Members Present:

Members Absent:
Mohammad Alasaghein, Cindy Albert, Jason Anderson, Jana Armstrong, Rose Marie Avin, Janice Bogstad, Maria Carvalho, Lisa Coen, Dan Gharrity, Beth Hellwig, Phil Huelsbeck, Cheryl Lapp, Colleen Marchwick, Leah Olson-McBride, John Pollitz, Manda Riehl, Audrey Robinson, Carter Smith, Pedro Sottile, Dan Stevenson, Odawa White

Guests:
Mike Carney, Debra Jansen, Reiko Shinno, Ashley Sukhu

The regular meeting of University Senate was called to order by Chair Freymiller at 3:05 p.m. on Tuesday, October 11, 2016 in the Dakota Ballroom of Davies Center.

1) Approval of the October 11, 2016 University Senate minutes
   • Approved as amended
     • Two people in attendance were added as guests

2) Administrator Remarks – Chancellor Schmidt
   • Celebrating Latin American Studies week
   • Ceremonial tree planting sponsored by Office of Sustainability
     • There are now 107 varieties of trees on campus; will eventually open an arboretum
   • Received final approval from Building Commission to self-finance renovation of Towers
     • Work will begin next summer
   • Many comments were received by Heather Kretz from future students and their families about how welcome they were made to feel when they visited campus
   • Freshman applications up by 4%; still too early to speculate on enrollment numbers, although deposit rates are double from last year
   • Still working with UW System on how we can accomplish compensation proposal
     • Merit increase just added to statute; Chancellor would like to see it more broadly distributed
     • Working groups have been meeting to determine how to do this the right way
       • Lowest paid workers should be compensated
       • We need to tie it to our strategic goals
       • Resources have not changed; perhaps by third year enrollment will have risen allowing us to do some base increases for merit
   • Chancellor Schmidt has been meeting with legislative candidates, talking to them about budget requests, bonding, greater flexibilities and pay plan requests
   • UW System may propose some type of compensation plan
   • State agencies are reporting that they cannot keep their best people
3) Reports  
   a) Report from University Senate Chair Freymiller  
      • Welcomed Steven Fink and Bao Vue as new senators  
      • Chancellor Schmidt has approved the following Senate actions:  
         • To change language in the FASRP (page 106) regarding formation of search committees for Directors and Dean of Students  
         • To close the study abroad program at City University of Hong Kong  
         • To develop a summer semester program with American College of Thessaloniki, Greece  
         • To rename the Information Systems major to Comprehensive Major: Information Systems  
         • For those senators who left immediately after the last Senate meeting was adjourned, you missed a wonderful program celebrating shared governance at UWEC  
         • Comments by former Vice Chairs Andrea Gapko and Linda (Spaeth) Presley and former Chairs Mort Sipress, Marty Wood and Susan Harrison provided a nostalgic look at the accomplishments of the University Senate since the 1990s  
         • Reception that followed offered an opportunity to reminisce with these past leaders of shared governance about some of their fondest memories  
   
   b) Executive Committee Report  
      • On October 18, members of the EDI Implementation team met with the Senate Executive Committee to request that the University Senate endorse a resolution in support of the EDI Implementation Plan  
      • After considerable discussion about the resolution, Executive Committee suggested that the resolution be returned to the EDI Implementation team for language changes  
      • That resolution could come to the full Senate in the near future  

4) Unfinished Business  
   a) Second Reading: Motion from the Faculty Personnel Committee  

   Post-Tenure Review (amended)  

   After the motion was presented, it was determined that there were errors in referencing Section f.4), which describes the Post-Tenure Review Subcommittee of the Department Personnel Committee (DPC), rather than Section f.3), which provides a Definition of Review Categories. Without objection, references to Section f.4) will be replaced with Section f.3) in these locations:  
      f.5); a) Role of the Department Chair in Post-Tenure Review; f.6); a) Role of the Dean in Post-Tenure Review; f.7); a) Role of the Provost in Post-Tenure Review; f.8); a) Role of the Chancellor in Post-Tenure Review.  

   Without objection, those changes will be made to the motion.  

   After the motion was presented, the Chair of the Faculty Personnel Committee requested that Section f.9); a) Post-Tenure Review of the Department Chair be amended to strike the phrase “and advising” from the evaluation criteria.  
   
   • It is the desire of the Faculty Personnel Committee to support this amendment  
   • Since this request comes from a Senate committee no second is required  

   Debate on an amendment to Section f.9); a) Post-Tenure Review of the Department Chair to strike the phrase “and advising” from the evaluation criteria  
   
   • Advising cannot be included in Post-Tenure Review because the BOR only allows us to include the categories of teaching, scholarship, and service  
   • Advising will need to be moved into Service; FPC is working to redefine that section in FASRP  

   VOTE on AMENDMENT: PASSED
Continued debate on the motion as amended

- Proposal goes far beyond what the BOR requires
- Proposal does not need to engage administrators beyond department level
- If Regents want things in the policy, then they should state them more explicitly
- Role of the Department Chair in section f.5); a) needs to be consistent
- Should be clarification on what submitted materials are required when something is put forward
  - Inconsistency in what materials need to be submitted for review
  - Intent was to allow departments to make that decision
- Faculty who “meet expectations” cannot enter the salary adjustment pool
  - If you are doing your job, then you should be eligible for a pay increase
  - This is up to the Compensation Committee to include it in any Pay Plan proposal
- DPC is not being removed from the process, but rather they are initiating it
- Any proposal that halts the review process at the level of the Department Chair could be rejected or re-written by the Board of Regents
  - BOR could change it based on recommendations by UW System Legal
  - There is no appeal process if the BORrewrite it
- We seem to be rushing this though Senate just to get it through the bureaucracy; we should put forward a proposal that is right and appropriate
- We can modify language later if we pass proposal now; we wait to see what other institutions do
- Future modifications may not be subject to BOR approval; may only need approval of Chancellor
- If proposal only had Department Chairs with final authority, then it would be rejected by BOR
- If System Legal decides to rewrite our Post-Tenure Review language, then they might also edit other policies in the FASRP that aren’t even related
- The ¾ rule is something FPC considered, but the ¾ rule applies to tenure and not to any other actions by the DPC
  - When it comes to departments where the ¾ rule may be difficult to obtain, FPC considered who should make the final decision
  - Decision is with the Chancellor; remediation is with the Department Chair, which separates the sanctions
  - Dean will consult with Department Chair and Dean will decide whether remediation is completed

**MOTION to postpone further debate until after we dispense with new business**, seconded

**MOTION by Senator Erger to make the changes as bolded**, seconded

f. Faculty: Post-Tenure Review (RPD 20-9) (US 10/16)

1) The overriding purpose of the periodic, post-tenure review is tenured faculty development; such review shall not infringe on existing faculty rights and protections (with the exception noted in f.2), including those of academic freedom.

2) All policies, procedures, and definitions for post-tenure review, unless otherwise specified, are taken from RPD 20-9. The reviews conducted and remediation plans developed in accordance with this policy are subject to the complaint process set forth in Chapter UWS 6.01, Wis. Admin Code, but are not subject to the grievance process set forth in Chapter UWS 6.02, Wis. Admin. Code. Cases where failed remediation leads to a recommendation of termination for cause are subject to Chapter UWS 4.01, Wis. Admin. Code. The post tenure review process is separate and distinct from all other review processes, including all annual, salary, and promotion reviews.
Debate on amendments

- Difference between a complaint and a grievance is difficult to understand
- Handout was provided for clarification from Reiko Shinno, Chair of Faculty Complaint, Grievance, and Termination Review Committee

Vote on amendment: PASSED

MOTION by Senator Erger to change language in the motion from five days to seven days in f.4), e), 2; f.5), a); f.6), a); f.7), a); f.10), d); f.10), e), 2, seconded

Debate on amendment

- Seven days does not include holidays or Sundays if Sunday falls on the last day of the period

Vote on amendment: PASSED

Continued debate on the motion as amended

- Not known how this policy compares with universities outside of Wisconsin
- About half of the other UW campuses let the Chancellor make the final decision
  - UW Oshkosh is proposing language that designates final authority to its Colleges
- How could this policy impact future searches?
- Board of Regents requires that we submit our proposal to them no later than November 15th
  - FPC could not get a revised motion back to the full Senate in time for another vote, so the best solution would be to amend the current motion today so we can vote on it
- The language in this proposal would allow us to write our departmental policies where we could determine that “meets expectations” is based on the standard work week and that all work done should be considered
- We are here as part of shared governance to have a voice into what our policy says
- We need to send something to the BOR and this is the most effective policy for protecting faculty

MOTION to MOVE the previous question, seconded

VOTE to MOVE the Previous Question: FAILS

Continued debate on amended motion

- We are adverse to making changes on this campus
- The work of the FPC is respected
- Prefer that we pass something today and then make changes later if necessary

VOTE on MOTION as AMENDED: PASSED

5) New Business
   a) First Reading: Motion from the Budget and Compensation Committees
      Merger of Compensation and Budget Committees

Debate

- None

Motion to suspend the rules to vote on this today, seconded

Vote on Motion to Suspend the Rules to Vote on this Today: PASSED

Vote on Motion 53-BC-01/53-CC-01: PASSED
6) Announcements
   • The next meeting of the University Senate is November 8th, 2016 in the Woodland Theatre of the Davies Center.
   • Recognition for Senator Peterson and the FPC members for their work on this

Without objection, meeting adjourned at 4:34 p.m.

Submitted by,

Tanya Kenney
Secretary to the University Senate