



Minutes of the UWRF Faculty Senate for March 26, 2008 Vol. 32 No. 14.

Representation	Term Expires 2010	Term Expires 2008	Term Expires 2009
CAFES	Kris Hiney	Laine Vignona	
CAS	Wes Chapin	Patricia Berg	Peter Johansson
	Karl Peterson	John Heppen	
COEPS		Ogden Rogers	Michael Miller
CBE			Glenn Potts
4th Division	Kristie Feist	Gregg Heinselman	Sarah Egerstrom
	Kristen Hendrickson		
At Large		Brenda Boetel (Jr)	Melissa Wilson (Jr)
	Sarah Parks (Jr)	Dawn Hukai (Sr)	David Rainville (Sr)
	David Furniss (Sr)		Terry Ferriss (Sr)
	Connie Foster		

* Chancellor's Designee

** Absent

() Substitute

Call to Order: David Rainville called the meeting to order at 3:37 pm

Seating of Substitutes: none

Guests: Sandy Soares, Brad Mogen, Nan Jordahl, Stephen Olson, Kim Mogen

Approval of Minutes from February 20, 2008

John Heppen motioned to approve minutes and was seconded by Ogden Rogers

Corrections:

Mare Manke was a guest.

Approval of Minutes with corrections

19 yes

0 opposed

0 abstentions: Minutes approved

Chair's Report: David Rainville will be attending a Faculty Representative meeting on Friday in Madison. There will also be a meeting in April concerning Academic Staff and governance issues. Three people from US System will be invited to our next meeting Ron Singer Lisa Cornesky, Bob Korkesh

Vice Chair's Report: none

Old Business:

1. Proposal from Faculty Welfare to redefine load.
Pulled from the agenda as it is being reworked by the committee.

New Business Consent Agenda.

1. Appointment of Mary Wright to replace Judy Rabak-Wegener (COEPS) on the Sustainability Task Force.
All in favor 15
Opposed 0
Abstentions 2

New Business:

1. A motion from the Executive Committee to adopt the 2008 edited version of Chapter One of the Faculty Staff Handbook. This is the first reading. Preface to Chapter One was also passed out to be reviewed.
2. A motion from the Executive Committee to adopt the 2008 edited version of Chapter Two of the Faculty Staff Handbook. Does not require a second reading.

Motion to bring to discussion by Glenn Potts and seconded by Peter Johansson.

Discussion: Wes Chapin wanted to abstain until he read the document.

13 in support
0 no
4 abstentions; Motion passed

3. A motion from the Executive Committee to adopt the 2008 edited version of Chapter Four of the Faculty Staff Handbook.

Motion to bring to discussion by Peter Johansson and seconded by Sarah Parks.

John Heppen made a motion to postpone until the next meeting as multiple members of senate had difficulties opening the electronic file and was seconded by Wes Chapin.

Motion to postpone: unanimous
Chapter four will be made available by Sandy Soares in Falcon File.

4. Calendar for 2010-2011

Motion to bring to discussion by Terry Ferriss and seconded by Kristen Hendrickson.

Discussion – Would there be a possibility of splitting spring semester to eight and six weeks versus seven and seven to move spring break back?

Fall calendar – has to be balanced number of class periods. The campus had previously discussed a desire to not have “fake days”; therefore the calendar includes having class the Wednesday before Thanksgiving.

18 for

2 opposed

0 abstentions – Calendar is approved.

5. Motion from Advising Committee to recommend Faculty Senate adopt a campus wide modified intake model for academic advising at UWRF. If so done, the Advising Committee will then develop an implementation plan for further Faculty Senate action.

Motion to discuss by Glenn Potts and seconded by Melissa Wilson.

Discussion: Is this centralized advising? That has previously been defeated by Student Senate and is believed to have a negative impact on retention.

From where did the motion originate? From Advising committee who were seeking to improve advising. When students were interviewed, sophomores through seniors were very satisfied but freshman were not.

Students don't want differential tuition spent on advising.

Shouldn't students who have already selected a major be allowed to interact with their faculty? Individual majors can advise if they so chose.

Concerns about ramifications to faculty related to promotion and tenure as described by the handbook.

Is the motion to adopt the idea and then implement a plan? What if the idea is adopted but the plan is rejected?

Students need a chance to review the model as students have strong opinions. This should appear before student senate.

Faculty should be allowed to discuss in their own departments.

Advising committee should survey the students and the majors (faculty as a whole) as further information is needed. How many majors would opt out? How many would use it? How many advisors would have to be hired? Where does the money come from? Is this a choice between hiring more advisors or hiring more faculty?

The committee should do more work on creating the plan.

This is the model in CBE and it offers greater consistency.

Currently we have three professional advisors with 12 month appointments. What is this going to cost?

There are not enough details.

Why does advising go from bad to good between freshman and upper classmen? This should come from desires of individual colleges.

Is this more a student mental health issue? Perhaps there is more value in adding these types of advisors. What are the requirements to be a professional advisor?

Currently *one third* of the entire incoming freshman are on academic probation. That's appalling.

Inconsistencies are reported in the Gen Ed program. Maybe that is their major advisors choice.

Typically most professional advisors are counselors or have a masters in education.

Wes Chapin moved to postpone until next meeting to allow the Student Senate to see the motion and was seconded by John Heppen.

Discussion: Why postpone if it has no chance of passing next time?

We need the input of the Deans and the department chairs.

Motion to postpone: 9 in favor, 10 opposed, 1 abstention

Melissa Wilson make a motion to amend the motion by asking the Advising Committee to do further investigation.

John Heppen ruled the motion out of order.

Original motion was voted upon: 5 in favor, 13 against, 2 abstentions

Motion defeated.

6. A motion from Faculty Compensation to address Strategic Goal Number 7; Invest in Human Resources.

Kristen Hendrickson moved to bring forward to discussion and was seconded by Glenn Potts.

Stephen Olson attended to speak on behalf of the motion.

The goal of this proposal is to move the salaries of full professors at UWRF to average for the system. This does not include Madison or Milwaukee.

Discussion:

Why are Madison and Milwaukee not included?

What are our other peer groups?

Why would all of the money go to full professors leaving nothing for Academic Staff or non-classified staff?

Part of the strategic plan is to address this issue. This plan would also add to the base for merit pay.

What is wrong with addressing this issue first?

Brad Mogen was seated for Glenn Potts.

We could tell the committee to rework the order in which they address problems.
For future discussion, could Madison and Milwaukee be included.
We (senior administration) are trying to look at the Academic Staff issue as well, but the full professor salaries seemed to be the most glaring issue.
This motion allows us to keep salary savings for other issues.

Doug Johnson was seated for Melissa Wilson and Mark Kinders for Sara Egerstrom.

We need to attack the problems as they come and not wait for all of them to come at one time to senate.

Everybody works for the money, why doesn't everybody get the money?

Full professors have had substandard salaries for a longer period of time than other individuals. Thus, they have been financially hit the hardest for a prolonged period.

Thus, it is only fair that they are addressed first.

The chair of Academic Staff is trying to address these issues with an Ad Hoc committee.

Voting on this motion will not preclude other issues from being addressed.

Motion to approve; 17 for, 3 against, 0 abstentions

David Furniss moved to adjourn the meeting and was seconded by Mike Miller
Meeting adjourned at 5:35pm.