AGENDA

UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 11
Wednesday, April 29, 2015
Alumni Rooms, 3:00 p.m.
Presiding Officer: John Lyon, Speaker
Parliamentarian: Clifford Abbott

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 10
   April 8, 2015 [page 2]

3. CHANCELLOR’S REPORT

4. CONTINUING BUSINESS
   a. Compensation Resolution from Committee on Workload and Compensation [page 5]
      Revised version Presented by CWC Chair, Patricia Terry

   b. Elimination of Facilities Planning Committee – second reading [page 6]
      Presented by UC Chair, Steve Meyer

5. NEW BUSINESS
   a. Election of Speaker of the Senate for 2015-16

   b. Creation of an Executive Committee for Masters in Data Science [page 8]

   c. Request for future business

6. PROVOST’S REPORT

7. OTHER REPORTS
   a. Academic Affairs Council Report [page 9]
   b. 50th Anniversary Celebration – Presented by Tracy Heaser
   c. University Committee Report - Presented by UC Chair Steve Meyer
   d. Academic Staff Report - Presented by Josh Goldman
   e. Student Government Report - Presented by Vanya Koepke

8. ADJOURNMENT
1. CALL TO ORDER.
Speaker Lyon called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES for Faculty Senate Meeting No. 9, March 11, 2015.
The Speaker called for corrections and with none offered the minutes were declared approved.

3. CHANCELLOR’S REPORT
The Chancellor being on his way to the Regents’ meeting, the report was omitted.

4. CONTINUING BUSINESS
   a. Code Change on Senate Meeting Schedule. UC Chair Steve Meyer presented the second reading of this proposal for monthly Senate meetings. Senator Vespa (Senator Sutton second) moved adoption. The discussion included a wonder over whether the Senate should be meeting more frequently in turbulent times (since the UC meets on weeks when the Senate does not, there’s a trade-off with more Senate meetings meaning fewer UC meetings to prepare issues for the Senate) and a claim that cancelling a Senate meeting may be more convenient than adding one for special business, but the Senate voted its approval (21-4-0).
b. Proposal for Ed. D in First Nations Education. Dean Sue Mattison presented this second reading, stressing the applied nature of the degree. Senator Malloy (Senator Wolf second) moved approval for the program. Discussion was sluggish so Dean Mattison primed the pump with a concern about finances, coupling it to a more general problem of compensating faculty for supervision of graduate students, an issue the Graduate Studies Council has been and will be wrestling with. There are no immediate plans for additional positions for the program and tuition seems to be the only possible source for better compensation in the cost recovery budget model in the proposal. The Senate voted its unanimous support (27-0-0). Dean Mattison praised and thanked all those who had been involved in the proposal.

5. NEW BUSINESS
  a. Resolution on Granting Degrees. The Speaker presented this formal reminder of a faculty prerogative. Senator Meyer (Senator Ganyard second) moved approval and the Senate was unanimously in favor (27-0-0).
  
b. Elimination of Facilities Planning Committee. UC Chair Meyer introduced this proposal to eliminate committee overlap. There were no immediate questions or comments, so the Speaker announced that this was a first reading and a vote will be sought at the next Senate meeting.
  
c. Compensation Resolution. Patricia Terry, chair of the Committee on Workload and Compensation, presented this proposal to link compensation to tuition increases coming eventually from increases in future enrollment. Senator Kubsch (Senator Tabers-Kwak second) moved adoption of the resolution. There was much discussion that focused mostly on finding a way to support the spirit of the resolution (faculty and staff should be better compensated) without supporting specifics that might end up being used for the opposite result. Some of the concerns about the specifics: if compensation is linked to tuition, does it suggest a tuition freeze necessarily means a compensation freeze; if enrollment decreases, does that suggest a reason to limit pay; does the resolution address across the board rather than merit adjustments; might the calculation of pay increases by percentage become complex if tuition rates become more differentiated; is the Fall 2014 enrollment level the appropriate baseline for a three-year calculation. The dilemma of wanting to support the spirit but not the letter of the proposal led Senator Pott (Senator Austin second) to move to table the resolution and the Senate agreed (24-2-1). The CWC is invited to consider revisions for the next Senate meeting.
  
d. Request for future business. The Speaker made this standard request.

6. PROVOST’S REPORT
This report became a semi-choreographed dance between the Provost and his faculty. It began with the Provost’s bow to the faculty in saying work continues on examining all possible budget points for efficiencies, i.e. reductions, and in holding various open positions. The dance continued with the senators wanting to know what decisions had been made, the Provost responding that everything is still in play, the senators wanting to know where the thinking was on various issues, and the Provost being reluctant to fire up rumor mills with mere speculation. In the midst of this kind of dancing around issues such as the Voluntary Separation Incentive,
legislative intent on separating policy and budget or reductions in proposed budget cuts or the
public authority idea, data analysis on reassignments and overloads, what’s going on in UPIC,
and the possibility of a change to a 24 credit annual teaching load, there were a few more solid
contributions. The tenure and promotion recommendations for the current year are not being held
up – they are being forwarded to the Regents. The timeline for certain decisions is being pushed
back slowly. Any changes in reassignment practices are unlikely to be sudden – the need to be
sensitive to their effects will necessitate a more gradual phase-in process. The dance ended with
bows on both sides. (See 7d below for continued discussion after the Provost’s departure.)

7. OTHER REPORTS
   a. Academic Affairs Council. The Speaker called attention to this written report.

   b. University Committee Report. UC Chair Meyer announced the UC is finalizing a Senate
      schedule for next year that will avoid, except for December, conflicts with Regents meetings.
      The UC plans to confer with the Registrar over some wait-listing issues. As he stood for
      questions, one senator asked that the UC confer with the Chancellor specifically over the
      possibility of a 24 credit annual teaching load so that, if this is being considered, the faculty will
      have time to prepare a response.

   c. Academic Staff Report. Josh Goldman, who will chair the Academic Staff Committee next
      year, announced that next year’s placements for Academic Staff committees have concluded,
      UPS policies are being reviewed with HR and the University Staff, and the CWC resolution on
today’s Senate agenda had been approved by the Academic Staff Committee, despite some of the
concerns raised in the Senate’s debate.

   d. Student Government Report. Vanya Koepke reported on the progress for deciding next year’s
      leadership in student government. He announced the placement of three monitors for the
      sustainability efforts to reduce paper waste. He has been pressing to continue student
      representation on UPIC into the future and he asked the faculty what is the best process to slake
their thirst for more information on budget cutting ideas. One response was that it would be nice
to know what UPIC is doing – are their meetings open – are minutes kept for their meetings.
Dean Mattison, a member of UPIC, volunteered that UPIC is only advisory but it had put on the
table the Curator of Art position and CATL as possible cuts. [Note: After the Senate meeting
Dean Mattison clarified that “The UPIC met with representatives from CATL, OAA, and
Advising, but has not met with or discussed the Lawton Gallery curator position or any other
area that is being considered for cuts.”] The UC may ask the chair of UPIC for a report in the
future.

8. ADJOURNMENT The Speaker adjourned the meeting at 4:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cliff Abbott, Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff
Compensation Resolution

Whereas, the 2012 Fox Lawton study demonstrated that most faculty and many staff salaries are well below market medians; and

Whereas, the Spring 2014 faculty (HERI) and UWGB staff surveys show that only 1% of faculty and 4% of staff are very satisfied with their salaries, over 60% of faculty and staff have considered leaving UWGB, and 17% faculty and 21% of staff received a job offer somewhere; and

Whereas, the success and the reputation of UWGB depends on effective recruitment, retention, and advancement of talented employees; and

Whereas, Governor Walker has proposed that tuition increases be capped at the consumer price index;

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate, Academic Staff Committee, and University Staff Committee request that

1. All avenues and opportunities for increased compensation be pursued until UW-Green Bay faculty and staff compensation is at least the national median as determined by appropriate benchmarks; and

2. Future faculty and staff pay increases should be at minimum the consumer price index, and

3. Faculty and staff efforts and innovation to increase enrollment and tuition revenue be acknowledged by devoting a significant percentage of such revenues to a supplemental pay plan once funds are sufficient to result in a net base budget increase.

Faculty Senate Continuing Business 4a 4/29/2015
Proposal to Eliminate the Facilities Planning Committee

Whereas the Faculty Senate in 1991 created the Facilities Planning Committee to give faculty a voice in changes in university facilities, and

Whereas the administration later created the Facilities Management Committee to give all governance groups a voice in changes in university facilities, and

Whereas the Facilities Management Committee has included the members of the Facilities Planning Committee in their membership, and

Whereas now the two committees overlap in function and procedures for membership with the Facilities Planning Committee having no function or meetings beyond the Facilities Management Committee,

Therefore, be it resolved that the Faculty Senate abolish the Facilities Planning Committee.

Facilities Planning Committee Charge

1. Three tenured faculty members, appointed by the Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff from among a slate prepared by the Committee on Committees and Nominations, will serve on the Facilities Planning Committee and on such related Chancellor's task forces as may be useful from time to time.

2. Members serve for staggered three-year terms and appointees preferably will represent three different domain voting districts; there will be no more than two appointees from any one district.

3. Faculty members who serve on these committees must make periodic reports to the University Committee or the Faculty Senate and will be expected to initiate interactions with faculty governance when such seems warranted.

Facilities Management Committee Charge

1. The committee shall be composed of three tenured faculty members, one Academic Staff member, and one University Staff member, appointed by the Secretary of the Faculty and Staff from among a slate prepared by the respective nominating committees, will serve on the Facilities Management Committee and on such related Chancellor's task forces as may be useful from time to time.

2. Faculty members serve for staggered three-year terms and appointees preferably will represent three different domain voting districts; there will be no more than two appointees from any one district. Academic Staff and University Staff serve a three-
year term.

3. Members who serve on this committee must make periodic reports to their respective governance groups regarding projects that are in the queue for the next biennium and potential building and maintenance projects beyond the next biennium. They will also initiate interactions with them when such seems warranted.

4. Members who serve on this committee will solicit information, ideas, and suggestions from colleagues/constituents on potential future projects/repairs.

5. The committee will meet at least once each semester.
Proposed Executive Committee for Masters in Data Science

A joint meeting of the Graduate Studies Council and the Personnel Council on April 20, 2015, in accordance with UWGB 53.06, approved the following individuals for the initial executive committee for the Master of Science in Data Science:

   - Associate Professor Gaurav Bansal (BUA)
   - Associate Professor Peter Breznay (ICS)
   - Professor Bob Howe (NAS)
   - Associate Professor Janet Reilly (NUR)
   - Associate Professor Chuck Rybak (HUS)

It is proposed that the Faculty Senate approve this action.

Faculty Senate New Business 5b 4/29/2015
Academic Affairs Council Report

The Academic Affairs Council discussed the merger of PEA and URS, approved three new courses, deactivated one, rolled one back, and is waiting for two program reviews.