

MINUTES

University Committee Meeting
Wednesday, November 19, 2014, 3:00 PM
Cofrin Library 750

Present: Clifton Ganyard, Kristin Vespia, John Lyon, Sylvia (Mimi) Kubsch, Steven Meyer (chair), Cristina Ortiz, Vanya Koepke (Student Government Rep).

Absent: Katrina Hrivnak

Guests: Tyler Sterr (student government vice president), Jan Snyder, Amanda Wildenberg

1. Information item. UW System would like feedback from the SWOT worksheet from all campuses on what we perceive as the Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats to the UW System. Senators will discuss this with their respective units and bring feedback to Faculty Senate on 12/3/14.
2. The minutes of 11/5/14 were approved of as written.
3. Summer course timeline. The UC discussed the rationale for the proposed summer timeline and again reviewed the document (talking point sheet) to be distributed about it. Seems Human Biology does not approve of the proposed plan and sent an email stating their objections to all department heads. Christina brought up topic to HUS and one member of HUS disapproved of the plan. Mimi voiced her concern over the plan in that what started out as a problem involving one student registering for what seemed like too many credits has now morphed into a different timeline project which does not have much to do with the original problem. Pros and cons of the plan were discussed with Cliff mentioning potential problem that we could lose student interest between the two 4 week sessions. There is also a concern over the fact that we need to consider Bellin and the Medical College of Wisconsin's needs. Another concern was voiced that the start date of the proposed timeline may interfere with students who have not graduated yet from high school enrolling in first 4 and 6 week sessions. The committee agreed that we want to do what is best for the students. John said if current plan meets student needs then we may not have to change it. All agreed that at this time what is needed is more data. Steve will send out "talking point sheet" to all Senators to discuss with their units before the next faculty senate meeting (12/3/14).
4. Administrator Evaluations. Steve distributed a brief history of UWGB administrator evaluation handout. The last effort done on administrator evaluation was in 2008-2009 where Cheryl Grosso, Ray Hutchison, Lloyd Noppe and Greg Davis (members of the then Administrator Evaluation Committee [AEC]) developed a survey which was never administered because many of the administrators left. An "Administrator Review Timeline 2008-2009" developed by the then AEC was distributed and discussed. The UC agreed that administrators would be reviewed every three years. John suggested that we not evaluate everyone all in the same year but rather evaluate some every year on a 3 year rotation schedule. For example one year evaluate all academic administrators, the next year evaluate academic staff administrators, etc. If someone is retiring he/she would not be evaluated. The UC then reviewed and discussed the "Administrator Review Process" policy which was approved of by Senate April 2014. The policy needs to be revised so that it includes faculty, academic staff and university staff. Next who would be on the

AEC was discussed. There was agreement that there would be equal representation from faculty, academic staff and university staff. It was suggested that the faculty be full professors. The appointment would be on-going for 3 years of staggered service. This discussion led to a discussion of concern over possible retribution. It was questioned whether the review results would fall under the open record policy or whether they would just be shared by the AEC with the administrator being evaluated. Jan questioned number VII of the “Administrator Review Process” policy if the University community is not appraised of the results how would the administrator then “respond to the University Community”? The new AEC will be appointed by the UC and the survey will contain items that can be used for all 3 groups (faculty, academic staff, university staff) with a N/A option. The AEC will determine who will be evaluated.

5. Next the issue of the extent of administrator participation in faculty governance was briefly discussed. It was questioned whether administrators with split appointments be counted in headcount for determining how many senators are from the respective unit. There are some councils/committees Unit Chairs cannot serve on.
6. Kristin brought up issue of the University Ombudsman. In the past University legal counsel served in this role but currently the SOFAS serves in this capacity. The UC intends to ask Cliff Abbott how this responsibility has been working out.

Respectfully submitted,

Mimi Kubsch