



Agenda: December 1, 2021 (12:30-1:45)

<b>Present</b>	Jessica Berge, Cody Busch, Susan Chandler, Nina Denis, Ciera Edwards, Patricia Fragola, Michael Gorman, Christine Hoover, Brenda Johansen, Becky Jones, Rick Pues, Huckleberry Rahr, David Reinhart, Terry Tumbarello, JP Villavicencio, Jessica Walz, Abbie Windsor
<b>Excused</b>	none
<b>Priority Business</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meeting called to order at 12:31 p.m.</li> <li>Review/Approval of November 10, 2021 Minutes. Motion by Christine Hoover, second by Sue Chandler. No discussion- passed unanimously.</li> </ul>
<b>Chair's Report</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Welcome</li> <li>Guest Speaker, Heather Chermak, Registrar, to discuss 2023-24 Academic Calendar (see Appendix A- 2023-2024 Academic Calendar). Heather notes that this calendar is a little easier than past years, with a start after Labor Day and ending the spring term on May 10 with commencement on May 11. This may seem early, but that's how the calendar fell. Per state statute, we cannot start until after September 1<sup>st</sup>, which is why fall tends to have fewer teaching days than spring. Huckleberry notes that 79 teaching days seems very short, and Heather replies that this does seem short, but there have been shorter semesters in the past. This keeps finals week as Monday through Friday. Terry notes that the semester seems to end early in December, and Huckleberry agrees. Christine notes in the chat that, for comparison, the 21-22 school year has 82 fall days and 88 spring teaching days. Abbie asks how this affects curriculum? Rick notes that he plans all courses for the shorter term (typically fall), which allows him to have additional flexibility or an additional topic in the spring rather than trying to compress curriculum in the fall. Huckleberry notes that more people take math in the fall, which also typically has fewer days, and that the department just tries to take the extra days in the spring to drill down on a topic, and that fall is just always tricky in order to cover material. Sue notes that fall music classes are often the heavy lift, and that looking at 79 teaching days makes her nervous. Terry notes that he doesn't think there's a solution here, because of the Labor Day requirement, but that every single year it becomes clearer that by Thanksgiving, everyone (students and staff) need a break, but we aren't able to do one because of the start requirement. Mike notes in the chat that this always happens. Christine notes in the chat that she follows Rick's plan of structuring things around the fall schedule. David asks about the Labor Day/move-in weekend and how classes beginning at 8 am the Tuesday after Labor Day will affect students (Terry and Heather note that this is common) and whether or not starting on that Wednesday would be abnormal (Heather notes that may happen if September 2 falls on a Wednesday). Christine notes that the Monday/Wednesday classes don't meet until Wednesday of week 2, and Monday night classes don't meet until week 3 for 8-week classes, which makes the first 8 weeks difficult for students. David asks about the grade due date- is there any way to give more time just to the grading period for</li> </ul>



Agenda: December 1, 2021 (12:30-1:45)

	<p>instructors? Heather answers that grades drive a lot of office processes (financial aid, academic standing, athletic eligibility, etc.) that have to be done quickly in the days after grades are finalized, which also bump up against holidays. Mike notes in the chat that this is another discussion Rock has a lot- the tension between grading final papers and the time needed by the registrar often leads to a compromise that is tough on everyone. Heather notes that feedback has been that people prefer to have Monday through Friday finals, even if that seems to shorten deadlines.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Joint Resolution on tuition reimbursement- has been passed by Faculty Senate, and is schedule to go to WSG next week. There has been a lot of dialogue around the registration deadline, and it was decided to keep that out of the resolution. A sentence was also added noting that, if approved, a committee would be established to hash out these types of details.</li> <li>• TTC Update, including appeals- After several meetings, the appeals process has been finalized (keep in mind this is only if you want to appeal the title-not pay ranges). Terry’s understanding is that it is up on the HR web site. HR is working to disseminate this information to all staff and Terry will continue to follow up on that, because there is a strict appeals window.</li> <li>• Update on Rock IAS Promotions- at the last meeting, a comment was made that UWW-Rock instructional academic staff are not eligible for promotions. Terry has followed up on this and so far, the answer seems to be that this should be able to be done, but there doesn’t seem to be a process. Terry’s plan is to meet with the Provost, a Rock administrator, and other promotions experts in order to get this process built into the current promotions process. Everyone seems to be on board so far.</li> <li>• Terry has begun to reach out to each committee, but with differing committee goals and charges, not all meet on the same regular schedule. Goal is to meet with all committees at least once. No agenda or questions, just a visit to give Terry an opportunity to learn more. If your committee has an upcoming meeting, please invite Terry.</li> <li>• System Shared Governance December Meeting (this Friday)- so far looks like a fairly light agenda, so Terry wants to know if anyone has any questions for other campuses. Terry plans to raise the question of how other merged campuses have handled promotions for the staff transitioning from the two-year campuses. Get questions to him by tomorrow morning.</li> <li>• Next Executive board meeting will talk about meeting dates and modalities for next semester. No plan yet, so if you have any thoughts or opinions, please share.</li> </ul>
<b>Vice-Chair’s Report</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No report</li> </ul>
<b>Communications Director’s Report</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No report</li> </ul>



Agenda: December 1, 2021 (12:30-1:45)

<b>Faculty Senate Liaison's Report</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The biggest agenda item was the tuition reimbursement resolution. An amendment was passed with the notes from Terry above (in re the registration deadline). Abbie asks about whether something was reviewed regarding term honors? (Currently set to 3.4, full time, 9 credits graded) Nathan notes that you're only eligible if you take 12 units in a term, which seems to potentially disqualify students with disabilities who may be authorized to take less than 12 units- the question was raised whether CSD could set a different "full time" status that could be used.</li> </ul>
<b>Actionable Items:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continuous Improvement (formerly Upward Evaluation) Working Group</li> <li>Brenda presented a draft version of the Shared Governance Resolution "Continuous Improvement and Development" to obtain feedback from ASA prior to resolution, which is expected at next meeting. Note that this is another resolution that, after being presented to administration, shared governance expects to have a seat at the final table for implementation. Sue asks if this is the same evaluation process used when Deans receive a 5-year evaluation. Brenda notes that the team's hope is that the Dean's process would be folded into this, as there are a number of other campus offices that have a different cycle, and that based on title, salary structure, overall job duties, a varying level of frequency is called for. The hope is to provide a structure that allows each of these supervisory structures with a way to provide ongoing feedback. Question is asked about the involvement of the Process Improvement Office. Brenda notes she believes this suggestion came from HR, and that the goal is to find a place on campus for this to live that is outside of current reporting structures rather than making an immediate assumption that an outside contractor must be utilized, and is not sure whether the current individual in the PIO position has weighed in yet on their comfort and bandwidth availability to take on this role, but having them as the holder of record and an unbiased party. Terry asks whether these records would be kept in HR. Brenda notes that the records could transfer to HR's employee evaluation record, but that the individual, original records and names attached to them would not immediately be attached to a personnel record, and that it is important to parse out the distinction between the opportunity for each employee to provide feedback on their supervisor and the inclusion of specific feedback from individual supervisees in a supervisor's personnel record. A question was asked about who the other relevant individuals and campus partners being surveyed would be and whether there are specific levels of supervisors this would apply to and whether it might overburden this process in identifying and distributing this survey. Brenda notes that this piece is a part of some current evaluation and feedback processes. Becky asks whether this portion should be switched to say that the process will be "and other relevant individuals and campus partners CAN be identified and MAY be surveyed". Becky notes that the current wording allows for individual departments and units to focus on priorities, so that might already be addressed as some units will have a</li> </ul>



Agenda: December 1, 2021 (12:30-1:45)

	<p>priority of interaction with campus partners. Brenda agrees and notes that the balance between allowing those departments and individuals to identify the important external partners and insuring that all individuals in a supervisory role are automatically included in the process is a difficult one, and an important piece. Terry and JP ask that the definition of “Supervisor” be added into this, as it appears in statutes or current policies. Terry asks whether this covers all types of supervision- grad students, full time only, student workers? Brenda notes that this does cover all types of supervision. Terry asks whether individuals who do not supervise anyone directly would be involved in this as a 360-degree review process. Brenda notes that the current working group and resolution focuses only on supervisory relationships, and that while industry best practice might lead toward establishing a full 360 review process for the university, that’s a significant policy and resource shift and appears to be outside the current working group’s mandate and goal. Brenda notes that we can add a note at the start of the resolution that this is intended to cover all types of supervisory relationships at the university and that ensuring this covers student employment is a part of the university mission to provide students with quality opportunities. Becky notes that at some point there was a minimum of 3 employees but it seems to be gone now? Brenda notes that in order to move the feedback to a more formal process, more than one employee is necessary, but that HR and supervisors in general will need to work out a way to provide these secure opportunities for feedback. Terry notes that this is where the value of including other stakeholders and campus partners comes into play, by soliciting feedback from a variety of individuals instead of only the direct reports. Rick notes that he has participated in these in the external world, and that external stakeholders were always included. He also notes that in many cases it was allowed to hand pick who those external stakeholders would be, which allowed for a cherry-picking situation. Rick notes that having colleagues, direct reports, and partners were important. Brenda notes that the hope is that as this becomes a standard part of university culture, this will become a part of the ongoing discussion between supervisors and their own supervisors.</p>
<p><b>Academic Staff Committee Reports</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Elections- JP reports that the committee is waiting on on the updates to constituencies in development in the By-laws Committee before beginning the elections process.</li> <li>• Promotions- Sue Chandler reports that they are in the process of receiving applications (deadline 12/15)- 7 applicants so far. Some people have reported that the electronic folder and documents have been helpful. (Terry notes that Sue and the committee are handling inquiries with incredible grace, poise, and professionalism)</li> <li>• Outreach- Christine reports that the next item is to set a spring social date and determine whether it’s a live or remote opportunity.</li> </ul>



Agenda: December 1, 2021 (12:30-1:45)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Personnel Rules- Patty reports that they met and will meet again tomorrow and have covered a lot of ground and continue to make progress through a lot of dense content.</li><li>• By-laws committee- Christine reports we plan to make a proposal around electronic meetings at the next meeting. Next item is to work on constituencies and committees.</li></ul>
<b>Other Business</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Sue asks about the TTC appeals process deadline. Has there been discussion about allowing the process to be open-ended? People in her college have expressed concerns about the short window. Terry answers that the window was set by System and is standard for all schools. Patty notes that the deadline is for filing the appeal, and that the decision period will last beyond that- the December period is just to notify that an appeal is desired. Terry notes that the University has until sometime in June to complete all appeals.</li></ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Meeting adjourned at 1:24 p.m.</li></ul>

**CALENDAR 2023-24 – (Leap Year)****Instructional Staff Contractual Period: August 21 – May 17**

9.21.21 Revised

FALL TERM 2023

Faculty/Staff Orientation/Registration	August 21 (M) - Sept 1 (F)
Labor Day	September 4 (M)
Classes Begin 8:00 a.m.	September 5 (T)
First 8-week session ends	October 28 (Sa)
Second 8-week session begins	October 30 (M)
First 8-week grades due by Noon	November 1 (W)
Thanksgiving recess begins 9:00 p.m.	November 21 (T)
Thanksgiving recess ends 8:00 a.m.	November 27 (M)
Classes end	December 8 (F)
Exam period begins 7:45 a.m.	December 11 (M)
Exam Period Ends 9:00 p.m.	December 15 (F)
Exam Period Make-ups 12:15 – 9:00 p.m.	December 15 (F)
End of Term	December 15 (F)
Commencement	December 16 (Sa)
Grades due to Registrar by Noon	December 19 (T)

SPRING TERM 2024

Faculty/Staff Orientation/Registration	January 8-12 (M-F)
Martin Luther King, Jr. Holiday	January 15 (M)
Classes Begin 8:00 a.m.	January 16 (T)
First 8-week session ends	March 9 (Sa)
Second 8-week session begins	March 11 (M)
First 8-week grades due by Noon	March 13 (W)
Spring Recess Begins 9:00 p.m.	March 22 (F)
Spring Recess Ends 8:00 a.m.	April 1 (M)
Classes end	May 3 (F)
Exam Period Begins 7:45 a.m.	May 6 (M)
Exam Period Ends 9:00 p.m.	May 10 (F)
Exam Period Make-ups 12:15 – 9:00 p.m.	May 10 (F)
End of Term	May 10 (F)
Commencement	May 11 (Sa)
Grades due to Registrar by noon	May 14 (T)
End of Full/Second Semester Contracts	May 17 (F)*

Fall Term 2023	10 Administrative Days	
	79 Teaching Days	
	1 Commencement Day	
	5 Exam Days	= 95
Spring Term 2024	5 Administrative Days	
	87 Teaching Days	
	1 Commencement Day	
	5 Exam Days	= 98
	TOTAL	= 193

WINTERIM 2024 December 27 - 29, January 2-5, 8-12 (12 days)

SUMMER 2024	May 20 – August 10	Summer Grades Due
Session 1	May 20 – June 8	June 12 (May 27** - no classes held)
Session 2	June 10 – June 29	July 3
Session 3	July 1 - July 20	July 24 (July 4** – no classes held)
Session 4	July 22 – August 10	August 14 including any grades not previously submitted

\*Approximate date; Date set by UW System

\*\*UW-Whitewater observes all Legal Holidays in accordance with the University of Wisconsin System Administrative policy 1211

11/18/2021