

Minutes: 170207 (approved October 17, 2017 at the Fall 2017 Faculty Meeting)

SPRING FACULTY MEETING 2017 AGENDA

Tuesday, Feb. 7, 2017 3:30-5:00pm University Center, Room 275B

Meeting called to order, 3:37.

Approval of Minutes.

Purpose: To review and approve the meeting minutes [Hartwick]:

- Feb. 16, 2016 Spring Faculty Meeting minutes. Motion to approve from Simmons/Levy-Navarro with editorial amendments. Approved by voice vote.
- Oct. 18, 2016 Fall Faculty Meeting minutes. Motion to approve by Ossers/Brady. Approved by voice vote.

Organization Committee Report with Introduced Motions [Hayes]

Hayes noted that he believes these had passed previously, but no clear record could be found. Background described below, but in addition the Financial Aids committee can't really have any influence because the government controls financial aid.

1. To change the Constitution of the Faculty, Article VI, Section 2, Membership, #2 to the text as follows.

Twenty (20) constituency senators, 5 from each constituency. For Senate purposes there shall be four constituencies. They are the four colleges of the University. Any faculty member, who holds an appointment that lies outside an academic department, shall vote in the constituency in which he or she is tenured or in which he or she holds probationary appointment status. For the purpose of governance, faculty members with an appointment in the library shall be considered as members of the Arts and Communication constituency. The twenty (20) constituency senators shall be elected at large by and from each constituency.

Hayes entertained a motion to approve. Kumpaty/Weston so moved. Passed by voice vote.

2. To dissolve the Financial Aids Committee.

The Organization Committee voted unanimously to dissolve the Financial Aids Committee. Hayes noted that the committee has not met for at least 10 years. He indicated that there is non need for the committee since its scope is dictated by rules established by the federal government. He argued that the removal of the committee is sensible and necessary since we do not need useless committees in the faculty constitution.

Herriot/Davis moved to approve. Passed by voice vote.

Report from Chancellor Kopper

Purpose: To provide information on the Biennial Budget for 2017-2019.

Chancellor had just received a memo from Governor's Office with updates. Budget process outlined for the faculty on PowerPoint. Governor has been making announcements today in

Draft Minutes: 170207 (to be approved at the Fall 2017 Faculty Meeting)

anticipation of his budget address tomorrow. His proposal goes to the Joint Finance Committee, who have ability to rewrite it. Their version goes to full legislature, then for the governor's signature.

Chancellor has been talking to legislators and mentioning the importance of a pay plan. The UW-System Strategic Plan is relevant for how budget increases will be distributed. Regents recommended a fully funded 2+2 pay plan—campuses often cover 30%. BoR also conveyed to legislature that this funding won't cover recent years without pay plan. Even the proposed plan would not have our faculty's pay near the national averages.

Kopper has UWW "Coffee at the Capitol" events to meet with UWW grads working in govt. UWS President Cross also asked the Chancellor to be part of a group to educate legislators and public on what UW institutions do.

UWW's GPR per FTE continues to be the lowest in UWS—50% lower than the next lowest campus and just 1/8th of the highest. Administrative proportion of total expenses is lower than UWS, regional, and national averages.

Governor's announcements: 5% tuition cut proposed. Some legislators not entirely convinced. Gov. proposes funding the cut at this point. He's also proposing allowing students to opt out of segregated fees. Wants to provide 3yr degree completion options, increased funding for flex option (competency based), new flex option programs, and doubling number of credits that can transfer from technical colleges. He's proposing that the funding increase be tied to "performance indicators" he selects. "Faculty Work Load" study proposed, as well as internship-type experiences required for graduation.

Post Tenure Review Policy [Hartwick, Elrod, Reed]

Purpose: To provide an update on UW-Whitewater's Post-Tenure Review Policy.

Faculty Senate Chair, referring to a handout (which provided an overview of the process, examples of UW System comments, and a tentative plan) described the status of UWW PTR policy. The current policy represented countless hours of work and collaboration of a number of campus governance actors. The policy was written with scrupulous attention to conforming to RPD 20-9 as well as later to the amendment passed by the BoR (December 2016). The Faculty Senate Chair also commended the administration for their collaborative work on the latest and most current document and their defense of it. The Chancellor commended Provost Elrod and Paige Reed on their efforts, as she has asked them work on this policy on her behalf. The Chancellor also thanked the faculty members for their collaborative work.

UW System provided feedback of a more general nature. It did not provide specific instances that violated RPD 20-9, nor did it provide specific feedback on how to revise the document so as to conform to RPD 20-9. The feedback, the Faculty Senate Chair explained, was most frequently about style and length, which led to the assumption that it might merely be the level of detail which is the problem. The Chair observed that UWM's policy, passed by the Board of Regents, has the same elements as ours, including a sufficiency review committee, and UW-Madison's policy, which has just been vetted by UW-System was in many ways a generalized version of our own. The Chair directed faculty to the Faculty Senate website, where they can read the current passed (12.22.16) version of the policy.

Draft Minutes: 170207 (to be approved at the Fall 2017 Faculty Meeting)

Noting that this situation might seem to have us at an impasse, since the comments were so general and not grounded in BoR policies (RPD 20-9 nor the December 2016 amendments to the policy) as to be unhelpful, the Faculty Senate Chair described an agreement between faculty and administration, in which a general policy would be passed, which would be modelled on these policies – perhaps especially the newly drafted UW-Madison one – even as the provisions inherent to the currently passed (12.22.16) versions of the PTR policy would be adopted as our on-campus procedures. This is consistent with what other campuses will need to do, as most, if not all, of the campuses will need to develop campus-specific procedures for implementing the BoR approved PTR policies.

The Provost characterized UW System’s feedback as oriented primarily toward winning BoR approval. The Provost and Paige Reed spoke of the benefit of having two policies – one which has yet to be finalized but which offers broad brushes, modelled on other policies, and the other that offers our campus-specific policies. A draft document written by Paige Reed and not yet considered by faculty governance is currently being considered by UW System, Paige Reed explained. This draft document pulls out details from the current policy as passed by governance and generalizes its scope in order to win BoR approval. The Faculty Senate Chair indicated that the faculty permitted Paige Reed to draft a version for the UW-System to consider in the hopes that this might help resolve the current impasse, but he noted that the faculty have the primary responsibility for writing their own rules in faculty personnel matter such as PTR.

A faculty member asked for clarification about the process going forward. More specifically, she asked whether the intention was to pass the two documents simultaneously: the broad policy and the campus-specific procedure policy as drafted and approved through the governance process. The Provost replied that that had always been the intention. Another faculty member asked what would be the status of the two policies. Would both have legitimacy, and would the Board of Regents “allow” the latter? Reed explained that it seemed that the Board of Regents wished to pass generalized policies, which necessitated the development of campus-specific procedures. Like other campus procedures, there would be no reason for the Board of Regents to review campus-specific procedures. There is certainly no expectations that such procedures receive BoR approval, she added. The Provost added that the benefit of the generalized policy and campus-specific procedures is that minor details can be modified without requiring board approval (calendar, etc.).

The Faculty Senate Chair rejoined that the actions of the UW System has given the university and faculty cause for concern. Even the solution of adopting two policies is far from an ideal one, and one which at the end of the day, the faculty may choose to reject. UW System’s changes in policy and changing demands have put the university in a difficult position. The generic policy may be preferable over the imposition of one that was arrived at outside of the governance process. The UW System’s actions makes one wonder whether the UW System is acting in good faith. He hopes the faculty might find it acceptable, however, to adopt the generalized policy as long as the detailed policy, as passed through governance, is instantiated at the same time. Faculty Senate Chair turned to the Provost to seek her agreement on this point, which she affirmed.

Draft Minutes: 170207 (to be approved at the Fall 2017 Faculty Meeting)

The Chancellor also thanked all involved, and agreed that the process has represented the best of shared governance. The Faculty Senate Chair expressed a similar sentiment about their collaboration thus far and expressed the hope that the spirit would continue into the future.

UW-Whitewater Strategic Plan [Elrod]

Purpose: To provide an update on the Strategic Plan.

Copies of the Strategic Plan (SP) were at the door—copy of what at this point is the final policy is on the Provost’s website. She noted it has revised Mission, Vision, Values, Goals, and Objectives. She and the Chancellor thanked all involved and invited additional comments and suggestions.

Academic Plan [Herriot, Travis]

Purpose: To review and discuss the attached draft Academic Plan.

Herriot (Co-Chair of the Academic Plan Committee) described the evolution of the plan. Initially proposed by then Provost Kopper, as there was previously no academic plan. A draft version of the Academic Plan will be posted soon, as the BoR requires that all academic/program proposals be linked to one. He drew attention to the projected numbers they were working from when writing a draft last academic year. They then took it to the constituency groups for feedback and revision. The Academic Plan Committee reconvened last fall to revise for final feedback, revision, and approval process. He noted that it’s more of a values and principles document rather than specific, concrete goals like the Strategic Plan.

Herriot drew special attention to the five-year program array reviews and the speculative “growth areas” listing. Chancellor noted she initiated the process by meeting with FSEC.

A faculty member asked where the current draft of the Academic Plan can be found. Cook noted the draft is posted on Provost’s site—academic initiatives—so they could link to it in a couple of program proposals. Herriot noted it can and probably will be updated.

A faculty member asked if it applies to graduate programs, too. Herriot noted there was input from the group on behalf of graduate programs. Travis noted that page 4 in particular focuses in grad programs and outreach. A faculty member asked if Library was consulted, and she suggested it would be useful for them to know how they would connect with it. Provost Elrod noted this is a good time to make such suggestions.

Hartwick noted how receptive the committee and its chairs over the years (Cook, Travis) were to improved faculty representation, since that is technically the responsibility of the faculty. Cook, Travis, and Kopper suggested that it had improved the process.

One faculty asked if, given the reduced protections for faculty being pushed politically, the faculty’s importance could be at least restored in a document like this, especially since it is so directly the realm of faculty. He noted the rhetorical weight of the document is on workforce and employer needs rather than on faculty direction and expertise. Goals 8 and 9 seem especially relevant. Something like “societal demands” is easily manipulated and abused. Herriot was thankful for the comment, but also noted there was disagreement on campus about just that issue.

Draft Minutes: 170207 (to be approved at the Fall 2017 Faculty Meeting)

Hartwick asked how people could submit their suggestion. Elrod indicated that she may offer a survey. Travis noted they plan to consult the respective governance groups. Hartwick suggested faculty give their feedback to their FS reps or to FSEC members, and indicated, that the Faculty Senate will vote on the Academic Plan, when it is completed. Further, noting that an academic plan focuses on “academic and educational activities,” and thus, clearly falls with the responsibility of the faculty.

Herriot/Brady moved to adjourn. Chancellor Kopper closed the meeting, 4:56pm.

Submitted by McGuigan, Hartwick