

AGENDA
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
January 27, 2009
Huff's
2:30 – 4:30 p.m.

- I. Call to Order**
 - 1. Chancellor's Report**
 - 2. Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs' Report**
 - 3. Vice Chancellor for Administrative & Student Life Services' Report**
 - 4. Other Information**
 - a. Charge to PPC: Administrative Hiring Charge (Attachment 1)**
 - b. Charge to PPC: College Level Governance Charge (Attachment 2)**
 - 5. Announcements**
- II. Minutes of December 9, 2008 (Attachment 3)**
- III. Committee Reports**
 - 1. Other**
- IV. Old Business**
 - 1. Information Items**
 - a. Ad-hoc Committee for Polytechnic Curriculum Framework (Steve Deckelman, Attachment 4)**
 - 2. Other**
- V. New Business**
 - 1. Decision Item**
 - a. Faculty Senate Department Representative (Steve Deckelman)**
 - 1.) Steve Terry, Physical Education Department**
 - b. PPC Recommendations on Emeritus Status Process (Joe Holland, Attachment 5)**
 - 2. Discussion Items**
 - a. Minority Faculty Staff Network (MFSN) Proposal (John Dzissah, Attachment 6)**
 - b. Inclusivity Committee Proposal (Jan Hare, Attachment 7)**
 - c. Job Satisfaction and Engagement Report (Steve Deckelman, Attachment 8)**
<http://www.uwstout.edu/bpa/ir/surveyresults/qw108/index.html>
 - 3. Information Items**
 - a. Sabbatical Guidelines 2010-2012 (Provost Furst-Bowe, Attachment 9)**
 - b. Form Changes for Evaluations of Administrators (Meridith Wentz)**
 - 1.) Use of Scantrons (bubble sheets)**
 - 2.) Online Submission**
 - 4. Other**
- VI. Adjournment**



Faculty Senate
 11 Harvey Hall
 University of Wisconsin-Stout
 P.O. Box 790
 Menomonie, WI 54751
 715/232-1789

Date: January 12, 2009
To: Joe Holland
 Chair, Personnel Policies Committee
 cc: Charles Sorensen, Chancellor, Julie Furst-Bowe, Provost
From: Steve Deckelman
 Chair, Faculty Senate
Subject: Charge to PPC on Administrative Hiring

I am charging the PPC with reviewing and making recommendations on the composition and operations of administrative hiring committees with the aim of achieving broad participation by elected members of the affected faculty and academic staff. Since UW-Stout policy currently contains no language on this subject, the PPC may find it useful to consult with faculty governance bodies at peer UW Campuses, UW System Legal, as well as our own administration. The committee should submit its recommendations to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee by April 14, 2009.

As an example of a possible model, I am attaching a copy of UW Eau Claire's policies. This was also included as an attachment to the Faculty Senate Agenda of November 4, 2008 and is available online at <http://www.uwec.edu/acadAff/policies/handbook/index.htm>. Chapter 5 contains their administrative hiring policies.

Some other items I would ask the PPC to consider as a part of this charge:

- Chancellor Sorensen has expressed an interest in this issue and the PPC should consult with him as part of your process.
- Because of possible Affirmative Action aspects, the PPC should also consult with Donna Weber. In addition Affirmative Action also has an informal set of hiring guidelines the PPC should also apprise itself of.
- The fact that other peer institutions have faculty written policies governing administrative hiring committees establishes some precedent that faculty do have some input on the way in which administrative hiring is conducted. Nevertheless, UWS Chapter 36 delineates the principles of shared governance and it is reasonable to assume an institution's Chancellor has some prerogatives in the process as well. As part of its work, the PPC should try to ascertain and clarify the parameters governing the roles of faculty and administration in crafting policy governing administrative hiring to the extent that these have been legally determined or defined. You may find it useful to consult with attorneys from UW System legal. Either Wayne Argo, or the Faculty Senate Chair can put the PPC in touch with these people.
- In addition to UW Eau Claire, a number of other UW peer campuses (e.g., Stevens Point and the UW Colleges) have similar policies. The Faculty Senate Chair can put the PPC in touch with contact people at these campuses upon request.
- It would be helpful if the PPC were also to draft new policy that the Faculty Senate could discuss and vote on later in the spring semester.

jr





Faculty Senate
11 Harvey Hall
University of Wisconsin-Stout
P.O. Box 790
Menomonie, WI 54751
715/232-1789

Date: January 12, 2009

To: Joe Holland
Chair, Personnel Policies Committee
cc: Charles Sorensen, Chancellor, Julie Furst-Bowe, Provost

From: Steve Deckelman
Chair, Faculty Senate

Subject: Charge to PPC on College Level Governance

I am charging the PPC with reviewing and possibly making recommendations on College Level Governance policies. University Policies pertaining to College Level Governance are contained in section 2.1 of the FASLAH and have not been revised in 20-24 years. The committee may find it useful to consult with peer UW Campuses, UW System Legal, as well as, our own administration and to examine existing, as well as, new College bylaws that are being developed as a result of realignment. The committee should submit its recommendations to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee by April 14, 2009.

As part of its review I would ask the PPC to address:

- Addition of a requirement for PPC review and Faculty Senate Approval of college bylaws.
- More active periodic review of college level governance.
- Guidelines for the processes by which college bylaws are proposed and approved.
- Clarification of faculty roles in other college level initiatives including Mission Statements, Strategic Plans etc.

jr



**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
December 9, 2008
Ballroom A
2:30 – 4:30 p.m.**

ATTENDANCE:

CHAIR: Steve Deckelman
VICE CHAIR: Abel Adekola

SECRETARY: Laura Schmidt
PAST CHAIR: Jerry Kapus

PRESENT: Abel Adekola; Paul Calenberg; Hector Cruz; Steve Deckelman; Kevin Doll; Kevin Drzakowski; Brian Fitch; Nelu Ghenciu; Joe Holland; Renee Howarton; Jerry Kapus; Lamin Kassama; Alec Kirby; Marcia Miller-Rodeberg; Phillip Motley; Noah Norton; Cynthia Rohrer; Laura Schmidt; Scott Springer; Julianne Taylor; Ned Weckmueller

EXCUSED: Lars Jerlach; Ruth Nyland; Ann Parsons; John Rompala

GUESTS: Chancellor Sorensen; Provost Furst-Bowe

I. Call to Order – 2:32 p.m.

- 1. Chancellor’s Report – The Chancellor said there is no news on the budget. President Reilly will recommend that the Board submit a request to the State for annual increases of 2.5 percent for each of the next two years. The Board of Regents approved two new programs and a plan to spend \$18 million to renovate and remodel parts of the Memorial Student Center. There should be news about the budget before Christmas. A hospital tax may be imposed to help with the shortfall before July 1. There were questions concerning the reduction of pay raises requested by President Reilly. It was discussed that faculty were not aware of this ahead of time. There hasn’t been any reaction to the lower pay increase.**
- 2. Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs’ Report – The Provost said there were two new education majors, B.S. in Science Education and a B.S. in Technology and Science Education, approved by the Board of Regents. There is funding for curricular incubation grants for spring and summer. Information and the application can be found on the Provost website, <http://www.uwstout.edu/rs/cic.shtml>, or RPS website, <http://www.uwstout.edu/rs/cic.shtml>. The program is geared toward nontraditional, adult or transfer students. The Provost meeting on Friday will cover a system-wide review of programs to see if any programs, due to the budget issues, may be eliminated. Since UW-Stout’s programs are specialized, implications to UW-Stout are expected to be minimal.**
- 3. Vice Chancellor for Administrative & Student Life Services’ Report – No Report**
- 4. Other Information**
 - a. Budget Reduction Narrative – Chair Deckelman redistributed the narrative. Please submit your input or concerns about the budget reduction narrative by the end of the semester.**
- 5. Announcements – Chair Deckelman announced that there is a Faculty’s Representatives Meeting on Friday, and he will not be able to attend. Please contact Chair Deckelman if anyone is interested in attending. President Reilly will be attending this meeting.**

II. Minutes of November 25, 2008

Motion: Holland/Howarton moved to approve the Minutes of November 25, 2008.

Amendment: Gene Ruenger attended the meeting for Marcia Miller-Rodeberg. Therefore, remove Marcia Miller-Rodeberg as being present at the meeting and include Gene Ruenger.

Vote: Passed with Amendment and 2 Abstentions.

III. Committee Reports

1. Curriculum & Instruction

- a. Global Perspectives Requirements – Steve Cole said that Tom Ebert, along with Jill Stanton and Sue Wolfgram, were on the committee to review the Global Perspectives courses and requirements to make sure they are satisfied and discussed strengthening the requirement. Tom Ebert gave an overview of the Global Perspective Requirement review and recommendations document. It was found that seventy-five percent of students meet the requirement with high school credits. Nine changes to the requirement were recommended. It was questioned if there was an attempt to see how this would affect individual programs and possibly require students to attend Stout longer. Some programs 18/30 are automatically covered. With the additional foreign language courses, enough seats are added to cover the nine courses dropped from the approved list. Students should be able to satisfy the requirements the same way current requirements are met. The nine courses have not been notified yet that they no longer have the designation. The suggested implementation would be Fall 2009. Since recruitment is already following the current requirements, it is more realistic to have them implemented in Fall 2010. A discussion pursued that it would be an opportune time to review program or course curricula to increase global perspectives. There were a lot of responses to their Global information survey. The results will be presented as part of professional development in January. Due to the current budget crisis, there was a concern about recommendation #7, Increase allocations to the foreign languages area with the intent of offering more foreign languages and language courses. It was wondered if students would be able to satisfy the requirements within their program and graduation time frame. The courses that students are allowed to take for general education courses could be severely limited. However, more courses may be incorporating global perspectives so that students can satisfy the requirement. Transfer or distance education students may need to take additional UW-Stout courses, since their current courses may not transfer and now count for the requirement.

Motion: Kapus/Holland moved to approve the Global Perspectives Requirements.

Amend: Approve with the requirements to be implemented in Fall 2010 and Spring 2011 review.

Vote: (By show of hands): 14 Yea's, 4 Nay's, and 3 Abstentions. Motion passed with Amendment.

2. Educational Activities

- a. Recommendation of Class Period Lengths – Renee Howarton said the EAC was charged to make a review of the class period length and recommend any changes. Renee gave an overview of the results of a survey given to faculty. Since the results didn't indicate a strong majority for the change, the EAC committee recommends not making any changes. Some faculty were concerned if there

would be enough time to teach effectively. Other faculty said that if the length of the class period were shortened, additional days could be added or technology could be used more efficiently. The EAC asks for Faculty Senate approval of the recommendation and acknowledges the conclusion of their charge. Due to confidentiality, the survey comments will not be distributed and can only be reviewed at the Senate Office.

Motion: Howarton/Calenberg moved to approve the Recommendation of Class Period Lengths.

Vote: Passed with 1 Abstention.

- b. 2010-2011 Academic Calendar – Renee Howarton presented the 2010-2011 calendar and the criteria that needs to be followed to produce the calendar. There will not be a study day in the fall. Advisement Day will be on a Wednesday next year, instead of a Tuesday, to balance off the Monday/Wednesday/Friday and Tuesday/Thursday classes. It was mentioned that the study day is vital to give students an opportunity to study newly introduced materials before taking the final, so keep a study day for future calendars if we can. It was questioned why commencement is before the end of finals. The Chancellor said that this is based on history and allows more students to participate before the holiday break.

Motion: Weckmueller/Cruz moved to approve the 2010-2011 Academic Calendar.

Vote: Passed unanimously.

3. Elections

- a. Officers – Abel Adekola said that there hasn't been any nominations for Vice Chair and College Representatives; College of Education, Health and Human Sciences, two representative; College of Management, one representative; and College of Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics for Faculty Senate. He pleaded to have faculty consider running for these positions.

4. Graduate Education

- a. English Language Proficiency Policy – Gene Ruenger presented the Graduate School Policy 1.24: Test of English as a Second Language document to change the policy for the graduate level. The new English proficiency test is already being used at the undergraduate level. Implementation of the use of the test would begin immediately.

Motion: Ghenciu/Holland moved to approve the English Language Proficiency Policy.

Vote: Passed unanimously.

5. Other

IV. Old Business

1. Summer Session Salary Recommendations – Chair Deckelman put the motion to approve the Summer Session Salary Recommendations back on the table.

Motion: Springer/Weckmueller moved to make an amendment to the Summer Session Salary Recommendations to eliminate item 4. (Committee Recommendations). If item 4 is eliminated, the department chair would be responsible for assigning the correct number of students to make money. There are too many differences among courses to have a campus-wide class size. Some departments use item 4 as a way to correct these differences. Comments were also raised regarding item 3.

and item 7.

Amendment: Weckmueller/Kapus moved to strike “4 weeks” in item 2. and eliminate item 3 (Committee Recommendations).

Amendment to the

Amendment: Ghenciu, accepted by Weckmueller/Kapus, moved to keep item 1. and item 2., with the “4 weeks” strikeout, (Committee Recommendations) and eliminate items 3. through item 8.

Questions were raised concerning the flexibility of summer session compensation. There has been a steady increase in summer session credits being generated, so it allows some flexibility with summer compensation. If more money is spent on salary, the Provost will have less money available for other requests. It was expressed that faculty should not take a pay cut in the summer when no other positions on campus takes one.

Vote: Passed unanimously with Amendment.

Motion: Tabled motion moved to approve the tabled motion on Summer Session Salary Recommendations with amendments.

The amended Summer Session Salary Recommendations would include item 1 and item 2, with the “4 weeks” strikeout, (Committee Recommendations).

Vote: Passed unanimously.

2. **Request by UW-Oshkosh for Senate Resolution in Support of Audit by Legislative Fiscal Bureau – Chair Deckelman** said this was brought forward at the last Faculty Representative meeting. He said the rationale behind this request is to put some weight on the Legislative Fiscal Bureau.

Motion: Drzakowski/Calenberg moved to approve the Endorsement of the Request UW-Oshkosh for Senate Resolution in Support of Audit by Legislative Fiscal Bureau.

It was commented that getting politicians involved is questionable. The sentiment might be nice, but is an audit necessary. Once an audit is unleashed, other issues may be brought out that may not be beneficial. It wouldn't show anything that isn't already known. This is the same group that evaluated and changed the sick leave policy. There is no control over how the results would be used, including press releases. Faculty should be the ones to research and present the information themselves. UW System already does an audit annually, but it was questioned if they compare the results to other state agencies.

Vote: Defeated unanimously.

V. New Business

1. **Entitlement to Plan: B.S. in Sustainable Management – Anne Hoel** gave an overview of the B.S. in Sustainable Management handouts. It is truly a collaboration of the five campuses, breaks down barriers and eliminates transfer issues. This is designed for non-traditional students. The program is needed in this region, since there are few programs available. The students would decide which campus the degree comes from. This is similar to the technical college system.

Motion: Ghenciu/Howarton moved to approve the Entitlement to Plan: B.S. in Sustainable Management.

Vote: Passed unanimously.

2. **Faculty Senate Committee on Administrative Hiring – Steve Deckelman said that Ned Weckmueller and he are interested in working on this ad-hoc committee. Other interested faculty could also be a part of the committee. The Chancellor requests Administration input on this committee. Since there are currently standing committees that have vacancies, it was wondered if there is enough interested faculty to form additional committees. However, the Faculty Senate does not have control over other people volunteering.**

Motion: Springer/Miller-Rodeberg moved to approve the endorsement of a Faculty Senate Committee on Administrative Hiring.

It was suggested that these issues should be charged to the PPC, not to form another committee. Dysfunctional standing committees need to be addressed and made accountable.

Vote: Defeated with 1 Yea and 1 Abstention.

The reason for this review was concerns with the hiring process and how the hiring committees were formed. Chair Deckelman said there is a disconnect on appointing committee members on what he hears from the Provost and how the members are actually being appointed and the implications of appointed committee members. The issues are to get more faculty representation on these committees and the process of electing, not appointing, these representatives.

Motion: Schmidt/Weckmueller moved to charge the Personnel Policy Committee to review the Administrative Hiring process.

Vote: Passed unanimously.

Motion: Weckmueller/Springer moved to make the Faculty Senate Chair the new chair of the PPC until the new chair is chosen by PPC.

The Faculty Senate expresses thanks to the current PPC Chair, Dennis Vanden Bloomen.

Vote: Passed unanimously.

3. **Faculty Senate Committee on College Governance – Chair Deckelman will charge PPC.**
4. **Faculty Senate Committee on Curriculum and Program Framework –**
5. **2007-08 Annual Teaching Workload Report – Chair Deckelman distributed this for information only. If there are any questions, please inform Chair Deckelman, and he will invite Meredith Wentz to attend a Faculty Senate meeting.**
6. **Other – It was suggested to review the standing committees makeup (tenure vs. tenure-track) especially the PPC.**

VI. Adjournment – 4:38 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Laura Schmidt, Secretary

Recorded and prepared by,
Janell Reitz

Faculty Senate Committee on Curriculum and Program Framework

The Faculty Senate will establish an ad-hoc committee with the charge of continuing the conversation on Stout's emerging Polytechnic identity in areas of programs and curricula with the aim of sharing the results with the Chancellor's Mission, Vision, Values Review Team. As part of its work the committee may want to consider holding some listening sessions, visiting departments with the aim of writing up a short report and statement of learning goals to the Faculty Senate. The committee should submit its report to the Faculty Senate by April 21, 2009.

Faculty/Academic Staff/Limited Appointees Handbook

Emeritus Status

1. POLICY

The Chancellor, upon recommendation by a retiree's department and/or dean, and/or director, may award Emeritus status to a retiring person.

- 1.1 The department of which the retiree was a member, shall make a decision, within thirty (30) days of the retirement, to recommend, or not recommend, the retiree for Emeritus status, and forward that decision to the Chancellor.
- 1.2 If the department fails to make a recommendation within thirty days, the retiree's Dean shall, within the next thirty (30) days, make a recommendation for or against Emeritus status, and forward that recommendation to the Chancellor.

Draft Motion for MFSN Faculty Senate Representative 12-02-08

Questions/items to consider (Items taken directly from 3-25-08 meeting with faculty senate board members):

1. MFSN is encouraged to meet and share its history with the Executive Board prior to the vote.

The Minority Faculty and Staff network was started in response to the initiatives contained in the UW System 1998 Design for Diversity and Plan 2008, which were brought to light in the 2003 Minority Faculty and Staff Report conducted by Howard Lee and Hector Cruz. To understand the findings of the study the Chancellor and MSS office funded a retreat held at the Creamery restaurant in spring of 2005. Results of this retreat and discussion provided a springboard for the formation of the MFSN in June 2005.

The primary goals of the group are to provide a network, camaraderie, advocacy and support for minority people on the UW- Stout campus, who have very different life experiences, cultural experiences and to provide a group where minority issues can be voiced.

The needs of minority faculty and staff are socialized barriers to attaining equal employment opportunity, access and upward mobility based on the very nature of social institutions, therefore founding a culturally sensitive network reinforces and develops a support system that is shared by minority people.

MFSN was formally recognized in 2007 as UW-Stout committee and is sponsored by the Chancellor and is open to all members of the UW-Stout community, with particular emphasis on the following:

MISSION STATEMENT

Our mission is to foster growth and opportunities for minority faculty and staff, to create an awareness of people from diverse backgrounds, and to enhance relationships to benefit the campus and community at-large.

Goals:

- Offer a culture of affirmation and camaraderie for minority faculty and staff.
- Provide support to the ethnic/minority members with resources to enhance their professional and personal success.
- Enhance the University recruitment and retention of minority faculty and staff.
- Provide leadership to create a positive climate within the University and community.

VISION STATEMENT

Our vision is to be active partners with the University's planning, development, and implementation activities in the integration of minority faculty and staff into the community at-large.

2. Why does MFSN merit a seat if the current make-up represents all faculties?

While the current make-up represents faculty at UW-Stout, an MFSN representative would facilitate communication between MFSN and the Faculty Senate and embrace retention efforts of Minority faculty.

The unique insight, influence and needs of the members of MFSN warrant a seat on the faculty senate because the senate is the governing board for an all inclusive campus.

Research indicates that in addition to conventional faculty representation, MFSN members by virtue of their racial and/or ethnic heritage, social barriers, and culturally relative experiences merit the need for a separate and equal voice. Unless representatives on the faculty senate share similar socially imposed barriers, as experienced by minority faculty and staff they cannot adequately be the voice for MFSN members.

3. Who and how would the senator be elected?

The MFSN representative would be an active Minority faculty member. The individual would be nominated and recommended by the MFSN, to the Faculty-Senate to serve for the same term as all Faculty Senators

4. What additional concerns would/could an MFSN senator address?

An MFSN senator could address all concerns directly related to the mission, vision and goals of the MFSN, and the strategy goals of the university.

An MFSN senator can help develop cultural sensitivity, provide a worldview shared by minority people, aid in discussions of diversity and give a broader insight to racial and ethnic concerns.

5. What has been a tangible outcome from having an MFSN senator on the Academic Staff Senate?

Meeting the university's strategic goals and providing a diverse and inclusive view to address goals and objectives of university's strategic plan, and those of the Staff Senate.

Facilitating communication between the Staff Senate and the MFSN membership concerning University and UW-System initiatives and priorities.

Providing leadership opportunities and improving retention efforts for minority staff.

6. Write separate motions: 1) for a Senator

Motion 1: (Language taken from amendment language of their constitution)

One senator shall be elected by the Minority Faculty and Staff Network (MFSN), a faculty of an academic department within the university to represent the MFSN, for the same term serve by all Faculty Senators. If the MFSN has no faculty, it may choose to elect a nonvoting, ad-hoc representative to the faculty senate.

Rationale: Insures representation on the senate by a MFSN member.

7. If the request is denied, what would be a plan "b"?

MFSN would request an informal connection to the faculty senate by inviting a member of the faculty senate board to attend all MFSN general meetings each semester.

If this request is denied, there is no plan B. The MFSN would have to continue to function as a secondary resource on campus. Having the visibility of the senate furthers a higher visibility for minority people.

Draft Motion for MFSN Faculty Senate Representative 12-02-08

8. Does approval of the motion open discussion for a specific Woman or LGBTQ senator position?

MFSN is unable to comment on behalf of other groups at this time.

Date: 1/27/09

To: University of Wisconsin—Stout Faculty Senate

From: The UW-Stout Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Questioning (LGBTQ) Inclusivity Committee

Re: Revised Request for Representation on the Faculty Senate

Request to Faculty Senate (FS): The LGBTQ Inclusivity Committee is requesting representation on the FS via a non-voting seat. Specifically, we propose that the Director of Diversity (currently Richard Tafalla) occupy this seat. Our committee would keep the Director abreast of current concerns and issues that pertain to LGBTQ faculty and students, and the Director would keep our committee informed of relevant discussions in the Faculty Senate. Other non-student diversity organizations, such as the Minority Faculty/Staff Network, would follow the same processes for issues relating to their constituencies. The Director would incorporate these concerns/issues into a regular informational report to the FS.

- FS is charged with representing a cross section of the academic community, yet LGBTQ faculty members have not had regular, dedicated, responsive communication channels with FS, nor have other minority and diversity groups on campus.
- LGBTQ people at UW-Stout face discriminatory practices. Several of the Personnel Policies are particularly relevant. Examples include DP benefits, bereavement leave, retiree spousal benefits, access to appropriate medical care, etc.
- We also have some specific input relevant to Curriculum and Instruction, e.g., infusing LGBT content across the curriculum where relevant, dealing with hate/bias language in the classroom, and helping to ensure that new program proposals satisfy System's requirements for diversity and inclusion.
- Faculty/Academic Staff/Limited Appointees Handbook is not up-to-date in terms of groups protected under UW-System non-discrimination statement. This illustrates another example of why we need better communication channels with the FS.
- In the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) meeting, we were asked how many faculty the LGBTQ Inclusivity Committee represents. Because many LGBTQ people yield to social pressures to pass for straight and because the LGBTQ Inclusivity Committee works to represent all faculty and staff members who would like to see a campus environment that is friendly to LGBTQ inclusivity, we don't know how many people we represent.
- We could get representation on the FS by having more members run for FS seats or join FS committees. However, the LGBTQ Inclusivity Committee has only one tenured faculty member on it. Serving on a committee specifically to represent a non-majority position can be politically hazardous as well as time consuming. It is not appropriate to require junior faculty members to take on that responsibility and risk in order for their concerns

to be heard—indeed, creating such an obligation can function to silence people whose concerns are not yet represented.

- The fact that all faculty members on our Committee except one are untenured speaks to two issues: 1) the social pressures of invisibility of people with non-normative sexuality and gender identity, and 2) the need for Stout to work on retention/leadership development opportunities for LGBTQ faculty members.
- For these reasons, and to assist the FS in fulfilling its constitutional mandate to represent “a cross-section of the academic community of the university” and to act with “highest consideration to the good of the university and its students,” we request that the Director of Diversity be given a non-voting seat on the FS.

*Written by Jan Hare, Ph.D., Chair of LGBTQ Inclusivity Committee and Professor
harej@uwstout.edu*

*Leni Marshall, Ph.D., Committee Member and Assistant Professor
marshallel@uwstout.edu*

For further information about the LGBTQ Inclusivity Committee, visit the organization’s website:

**Job Satisfaction and Engagement Report
Introduction from Chancellor Charles Sorensen**

UW-Stout has a history of loyal, dedicated faculty and staff. As I have been on my walks around campus during these past years, I am always impressed with the commendable level of professional activity and service that is demonstrated by our staff. We all realize how complex the university is yet we do not always know the effort it actually takes to operate this organization effectively and efficiently.

Last spring, a Quality of Life/Job Engagement survey was conducted to gather perceptions and ideas from all UW-Stout staff and the results are in.

Overall Job Satisfaction	7.0	(10 point scale)
Overall Quality of Worklife	4.3	(6 point scale)
Overall Job Engagement	4.5	(6 point scale)

We are pleased that the report feedback is quite positive in many areas. The results are especially significant given the economic conditions both nationally and statewide as well as the troublesome demographic changes, and declining support for higher education in the state legislature. A recent posting from the Wisconsin Office of Economic Advisors indicates, "Gasoline, food, and other commodity prices have pushed inflation up over 4 percent, and Wisconsin June 2008 job figures are 17,800 below last year." I think we all feel the stress of working and living in a stagnant economic situation.

We also understand and respect that there are some areas of concern. There is a level of frustration for all of us on those areas that are not within our control. Several of the suggestions received included areas that are outside of the university's ability to make change although we will continue to press the case at the University of Wisconsin System level and State level. These include suggestions to increase the levels of pay and benefits, to reduce workload, increase resources, and eliminate bureaucratic hurdles.

And, I am also pleased to see some of the ideas for improvement that you have identified through the survey are those we are focusing on as well. For example, a Director of Diversity position has been established, we have allocated special funding to support professional development/training opportunities, and we continue to look at ways to improve communication methods on campus.

I have served as the UW-Stout Chancellor for two decades and, during my tenure, as I have seen administrators of divisions, colleges, and units change, it has become apparent to me that we all share a personal responsibility to keep ourselves informed and engaged in the activities of the university. This campus values transparency of information and participation in campus decision making. Only by taking personal responsibility to be informed, to be involved in governance, and participate in the processes for decision making will assure that we are successful as an organization and engaged as a community.

There is much detail included in the full report which will be valuable to the division administrators and deans as they work with their leadership teams to review and identify opportunities for improvement appropriate to their units. In about a year, I'll ask for an update on initiatives implemented as a result of the review and share those results with you.

If you are interested in the complete report, that is available at <http://www.uwstout.edu/bpa/ir/surveyresults/qwl08/index.html>. I would like to take this opportunity to thank everyone who participated in the survey last spring. If you would like to discuss the report further, please feel free to contact Provost Julie Furst-Bowe, Vice Chancellor Diane Moen, or Director of Budget, Planning & Analysis Meridith Wentz. We value your opinions.



Charles W. Sorensen
Chancellor

Job Engagement and Satisfaction Report
Executive Summary
Summary prepared by Budget, Planning & Analysis

The following is a summary of the findings from the Quality of Worklife/Job Engagement Survey (QWL/JE) developed by Russell Consulting Inc. and summarized by Budget, Planning and Analysis.

Background:

This QWL/JE Survey replaces UW-Stout's Morale Survey and One-Minute Climate Assessment Survey. The primary reasons for revising the survey were as follows:

- To shift the focus from morale to job engagement and satisfaction. This shift is in alignment with the national literature in this area and with current Baldrige criteria.
- To allow UW-Stout to obtain benchmarking data to other institutions of higher education.

The QWL/JE survey was developed by Russell Consulting (RCI), with input provided by UW-Stout.

Representativeness of sample:

The survey was administered to all faculty, academic staff, classified staff and LTE's who were on the payroll as of March 1, 2008 (N=1,106) and 578 responded for a response rate of 52.3%.

The demographics of the respondents were compared with the demographics of the UW-Stout population in order to determine the representativeness of the sample. The results from this analysis are used to determine if the sample is representative of the population. The results suggest that the sample is fairly representative in all areas except for a slight under-representation of adjuncts (and slight over-representation of classified/project + LTE).

	Respondents	UW-Stout population (as of 10/1/07)
Campus role		
Classified/project + LTE	219 + 32 (48%)	487 (42%)
Professional Academic staff	126 (24%)	249 (22%)
Faculty	119 (23%)	262 (23%)
Adjunct	32 (6%)	155 (13%)
Gender		
Female	323 (62%)	698 (57%)
Male	198 (38%)	523 (43%)
Race/ethnicity		
White	481 (84%)	1047 (86%)
Racial Minority	93 (16%)	174 (14%)
Years working at Stout		
0-5	192 (36%)	471 (39%)
6-10	113 (21%)	297 (24%)
11-15	57 (11%)	84 (7%)
16-20	53 (10%)	111 (9%)
21+	116 (22%)	258 (21%)
Division		
Academic and Student Affairs	273 (58%)	734 (60%)

Administrative and Student Life Services	171 (36%)	408 (33.5%)
Chancellor's Division	29 (6%)	79 (6.5%)

Data for 208 adjuncts unavailable for gender, race, years

Results

The survey provided opportunities for respondents to provide numerical assessment as well as respond to open-ended questions. Respondents were promised that comments would be anonymous and therefore we received many valuable insights. The following narrative first summarizes the numerical questions, and then the open-ended questions.

Numeric question results

Results in this section are split into two parts:

- Results from the individual likert-scale questions
- Results from composite variables, which are a grouping of individual questions averaged together that address a similar topic.

Average ratings on the individual survey questions ranged from 3.13 to 5.51 on a 6-point scale. A total of 37 questions (42%) had average ratings of 4.5 or higher. Average ratings on the composite variables ranged from 3.73 to 5.11.

Responses from Individual Questions

Individual questions that received averages ranging from 5.10 to 5.51 were:

- I have the knowledge, skills and abilities that I need to accomplish my performance goals.
- I am proud of the work that I do for this campus.
- I take the initiative when I see a job that needs to be done.
- When I'm dealing with a difficult problem or challenge, I can usually figure out a solution or know who to go to for help.
- I am confident in my abilities to meet almost any performance challenge set before me.
- My work is meaningful to me.
- I am responsible for creating my own success in my job.
- When I experience setbacks and failures I am usually able to bounce back.

An additional 29 questions received average ratings of 4.5 or higher, and covered these areas: comfort with change, approaching supervisor, and asking for help; involvement in setting performance goals and fairness of performance standards; level of independence; satisfaction with work; relationships and collaboration with co-workers; recognition; fair treatment; diversity/cultural competency; encouragement to apply new ideas and grow in job.

Individual questions that received averages ranging from 3.13 to 3.34 (where 37% to 50% of the respondents responded with a 4 or higher) were:

- The systems on this campus for deciding job promotions and opportunities are fair.
- I am given an opportunity to offer timely input into decisions being made at the campus level that affect me.

- The pay I receive for my work is fair and reasonable when compared to the pay that others on this campus receive for doing comparable work.
- People who work hard and do good work on this campus are rewarded (e.g. recognition, promotions, opportunities for advancement, or other rewards).
- When addressing a problem on this campus, we try to get at the root cause of the problem before implementing solutions.
- All faculty and staff on this campus are held accountable for the decisions they make.
- All faculty and staff on this campus are held accountable for their actions.
- The leaders on this campus are receptive to new ideas – even those that challenge the status quo.

An additional 16 questions received average ratings between 3.40 and 4.0, and covered these areas: appropriate number of staff; accountability; rewards; modeling by leaders; campus culture of cause vs. blame; knowledge of steps needed to advance career; opportunities for advancement; communication about issues across departments and from leaders; applicability of strategic plan to individual; work/life balance; satisfaction with performance review process; and comfort with requesting change.

Responses from Composite Questions

These composite variables received average ratings of 4.82 and higher:

- Job Engagement: Personal Strength and Resilience
- Employee job ownership
- Overall satisfaction with the job itself
- Job Engagement: Job Design/Enrichment
- Peer relationship/teamwork

These composite variables received average ratings between 3.73 and 3.95:

- Career Advancement Opportunities
- Recognition, rewards, and compensation
- Quality of Leadership
- Decision making and problem solving
- Vision and Strategy
- Job engagement: strategic alignment

When asked about their overall job satisfaction (on a 10-point scale), the average response was 6.95, with the largest number of respondents (23%) selecting a response of 8.

Open-Ended Question Results

What Contributes Most to People's Job Engagement

Employees shared many positive reasons to work at UW-Stout with the following two most frequent reasons: 1) supportive, helpful co-workers and peers; and a collaborative work environment. 2) Employees also like the kind of work that they do, finding it challenging and personally satisfying to work in an educational environment.

Other positive comments about the university included relationships with department chairs/supervisors and campus leaders; the ability to work independently; recognition and appreciation

of work performed; the specific characteristics of UW-Stout; the work environment; the pay, benefits, and job security; adequate resources to do their work; being treated fairly; the work schedule; and level of communication.

Suggestions for Improving Job Engagement

The suggestions for improvement were varied. The most frequent comment was about pay and benefits. Individuals desired a change in salary, pay equity, and pay for performance.

Other suggestions for improving job engagement included improving the campus climate and culture and to emphasize collaboration between departments. There was also an interest in infusing university level values of participation, communication, accountability, and cooperation at all levels of the university as well as emphasizing professional development and training opportunities. Finally, there were suggestions to improve leadership abilities and responsibilities from managers and supervisors to the Vice Chancellors and Chancellor.

Differences by segment

Results were also analyzed to identify differences by segment.

- There were few statistical differences by gender, but women generally had higher means than the men.
- There were few consistent statistical differences by campus role, years at Stout and division.
- There were few statistical differences by race/ethnicity, but the white group generally had higher means than the racial minority group.

Confidence of findings

Some of the findings from the QWL report are supported by other surveys recently conducted at UW-Stout. These recent survey results provide comparative data to the QWL survey:

- UCLA HERI faculty survey
- Internal communications audit focus group and survey report

All three surveys provide support that these items are opportunities for improvement at UW-Stout: workload, pay, involvement in decision-making.

Both the QWL/IE survey and the Internal Communications Report suggest that personal responsibility is an important component of job engagement at UW-Stout. Several areas of strength dealt with individuals taking initiative, finding solutions, having confidence and taking responsibility. As well, the Internal Communications Report found that employees who felt that they were kept well informed often reported that one reason was because they personally sought out the information. Conversely, those that reported they were not kept well informed reported that they didn't have the time to read the information they received.

**SABBATICAL GUIDELINES
FOR ACADEMIC YEARS 2010-2012
THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SYSTEM**

BACKGROUND

The purpose of the UW System Faculty Sabbatical Program is to provide in-depth study opportunities for faculty members. Sabbaticals offer opportunities for faculty in all disciplines to acquire and/or develop new knowledge in their fields and incorporate them into their classroom activities. In December of each year, a formal announcement of those faculty members receiving sabbatical opportunities is made by UW System institutions to the Board of Regents.

Every few years the Education Committee of the Board of Regents reviews guidelines for the UW System Sabbatical Program. The purpose of the guidelines is to enable the Board to recommend priorities for institutional sabbatical decisions without continually revising the sabbatical policy contained in Academic Planning Statement #3.3 (ACPS 3.3), *The Faculty Sabbatical Program*.

At the December 4, 2008 meeting, the Education Committee decided to maintain the recommendations from the 2007-09 guidelines and to incorporate into them the UW System's Shared Learning Goals, endorsed by the Board of Regents at the December meeting. The *UW System Shared Learning Goals* provide a framework to communicate the meaning and value of a college education to students, parents, and the broader community. Developed from extensive discussions among faculty and staff representing every institution within the University of Wisconsin System, the five shared learning goals represent the synthesis and essence of the instructional goals of these various institutions. The *UW System Shared Learning Goals* provide support to faculty, instructional, and academic staff to be more intentional in their teaching and learning activities.

SABBATICAL GUIDELINES

For the biennium covering 2010-12, the Board of Regents recommends the following to UW institutions as they determine their annual sabbatical assignments:

- UW institutions should continue to give consideration to projects that support the mission of the institution, in recognition of the fact that sabbatical leaves are supported by the institution and are to serve institutional purposes.
- The following areas of emphasis are encouraged to faculty as they develop sabbatical proposals: Interdisciplinary Activities; Scholarship of Teaching and Learning; Collaborative Program Activities; International Education; and Application of Technology to Instruction and Distance Education.

- Sabbatical proposals are encouraged that take up the teaching and learning of any of the five UW System Shared Learning Goals, including the development of curricula and assessable objectives for student achievement:
 - **Knowledge of Human Cultures and the Natural World** including breadth of knowledge and the ability to think beyond one's discipline, major, or area of concentration.
 - **Critical and Creative Thinking Skills** including inquiry, problem solving, and higher order qualitative and quantitative reasoning.
 - **Effective Communication Skills** including listening, speaking, reading, writing, and information literacy.
 - **Intercultural knowledge and competence** including the ability to interact and work with people from diverse backgrounds and cultures; to lead or contribute support to those who lead; and to empathize with and understand those who are different than they are.
 - **Individual, Social and Environmental Responsibility** including civic knowledge and engagement (both local and global), ethical reasoning, and action.
- The Provost at each institution should take responsibility for ensuring that the guidelines are observed as part of the institutional approval process, while also supporting the efforts of faculty members to pursue and develop their individual areas of research and teaching expertise.