td>$2,815</td>
<td>$4,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>7.88%</td>
<td>$1,418</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
<td>$5,827</td>
<td>$7,245</td>
<td>$7,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Studies</td>
<td>3.03%</td>
<td>$545</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>3.55%</td>
<td>$2,482</td>
<td>$3,027</td>
<td>$3,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Languages</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>165</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>324.00</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>$69,922</td>
<td>$87,922</td>
<td>$87,922</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **$ Per Section** $215.81

---

FA14: 4 sections of AIS, none cross listed (three taught by a POL instructor, one taught by an ANT instructor)

SP15: 3 sections of AIS not cross-listed (all taught by POL instructor) and 1 cross listed course (AIS and ANT) taught by an instructor in ANT

(from Office of Academic Affairs)
## 2015-16 Department Chair Budgets

As of July 2015

For more detail about the department chair budgets, see APPP 0013 - Department Budget Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department/Program</th>
<th>Dept #</th>
<th>Releases /Year</th>
<th>S&amp;E</th>
<th>Professional Development</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology &amp; Sociology</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$2,255</td>
<td>$13,933</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$17,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Herda-Rapp (MTH)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,300</td>
<td>$14,200</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$16,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian Studies</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,300</td>
<td>$14,200</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$16,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,528</td>
<td>$6,532</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$9,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitty Kingston (MSF)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,528</td>
<td>$6,532</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$9,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$3,974</td>
<td>$12,131</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$17,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Klubertanz (RCK)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$3,974</td>
<td>$12,131</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$17,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; Economics</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$3,598</td>
<td>$19,797</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$24,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Polodina (FDL)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$3,598</td>
<td>$19,797</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$24,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$2,795</td>
<td>$7,571</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$11,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Neal (BRB)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$2,795</td>
<td>$7,571</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$11,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication &amp; Theatre Arts</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$2,311</td>
<td>$7,081</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$10,992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tricia Clasen (RCK)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$2,311</td>
<td>$7,081</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$10,992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science, Engineering,</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$2,707</td>
<td>$16,702</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$21,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics &amp; Astronomy</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$2,707</td>
<td>$16,702</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$21,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carey Woodward (FDL)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$2,707</td>
<td>$16,702</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$21,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$5,270</td>
<td>$29,570</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$36,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Ahrenhoerster (WAK)*</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$5,270</td>
<td>$29,570</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$36,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography &amp; Geology</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$2,176</td>
<td>$14,117</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$17,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim McCluskey (MTH)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$2,176</td>
<td>$14,117</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$17,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health, Exercise Science, &amp;</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,582</td>
<td>$8,056</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$11,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,582</td>
<td>$8,056</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$11,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam Massey (FOX)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,582</td>
<td>$8,056</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$11,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,440</td>
<td>$22,175</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$25,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Leigh (MTH)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,440</td>
<td>$22,175</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$25,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$4,509</td>
<td>$87,324</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$93,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kavita Bhatia (MSF)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$4,509</td>
<td>$87,324</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$93,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$2,542</td>
<td>$15,787</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$19,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Hurst (WAK)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$2,542</td>
<td>$15,787</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$19,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,914</td>
<td>$18,789</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$22,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Dunn (WAK)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,914</td>
<td>$18,789</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$22,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,845</td>
<td>$18,194</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$21,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dylan Bennett (WAK)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,845</td>
<td>$18,194</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$21,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,727</td>
<td>$26,057</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$29,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Carpenter (RLN)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,727</td>
<td>$26,057</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$29,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Studies</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,300</td>
<td>$6,036</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$8,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Reddinger (MNT)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,300</td>
<td>$6,036</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$8,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Languages</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,285</td>
<td>$7,024</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$9,909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Knighten (FOX)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,285</td>
<td>$7,024</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$9,909</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 41  $46,058  $338,076  $30,400  $414,534

*Chair of Chairs

$44,758  $336,876  $28,800  $410,434
UW Colleges Senate Policy
Institutional Policy #408
Procedure for the Creation of New Departments

Adopted by the Senate (SAPC) 2014-10-24

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

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

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

1. The group of faculty seeking departmental status will petition the Senate Steering Committee for departmental recognition. SSC will steer the proposal to the Senate Curriculum, Academic Policy, Faculty Professional Standards and Senate Assessment committees for review.
2. The petition will be presented to the Senate as an introduction for voting. If approved, the introduced petition will be sent for review by the faculty of the UW Colleges campus collegia.
3. Upon receipt of commentary from the collegia, the petition will be voted on by the full Senate for adoption.
4. If adopted, the petition will be forwarded to the Chancellor for review. If approved, the Chancellor forwards the petition to the Board of Regents.
5. Approval by the Board of Regents establishes the new department. Since UW System policy ACIS 1.0 delegates the role of the board of regents in approving new departments to the chancellor, the chancellor will have final authority in approving new departments.

II. Information to be Included in Petitions for Departmental Status

Chapter 4 of the UW Colleges Constitution requires that departments consist of faculty that deal with a common field of knowledge or have a common or closely related disciplinary or interdisciplinary interest.

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

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

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

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

4. Petitions will indicate if new faculty or faculty lines are required to address the following conditions:

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

5. Petitions will describe the role of Instructional Academic Staff in the proposed department.

6. Petitions will describe any roles, impacts on and needs for participation of University Staff.

7. Petitions will address the following issues regarding faculty appointments:

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

C. Courses/Curriculum

1. Petitions will describe the curriculum, either existing or in development, and relate the curriculum to the common field of knowledge or disciplinary or interdisciplinary interest of the faculty.

2. Petitions will include a list of courses and course descriptions of existing or planned courses that will be offered by the new department.

3. Cross-listed courses, both current and proposed, must conform to Chapter 4: Departments of UWC Constitution, specifically section 4.03: Jurisdiction and Responsibilities and Institutional Curricular Policy #101.02: Curriculum Guidelines section VII A. 2.

4. Petitions will indicate how courses will transfer to other UW System institutions.

D. Bylaws will be submitted with the petition, and should address departmental requirements as outlined in Chapter 4 of the Constitution.
E. Petitions will describe how the new department fulfills needs that are not addressed by
current departments or programs, and will address the following:

1. Demonstration of academic need. Petitions will include a description of teaching and
research needs that are not met by current departments that the proposed department
will fulfill. A demonstration of academic need may also consider how the proposed
department will contribute to other academic programs/disciplines, increasing
bachelor degrees in Wisconsin, FLEX degree options and inclusive excellence.
2. Petitions will describe how the proposed department contributes to workforce
development, including career paths for students, economic development and non-
economic benefits.
3. A description of the how the proposed department contributes to the UW Colleges’
mission of access and The Wisconsin Idea will be included.
4.Projected enrollments will be included.

F. Budgetary considerations will be addressed, including any new funding requirements,
contributions to revenue streams at the campus and UW Colleges levels and a description
of long-term financial commitments to be imposed on campuses, the UW Colleges and
the UW System.

AIS Petition Committee Reports and Responses

I’m writing with a charge from the Senate Steering Committee regarding the American Indian
Studies program which has submitted a petition to be considered a ‘free-standing’ program
rather than their current status which is as a program housed within a department. AIS is
currently housed within the Political Science department. As you will see from the email
communication below, Provost Lampe and I have confirmed that we are using the process
spelled out in institutional policy 408 (process for becoming a department) as a guideline, since
there currently is no process for programs to become free-standing as well as the definitions,
jurisdictions, and responsibilities spelled out in Chapter 4 and Chapter 11 of the UW Colleges
Constitution to make a recommendation about the program’s request.

I’m including relevant documentation in the body of this email as well as in attachments,
including the email initiating the petition and the actual petition submitted by the current/interim
program coordinator, Renee Gralewicz (ANT/SOC, Fox Valley). Attached are the program
bylaws and a budget assessment (the excel spreadsheet).

Could your groups please add this review to your respective future agendas? I would like
to receive reports back from each of your groups in time for our SSC meeting on Monday,
October 26th (please submit, then, by Friday October 23 to me, copying Linda Baum). And by a
‘report,’ I would like a short overview of your committee’s recommendation regarding the
petition, including any concerns, benefits, or considerations you have regarding each of your groups’ respective areas of emphasis (for example, assessment or budget implications).

Committee Responses:

Senate Assessment Committee

The Senate Assessment committee discussed this issue over email. In regards to assessment, if the institution sees fit to make the American Indian Studies a free-standing program, it would indeed need to be assessed independently with its own DAC. As a subset of political science, AIS courses do not get much attention in the current assessment scheme, but that may be appropriate given the small numbers of stand-alone AIS courses offered.

A quick note, in the proposed budget, the DAC is listed as a cost shifted from other departments, but in actuality it would be a new expense.

We expect Senate Curriculum committee may have more to add to the discussion on whether we, as a University, feel it is an important part of the curriculum, meriting its own program structure, especially in relation to other growing/large programs such as engineering and education. And Senate Budget Committee will have a better perspective on whether our institution has the resources to support the program.

Serving as SAC Chair,
Kristin Plessel, Ph.D.

Senate Curriculum Committee

Dear Holly,

The Senate Curriculum Committee recently met and discussed the curricular aspects of creating a new, standalone American Indian Studies program. The procedures for creating new courses outlined in the proposed bylaws for the AIS program follow current SCC procedure. Furthermore, the curricular claims made in the petition seem reasonable and from a curricular perspective (managing curriculum, creating new courses, providing course oversight), the committee saw no concerns with a freestanding program.

If you have further questions about the Committee's stance on the AIS program, please feel free to contact me.

Best,
William Q. Malcuit, Ph.D.

Faculty Professional Standards
The Senate Faculty Professional Standards Committee (FPSC) recently reviewed and discussed the petition to have American Indian Studies (AIS) become a program. During the discussion it was noted the rationale was well thought out and detailed a valid reason for AIS to become a stand-alone program within the UW Colleges. Other supportive items mentioned included:

- The program could provide new avenues for the Colleges including online.
- There appears to be growth potential for the program.
- They do have a ‘model’ to follow in regards to how Women’s Studies have developed their program.
- It could create more interdisciplinary courses (IS).
- Some of the issues being addressed in their course relate directly to conditions here in Wisconsin.
- The course can provide a diverse perspective concerning environmental attitudes.
- There is a potential for Global Studies courses that would include Canadian and South American Tribes.

The consensus of the committee after the discussion was, with the variety of benefits the program could offer that the petition for AIS to become a program move forward. However, several concerns were expressed during our discussion and are mentioned below. Some of these might have already been addressed by the initiators or raised by other reviewers. They are listed here only because they were part of the overall discussion and do not indicate any less support for the petition to move forward.

- Although cross-listing courses might alleviate this concern, some wondered how offering these courses might impact other course offerings for that faculty on campus or online. In other words would offering an AIS course mean a faculty would not offer another course they might otherwise teach?
- Some wondered how faculty would be assigned in regards to departments.
- How might faculty involvement in the AIS Program impact the department, especially smaller departments where there are limited number of faculty to fill those committees?
- Besides the benefits, are there other reasons why the initiators want AIS to become a Program now?
- Given the current situations the Colleges face (regionalization, budget cuts etc.), is this the right time? Would it be more beneficial to wait until the Colleges work all these issue out before moving forward with the petition?

As mentioned previously, the committee does believe the petition for AIS to become a Program should move forward.

Please let us know if you have any question regarding our review or need further clarification regarding our statement.

2015-16 Senate Faculty Professional Standards Committee
Mike Gorman
Ron Gulotta
Hi Holly,

Sorry it’s taken me some time to get back to you regarding the AIS petition. I’ve been buried under grading the last week or so and lost track of many such tasks.

SAPC has no major concerns with the AIS petition, and I would say we are supportive in general. One comment reflected that the proposed bylaws are better than many current department bylaws, and I would have to agree. It’s clear much thought and effort went into the program proposal.

Penny Workman identified one particular issue that might deserve further attention. I’ll paste Penny’s message here:

"I found one item that might need clarification. Section IID 2a and 2b defines the makeup of the curriculum and assessment committee. Item a indicates that the membership of this committee shall be appointed by the program chair, while item b specifies that a member may be re-elected. While this is not a large issue, perhaps this latter statement could be changed to “reappointed” to prevent any potential misunderstanding."

That’s the only, substantive issue SAPC identified. As Chair, I think I can speak for the committee as a whole and say we support this petition going forward for further consideration.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks,
Caleb M. Bush, Ph.D.

Hi Holly,

Regarding the AIS petition to become a stand alone program, the general sense from the SBC is that we like the idea of creating a stand alone program, but when it comes to the budgetary implications, and in particular the timing of the proposal, we have concerns about AIS becoming a stand-alone program at this time.

We are not convinced that the benefits of creating the new program justify the costs, particularly during time of shrinking budgets. Department Chairs have been asked to cut $100,000, which is likely to result in reduced stipends for existing chairs and other reductions. We wonder whether
the addition of a new program chair (and associated costs) will lead to additional reductions. We also wonder to what degree having a chair/stand alone program is necessary to achieving the goals of strengthening and reinvigorating the AIS curriculum. Could members of the AIS program start working on these goals without stand alone status, at least in the short term?

It is possible that the new costs associated with creating the new program would be offset by revenue generated by increased FTE and enhanced retention. However, we find there is not enough evidence that such additional revenue would be generated, at least not at this point in time. Would creating a new stand-alone program create new FTE, drawing additional students beyond what we currently have, or only draw from our current student body? AIS 101 is a high-enrolling course online, and it is possible that creating AIS 102 would generate similar enrollments. But we also wondered, particularly in light of the emphasis on enrollment efficiencies, whether other new AIS offerings (higher level cross-listed course) would generate high enough enrollment to run.

I hope these observations and concerns are helpful. And keep in mind that this feedback is coming through the lens of the budgetary perspective, and should not be taken as a general lack of support of the AIS program.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of the Senate Budget Committee, Margaret Hankenson, chair
Happy 2016 colleagues.

As you are aware, the American Indian Studies Program has requested to become a standalone Program. It is currently embedded within the Political Science Department and has been since its inception. Since its inception in 2002, there has not been any new courses developed nor added to the Program. We did not have meetings nor really communicate as a Program.

The past few years Dr. Renee Gralewicz has been attending UW System wide American Indian Studies Consortium meetings and developed another AIS/ANT online course (ANT/AIS 314) moving toward making the AIS certificate more available to our students. She also worked with Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (DPI) to develop a non-credit course to assist K-12 educators in meeting their Wisconsin teaching licensure. As she got more involved with AIS instructors across the state, she, with the help of many, began a movement to invigorate the Program. In this light Provost Lampe graciously gave her release time Spring 2015 to develop Program bylaws by collaborating with other UWC AIS instructors.

Here are some current facts regarding our current AIS Program status, most of which you will read somewhere in the myriad of documents sent regarding this proposal.
- There are currently 13 instructors representing five departments and eight campuses. Renee has been contacted by two additional faculty who wish to join the Program and are awaiting the outcome of this proposal.
- UW Colleges currently has five courses AIS or cross-listed AIS. There are three current courses that can (should) be cross-listed; also waiting for the outcome of this proposal.
- UWS AIS Consortium has been collaborating across campuses to enhance offerings. We are working as a system ensuring that all students can attain the certificate, emphasis, minor, or AIS major.
- UW Madison, UW Extension, and UW Colleges are collaborating on a statewide initiative working with Wisconsin Tribal Councils to enhance the college success rate of American Indian students and faculty. Our Program will be part of the discussion and perhaps part of the solution.

Throughout the Senate deliberation process a number of questions arose. Below are the responses to them.

- Why American Indian Studies? Is this the most appropriate title? There is currently no UWS agreement on this. However, there is an informal Wisconsin American Indian Studies Consortium which meets regularly. UW – Green Bay and UW – Superior have First Nations Studies. UW – Madison and UW – Milwaukee have American Indian Studies. It is not really the title that is of concern, but the relationship with tribal peoples that matters.
- Why Program Coordinator versus Program Chair? We believe the purpose of the Program is to coordinate courses across disciplines and campuses. Additionally, this title more aligns with American Indian philosophy of consensus.

Faculty Professional Standards Committee Concerns:
• Although cross-listing courses might alleviate this concern, some wondered how offering these courses might impact other course offerings for that faculty on campus or online. In other words would offering an AIS course mean a faculty would not offer another course they might otherwise teach? All but one of the cross-listed courses are already frequently taught, well as frequently as can be expected. We can begin organizing the offerings so that students have an opportunity to earn the emphasis or the certificate. We also can collaborate across campuses to offer them via NODE or point-to-point where practical.
• Some wondered how faculty would be assigned in regards to departments. I don’t believe that faculty are assigned as much as invited to participate given the course that is already cross-listed.
• How might faculty involvement in the AIS Program impact the department, especially smaller departments where there are limited number of faculty to fill those committees? This too is a concern of ours given the limited amount of time each individual has. Again, they would be invited to participate in governance, and we understand when they have more pressing department/campus/region/system obligations.
• Besides the benefits, are there other reasons why the initiators want AIS to become a Program now? AIS has been a program for quite a while but under the auspices of Political Science Department there has been no action since the establishment of AIS 101. That small department, rightly so, put the energies of its members into department issues. Their bylaws did not incorporate AIS in any fashion. There was no structure for growth. A few of us who teach cross-listed courses began conversations a few years ago seeking ways of expanding and collaborating courses into a viable certificate or emphasis program.
• Given the current situations the Colleges face (regionalization, budget cuts, etc.), is this the right time? Would it be more beneficial to wait until the Colleges work all these issue out before moving forward with the petition? Well, it could wait but the longer the process takes, the less interest and motivation many of us might experience. Our energies will be diverted back to department/campus issues. Since everything is in flux now, it’s easier to join the flux rather than creating one.

Senate Academic Policy Committee
• "I found one item that might need clarification. Section IID 2a and 2b defines the makeup of the curriculum and assessment committee. Item a) indicates that the membership of this committee shall be appointed by the program chair, while item b) specifies that a member may be re-elected. While this is not a large issue, perhaps this latter statement could be changed to “reappointed” to prevent any potential misunderstanding." Good catch! Noted and it will change when we have an approved structure.

Budget Committee
• We also wonder to what degree having a chair/standalone program is necessary to achieving the goals of strengthening and reinvigorating the AIS curriculum. Could members of the AIS program start working on these goals without standalone status, at least in the short term? … enrollments We firmly believe a standalone Program is necessary to achieve the goals with vigor. If embedded within a department, there is a very good chance that the program’s interest will be secondary to department needs. Regardless of which
department the Program becomes embedded in, there will be delays due to restructuring bylaws that encompass the Program.

As a standalone Program we will be able to address current changes in the UWS as well as UW Colleges with more flexibility and intent. There is a tribal statewide initiative to enhance their members’ access and success within higher education. We want to be, need to be part of that conversation. Given our multiple locations, many near Wisconsin reservations, we are poised to make a positive change.

Another important issue is transferability of our courses, regardless of department. Department Chairs and Curriculum Committees are well aware of the time and effort that goes into ensuring appropriate transfer of courses. With a standalone program, AIS Coordinator will be able to take up the mantle regarding the AIS part of the cross-listed courses.

Could we accomplish this embedded within a department? Certainly. We believe that an embedded program is much more of a challenge to growth as evident of Gender, Sexuality, and Gender Studies (AKA WOM) Program. It was after they became standalone that their program blossomed and strengthened. WE, AIS faculty need to be flexible enough to control our own destiny and growth, not secondary to another department.

- But we also wondered, particularly in light of the emphasis on enrollment efficiencies, whether other new AIS offerings (higher level cross-listed course) would generate high enough enrollment to run. Well, we’ll never know until we try. Some of our courses do indeed have low enrollment. However, if we coordinate across campuses using digital technologies already available, we can reach more students which will bolster interest.

**Specific Budget Issues**

- The cost analysis shows $14,182 is “new” costs of course release for the Coordinator and summer stipend. S & E funds are shifted from other departments. Assessment funds come from the overall assessment line. According to Associate Vice Chair of Academic Affairs Joe Foy (and I may be remembering incorrectly), the PD funds will be primarily shifted from POL which has been receiving PD funds for AIS and the Online revenue sharing also comes primarily from POL as the bulk of AIS online courses are AIS 101 taught by Roger Wall. Some will come from ANT/SOC and HIS as they too have instructors who teach AIS online. Note that we do not have a clear idea of how ONL funds are shared with departments but the UWC Online UWC Online Year End Net (YEN) FY 15 summary shows POL with 15 online sections; many of those are AIS 101 which tends to run 7 – 8 sections a year.

[End]
Rationale:
Senate Steering charged SAPC with a review of Chapter 11 to clarify roles and responsibilities for academic programs housed in academic departments. The existing language contained internal contradictions concerning a department’s place in overseeing program curriculum, instructional staffing, and establishing program bylaws. The proposed changes, eliminating some existing language and incorporating a few, key additions, aims to eliminate such contradictions in academic program roles and responsibilities.

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

UW Colleges Constitution
Chapter 11 - Academic Programs

11.00 Academic Programs

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

11.01 Membership

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

11.02 Voting Rights

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

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

11.04 Directors and Coordinators and Chairs of Academic Programs

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

11.05 Committees

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

11.06 Meetings

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

11.07 Bylaws

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

11.08 Creation and Termination of Academic Programs

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

11.09 Status of Programs Existing Prior to This Amendment

Academic programs existing prior to the adoption of this amendment shall have one year to comply with constitutional requirements.
Rationale:
In a very preliminary review of looming policy and Constitution changes resulting from regionalization/centralization, SAPC identified an initial, important change for campus governance. The proposed changes to Chapter 3 makes the campus steering committee chair (or designee) the presiding officer of collegium. This change reflects common practice on many campuses already and brings campus governance in line with the recent change making Senate Steering Chair the presiding officer of the Senate. The changes also add new language to address the role(s) of campus administrators and regional deans in campus governance.

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

UW Colleges Constitution
Chapter 3 - Campus Governance

3.00 Campus Constitution

Each campus collegium shall maintain a constitution which is in compliance with the constitution of the UW Colleges. Amendments to campus constitutions require the approval of the chancellor.

3.01 Membership

Each campus collegium shall consist of faculty, academic staff, university staff, and student representatives. The campus dean steering committee chair or his/her designee shall be the presiding officer of the collegium. As presiding officer, the campus steering committee chair will retain full voting rights as a member of collegium. Collegia constitutions shall allow for no fewer than three and no more than eight student members of the collegium. Students shall select their representatives to the campus collegium. All collegium members with appointments of one half time or more, and student representatives may participate in all elections and vote on all collegium motions, except that only faculty shall vote for the faculty senator, only ranked faculty shall vote on faculty personnel issues, only eligible academic staff shall vote on academic staff personnel issues, and only university staff shall vote on matters
pertaining to university staff.

A faculty, academic staff, or university staff member with a split appointment or at least a 40% appointment that is entirely through the University of Wisconsin Colleges Online shall have his/her collegium membership determined in the letter of appointment or by designation.

3.02 Jurisdiction and Responsibilities

Each campus collegium shall be the deliberative and legislative body of the campus. Through its actions and its standing committees, the collegium shall recommend to the campus dean administrator and/or regional dean means of improving the educational program. It shall refer to the Senate matters of UW Colleges or campus concern and act on matters presented to it by the Senate.

3.03 Divisions

Each campus may organize its faculty into appropriate divisions to provide broad disciplinary representation in committees.

3.04 Campus Collegium Steering Committee

Revised by the Senate (SSC) 2014-03-14

Each campus collegium shall elect from its members a steering committee composed of faculty, academic staff and university staff, the majority of which must be faculty. The campus dean administrator shall be a non-voting ex-officio member. The steering committee of the campus collegium shall have among its duties and responsibilities the following:

1. Prepare the agenda for the collegium;
2. Call regular and special meetings of the collegium;
3. Establish ad hoc committees;
4. Refer specific issues to appropriate collegium committees;
5. Act for the collegium until the next scheduled meeting of the collegium.

3.05 Other Campus Collegium Committees

Revised by the Senate (SSC) 2014-03-14

Each campus collegium shall elect as many standing committees as it deems necessary to serve the campus as major advisory bodies to the campus dean administrator and/or regional dean on the following subjects:

6. Appointment of faculty and academic staff;
7. Evaluation of faculty and teaching academic staff;
8. Curriculum and course improvements;
9. Budget;
10. Academic actions;
Each standing committee shall have a majority of faculty. Academic staff shall have the right to representation and to select their own representatives on all committees except those designated for faculty and university staff personnel issues. University staff shall have the right to representation and to select their own representatives on all committees except those designated for faculty and academic staff personnel issues. The committee charged with retention, tenure and promotion decisions for faculty must consist only of tenured faculty members. Collegia constitutions shall allow for student members on committees designated to consider all professional appointments, curriculum, academic actions and on the committee designated to advise the campus dean on the budget. The campus student government will be the electing body for all student representatives on all campus governance committees. There shall be no students on the committees designated to evaluate faculty and teaching academic staff, or consider faculty grievances. However, student input must be sought in the evaluation of faculty and teaching academic staff at least once every three years. The campus student government will be responsible for creating a committee for student life and interests and for the dispensation of segregated university fees.

The committees providing advice on faculty and teaching academic staff appointments and curriculum shall seek the advice of appropriate department executive committees. The committee designated to evaluate faculty and teaching academic staff shall seek the advice of the appropriate department executive committees in its annual evaluation of all faculty and academic teaching staff. Appointments, renewals, tenure, and promotions may be granted only after affirmative recommendations of the appropriate campus committee(s) and academic department.

[End]
Background and 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

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. Dossiers received by the department will be forwarded to the campus evaluation committee by January 25, 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]
Background and 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 #501.02
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.
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]
UW Colleges Faculty Council of Senators
Introduction: February 19, 2016
Proposed Revision of FPP #503
(“Faculty Merit Policy and Procedures”)

Rationale:
As a result of the recent discussion on revisions to FPP#503, several suggestions were offered that help to clarify the merit ranking procedure and new ranking level of Satisfactory. The Faculty Professional Standards committee (FPSC) was also tasked to develop a template outlining a set of general criteria for each ranking level. Further revisions to this policy flows with the template provided at the end. With the recent regionalization restructuring administration positions, it is unclear at this time who will be ‘replacing’ the Campus Dean in the merit ranking procedures (deliberations, letter writing, etc.). Therefore this title remains in the policy until it is determined whose position will assume these tasks.

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

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

A. Merit evaluations will be 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 (this position and/or procedures will be revised in future policy updates)
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. Each year, the relevant committee will commence by determining whether each faculty member is satisfactorily meeting the basic expectations for the position. Individuals who receive an unsatisfactory rating shall not receive either across-the-board or merit salary increases.

C. All faculty performing satisfactorily will then be separated into four categories: Satisfactory; Meritorious; Highly Meritorious; and Exceptionally Meritorious for the two year period.

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

2. In campus years, the written evaluation may be provided by the dean (this position and/or procedures will be revised in future policy updates) or the merit committee, as the campus merit committee determines.

3. The written evaluation shall include a statement that a follow-up meeting, conducted either via telephone or in person, may occur at the request of either the faculty member or the chair of the committee which provided the written evaluation. (There is no specification as to the reason a follow-up meeting can be requested, should there be?) 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. Merit Ranking Criteria – The appropriate campus or departmental merit committee will determine merit rankings based on committee members’ assessment of each faculty member’s achievements compared to the criteria established by the evaluating unit (campus or department); these criteria standards will state the type of achievements criteria for Unsatisfactory, 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 general standards for performance criteria for at each ranking from Unsatisfactory, Satisfactory through Exceptionally Meritorious (see Table in section IV). Each ranking unit (campus or department) shall publish specific standards, modified from the Senate templates, separating Unsatisfactory, Satisfactory, Meritorious, Highly Meritorious, and Exceptionally Meritorious faculty performance. These criteria shall be approved by a majority vote of the faculty for each ranking unit and These standards shall give majority weight to teaching effectiveness 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. (Are these last 2 sentences necessary? Perhaps the second sentence does but the first sentence states assessment is “expected” which indicates it’s not “required” and provides no consequence for those NOT participating in assessment)

2. The committee of each unit assigned to perform merit rankings shall review the criteria standards for its unit, and may update their criteria standards, if desired. Any revisions to the criteria Revised standards would need to be approved by a majority vote of the faculty in that unit published by April 30 of the year in which a unit conducted merit reviews. These revised criteria 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 (this position and/or procedures will be revised in future policy updates) 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 criteria 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.

F. Evidence - Committees shall primarily consider an Activity Report covering the preceding two years. Within the Activity Report, faculty members shall document their achievements of the criteria standards of the unit performing merit rankings for that year. (this statement seems to imply each year the reports must be geared for either the department criteria or
the campus criteria. This would be problematic as each ranking unit still reviews 2 years of reports: one designed for the campus criteria and another for the department criteria) 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 by the deadline date shall not be eligible for merit consideration.

2. 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. The committees may, in the course of their evaluations, use other information provided by the faculty member, including the results of class visitations when available. (It was noted this seems ‘unfair’ as some faculty could include materials to benefit themselves that was not known could be submitted by others. Evaluations should be based upon equal/similar materials. Also it could lead to LARGER reports which many prefer not to see!)

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

1. 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. 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.) (this position and/or procedures will be revised in future policy updates)

H. First year faculty appointees will be given a salary increase commensurate with a Satisfactory 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
Revised by the Faculty Council (FPSC) 2015-11-13
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 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
Revised by the Faculty Council (FPSC) 2015-11-13

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 (this position and/or procedures will be revised in future policy updates) 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 criteria standards for merit reviews by Feb. 1, 2016 (sorry we missed this deadline). Merit Ranking Units shall produce their specific unit criteria 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 criteria 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 criteria standards following completion of ranking of its faculty for the 2016-17 cycle.

IV. Sample Performance Criteria Template
The following table provides a guide for campus and department committees to establish their own set of merit ranking criteria. The items listed are samples of possible criteria and are not items required for each ranking level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Meritorious</th>
<th>Highly Meritorious</th>
<th>Exceptionally Meritorious</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>* Lack of teaching effectiveness in the following categories: * Displaying a vigorous commitment to teaching * Employing effective teaching strategies * Enabling notable achievements by present and/or former students * Course development and/or revision</td>
<td>* Minimal teaching effectiveness displayed in one of the following categories: * Displaying a vigorous commitment to teaching * Employing effective teaching strategies * Enabling notable achievements by present and/or former students * Course development and/or revision</td>
<td>* Teaching effectiveness displayed in the following categories: * Displaying a vigorous commitment to teaching * Employing effective teaching strategies * Enabling notable achievements by present and/or former students * Course development and/or revision</td>
<td>* Teaching effectiveness and excellence displayed in the following categories: * Displaying a vigorous commitment to teaching * Employing effective teaching strategies * Enabling notable achievements by present and/or former students * Course development and/or revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>* Lack of participation in service work at any level. * UW System * UW Colleges * Campus * Department * Community</td>
<td>* Minimal participation in service work. * UW System * UW Colleges * Campus * Department * Community</td>
<td>* Participation in meaningful service work at one or more levels. * UW System * UW Colleges * Campus * Department * Community</td>
<td>* Participation in meaningful service work and effective service in leadership positions * UW System * UW Colleges * Campus * Department * Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>Lack of meaningful professional development work in the following categories:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional society participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Progress toward or attainment of a terminal degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scholarly or professional publication, research, and presentations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discipline related performance,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other types of professional creativity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Development</th>
<th>Meaningful professional development in the following categories:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional society participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Progress toward or attainment of a terminal degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scholarly or professional publication, research, and presentations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discipline related performance,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other types of professional creativity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Development</th>
<th>Meaningful, high-quality professional development in the following categories:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional society participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Progress toward or attainment of a terminal degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scholarly or professional publication, research, and presentations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discipline related performance,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other types of professional creativity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Development</th>
<th>Meaningful, high-quality professional development in the following categories:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional society participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Progress toward or attainment of a terminal degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scholarly or professional publication, research, and presentations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discipline related performance,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other types of professional creativity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[End]
Scope

This policy describes the authority of the University of Wisconsin System Board of Regents to grant faculty tenure.

Purpose

The purposes of this policy are to define who may be granted tenure, establish conditions under which a faculty member having tenure may be dismissed; and require UW System institutions to develop procedures for dismissal notice and hearing.

Definitions

For the purpose of this policy, the following definitions are used:
(a) “Probationary appointment” means an appointment by the board held by a faculty member during the period which may precede a decision on a tenure appointment.
(b) “Tenure appointment” means an appointment for an unlimited period granted to a ranked faculty member by the board.

Policy Statement

The Board of Regents shall provide tenure appointments within the following parameters:

1. APPOINTMENTS

(a) Except as provided under par. (b), the board may grant a tenure appointment only upon the affirmative recommendation of the appropriate chancellor and the appropriate academic department or its functional equivalent. Neither the chancellor nor the academic department or its functional equivalent may base a tenure recommendation upon impermissible factors, as defined by the board by rule.
(b) The board may grant a tenure appointment without the affirmative recommendation of the appropriate academic department or its functional equivalent if all of the following apply:

1. The board has the affirmative recommendation of the appropriate chancellor.

2. A faculty committee authorized by the board by rule to review the negative recommendation of the academic department or its functional equivalent finds that the decision of the academic department or its functional equivalent was based upon impermissible factors, as defined by the board by rule.

3. The board has the affirmative recommendation of a committee appointed according to the policies and procedures of the appropriate institution to review the individual’s record with reference to criteria for tenure published by the institution under procedures established by the board by rule. No person may be appointed to the committee under this subdivision unless the person is knowledgeable or experienced in the individual’s academic field or in a substantially similar academic field. No member of the committee appointed under this subdivision may be a member of the academic department, or its functional equivalent, that made the negative recommendation. The committee appointed under this subdivision may not base its tenure recommendation upon impermissible factors, as defined by the board by rule.

(c) A tenure appointment may be granted to any ranked faculty member who holds or will hold a half–time appointment or more. The proportion of time provided for in the appointment may not be diminished nor increased without the mutual consent of the faculty member and the institution subject only to Section 4, “Procedural Guarantees,” and sss. 36.21 and 36.22, Wis. Stats.

(d) A probationary appointment shall not exceed 7 consecutive academic years in a full–time position in an institution. A leave of absence, sabbatical or a teacher improvement assignment does not constitute a break in continuous service and shall not be included in the 7–year period. The board may promulgate rules specifying additional circumstances that do not constitute a break in continuous service and that shall not be included in the 7–year period.

2. RULES

The board and its several faculties after consultation with appropriate students shall promulgate rules for tenure and probationary appointments, for the review of faculty performance and for the nonretention and dismissal of faculty members. Such rules shall be promulgated under ch. 227, Wis. Stats.

3. CONTINUATION OF APPOINTMENT
(a) Any person who holds a tenure appointment under ch. 36, 1971 Stats. and ch. 37, 1971 Stats., and related rules on July 9, 1974 shall continue to hold tenure as defined under those chapters and related rules.

(b) Any person who holds the equivalent of a probationary appointment under ch. 36, 1971 Stats., and ch. 37, 1971 Stats., and related rules on July 9, 1974 shall continue to enjoy the contractual rights and guarantees as defined under those chapters and related rules, and may elect to be considered for tenure according to the procedures existing under that appointment or under Section 1, “Appointments.”

(c) Any person who is not a ranked faculty member on August 15, 1991, and who is also described under subd. 1. or 2. shall be treated as a faculty member with the rank of associate professor for all purposes:

1. Any person who held an unranked faculty tenure appointment or unranked faculty concurrent tenure appointment under ch. 37, 1971 Stats., prior to July 10, 1974.

2. Any person who held an unranked probationary appointment under ch. 37, 1971 Stats., prior to July 10, 1974, and who subsequently received an unranked faculty tenure appointment or unranked faculty concurrent tenure appointment.

4. PROCEDURAL GUARANTEES

Any person having tenure may be dismissed only for just cause and only after due notice and hearing. Any person having a probationary appointment may be dismissed prior to the end of the person’s contract term only for just cause and only after due notice and hearing. The action and decision of the board in such matters shall be final, subject to judicial review under ch. 227, Wis. Stats. The board and its several faculties shall develop procedures for the notice and hearing which shall be promulgated by rule under ch. 227.

5. LIMITATION

Tenure and probationary appointments are in a particular institution. A tenure appointment is limited to the institution in which the appointment is held.

Oversight, Roles and Responsibilities

The Board of Regents delegates to the President of the UW System or his or her designee the authority to issue operational policies to implement and administer this policy. The Board further authorizes the President to delegate to individual chancellors the authority to implement this policy at their respective institutions within the parameters established by Regent Policy Documents, Wisconsin Administrative Code provisions, and University of Wisconsin System policies.
Related Regent Policies and Applicable Laws

Chapter 36, Wis. Stats.
Chapters UWS 3, 4, 5 and 7, Wis. Admin. Code Regent
Policy Documents 20-9 and 20-XX

History: Res. 10516, adopted 06/05/2015, created Regent Policy Document 20-23.
Regent Policy Document 20-9
Periodic Post-Tenure Review in Support of Tenured Faculty Development

On 2/5/2016 the Education Committee voted to recommend this language for adoption by the full Board of Regents.

2-2-2016

Note: This draft proposes the revision of the current RPD 20-9 and, if adopted, would replace that policy.

Scope

This policy applies to all UW System institutions and tenured faculty members. The post-tenure review described by this policy is not intended to serve as a substitute for annual or other evaluations of tenured faculty performance that may occur at an institution, nor is it intended as a re-evaluation of tenure.

Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to reflect the Board of Regents’ commitment to promoting the continued high-quality teaching, research/scholarship, and service of its tenured faculty, and thereby to enhance the educational environment for its students and the larger community. The primary purpose of the periodic, post-tenure review of tenured faculty is to support tenured faculty development.

Policy Statement

Tenure is an essential part of the guarantee of academic freedom that is necessary for university-based intellectual life to flourish. The grant of indeterminate tenure to faculty members represents an enormous investment of university and societal resources, and those who receive this investment do so only after rigorous review which established that their scholarship, research, teaching, and service met the highest standards and are congruent with the needs of the university.

It is the policy of the Board of Regents that a periodic, post-tenure review of tenured faculty members is essential to promoting faculty development, including recognizing innovation and creativity; enhancing the educational environment for students; and identifying and redressing deficiencies in overall performance of duties through a supportive and developmental remediation process.

Nothing in this policy shall be interpreted to alter or to infringe upon existing tenure rights, as set forth in UW System Board of Regents or UW System policies, nor shall this policy diminish the important guarantees of academic freedom. Specifically, this policy does not supersede
administrative rules providing for termination for cause set forth in Chapter UWS 4 of the Wisconsin Administrative Code.

Each institution, through its normal governance process, shall develop and implement a policy for periodic, post-tenure review of tenured faculty members that contains, at a minimum, the following:

1. A definitions section, as needed, that is consistent with the defined terms as they are used in related law and policy.

2. A statement that emphasizes that the overriding purpose of the periodic, post-tenure review is tenured faculty development, and that such review shall not infringe on existing faculty rights and protections, including those of academic freedom.

3. A summary description of the annual or other more frequent tenured faculty evaluation process that is separate and distinct from the post-tenure review process.

4. Provision for review, at least once every five years, of each tenured faculty member’s activities and performance. The post-tenure review period begins in the academic year following the granting of tenure. The review may be deferred, only with the approval of the provost, for unusual circumstances such as when it may coincide with an approved leave, promotion review, or other appointment. In such cases, the provost will specify the new review cycle that applies to the faculty member. The periodic, post-tenure review may substitute for annual review in the year a faculty member is scheduled for such review.

5. Provision for notice of the intent to review at least three months before the review is conducted. However, failure to meet this notice deadline does not obviate the requirement to conduct and participate in the review.

6. Identification of criteria by which to evaluate the tenured faculty member’s performance that are effective and consistent with the mission and expectations of the department, school or college, and institution, as applicable, and sufficiently flexible to permit shifts in professional emphasis. However any criteria must fall within the three categories of teaching, scholarship/research, and service.

7. Delineation of the roles and responsibilities of those who will conduct or contribute to the review.

8. Delineation of the process by which the review will be conducted, including a timeline.

9. Identification of the following categories reflecting the overall results of the review. In determining the category, the review will consider whether the faculty member under review has discharged conscientiously and with professional competence the duties appropriately associated with the faculty member’s position.
a. **Meets expectations.** This category is awarded to those tenured faculty members whose performance reflects the expected level of accomplishment.

b. **Does not meet expectations.** This category is awarded to those tenured faculty members whose performance reflects a level of accomplishment below the expected level and which requires correction. All reviews resulting in “does not meet expectations,” unless overturned upon further review, will result in a remediation plan as described below.

An institution may add an additional category of “Exceeds expectations,” which is to be awarded to those tenured faculty members whose performance reflects a significant level of accomplishment beyond what is normal for the institution, college or school, or department.

10. Provision for a written report for each faculty review and the opportunity for the reviewed faculty member to provide a written response to the report. The report should be provided to the faculty member, the department chair, the dean (as applicable), and the provost.

11. A description of any opportunities offered to faculty members who receive a review in the category of meets or exceeds expectations, as applicable, including additional compensation, subject to the availability of resources.

12. A description of the procedures that apply when a faculty member receives a review in the category of “does not meet expectations” that includes the following:

   c. Requirement that the identification of any deficiencies be described in writing and provided to the faculty member;

   d. Provision for review by the dean, followed by review by the chancellor (or designee). The faculty member may provide a written statement to accompany these reviews. Following the chancellor or designee’s review, the faculty member will be informed by the chancellor or designee that the faculty member has received a result of “meets expectations,” or that a remediation plan will be developed; and

   e. Provision for a remediation plan to be developed by the faculty member in consultation with the dean to assist the faculty member in addressing those deficiencies identified in the review.

       i. The primary focus of the remediation plan shall be developmental and provide the faculty member with appropriate support from the department or dean as applicable.
ii. Provision for a mechanism for determining how and when the faculty member will have satisfied the expectations of the remediation plan as determined by the dean in consultation with the chancellor and faculty member; however, all elements of the plan must be satisfied within a reasonable time period, commensurate with the identified deficiencies determined by the dean, not to exceed three academic semesters. In those few remediation plans related to a performance shortfall in research where more than three academic semesters may be necessary to correct identified deficiencies, an extension of one academic semester shall be permitted only with the approval of the chancellor, which shall trigger a notification of that extension to the UW System Administration Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs.

iii. Provision for actions to be taken when the faculty member fails to meet the expectations set forth in the remediation plan, which includes reference to existing faculty complaint processes, and which permits the imposition of discipline, as appropriate, up to and including dismissal for cause under Chapter UWS 4.

13. Provision for assistance prior to and following the review, regardless of the results of the faculty member’s post-tenure review, that is available to all faculty members to support their professional development at any time in their careers.

14. Provision for a full, written record to be created containing the results of a faculty member’s periodic, post-tenure review and any ensuing actions, as described above, and for the written record to be provided to the dean and chancellor (or designee). Information and documentation relating to the review shall be maintained by the appropriate department, college or school, or university personnel or bodies, and disclosed otherwise only at the discretion, or with the explicit consent, of the faculty member, unless required by business necessity or by law.

15. Provision that department chairs or their organizational equivalent be required to report annually to the dean and chancellor (or designee) that all periodic, post-tenure reviews for tenured faculty in that annual cycle have been completed, and that the chancellor (or designee) has responsibility for ensuring the reviews are completed on schedule.

16. The reviews conducted and remediation plans developed in accordance with this policy are not subject to the grievance process set forth in Chapter UWS 6.02, Wis. Admin. Code.

Oversight, Roles and Responsibilities

Each institution shall submit to the Board of Regents for approval the institutional policy developed in accordance with this policy. Within nine (9) months of the effective date of the policy, each institution shall submit to the Board of Regents their policy. Once the policy has been approved, the chancellor is responsible for implementing the policy and operating the institution consistent with its provisions.
Related Regent Policies and Applicable Laws

Chapter 36, Wis. Stats.
Chapters UWS 3, 4, and 6, Wis. Admin. Code
Regent Policy Document 20-23
On 2/5/2016 the Education Committee voted to recommend this language for adoption by the full Board of Regents.

1-21-2016


Scope

This policy applies to all University of Wisconsin System institutions and faculty.

Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to establish procedures for University of Wisconsin System institutions in the event that a financial emergency or program discontinuance requires faculty layoffs.

Policy Statement

Tenure is the keystone for academic freedom and excellence and is awarded for academic and professional merit. Tenure is an essential part of the guarantee of academic freedom that is necessary for university-based intellectual life to flourish. The grant of indeterminate tenure to faculty members represents an enormous investment of university and societal resources, and those who receive this investment do so only after rigorous review which established that their scholarship, research, teaching and service meet the highest standards and are congruent with the needs of the university. It is therefore expressly recognized that the awarding and continued enjoyment of faculty tenure is of vital importance to the protection of academic freedom and to the overall academic quality of the University of Wisconsin System institutions.

Accordingly, faculty layoff will be invoked only in extraordinary circumstances and after all feasible alternatives have been considered. Additionally, faculty layoff shall not be based on conduct, expressions, or beliefs on the faculty member’s part that are constitutionally protected or protected by the principles of academic freedom.

As provided in Wis. Stat. s. 36.21 and Wis. Stat. s. 36.22, and Chapter UWS 5 of the Wisconsin Administrative Code, the Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System (Board) has authority, with appropriate notice, to terminate through layoff a faculty appointment when necessary in the event of a financial emergency, or a program decision resulting in program discontinuance. The Board is permitted by Wis. Stat. s. 36.21 to adopt procedures relating to faculty layoff. Consistent with Chapter UWS 5 and Wis. Stat. s. 36.22, this Board policy sets forth those procedures. Faculty layoffs at University of Wisconsin System institutions may be undertaken only in accordance with this policy, Chapter UWS 5, Wis. Stat. s. 36.21, and Wis. Stat. s. 36.22.
Definitions

A. For the purposes of this policy, “program” shall mean a related cluster of credit-bearing courses that constitute a coherent body of study within a discipline or set of related disciplines. When feasible, the term shall designate a department or similar administrative unit that offers majors and has been officially recognized by the UW institution. Programs cannot be defined ad hoc, at any size, but should be recognized academic units. Programs shall not be defined to single out individual faculty members for layoff. For UW-Extension, the term “program” also shall include the substantial equivalent of an academic department that may or may not provide credit-bearing credentials.

B. For the purposes of this policy, “program discontinuance” as described in Wis. Stat. ss. 36.21 and 36.22 shall mean formal program elimination or closure.

C. For the purposes of this policy, “financial emergency” is defined and may be declared as described in s. UWS 5.02 of the Wisconsin Administrative Code.

D. For the purposes of this policy, “educational considerations” shall not include cyclical or temporary variations in enrollment. Educational considerations must reflect long-range judgments that the educational mission of the institution as a whole will be enhanced by a program’s discontinuance.

E. For the purposes of this policy, “layoff” is the indefinite suspension or involuntary reduction in services and compensation of a faculty member’s employment by the University of Wisconsin System. Wis. Stat. s. 36.22(1)(a). A laid off faculty member retains the rights specified in Wis. Stat. ss. 36.22(11) to 36.22(15).

F. For the purposes of this policy, “termination” is the permanent elimination of a faculty member’s employment by the University of Wisconsin System. Wis. Stat. s. 36.22(1)(c). A faculty member whose position has been terminated retains the rights specified in Wis. Stat. ss. 36.22(13) and (14).

I. Faculty Layoff for Reasons of Financial Emergency

A. Notwithstanding RPD 20-23 (Regent Policy Document on Faculty Tenure), a tenured faculty member, or a probationary faculty member prior to the end of his or her appointment, may be laid off in the event of a financial emergency. Layoff for reasons of financial emergency may occur only in accordance with this policy. UWS 5.01 through UWS 5.07 of Chapter UWS 5 of the Wisconsin Administrative Code, and Wis. Stat. s. 36.22. A nonrenewal, regardless of reasons, is not a layoff or termination under this policy.

B. The faculty of each UW System institution shall designate or create a faculty committee to consult with the chancellor as described in s. UWS 5.04 in the event a declaration of financial emergency is being considered. The faculty committee shall participate in the decision at the institutional level regarding whether to recommend to the Board that a financial emergency be declared. The chancellor shall provide the faculty committee with access to information
and data relevant to the proposed declaration of financial emergency. The chancellor shall consult with and take into serious consideration advice from the faculty committee at least three months before making any recommendation to the Board as described in s. UWS 5.05(1).

C. It shall be the responsibility of the faculty committee to recommend criteria to be used by the faculty committee and the chancellor to determine program evaluations and priorities as described in s. UWS 5.05(2). It also shall be the responsibility of the faculty committee to recommend to the chancellor and Board of Regents those areas within the overall academic program where layoffs may occur. The faculty committee shall prepare a report regarding the proposed declaration of financial emergency that shall be shared with the faculty senate, the chancellor and the Board, as described in s. UWS 5.05(1m). A decision to declare a financial emergency shall be made in accordance with the best interests of students and the overall ability of the institution to fulfill its mission.

D. If a chancellor decides to recommend that the Board declare a financial emergency for the chancellor’s institution, as described in s. UWS 5.06, the chancellor shall provide his or her recommendation to the System president and the Board, accompanied by a report that shall include data demonstrating the need to declare a financial emergency; identification of the programs in which faculty reductions will be made, with data supporting those choices; any report created by the faculty committee; and a report of any action of the faculty senate on the matter.

E. The Board may declare a financial emergency for a UW System institution if the Board determines the existence of the conditions set forth in s. UWS 5.02, Wisconsin Administrative Code. It is recognized that the Board should exercise its authority adversely to the faculty recommendation with respect to declaration of financial emergency only for compelling reasons which should be stated in detail.

F. If the Board declares a financial emergency for the institution, the tenured faculty in the affected departments and programs shall have responsibility for recommending which faculty will be laid off. These recommendations shall follow seniority unless a convincing case is made that program or budget needs dictate other considerations. Additionally, the faculty at each institution shall determine the form of seniority that is to be used as described in Wis. Stat. s. 36.22(3).

G. A faculty member whose position is recommended for layoff shall receive the notification provided in Wis. Stat. s. 36.22(4) and shall be entitled to the notification period provided in Wis. Stat. s. 36.22(5). The faculty member also shall be entitled to the due process hearing and appeal procedures, reappointment rights, and other rights and protections in Wis. Stat. s. 36.22. As provided in Wis. Stat. s. 36.22(12), institutions shall devote their best efforts to securing alternative appointments for faculty laid off under this section, and also shall provide financial assistance for readaptation of faculty laid off under this section where readaptation is feasible.
II. Faculty Layoff for Reasons of Program Discontinuance

A. The maintenance of tenure-track and tenured faculty, and of essential instructional and supporting services, remains the highest priority of the university. To promote and maintain high-quality programs, the institutions of the UW System may over time develop new programs and discontinue existing programs. Accordingly, and notwithstanding RPD 20-23 (Regent Policy Document on Faculty Tenure), a tenured faculty member, or a probationary faculty member prior to the end of his or her appointment, may be laid off in the event that educational considerations relating to a program require program discontinuance. Educational considerations may include strategic institutional planning considerations such as long-term student and market demand and societal needs. Layoff for reasons of program discontinuance may be made only in accordance with this policy and Wis. Stat. s. 36.22. A nonrenewal, regardless of reasons, is not a layoff or termination under this policy.

B. Program review and adjustment to the curriculum according to professional and educational standards and accreditation requirements is part of routine institutional planning. Educational considerations are related in part to regular program review, and reflect a long-range judgment that the educational mission of the institution as a whole will be enhanced by program discontinuance. This includes the reallocation of resources to other programs with higher priority based on educational considerations. Such long-range judgments generally will involve the analysis of financial resources and the needs of the program and any related college or school.

C. A proposal to discontinue a program due to educational considerations that will result in faculty layoff may be initiated by faculty in the program, faculty in the college or school that contains the program, the faculty senate, the dean, the provost, or the chancellor. The proposal shall be in writing and shall contain appropriate information and analysis regarding the educational considerations, including programmatic and financial considerations, supporting the proposed program discontinuance. The proposal shall be provided for review to the faculty in the affected program, to the faculty senate, to the academic staff shared-governance body and other governance bodies at the institution, and to the chancellor. A proposal to discontinue a program that will not result in faculty layoff shall follow the standard program review process in place at each institution, and shall not be required to follow the process outlined in this policy.

D. The faculty committee designated or created under Section I of this policy shall review and evaluate any proposal to discontinue a program that will lead to faculty layoff. The committee’s review and evaluation may be based on the following considerations, where relevant:

1. The centrality of the program to the institution’s mission;
2. The academic strength and quality of the program, and of its faculty in terms of national ratings if applicable;
3. Whether the work done in the program complements that done in another essential program;

Comment [T58]: A number of universities have policy or guidance language relating to academic program discontinuance and other changes and associated faculty layoffs, including Rutgers University (Academic Freedom policy recognizes that tenured faculty can be terminated if their academic program is terminated), the University of Colorado at Boulder (policies provide for faculty layoff due to program discontinuance as a result of educational, strategic or financial considerations), the University of Maryland (policies provide for faculty layoffs due to reduction, consolidation, transfer or discontinuance of program), the University of Michigan, the University of Utah, the University of Tennessee and the Tennessee Board of Regents System, Iowa State University, University System of Georgia, and the Nevada System of Higher Education. Additionally, faculty collective bargaining agreements relating to the California State University System, the University of Maine System, the MnSCU System, the Connecticut State University System, and the Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education contain provisions permitting layoffs for bona fide financial or programmatic reasons separate from fiscal emergency.

Comment [T59]: This sentence is taken from the University of Michigan’s policy on discontinuance of academic programs.

Comment [T510]: This language is taken in part from the U of Colorado’s layoff policy.

Comment [T511]: This sentence is based in part on language in the University of Utah faculty layoff policy.

Comment [T512]: This list of considerations is taken in modified form from the University of Maryland’s faculty layoff policy. The University of Michigan and the University of Utah have similar lists.
4. Whether the work done in the program duplicates academic instruction and course content delivered in other programs at the institution;
5. Student and market demand and projected enrollment in the subject matter taught in the program;
6. Current and predicted comparative cost analysis/effectiveness of the program; and
7. Other relevant factors that the committee deems appropriate.

E. The faculty committee shall request and review comments and recommendations on the proposed program discontinuance from faculty and staff in the program, faculty and staff in the affected college or school, students in the program, and other appropriate institutional bodies or individuals. Based on this review and evaluation, the faculty committee shall prepare a recommendation and report regarding the proposed program discontinuance that shall be shared with the faculty in the program, the faculty senate, the college dean, the provost and the chancellor. The faculty committee shall provide its recommendation and report to the chancellor within three months of the date of the faculty senate’s receipt of the program discontinuance proposal.

F. The chancellor shall consult with the faculty committee and the faculty senate before making any recommendation to the Board. It is recognized that the chancellor should make a recommendation adverse to the faculty recommendation with respect to discontinuance of an academic program only for compelling reasons which should be stated in writing and in detail.

G. If the chancellor decides to recommend that the Board approve discontinuance of a program that will result in the layoff of faculty, the chancellor shall provide his or her recommendation to the System president and the Board, accompanied by a report that shall include information demonstrating the educational considerations supporting program discontinuance, any recommendation and report created by the faculty committee, and a report of any action of the faculty senate on the matter. The chancellor shall provide any such recommendation to the System president and the Board within four months of the date of the faculty senate’s receipt of the program discontinuance proposal.

H. The System president shall provide the Board with his or her recommendation on the program discontinuance proposal. After reviewing the System president’s and the chancellor’s recommendations and related report, the Board shall make the final decision on whether the program is to be discontinued, resulting in faculty layoffs. It is recognized that the Board should exercise its authority adversely to the faculty recommendation with respect to program discontinuance only for compelling reasons which should be stated in detail.

I. If the Board approves discontinuance of a program resulting in faculty layoffs at a UW System institution under this policy, the tenured faculty at that institution shall have responsibility for recommending which faculty will be laid off. These recommendations shall follow seniority unless a clear and convincing case is made that program needs dictate other considerations, as described in Wis. Stat. s. 36.22(3)(a). Additionally, the faculty at each institution shall determine the form of seniority that is to be used, as described in Wis. Stat. s. 36.22(3)(b).
J. A faculty member whose position is recommended for layoff shall receive the notification provided in Wis. Stat. s. 36.22(4), and shall be entitled to the notification period provided in Wis. Stat. s. 36.22(5). The faculty member also shall be entitled to the due process hearing and appeal procedures, reappointment rights and other rights and protections in Wis. Stat. s. 36.22. As provided in Wis. Stat. s. 36.22 (12), institutions shall devote their best efforts to securing alternative appointments for faculty laid off under this section, and also shall provide financial assistance for readaptation of faculty laid off under this section where readaptation is feasible.

III. Safeguards for Students

UW System institutions will make every effort to accommodate students adversely affected by discontinuance of an academic program for reasons of financial emergency or because of educational considerations. Discontinuance of a program should be phased in over a reasonable time period to provide students with the opportunity to complete the program or transfer to another program. Completion of a program or transfer to another program cannot be guaranteed by the university.

Oversight, Roles and Responsibilities

UW System institutions shall submit to the Board of Regents for approval any institutional policy developed in accordance with this policy. The chancellor at each institution shall be responsible for implementation of this policy.

Related Regent Policies and Applicable Laws

Chapter 36, Wis. Stats.
Chapters UWS 3 and 5, Wis. Admin. Code
Regent Policy Document 20-23
Attachment 26

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 final Senate meeting of the academic year.

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 at the final Senate meeting of the academic year, 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 final Senate meeting of the academic year 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.

[End]
Regarding ASCS Bylaws
AS were notified about the revisions to the ASCS Bylaws on December 1, 2015. We received no comments regarding the revisions. Therefore, the version of the bylaws dated December 1, 2015, will be introduced today and approved at the April 22, 2016 Council meeting.

Regarding ASPP #804
Proposed definition of FLSA-exempt employment
*Academic staff service is defined as continuous years of paid UW Colleges academic staff employment. For staff who were employed in a university staff FLSA-exempt position on July 1, 2015 and elected to voluntarily reassign to academic staff after July 1, 2015, the period that they were employed in FLSA-exempt status, in the same position from which they are voluntarily reassigning, will also count as academic staff service. Continuous years of paid UW Colleges academic staff employment is determined 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.

Mike Gorman

Are we absolutely sure that adding FLSA exempt is legal? The law has changed, labor law views the exemption quite narrowly, unless a pay threshold is surpassed. The newly written rulemaking is still in implementation. In short, I am wary. We should probably address what we mean (post-rule change or pre-rule change). This creates some muddy water.

Yours,
Mike Winkler

From: "Lampe, Greg" <greg.lampe@uwc.edu>
Date: Monday, November 23, 2015 at 8:44 PM
To: Jeff Verona <jeffrey.verona@uwc.edu>
Cc: "Baum, Linda" <linda.baum@uwc.edu>, "Hassel, Holly" <holly.hassel@uwc.edu>, "Lund, Diane" <diane.lund@uwex.uwc.edu>
Subject: FW: Approved UWC Senate, Faculty Council, and Academic Staff Council Items

Dear Jeff,
I have been carefully reviewing the adoption items from the Friday, November 13, Senate meeting. During my review process, I shared the change to ASPP #804 as adopted by the Academic Staff Council of Senators with UW Colleges Human Resources Manager Diane Lund.

As you will see, Diane found the proposed change to the language confusing and saw a couple of possible problems with the approved language change to the policy. For your information, I am sharing her email below with you. I am also including a draft of ASPP #804 with Diane’s proposed language included.

Please consider the proposed language as presented in the attached document. Then, once you have reviewed it, and the Council has an opportunity to consider it and act on it, I will review the proposed changes to #804 once again, and prepare a recommendation for Chancellor Sandeen.

If you have any questions about the proposed language, please contact Diane Lund directly.

Sincerely and respectfully,

Greg

---

From: Lund, Diane
Sent: Monday, November 23, 2015 7:01 AM
To: Lampe, Greg <greg.lampe@uwc.edu>
Subject: RE: Approved UWC Senate, Faculty Council, and Academic Staff Council Items

Greg – I see a couple possible problems with the language, one of which can probably best be described by providing example: If an employee is in a Buildings & Grounds Superintendent position, that position is FLSA-exempt and he/she would be able to move to academic staff. If that’s the only FLSA-exempt position the employee has been in there’s no confusion and all of the service in that position would count toward determining the notice period. However, what if that employee had previously been in a Custodial Services Supervisor position? Under OSER rules all Custodial Services Supervisors were designated as FLSA-exempt. However, as part of the process for determining positions eligible for reassignment to academic staff, HR reviewed the actual duties of each position to ensure they actually met the criteria to be designated as FLSA-exempt. One-third of Colleges’ Custodial Services Supervisor positions did not meet that criteria and were determined to be non-exempt from the FLSA overtime provisions. In actuality, those positions should never had been designated as FLSA-exempt, but there was no way to properly designate it under OSER. The way the policy is amended it sounds like it includes all FLSA-exempt employment, but doesn’t clarify what that means.

The other problem is that the salary threshold for FLSA-exempt status is changing pretty drastically so a number of current academic staff will no longer be considered FLSA exempt and will paid on an hourly, rather than salary basis. I think the wording will make it confusing as to whether the policy applies to that group of non-exempt academic staff employees.
I’ve suggested some language (attached). I apologize that it’s a lot longer than what was proposed. Personally, I always think that the simpler, the better; however, because we’re talking about a very specific exception to the definition I couldn’t come up with simple language that didn’t have holes or leave too much room for interpretation.

Diane

From: Lampe, Greg
Sent: Sunday, November 22, 2015 9:05 AM
To: Lund, Diane <diane.lund@uwex.uwc.edu>
Subject: FW: Approved UWC Senate, Faculty Council, and Academic Staff Council Items

Hi, Diane,

Could you please take a look at the attached policy revision to ASPP #804? I would like to know your opinion before I recommend to Chancellor Sandeen to approve the change. If you are in early on Monday morning, I might stop in then to see what you think.

Best wishes,

Greg

Regarding elections
The following seats become available at the end of this academic year:

Luke Dock
Mike Winkler
Melissa Smiley
Troy Schoultz

Additionally, we have one vacant seat for a 2015-17 term (previously held by Tony Landowski). Therefore, we have a total of 5 seats to fill. Nomination statements need to be sent to Dave Carlson (dave.carlson@uwc.edu), chair of the ASNEC, by March 1.

Regarding policy review
Regionalization means that, once again, we need to review all Senate policies to update their language accordingly. In particular, any references to “campus” or “campus dean” need to be replaced with language that represents the regional structure. Holly Hassel, the SSC chair, wants to conduct the revision over the summer and have it in place by the start of AY 2016. We need to review the following policies and note any language that needs to be revised: 320; 323; 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 801, 802, 803, and 804. Note that the 300-level policies will need to be reviewed in conjunction with the FPSC.

[End]