



Minutes of the UWRF Faculty Senate for October 21, 2009 Vol. 34 No. 7.

Representation	Term Expires 2010	Term Expires 2011	Term Expires 2012
CAFES	Kris Hiney	Laine Vignona	
CAS	Wes Chapin	Patricia Berg	David Rainville
	Karl Peterson** Magdalena Pala	John Heppen	
		Jennifer Willis-Rivera** (Travis Tubre)	
COEPS		Hilary Pollack	Todd Savage
CBE			Hossein Najafi
4th Division	Kristie Feist	Valerie Malzacher	Barbara Stinson
	Kristen Hendrickson** (Gretchen Link)		
At Large		Kathleen Hunzer	Robyne Tiedeman
	Sarah Parks**	Dennis Cooper	Marshall Toman
	David Furniss		Dawn Hukai
	Fernando Delgado*		

* Chancellor's Designee

** Absent

() Substitute

Call to Order: David Rainville called the meeting to order at 3:33 p.m.

Seating of Substitutes: Magdalena Pala for Karl Peterson, Travis Tubré for Jennifer Willis-Rivera, Gretchen Link for Kristen Hendrickson

Recognition of Invited Guests:

Approval of Minutes of October 7, 2009: Approval of the minutes was moved by Robyne Tiedeman and seconded by Kristie Feist. The minutes were approved by a vote of 16 for, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention.

Chair's Report:

Chair David Rainville reported that last Wednesday, the Executive Committee met with Regent Jeff Bartell and discussed several issues with him, including furloughs, post-tenure review, compensation and regional representation on the BOR. Rainville also attended the Board of Regents meeting last Thursday and Friday. He will attend the Faculty Representatives meeting next week. The Executive Committee met with senior administration this afternoon. He informed the senate he has received a petition from a member of the faculty, which is a proposed Constitutional amendment. The proposed and current language was read. This petition will initiate a referendum.

One senator asked for clarification of who would be voting on this proposed referendum. Rainville replied that it is the faculty, and not the academic staff. He is also asking for clarification from the UW System to be sure of the voting body. Another senator asked Rainville to ask for clarification if the two language changes in the Constitution should be held as two separate referendums.

Vice Chair's Report: Rainville reported on behalf of Vice Chair Dennis Cooper that the special junior at-large election is underway. Nomination petitions are due on Monday, October 26, 2009.

Other Reports:

Provost Fernando Delgado reported that all of the data has been completed for Program Prioritization, including graduate programs, and it is now back at Deans Council.

Unfinished Business**New Business Consent Agenda:**

1. Appointment of Michael Kaltenberg, CAFES (2009-2010), to replace Susan Wiegrefe CAFES (2009-2010) on the General Education and University Requirements Committee

There were no objections to the consent agenda. The consent agenda passed by a unanimous vote.

New Business:

1. A **motion** from the University Curriculum Committee (Barb Nielsen, Chair) to approve an amended Course Proposal Form.

Approval of this motion was moved by David Furniss and seconded by Hossein Najafi.

A senator asked if this had been run by the Registrar's Office. Rainville said he believes the Registrar has representation on the committee itself.

The motion was approved by a vote of 20 for, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

2. A **motion** from the Executive Committee to approve a document entitled: "University of Wisconsin-River Falls; Procedures for Terminating or Suspending a Varsity Sport." The document is attached. The Executive Committee worked with Chancellor Van Galen and Brian Huffman (Athletic Committee, Chair) in the preparation of this document which is updated version of an older outdated document.

Approval of this motion was moved by John Heppen and seconded by Robyne Tiedeman.

A senator said it would be helpful if someone would include items such as these in Chapter Three.

Chief Diversity Officer Craig Morris gave an update on this issue, as he attended the Athletic Committee meeting. It was suggested at this meeting that this should be a public process. Several meetings will be held on campus, and a majority/minority report as well as the opinion of the Athletic Director, will be sent to the Chancellor and Faculty Senate.

A senator noted that item six has a certain ambiguity to it. He said that it may be read one of two ways, that the Faculty Senate may choose not to weigh in on the topic, or that the Chancellor does not require the Faculty Senate's opinion on the topic to proceed.

Wes Chapin moved to amend the motion to read that "This policy be effective until April 1, 2010". David Furniss seconded the motion. The amendment passed by a vote of 18 for, 0 opposed, and 3 abstentions.

The motion as amended was approved by a vote of 20 for, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention.

Miscellaneous New Business:

1. **1.** Kathleen Hunzer asked for further clarification on the previous petitions. Rainville will seek the council of System Legal to clarify whether one or two issues can be included in the referendum.
2. Gretchen Link said that as chair of the Academic Staff Council, she would like to hear any concerns that resulted in this petition going forward.

A senator said that he thinks the rationale is that since 1975, academic staff were included to give themselves a voice. He continued to say that in 1985, Academic Staff Council was created to give them that voice. He said having academic staff double-represented creates some structural conflict of interest. He said there is also the perception that some of this has been personal, and it is unfortunate, but that is not the reason.

Another senator said that a concern she had heard expressed was that academic staff had become voices for the administration on Faculty Senate.

A senator said that as a member of the academic staff, the explanation by a previous senator would be helpful as the petition is going around. She said that if there had been more discussion about this issue previously, some of the contention and misunderstanding that has occurred may have been avoided.

Another senator said he is concerned about the language on the petition, which he feels is inconsistent with the current Constitution in terms of who are defined as faculty. Rainville said there is a state statute that currently defines faculty, and will seek a legal opinion before proceeding with the referendum.

One senator agreed that the process leading up to this petition was unfortunate since there was misinformation about this very important issue. She said that she would hope that notice is given broadly of this, and that there will be informational sessions and discussion and sharing of ideas, the spirit of cooperation, collaboration, and communication.

A senator said that as to the point about this being personal versus structural, academic staff have served with honor and commitment to the university and to the faculty and students. He said he would not want the process or this action to cast any aspersions on the academic staff.

Another senator said that revisiting the original language which granted academic staff faculty status might clarify as to who should vote on this issue.

Rainville passed around a page of Chapter 3, 3.1.2, which details how faculty are defined.

A senator asked when the legal opinion is obtained, if it can be sent to all Faculty Senator. Rainville said he would. The senator asked about the removal of instructional academic staff names from the petition, to which Rainville replied that he would do so. The senator also asked what happens next. Rainville said that the university must have the referendum, ballots will printed and sent, collected and counted, but this will not happening until legal opinion, as there is no time stipulation.

Provost Delgado said that some questions were raised in this discussion. He said he sees shared governance as faculty and academic staff as sharing responsibility at this institution. He said that he has always seen Faculty Senates as places that senators and others who are invited put forward the university's mission, but if the Faculty Senate now sees itself as primarily advocating for faculty, where does that leave mission of the university?

A senator said he feels that advocating for the faculty and moving forward the university's mission are complimentary. He noted that a previous senator left the university due to compensation issues. He said that student success is directly related to the faculty.

Another senator said that he agrees with a previous senator that it is not mutually exclusive as to advocacy and the university's mission. He also said the roles of faculty and staff are clearly defined. He noted that the Constitution says that Faculty Senate is to participate broadly in governance of the institution, and the idea that Faculty Senate is only to address limited issues is false. He went on to say that the statutes define faculty advocacy as a primary responsibility of the Faculty Senate.

A senator said that previous statements have pointed out the importance of collective bargaining for the faculty, but asked if there is a representative council that serves the needs of the university as an institution.

Another senator said that there are different governance structures including University Senates.

A senator said that she feels her time working on a working group for the University Planning Group was shared governance, and that shared governance structures currently exist on campus.

A senator asked why this body can't act in the same manner without questions as to intent, and asks that the discussion held today continue and spread to the rest of the faculty and academic staff as the vote goes forward.

Academic Staff Council Chair Link said that this discussion was enlightening, and a broader governance structure could be looked at that would be more inclusive.

A representative of Student Senate said that from his perspective as a student, it is clear what the counterbalance as far as advocating for the university, which is the Student Senate. He also said that students are the reason for the university existing at all, to serve them, and shared governance is in place to represent the students to some extent. He said the role of student government could be significantly enhanced in terms of participating in issues which affect the institution as a whole.

A senator said that it seems contradictory that non-instructional staff have a voice on faculty personnel issues.

Another senator said she wants to be clear that all staff impact the academic progress of students, not just the faculty.

A senator said that she believes it is time to clarify the roles of varying types of staff and their responsibilities. She said not all institutions have separated faculty and academic staff as this petition would, and that UWRF has a long history of working together for our students. She also said UW-Stevens Point has a Faculty/Academic Staff Senate.

A senator said that the group is not going to get through this without hard feelings, and that in 1999, a referendum on a constitutional amendment to create a university senate was defeated very soundly.

Another senator noted that this would not do anything to Academic Staff Council, and the instructional academic staff would be included at Faculty Senate.

A senator said that instructional academic staff would be the easiest to convince to vote a certain way, if some as are accused of voting with administration.

A senator replied that the issue is not with coercion, but with administration being directly on Senate.

A motion to adjourn was made by John Heppen and seconded by Robyne Tiedeman. There was no dissention.

Adjournment at 5:07 p.m.