

AGENDA

UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 3

Wednesday, November 9, 2016

1965 Room, 3:00 p.m.

Presiding Officer: Patricia Terry, Speaker

Parliamentarian: Steve Meyer

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 2, October 12, 2016 [page 2]

3. CHANCELLOR'S REPORT (Chancellor Miller is in Madison for an Alumni Event, Provost Davis will address the Faculty Senate at this time)

4. CONTINUING BUSINESS

- a. Revised Post Tenure Review Policy [page 7]
Presented by UC Chair David Voelker

5. NEW BUSINESS

- a. Resolution on the Granting of Degrees [page 13]
Presented by Speaker Patricia Terry
- b. Certificate Program Policy [page 14]
Presented by Clif Ganyard
- c. Child Care Alliance Resolution [page 15]
Presented by Alison Staudinger
- d. Request for future business

6. PROVOST'S REPORT

7. OTHER REPORTS

- a. University Committee Report – Presented by UC Chair David Voelker
- b. Faculty Representative Report – Presented by Christine Vandenhouten
- c. Academic Staff Report – Presented by Eric Craver
- d. University Staff Report – Presented by Jan Snyder
- e. Student Government Report - Presented by Nikolas Austin

8. ADJOURNMENT

[draft]

MINUTES 2016-2017
UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 2
Wednesday, October 12, 2016
1965 Room, University Union

Presiding Officer: Patricia Terry, Speaker of the Senate

Parliamentarian: Steve Meyer

PRESENT: Greg Aldrete (HUS), Andrew Austin (DJS-UC), Gaurav Bansal (BUA), Bryan Carr (ICS), Ryan Currier (NAS), Greg Davis (Provost, *ex officio*), Karen Eckardt (EDU-Alternate), Joan Groessl (SOCW), Lisa Grubisha (NAS), Jim Loebel (BUA), John Luczaj (NAS), Upal Mahfuz (NAS), Kaoime Malloy (THEATRE), Gary Miller (Chancellor, *ex-officio*), Paul Mueller (HUB), Rebecca Nesvet (HUS), Laurel Phoenix (PEA), Uwe Pott (HUB), Michael Rector (MUS-Alternate), Chuck Rybak (HUS-UC), Christine Smith (HUD), Brian Sutton (HUS-Alternate), Patricia Terry (NAS-UC), Brenda Tyczkowski (NUR), Christine Vandenhouten (NUR-UC), Kristin Vespia (HUD), David Voelker (HUS-UC), and Elizabeth Wheat (PEA)

NOT PRESENT: Harvey Kaye (DJS), Mark Kiehn (EDU), Katia Levintova (PEA-UC)

REPRESENTATIVES: Nikolas Austin (SGA), Jan Snyder (USC-Alternate)

GUESTS: Scott Ashmann (Assoc. Dean, CHESW), Scott Furlong (Dean, CAHSS), Clifton Ganyard (Assoc. Provost), Paula Ganyard (Director, Cofrin Library), Amanda Nelson (Assoc. Dean, CST), Christina Trombley (Asst. VC for Enrollment Management), Sheryl Van Gruensven (Vice Chancellor, Budget and Finance), and (Mike Zorn (Assoc. Dean, CST)

1. CALL TO ORDER.

Becoming a little slower with the gavel, Speaker Terry called the second Faculty Senate meeting of the 2016-17 academic year to order at 3:01 p.m.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 1, September 14, 2016.

Speaker Terry asked for comments on or edits to the minutes. Hearing none, it was determined the afternoon caffeine had not yet kicked in and the minutes were declared acceptable by automatic consent.

3. CHANCELLOR'S REPORT.

The Chancellor began his report by recognizing UC Chair David Voelker and the entire UC for their work on the Post Tenure Review policy. Since the last senate meeting, the Council of Trustees met and was presented with an extensive report from Christina Trombley on enrollment, including upcoming strategies and data analytics related to enrollment. The Council of Trustees also passed a resolution unanimously supporting the "Notice of Intent" for a new Mechanical Engineering program at UW-Green Bay. This resolution, along with one from the Chamber of Commerce, the Green Bay Packers, and about 15 other organizations, will be sent to UW President Ray Cross. The UW-Green Bay Foundation also met and received a report from Lance Cavanaugh regarding the restructuring of University Advancement. There will be a number of

alumni events, including one on November 9 in Madison which will be hosted by most of the administrative leadership team (note to Faculty Senate: November 9 is also the next Faculty Senate meeting, so consider this your heads-up, with the Chancellor and Provost gone, this will be your opportunity to pass all of those controversial code changes we have been wanting to make). Other alumni events are planned for Milwaukee, the Twin Cities, and various other locations. There was a reception at the Chancellor's house honoring the student who did the art work for the Chancellor's holiday card, art donors and Arts faculty were among those in attendance. On September 24, the LaForce family returned to Green Bay and hosted a luncheon at Oneida Country Club for about 30 UWGB students who they support with scholarships. There was a kickoff dinner for the Life Long Learning Institute (formerly known as Learning in Retirement) at which the Chancellor spoke. UWGB hosted its first annual University Business Meeting on September 30, feedback on this event would be appreciated. Thanks were extended to Brent Blahnik, Aaron Weinschenk, and Ron Pfeiffer for hosting "The US-Korea Alliance and Security Challenges in East Asia". The event featured opening remarks by the Honorable Reid Ribble, U.S. Congressman and Member, U.S. Foreign Relations Committee and Lieutenant General (Retired) In-Bum Chun, Republic of Korea Army. At the October 5-6 Board of Regents meeting in Eau Claire, the Board took a position on tuition taking back the authority to set tuition. On October 13 there will be a press conference at the Green Bay Chamber of Commerce to announce that the county has put into their planning budget for 2019 a STEM teaching and research facility at the research park close to campus; this facility could potentially house our current engineering technology program and our future engineering program. Representatives from all UW System institutions are speaking with all candidates running for office to get them to back the System budget.

4. OLD BUSINESS

a. Post-Tenure Review Policy (second reading)

UC Chair David Voelker first introduced a few updates to the Post Tenure Review (PTR – not to be confused with PBR, which was probably on many senators' minds about now) Policy based on feedback received during last month's Faculty Senate meeting. The UC has also sent the PTR policy to UW System Legal Counsel for their examination at least twice since the last senate meeting and they have approved the current version that is before the senate (i.e., this version is consistent with the Board of Regents requirements). Under "Definitions", I.1.a, UWGB does not have an approved annual review policy for the faculty yet, so the UC added some generic language so any required annual review would be captured by the reference to annual review here. Under "Procedures", III. 1., the UC added that "the PTR process fulfills any annual review requirement for the year in which it is carried out". Under "Procedures", III. 5., the UC added language regarding failure to meet the three-month notice of the intent of a unit to perform a PTR. Under "Procedures", III. 11.d.iv., language was added to have progress meetings at the end of each semester with the Dean, Chair, and faculty member if a remediation plan was required – this was added so that the Dean would have all the necessary information to make a recommendation to the Chancellor at the end of the remediation period. Under "Procedures", III. 11.d.viii., language was added such that remediation would not prohibit a faculty member from receiving any salary increase due to equity adjustments or pay-plan adjustments not associated with merit pay increases. At this time, UC Chair Voelker along with other UC members responded to few questions from the senate before **Senator Sutton moved acceptance of the**

PTR Policy, seconded by Senator Pott. At this point, a series of amendments were requested by the senate. **Senator Bansal moved to amend the policy (seconded by Senator Loebl),** requesting the phrase “...and be sufficiently flexible to permit shifts in professional emphasis” in III.6. be changed to “...and be sufficiently flexible to permit shifts in the faculty member’s professional emphasis”. **The amendment to the policy was accepted (26-0-0).** To match a corresponding change made by the UC in III.9.b. that was suggested by the senate in the first reading of the policy in September, **Senator Vespa moved to amend the policy (seconded by Senator Groessl)**, requesting the phrase “in all three categories” be removed from III.9.a. **The amendment to the policy was accepted (26-0-0).** **Senator Bansal moved to amend the policy (seconded by Senator Pott)**, requesting that the heading of III.6.c. be changed from “Departmental, Institutional, and Community Service” to “Departmental, Institutional, Professional, and Community Service”. It was argued that the “professional” service was adequately covered in the text below that heading. **The amendment to the policy was defeated (2-24-0).** One last amendment was suggested, **Senator Malloy moved to amend the policy (seconded by Senator Smith)**, requesting the word “group” be removed from the phrase “professional group” in III.6.c. **The amendment to the policy was accepted (25-0-1).** Returning to Senator Sutton’s original motion to accept the PTR Policy (now with several amendments), **the motion was accepted (25-1-0).**

b. Authorization to Implement an MS in Athletic Training (second reading)

In presenting the “Authorization to Implement an MS in Athletic Training” for the second reading, Associate Dean Amanda Nelson first introduced a number of suggested changes made after the first reading at the September senate meeting. The number of credits to complete the program was reduced from 73 to 67; this was accomplished by reducing the number of credits in the clinical/practicum courses. This change was recommended as UW-Stevens Point had a similar authorization approved at 66 credits. Assoc. Vice Chancellor Dornbush also removed the request to charge tuition beyond the graduate plateau, as it was suggested it would not be approved by the Board of Regents. A \$500 first year fee was imposed, as this is becoming a common practice among other similar programs. The number of potential students in the program increased slightly from the first to the third to the fifth year (15 to 20 to 25 as opposed to 14 to 18 to 20 in the first reading). At this time, Assoc. Dean Nelson took questions from the senate. Noting the coursework requires an “Intro to Psych” course and a “Psychology of Sport and Injury” course, Senator Vespa speaking from the perspective of the Psychology unit asked about the expectation of collaboration/resource sharing between units. Prof. Nelson stated it is still early, once the program is approved by the Board of Regents those conversations would take place. At this point, it was decided it would be a good time to actually field a motion from the senate, so **Senator Sutton moved acceptance of the Authorization to Implement an MS in Athletic Training, seconded by Senator Vespa.** Senator Groessl asked for a tuition clarification regarding the split between the first 34 credit hours at the undergraduate level followed by the 73 (67) credit hours at the graduate level. Prof. Nelson deferred this question to Asst. Chancellor Dornbush, who was not at the senate meeting. Senator Smith wondered why students were only being accepted every other year. Nelson responded that accepting students every year would require the hiring of another faculty member or the hiring of a number of ad hocs; going to a true cohort model means fewer faculty covering all of the courses and less dependence on ad hocs. The question was called and **the motion was accepted (25-0-0).**

5. NEW BUSINESS

a. Request for future business

The request for future business was made
Perhaps upon deafened ears it was laid
With no response to the call
The request it did fall
And from the senate's thoughts it did fade

6. PROVOST'S REPORT

Using phrases such as “great job” and “incredibly professional,” Provost Davis began by thanking the UC for their work on the Post Tenure Review Policy. He then went on to discuss the Provosts’ meeting held in Madison the previous week, prior to the Regents meeting. There he learned the performance metrics for the performance-based portion of the budget are still unapproved – nothing is finalized. Some discussions are on-going regarding whether or not the performance metrics will be measured at the institutional level or the System level. At the Regents meeting, the code changes involving the elimination of the Graduate Studies Council and the creation of the Graduate Academic Affairs Council were approved. Jim Henderson, UW System’s new Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs, paid UWGB a visit, meeting with administrators from the Provost Office and the Administrative Council. He is a strong proponent of our interdisciplinary approach to education. In September, a retreat was held between UWGB administration and their counterparts from NWTC, learning a lot about each other’s respective campus. Interactions have continued since that retreat. Lastly, Provost Davis mentioned that UPIC has been meeting every other week. The major task on which UPIC has been working is taking the new vision statement (which will be sent out in the near future from the Chancellor’s Office) and seeing how it interacts with the strategic goals that had been created for our university a number of years ago.

7. OTHER REPORTS

a. University Committee Report. UC Chair David Voelker mentioned that in addition to working ad nauseum on the Post Tenure Review Policy the UC has also been: discussing the elimination of three shared governance committees (at the request of those committees); providing feedback to a civility and inclusivity policy that is being moved up from the Dean of Students webpage to potentially become a university level policy; participating in the discussion of the 24 credit workload policy; looking at a policy from Assoc. Provost Ganyard regarding our procedures and expectations of our certificate programs; discussing the annual review policy; and looking to get back to the program discontinuance policy specific to UWGB.

b. Faculty Representative Report. Christine Vandenhouten shared that the faculty reps met and have been discussing the Post Tenure Review policies being adopted on their respective campuses. The main topic in that discussion was the inclusion and rationale for two levels vs. three levels of performance in the review (1. meets expectations, 2. does not meet expectations, 3. exceeds expectations). The campus PTR policies will go before the Board of Regents at their November meeting. At the October Board of Regents meeting, Vandenhouten mentioned that a

lot of time was spent discussing the affordability of college and, in particular, time to degree (there is a big push for 4 years). Also discussed was the need for a greater number of students needing financial aid, hence a request for more funding from the state.

c. Academic Staff Committee Report. Eric Craver was not present to give a report.

d. University Staff Committee Report. USC Chair Jan Snyder reported on a request to investigate emeritus status for University Staff that would mirror that for Academic Staff. The USC drafted a document and asked for feedback from other UW campuses. Based on this feedback from other campuses they found that some campuses have policies specific to University Staff, some have policies that combine University Staff with Academic Staff, and some have one policy for all employees (faculty, academic staff, and university staff). At UWGB, University Staff are primarily looking for recognition upon retirement and permission to access campus computers.

e. Student Government Association Report. SGA President Nikolas Austin informed the group that SGA held a brainstorming session on student retention. Since retention is increased when students get involved in student organizations, the thought is that perhaps “academic incentives” (i.e., extra credit) ought to be offered to get students more involved. Until November 16 (or until the money runs out) students can get free bus passes at UTIC. Despite a request, early voting will not happen at our polling location. SGA is working on a more restrictive smoking policy that would bring us in compliance with granting agency requirements, thus making us eligible for more grants. SGA is working on a guest lecture program for Green Bay East High School, where a UWGB faculty member delivers a guest lecture. President Austin is working to fill student vacancies on shared governance committees.

8. ADJOURNMENT at 4:18 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Steve Meyer, Secretary of the Faculty and Staff

**Guidelines for Periodic Post-Tenure Review
in Support of Tenured Faculty Development**
(passed by UWGB Faculty Senate on 2016-10-12)

Note: The Faculty Senate originally passed this policy, as required by Regent Policy Document 20-9, on 10/12/16, after the policy had been vetted multiple times by UW System Legal Counsel. At the UW Chancellor's meeting on 10/28/16, however, President Ray Cross informed the chancellors that he would not accept any policy that did not include an administrative-level review for all faculty, including those deemed to meet expectations by their colleagues. The revised policy below should comply with this belatedly announced demand. The only changes to the policy as passed on 10/12 appear in section 10, along with one word added to section 11.b.

This policy has been created in pursuance of Regent Policy Document 20-9: Periodic Post-Tenure Review in Support of Tenured Faculty Development (adopted 3/10/2016).

I. DEFINITIONS

For the purposes of this document, the following definitions are used:

- a. "Annual review" refers to any review of a faculty member that is carried out annually in accordance with University or System policies.
- b. "Merit review" refers to the periodic review of a faculty member, carried out by their unit, for the purposes of determining a merit score for compensation increases, when available.
- c. "Post-tenure review" refers to the review of a tenured faculty member every five years, starting with the fifth academic year following the awarding of tenure.
- d. "Unit" refers to the primary budgetary unit to which a given faculty member belongs, viz., the unit that holds the budgetary line for the given faculty position.

II. PURPOSE AND PRINCIPLES

1. Post-tenure review shall be a formative process with the goal of continuing to develop and support, to the fullest extent possible, the talents and aspirations of each faculty member. The review shall not infringe on existing faculty rights and protections, including those of academic freedom, as defined by the University of Wisconsin–Green Bay Faculty Handbook. The review shall not be construed as a re-tenuring process.
2. The University should have an appropriately funded faculty development program that is available to all faculty members to support their professional development at any time during their careers. Evaluation of professional development and scholarly and

- creative activities should take into consideration the available resources and support (e.g., a freeze on travel or a lack of funds for travel or research, etc.).
3. These guidelines are intended to provide a framework and basic procedures for post-tenure review. Each unit is responsible for generating more specific policies, evaluation criteria, etc., consistent with the basic guidelines articulated herein.

III. PROCEDURES

1. Post-tenure review is a separate and distinct process from any annual and merit reviews conducted by a unit. However, the post-tenure review process fulfills any annual review requirement for the year in which it is carried out, and, at the discretion of the unit, a review for merit may happen at the same meeting as the post-tenure review. Moreover, a faculty member seeking promotion to full professor may use review and evaluation for promotion to meet the requirements for post-tenure review. The substitution is permissible only when promotion is sought in the same year as, or sooner than, the faculty member's scheduled post-tenure review. An individual receiving a positive recommendation for promotion consideration will be awarded a "meets expectations" status for the post-tenure review and will not be required to undergo another post-tenure review for five years. If the individual receives a negative recommendation for promotion consideration, the executive committee will subsequently vote on the post-tenure review determination as specified in Section III.9 below. A negative recommendation for promotion shall not be construed as a determination that the faculty member "does not meet expectations."
2. Post-tenure review shall be performed every fifth year after the year of the faculty member's promotion to tenure. The review may be deferred upon the request of a faculty member only with the approval of the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, for unusual circumstances such as when the review would coincide with a sabbatical, other approved leave, promotion review, announced retirement, or an appointment to a full-time administrative position. In such cases, the Provost will specify the new review cycle that applies to the faculty member. As a general rule, a faculty member who assumes a full-time administrative position should have a new five-year review schedule begin upon resumption of normal faculty duties.
3. The review shall be based upon the faculty member's current activities and the performance of the faculty member since their last post-tenure review, or since gaining tenure (for faculty who are having their first post-tenure review). The updated personnel file of the faculty member shall be used for the documentation of appropriate activities. This file shall contain the following materials, in addition to any other materials required by the relevant unit's policy: updated curriculum vita, Professional Activity Reports for the period under review, a summary of student evaluation data for the period under review, any annual and merit review memos from the period under review, and a one-page statement addressing the three areas of evaluation (see below).
4. The outcome of the post-tenure review should be consistent with the evaluations of materials from any annual and merit reviews from the same time period while taking into consideration materials from any unreviewed period.

5. Faculty shall have at least three-month's notice of the intent of a unit to perform their post-tenure review. However, failure to meet this notice requirement does not obviate the requirement to conduct and participate in the review. If notification requirements have not been met, the faculty member may accept a review date with less than three-months notice, or the review may be delayed, so long as the review takes place before the end of the academic year for which the faculty member is due to be reviewed.
6. Each unit shall develop criteria by which they will evaluate their tenured faculty. The criteria should be based upon the professional obligations of the faculty of the unit. The criteria should: allow for the effective evaluation of the tenured faculty member's performance; be consistent with the mission and expectations of the university and the faculty member's college and unit; and be sufficiently flexible to permit shifts in the faculty member's professional emphasis. All criteria must fall within the following three categories: teaching; scholarly and creative activities; and university and community service. Minimal standards include:
 - a. Teaching: Faculty consistently meet all of their classes and hold appropriate office hours (or maintain equivalent engagement with students for online courses); they continually reflect on their teaching and respond to constructive feedback; and they update their course content and pedagogy as appropriate, in light of scholarly and pedagogical developments in their fields.
 - b. Scholarly and Creative Activities: Faculty maintain familiarity with recent developments in their disciplinary field(s) and maintain scholarly or creative engagement, whether through attending conferences, publishing, or otherwise participating in scholarly or creative communities or dialogues.
 - c. Departmental, Institutional, and Community Service: Faculty contribute to departmental, college, university, professional, and community life through participation in committees, panels, forums, projects, etc. While regular participation is expected at the unit and departmental level, contributions to other groups will vary over time, and major commitments in one area (*e.g.*, serving as a committee chair) may compensate for fewer contributions in other areas (*e.g.*, community-level service).
7. Post-tenure reviews will usually occur during the first half of the spring semester. Supporting documentation to be considered during the review should be available to the review committee at least one week before the scheduled review.
8. The review shall be conducted by the executive committee of the unit, or by a review committee agreed upon by the executive committee, employing procedures to be determined by the unit.
9. Based upon the materials submitted for review, the review committee should consider whether the faculty member under review has discharged conscientiously and with professional competence the duties appropriately associated with the faculty member's position and then find the member to either meet expectations or not, as follows:
 - a. Meets expectations. This category is awarded to those tenured faculty members whose performance reflects the expected level of accomplishment over the previous five years.
 - b. Does not meet expectations. This designation should be given to those tenured faculty members whose performance reflects a level of accomplishment below the

expected level and which requires correction. All reviews resulting in “does not meet expectations,” unless overturned upon further review, will result in a remediation plan as described below.

10. For faculty members who receive the “meets expectations” award:
 - a. The review committee shall produce a written report for each faculty member reviewed. The report should summarize the accomplishments of the faculty member and address how the university can support their professional development goals. The reviewed faculty member shall be given access to the report and shall have the opportunity to provide a written response to the report. The report and any responses to the report shall be provided to the faculty member, their unit chair, and Dean.
 - b. The Dean, upon the full examination of the faculty member’s post-tenure review documentation, the report of the review committee, and any statements from the faculty member under review addressing the findings of the review committee, must either concur with or dissent from the findings of the review committee. If the Dean concurs with the “meets expectations” determination, then the review process is complete, and the Dean shall notify the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs of the outcome.
 - c. If the Dean dissents from the “meets expectations” finding of the review committee, then the Dean shall inform the faculty member under review and the review committee in writing of the reasons for this decision, based upon the criteria established under section 6 above. The faculty member and/or the review committee shall have thirty days to submit a response (unless granted an extension by the Dean). The Dean shall forward the case materials and any responses to the Chancellor (or the Chancellor’s designee) for consideration, at which point the review process continues in accordance with 11.c and subsequent guidelines stated below.
11. For faculty members who receive the “does not meet expectations” designation:
 - a. The review committee shall produce a written report identifying the deficiencies identified in the record that require remediation before a “meets expectations” award can be given. Said report shall specify which of the three categories (teaching, scholarship and creative activity, and/or university and community service) needs improvement for the faculty member to be recognized as meeting expectations. The faculty member will be given the opportunity to provide the review committee with a written statement addressing the findings of the review committee. (The faculty member’s response shall be submitted within thirty days, unless an extension is granted by the Dean.) The report, along with any statements by the faculty member under review, shall be forwarded to their unit chair and Dean.
 - b. The Dean, upon the full examination of the faculty member’s post-tenure review documentation, the report of the review committee, and any statements from the faculty member under review addressing the findings of the review committee, must either concur with or dissent from the findings of the review committee and forward the case to the Chancellor (or the Chancellor’s designee) for consideration.

- c. The Chancellor (or designee) may, upon review of the case, inform the faculty member that a finding of “meets expectation” has been awarded to the faculty member or may identify which deficiencies identified in the review committee report must be addressed in a remediation plan.
- d. Upon the request of the Chancellor (or designee) to develop a remediation plan, the faculty member, in consultation with their Dean, will develop a plan to address the deficiencies identified by the Chancellor (or designee).
 - i. The primary focus of the remediation plan shall be developmental and to provide the faculty member with appropriate support from the unit, department, or Dean as applicable.
 - ii. The plan will contain one or more specific measureable achievements for each deficiency identified by the chancellor or designee. The plan will specify what array of achievements will constitute the completion of the plan.
 - iii. The timeline for the completion of the plan should not be more than three consecutive semesters (not including summer terms) starting at the beginning of the semester after the chancellor or designee has requested a remediation plan. In remediation plans related to a performance shortfall in research, where more than three academic semesters may be necessary to correct identified deficiencies, an extension of one academic semester shall be permitted only with the approval of the Chancellor, which shall trigger a notification of that extension to the UW System Administration Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs.
 - iv. The remediation plan should indicate that: 1) progress meetings will be scheduled with the Dean, the chair, and the faculty member near the conclusion of each semester during which the plan is in effect in order to help determine progress and identify additional improvement resources that may aid the faculty member; and 2) a final remediation follow-up meeting will occur between the Dean, the chair, and the faculty member after the deadline, but before the start of the next academic semester, and not to exceed 21 calendar days past the deadline (e.g., if three semesters are provided, within 21 calendar days of the close of the third semester to allow for student evaluations to be accessed, etc.). At the meeting, the Dean will consult with the faculty member and the chair about the evidence indicating that the faculty member has met or not met the obligations of the remediation plan. The Dean may request additional evidence from the unit, the faculty member, and other sources (such as a publisher) prior to or following the meeting.
 - v. The faculty member is also advised to consult with the Secretary of the Faculty and Staff (SOFAS), as University Ombudsperson, throughout the remediation period.
 - vi. The faculty member may submit to the Dean evidence of the completion of the remediation plan at any time during the timeline of the remediation plan. Upon review of this material and following the remediation follow-up meeting described in 11.d.iv above, the Dean may:

1. deem the remediation plan to be completed and restore the faculty member to a status of “meets expectations.”
 2. deem the evidence to be insufficient to constitute the completion of the remediation plan and provide the faculty member with specific reasons for this determination.
 - vii. If the remediation plan is not completed to the satisfaction of the Dean by the end of its timeline, the Dean may file a complaint against the faculty member to the Chancellor regarding the faculty member’s failure to meet the expectations of their employment. Upon review of the complaint, the Chancellor, after consulting with the Dean, shall determine whether sanctions are necessary and, if so, shall pursue the appropriate sanctions specified in the remediation plan (see 11.d.ii), in compliance with UWGB 6.01 (for disciplinary action) or UWGB Chapter 4 (for dismissal).
 - viii. Faculty members who are completing a remediation plan, or who have been found to have not met the conditions of a remediation plan, are not eligible for merit-based pay increases. After the faculty member is restored to “meets expectations” status, the faculty member is once again eligible for merit pay, but retroactive pay cannot be awarded.
12. A full written record of each faculty member’s post-tenure review shall be provided to the Dean and Chancellor (or designee). Information and documentation relating to the review shall be maintained by the Dean and disclosed only at the discretion, or with the explicit consent, of the faculty member, unless required by business necessity or by law.
 13. Each unit chair is required to report annually to the Dean and Chancellor (or designee) that all post-tenure reviews for tenured faculty in their annual cycle have been completed. The Chancellor (or designee) has responsibility for ensuring the reviews are completed on schedule.
 14. The reviews conducted and remediation plans developed in accordance with this policy are not subjected to the grievance process set forth in Chapter UWS 6.02, Wis. Admin. Code.

RESOLUTION ON THE GRANTING OF DEGREES

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate of the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay, on behalf of the Faculty, recommends to the Chancellor and the Provost and Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs of the University that the students certified by the Registrar of the University as having completed the requirements of their respective programs be granted their degrees at the Fall 2016 Commencement.

Faculty Senate New Business 5a 11/9/2016

Certificate Programs

UW Green Bay

The University of Wisconsin Green Bay offers certificates to provide students the opportunity to develop focused expertise in select academic areas, as a means to further their employability, or to enhance their professional qualifications. All certificate programs must have an executive committee which oversees the offering of the certificate. In establishing a new certificate, a clear rationale must be provided by the Executive Committee detailing the purpose and value of that certificate.

Requirements for Certificates

All certificates must have a minimum of 12 required credits. Those credits can be any combination of lower and upper level courses.

The certificate may be either associated with an academic program or a stand-alone certificate (i.e. a certificate that is not associated with an academic program). If the certificate is a stand-alone certificate, it must demonstrate that it provides for increased employability or enhanced professional qualifications for anyone receiving the certificate.

The Executive Committee's membership must include a minimum of three faculty members. The committee can be an existing Executive Committee, such as a budgetary unit or department, or can be developed among interested faculty. The committee must meet at least once a year and forward copies of minutes for all meetings to the Provost's Office.

The Executive Committee must appoint an advisor for the certificate or have the chair serve that function. The advisor or chair would advise students and perform necessary administrative tasks such as approving substitutions.

In order to be awarded a certificate, a student must have a minimum 2.0 GPA in the certificate's courses and earn 9 credits or one half the total required credits, whichever is greater, in residency at UWGB. The Executive Committee can establish a GPA above 2.0.

Students are allowed to self-declare certificates.

Upon completion, certificates will be recorded on the student's transcript.

Child Care Alliance Resolution

The Child Care Alliance (CCA) asks that the Faculty Senate consider a resolution supporting moving forward on the planning process to develop a long-term plan for a Child Care Center on campus. While the CCA, in cooperation with our sister student organization, and SGA's Equity and Diversity committee, continues to advocate to make our campus more child-friendly, we ask that the administration follow up on their statements in our meeting of Spring 2016 and engage in a collaborative planning process. In accordance with our plan- which can be found [here](#) - we ask that the Faculty Senate, the Academic Staff Committee and the University Staff Committee resolve to support the four "Action Items" from section X of our plan. As we argue in the plan, this center would serve social justice imperatives and improve access, retention and recruitment- both for student parents, and for other students who need work, internship and research experience.

We ask the administration to do the following:

Commit publicly to supporting student, faculty and staff parents and to the long-term goal to establish a Children's Center rooted in High Impact Experiences for all UWGB Students.

Initiate a formal planning process to consider building site or renovation possibilities and further develop the business model; this can be an early version of the Childcare Committee mentioned in the plan and/or include a UWGB student competition to develop a profitable plan. This formal process could also include partnering with SGA on their subsidy plan and considering other ways to make the campus friendlier for student-parents.

Dedicate campus resources to gaining grants which could facilitate this program, as with the Department of Labor's Strengthening Working Families Initiative

Begin a fundraising drive through Advancement and commit to a 2-1 match; If 2/3rds of the required funds are raised, including segregated fees, the University will match the remainder.