

Faculty Senate
Meeting of February 9, 1999
2:15 p.m. in Room 219N of the James R. Connor University Center

Call to Order: Chair Erdmann called the meeting to order at 2:15 p.m.

1. Roll Call: Senators present: Anderson, Bradley, Bren, Cartwright, Clements, de Onis, Eamon, Ellenwood, Epps, Erdmann, Freiberg, Ghosh, Griffin, Hanson, Heiss, Hogan, Huang, Karges, Klug, Kozlowicz, Longrie, Macur, Marks, Molloy, Monfils, Ossers, Parks, Phanord, Powell, Rottet, Schauer, Stinson, Teske, Topp.
Senators absent: Weston (notified secretary), Yin.
2. Approval of minutes from December 8, 1998 meeting.
Corrections: Senator Molloy was excused.
Hogan/Epps noted that item 3.b. of the December 8 minutes (Report of the Faculty Personnel Rules Committee) as recorded was incorrect and that the following be substituted for the record:

I DEFINITIONS

- A. Constituency: Any of the five faculty constituencies: Technology and Information Resources and the colleges of Arts and Communications, Business and Economics, Education, and Letters and Sciences.
- B. Dean: The administrative head of a constituency. The Assistant Vice Chancellor for Technology and Information Resources performs the functions of a dean for the faculty in the administrative unit, Technology and Information Resources.
- C. Department: The organizational unit within the constituency that has the responsibility for making recommendations and decisions related to recruitment, reappointment, tenure, promotion, and merit.
- D. Procedure: A rule that governs how standards shall be applied in making recruitment, initial appointment, retention, and promotion decisions.
- E. Standard: The level of performance to be met.

IV. DEVELOPMENT OF STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION

- A. General Policy
- B. University Principles for Promotion
- C. Responsibilities of the Department Promotion Committees (DPC)
 1. Substantive
 - a. Write department promotion standards that are consistent with the constituency standards and the mission and goals of the department.
 - b. Submit department standards to the Constituency Promotion Committee (CPC).
 - (1) Negotiate differences between the CPC and the DPC.
 - (2) Submit unresolved differences between the CPC and the DPC to the constituency tenured faculty for resolution.
 - c. Report all decisions as specified in C.1.b.(1) and (2). to the constituency dean for review.
 2. Procedural
 - a. Define any elements of the format for submitting reappointment and/or promotion materials that are unique to the department. These elements must be consistent with the format particulars established by the University Promotion Committee.
 - b. Delineate the structure of reappointment and/or promotion reviews.
 - c. Describe the procedures that the department tenured faculty is to follow when making a promotion decision.
- D. Responsibilities of the Constituency Promotion Committees (CPC)
 1. Substantive
 - a. In consultation with the dean, write constituency standards that are consistent with the university standards and the mission and goals of the constituency.
 - b. Review department standards to appraise the compatibility of these standards with

- the constituency standards.
- c. Review department standards to determine the parity among them.
- d. Consult with department promotion committees to negotiate adjustments in standards and procedures to achieve parity and compatibility among constituency's and departments' standards and procedures.
- e. Report to the dean reviews as specified in D.1.b. and c.
 - (1) Negotiate differences between the constituency committee and the dean.
 - (2) Submit unresolved differences between the constituency committee and the dean to the constituency tenured faculty for resolution.
- f. Report all decisions as specified in D.1.b., c., and e. to the UPSC for review.
- 2. Procedural: Prescribe the format for submitting department standards and procedures.
- E. Responsibilities of the University Promotion Standards Committee (UPSC)
 - 1. Substantive
 - a. Write university standards that are consistent with the university mission, established personnel policies. Constituency standards shall be consistent with university standards.
 - b. Review constituency standards to appraise the compatibility of these the university standards.
 - c. Review constituency standards to determine the parity among them.
 - d. Consult with constituency promotion committees to negotiate adjustments in standards and procedures to achieve parity and compatibility among constituencies' and university standards and procedures.
 - e. Submit unresolved differences between the UPSC and constituency promotion committees to the Faculty Senate for resolution.
 - f. Report to the provost reviews as specified in E.1.b. and c. Differences between the UPSC and the provost are submitted to the Faculty Senate for resolution.
 - g. Present decisions and recommendations to the Faculty Senate.
 - 2. Procedural
 - a. Establish timelines
 - b. Identify the types of evidence required
 - c. Prescribe the format for retention, tenure, and promotion material files.

For the Faculty Handbook By-Laws:

UNIVERSITY PROMOTION STANDARDS COMMITTEE

I. FUNCTIONS AND PROCEDURES

- A. The University Promotions Standards Committee (UPSC) shall
 - 1. Write university promotion standards and procedures that guide constituency committees in writing their tenure and promotion standards and procedures.
 - 2. Review constituency level policies, standards and procedures.
 - 3. Negotiate differences with constituency committees.
 - 4. Submit unresolved differences with constituency committees to the Faculty Senate for resolution.
 - 5. Submit its decisions to the Faculty Senate for review.
 - 6. Distribute reports of Faculty Senate decisions concerning tenure and promotion policies, standards, and procedures to all affected parties.
- B. The UPSC shall consider recommendations for standards and procedures from departments, constituency committees, and the provost.
- C. Differences between the UPSC and the provost shall be submitted to the Faculty Senate for resolution.
- D. The UPSC shall resolve disputes concerning assignment of educational code.
- E. The UPSC shall distribute copies of its minutes, decisions, and reports to the Faculty Senate and Executive Committee, the Faculty Personnel Rules Committee, the provost, chancellor, and the University Archives.
- F. Decisions of the UPSC shall be based upon majority vote.

II. MEMBERSHIP AND TERMS

- A. Two tenured faculty members are elected from and by each constituency.
 - B. Members shall serve four year terms.
 - C. Terms shall be staggered at two year intervals within the membership of each constituency.
 - D. Mid-term vacancies shall be filled by special constituency election.
-

With the corrections as indicated above, the minutes passed by unanimous consent.

3. Reports:

a. Report of the Search & Screen for the Chancellor (Don Sorensen, Chair): The Search & Screen Committee was appointed by President Lyall and is composed of 18 people representing the University System, UW-Whitewater, and the Whitewater community. The services of an outside consultant have been engaged. Advertisements have appeared in the Chronicle of Higher Education, Wisconsin State Journal, the Milwaukee Journal-Sentinel, etc. So far, 24 applications have been received. The Search function of the committee will be closed on or about February 26. Screening of applicants will initially be held in Secret to protect the anonymity of the candidates. The last five or six finalists will be publicly identified and introduced to the campus. The new chancellor should be in place by July 1, 1999.

Questions/Answers
How are the outside consultants to be paid? They will be paid a fee based on the chancellor's first year's salary.
How will the finalist be given to President Lyall? The names of the final candidates will be given to President Lyall unranked.

b. Report of the University Curriculum Committee

i. November 20, 1998. Monfils/Hogan moved that the transmittal be approved. Passed. (FS989-20)

ii. December 4, 1998. Cartwright/Powell moved that the transmittal be approved. Passed. (FS989-21)

iii. January 22, 1999. Ossers/Epps moved that the transmittal be approved including item #9, the undergraduate grading policy. Parks/Ghosh moved to divide the question - Item #9 of the transmittal of U.C.C. action dated 1/22/99. Hogan/Hanson moved to table Item #9 until the 3/9/99 Faculty Senate meeting. Yes-23; No-7. The original motion, exclusive of Item #9, was approved. (FS989-22)

c. Report of the Chair on the promotion process for 1999/2000 and beyond:

i. Since late August there have been four meetings including members of UPSC, CPC, and PRC, campus administration, "they" committee

ii. Last Wednesday, there was a meeting among the UPSC and CPC's, set up by Fran Hill of the UPSC

iii. The PRC's revisions presented to the Senate in November clarified the role and responsibilities of the UPSC in revising the promotions process

iv. The PRC's revisions presented to the Senate in December clarified roles and responsibilities of the Constituency Promotion Committees (CPC) and the Department Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion

Committees

(DRTPC)

vi. Where are we now?

(1) UPSC is developing standards and formats and is communicating with CPC chairs about these as they are being developed

(2) all or some of the CPC's are preparing to accomplish their tasks-especially now that their role in '98/'99 promotions is done and UPSC work is well underway

(3) DRTPC's might begin considering how most efficiently to accomplish their tasks when they see the UPSC and CPC's work.

Report of the Chair on Salary Plan for 1999/2000 (permitted as a special agenda item by unanimous consent of the Senate)

On conditionally approving the salary plan (FS989-9), the Chancellor asked (in a Nov. 18 memo) that "market adjustments from salary plan dollars [be] restricted to individuals in ranks and disciplines under CUPA target averages." and that "[i]ndividuals in ranks and disciplines exceeding CUPA averages may be approved for base adjustments

but those adjustments will be funded by colleges as was the case last year." The Senate requested clarifications and both the Salary Committee and the Executive committee discussed their concern that individuals be able to request adjustments in inequitable salaries even if their discipline and rank are at or above CUPA average. In conference on February 2 with members of the Salary Committee and the Executive Committee, the Chancellor maintained his stand above, but claimed that adjustments may be requested by or for individual faculty by faculty members themselves, Department Chairs, College Salary Committees, or Deans and that such a request may go to any level, and that claims of pay inequities will be considered on the merits of the case, but any funds for adjustments must come from college funds (or other available institutional funds)-as had occurred last year. When asked about the claim that colleges lack sufficient funds for base adjustments even in warranted cases, the Chancellor claimed that, if necessary, he would discuss the matter with the dean and identify funds.

d. Request of the Memorial Committee:

- i. Edgar Schwager Memorial Drive.
Anderson/Macur motion to approve the Memorial Committee's recommendation: part i, 1-3. Motion passed. (**FS989-23**)
- ii. David L. Kachel Gymnasium. de Onis/Epps moved to approve. Passed. (**FS989-24**)

e. Report on the Strategic Planning & Budget Committee:
(S. Ghosh) The essence of Senator Ghosh's report may be found on the net at <http://www.uww.edu/SPBC/>

f. Report of the Faculty Senate Personnel Rules Committee:
(Epps, Bren)

- i. Revision of UW-W VI-7,(f),7 regarding abstentions in personnel decisions.
Epps/Macur moved to accept the report of PRC.
Hanson/Ghosh moved to amend by adding after #5 "as defined in UWS 8.03, 8.04, Regent Policy 91-8, and UWW University Handbook Section VI-V)"
Amendment Approved.

Teske/Longrie moved to amend by inserting "shall be recorded as an abstention but" in the last sentence of the revision. Passed.

The Original motion as amended passed. (**FS989-25**)
The motion now reads as follows:

An affirmative decision requires the affirmative votes of a majority of the members participating in the review. A participant is defined as any individual who is a qualified decision-maker or a tenured member of the department and who is

1. free of disqualifying conflicts of interest (as defined in UWS 8.03, 8.04, Regent Policy 91-8, and UWW University Handbook Section VI-V); and
2. present during the review and discussion of the candidate's documented performance.

A participant's abstention shall be recorded as an abstention, but has the effect of a negative vote.

- ii. Process of Appeals for promotions, 1998/1999 only: Ossers/Epps moved to approve:

Whereas, in the promotion procedures for 1998-1999, applications for promotion are reviewed in turn by the department, department chair, constituency promotion committee, dean (or constituency director), and provost;
And whereas, each individual or committee reviewing applications for promotion makes a recommendation, which recommendation is then forwarded to the next reviewer; that is, all promotion applications are forwarded through

each step (whether recommendations are positive, negative, or mixed);

Be it resolved:

- (1) that for the current year only, 1998-1999, appeals of promotion decisions be directed to the Faculty Appeals and Grievance

Committee (per

University Handbook Sec.

- VI-M [pp. 10 and 11]); and
- (2) that such appeals may be made once the Provost has completed decisions independent of consultation with the Chancellor; and
- (3) that such appeals must be made within 15 days of receiving notification of the Provost's decision; and
- (4) that the Chancellor shall withhold any decision on pending appeals until the appeals panel formed from the Faculty Appeals and Grievance Committee has made its report to the Chancellor; and
- (5) that (specifications in University Handbook VI-M, para. 1. notwithstanding) when making such appeals, appellants may present information and/or argument in response to recommendations made by any or all

reviewers; and

- (6) that for 1998/1999 appeals of reappointment and tenure decisions shall occur under the provisions of UWS 3.08 and UWW VI-F, Chapt. III, (4)-(7).

Passed. (FS989-26)

4. New Business

- a. L&S Senators were to select a new representative to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. The Chair declared a recess from 3:55-4:00 p.m. L&S Senators indicated Richard Schauer to serve on the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.
- b. Honorary Degrees - Withdrawn
- c. Resolution on out-of-class time per credit (D. Marks) Marks/Parks moved to following:
Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate strongly encourages all faculty to include a statement in their course syllabi reminding students that the University Handbook (Sec. V-C, p.1, Rev. August 1, 1992) requires instructors to assign, on average, a minimum of the equivalent of two hours of out-of-class work for every hour of class time. This is the minimum requirement for the typical student seeking the typical grade in the typical course.
Stinson/Epps moved to amend by striking "strongly" in the first sentence.
Phanord/Ghosh motion to table the main motion. Failed. The vote on the amendment failed. The main motion (as printed above) failed (Yes 10; No 16.).
- d. Other New Business (no action)
Senator Schauer asked Provost Prior if the ad hoc Committee formed to complete the personnel decisions for HPRC will be monetarily compensated? Provost Prior claimed that such compensation was not intended or discussed, but that staff support from the Provost's office is available to assist the ad hoc committee.
Senator Schauer asked if tenured members of HPRC are content with this policy? The Provost claimed that he understood them to be so.
Senator Schauer asked if it is legal to exclude tenured members if HPRC in personnel considerations. Provost Prior responded that UW System legal council indicated that it is legal to exclude tenured faculty of HPRC.
Senator Schauer asked who will perform the counseling function with probationary faculty? Provost Prior explained that the matter is not yet determined and that as of now, there is no clear view of how to help the department of HPRC resume its personnel processes.

Ghosh/Teske moved to adjourn. Passed. Adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

