Agenda
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
March 8, 2016
Ballroom B, STUC
2:30 – 4:30 P.M.

I.   Call to Order (Chair, Nelu Ghenciu)
II.   Roll Call – Sign Attendance Sheet
III.   Minutes of February 9, 2016 (Attachment 1)
IV.   Administration Reports
    1. Chancellor's Report
    2. Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs' Report
V.   Announcements
    1. Administrative Procedure – Clothing Purchase – Kim Schulte-Shoberg (Attachment 2)
    2. HLC Site Visit Draft Schedule & Expectations for March 28-30, 2016 – Meridith Drzakowski (Attachment 3 & 4)
VI.   Unfinished Business
    1.
VIII.   New Business
    1. Proposal of Eliminating Individual Desktop Printers – Kim Schulte-Shoberg (Attachment 5)
    2. Graduate Faculty Qualifications – Deanna Schulz (Attachment 6)
    3. Graduate Policy 7.0 Exceptions to the Graduate Policies Committee and Policy 8.0 Exception to Graduate Policy – Deanna Schulz (Attachment 7)
    4. Time and Rank Edits in FASLA – Tim Shiell (Attachment 8)
    5. Promotion Application Edits – Tim Shiell (Attachment 9)
    6. Work Harassment Statement/Form – Tim Shiell (Attachment 10)
    7. PRC Bylaws – Loretta Thielman (Attachment 11)
IX.   Information Items
    1. Faculty Senate Dashboard (Attachment 12)
X.   Adjournment

Minutes
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
February 9, 2016
Room 413B Heritage Hall
2:30 – 4:30 P.M.

CHAIR: Petre Ghenciu   **SECRETARY:** Amanda Brown

VICE CHAIR: Ana Vande Linde

PRESENT: Gregory Bard, Amanda Barnett, Lopa Basu, Julie Bates-Maves, Seth Berrier, Michael Bessert, Amanda Brown, Xuedong (David) Ding, Petre (Nelu) Ghenciu, Kiki Gorbatenko-Roth, Gene Gutman, Ted Harris, Glenda Jones, Jeanette Kersten, Benjamin Kirkby, Adam Kramschuster, Virginia Lea, Georgios Loizides, Colleen Murphy, Brian Oenga, Kerry Peterson, Matthew Ray, Kevin W. Tharp, Ana Vande Linde, Jackie Weissenburger, Keith Wojciechowski, and Julie Zaloudek

ABSENT: Desiree Budd (excused), Jen Grant (excused), Eun Joo Lee (excused), Kate Maury (excused), Christine Peterson (excused), Paul Stauffacher, and Kim Zagorski (excused)

GUESTS: Chancellor Meyer, Phil Lyons, Tom Lacksonen, and Tim Shiell

  I.   Call to Order (Chair, Nelu Ghenciu)
        Meeting called to order at 2:31 p.m.
 II.   Roll Call – Sign Attendance Sheet
III.   Minutes of December 15, 2015
        Motion to approve: (Vande Linde/Bard)
        Vote.   Approved unanimously.
 IV.   Administration Reports
        1. Chancellor's Report
            A. Tenure Taskforce
                 ∗   Board of Regents met last week. Chancellor Meyer is pleased with the first reading of the tenure policy.
                 ∗   Chancellor Meyer thanked Lopa Basu for her service on the taskforce.
                 ∗   Bailing felt that the UW-System needed to be ready for additional budget reductions.
                 ∗   Faculty layoffs due to program modification is no longer in the tenure policy. The policy does allow for layoffs for program elimination. Chancellor Meyer hopes to manage layoffs by having faculty serve in other departments or programs related to their area of expertise, rather than laying them off.
                 ∗   Faculty can still be laid off in the event of a financial emergency. The university must declare a financial emergency, which has negative implications for the university.

      * The tenure policy allows faculty to be terminated for cause.
      * The tenure policy strengthens post-tenure review, with performance reviews on a five-year cycle. In the event of a negative review, the faculty member will have 18 months/3 semesters to improve. The negative review can lead to termination, but this part of the policy is not yet approved. This issue will be discussed further at the March Board of Regents meeting.
      * Chancellor Meyer advocated on behalf of performance-based funding, using placement as a metric. Current performance metrics do not favor UW-Stout.

    B. Veterans' Tuition Remission Funds
      * The fund contains about $200,000. After funding promotions, approximately $100,000 remains for faculty compensation.
      * Faculty receiving a base salary increase will not see the increase in the March paychecks, but may see the change reflected in April paychecks. Salary increases will be retroactive to October.
      * The WI legislature will not allow across the board raises. Pay raises must be based on merit.
      * Some non-faculty university staff have expressed concern about not being included in the pay raises. However, UW-System President, Ray Cross, directed the salary increases for faculty compensation.
      * Chancellor Meyer, and other UW-System Chancellors, felt that compensation would be a concern during the next biennial budget, but that the issue would not be popular among the legislature.
      * Phil Lyons stated that academic and university staff compensation is an issue being examined.

    C. WI legislature approved a joint resolution honoring UW-Stout for 125 years of service to the state.

  2. Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs' Report
    Provost Guilfoile was in Madison for the joint resolution honoring UW-Stout for 125 years of service with Doug Mell.

V. Announcements
  1. Volunteers are needed to serve on a committee to streamline the PRC, AIM, and program viability process. Ideally, committee members should have experience as program directors. Send names of candidates to Chair Ghenciu by Thursday.
  2. A volunteer is needed to represent Faculty Senate on the Stout Foundation Board and the Stout Alumni to replace Kevin W. Tharp. The Board meets three times per year for two-day meetings. Would like a volunteer by the end of the semester. If there are no volutneers, Nelu will serve on both.
  3. HLC Site Visit Draft Schedule for March 28-30, 2016 (Attachment 2)
    * Chair Ghenciu urged senators to attend sessions and to share the schedule with representative units.
  4. Tenure Taskforce – Lopa Basu (Attachments 3-5)
    * Chair Ghenciu thanked Lopa Basu for her service on the Tenure Taskforce.

∗ Lopa Basu thanked Andrei Ghenciu for driving her to Tenure Taskforce meetings in Madison and Tim Shiell, Joan Menefee, and Steve Deckelman for consultation on the tenure draft.
∗ The current draft of the tenure policy is an improvement over previous drafts.
∗ Severance pay in case of layoffs is not addressed in the current policy.
∗ The Board of Regents Tenure policy is an umbrella policy. Individual campuses can develop their own tenure policy that would be approved by the Board of Regents.
∗ The Board of Regents is close to approving UW-Madison's tenure policy.
∗ The university's tenure policy is a recruiting tool for faculty.
∗ PPC will likely be charged with integrating this policy into FASLA.
∗ Any comments or questions about the tenure policy should be addressed to the Chancellor or Provost because they will be attending the March Board of Regents meeting.

VI.   Unfinished Business
1. Children in the Workplace Policy – Lopa Basu (Attachment 6)
Motion to approve: (Vande Linde/Weissenburger).
Discussion:
∗ This policy states that the campus must be a safe place for children, but is not a substitute for child care/daycare. Children can be on campus with supervisor permission, but cannot become routine. If the supervisor does not allow children in the workplace, Human Resources will handle the issue.
∗ Chair Ghenciu will consult with Human Resources regarding specifying instances in which children would be allowed in the workplace (e.g. emergencies, inclement weather).
Vote.
Motion passed unanimously.

VIII. New Business
1. EAC Bylaws – Jeanette Kersten for Daniel Kelsey (Attachment 7)
Motion to approve: (Zaloudek/Tharp).
Discussion:
∗ The EAC updated their bylaws with the college reorganization and other minor edits.
Vote. Motion passed unanimously.
2. Academic Forgiveness – Daniel Kelsey (Attachment 8)
Motion to approve: (Vande Linde/Ding)
Discussion:
∗ Wording change: "Students ~~that~~ who are granted academic forgiveness are eligible to graduate with academic honors (i.e. cum laude, magna cum laude, and summa cum laude); however, the forgiven coursework will be used in the grade point average (GPA) calculation for academic honors."
Vote. Motion passed unanimously.
3. CIC Bylaws – Tom Lacksonen (Attachment 9)
Motion to approve: (Vande Linde/Bates-Maves).
Discussion:
Everyone but PRC updated bylaws to reflect college reorg.

∗ The CIC updated their bylaws with the college reorganization and other minor edits.
    Vote. Motion passed unanimously.
4. General Education Bylaws – Nelu Ghenciu for Tina Lee (Attachment 10)
    Motion to approve: (Tharp/Weissenburger).
    Discussion:
    ∗ The General Education Committee updated their bylaws with the college reorganization and other minor edits.
    Vote. Motion passed unanimously.
5. Sabbatical Application 2016-2017 for 2017-2018 – Tim Shiell (Attachment 11)
    Motion to approve: (Basu/Barnett).
    Discussion:
    ∗ Minor edits to the Sabbatical Application in addition to dates.
    Vote. Motion passed unanimously.
6. Sabbatical Updates in FASLA – Tim Shiell (Attachment 12)
    Motion to approve: (Weissenburger/Vande Linde).
    Discussion:
    ∗ With the edits to the Sabbatical application, the edits in FASLA needed to match.
    Vote. Motion passed unanimously.
7. Alteration to Time in Rank/Experience Criteria for Full Professor – Tim Shiell (Attachment 13)
    Motion to approve: (Vande Linde/Barrier).
    Discussion:
    ∗ Other institutions allow Associate Professors to apply for Full Professor status after four years; and increase experience from seven to ten years.
    ∗ This change synchs UW-Stout with other institutions.
    Vote. Motion passes with 1 no vote and 1 abstention.
8. Processes/Application for Terminal Degree Exceptions – Tim Shiell (Attachments 14 & 15)
    Motion to approve: (Bates-Maves, Vande Linde).
    Discussion:
    ∗ The terminal degree exception was passed previously from PPC and Faculty Senate.
    ∗ The proposed process and application would be posted on the Faculty Senate webpage so this exception would be clear.
    Vote. Motion passed unanimously.
9. PPC Bylaws – Tim Shiell (Attachment 16)
    Motion to approve: (Barnett/Vande Linde).
    Discussion:
    ∗ The PPC updated their bylaws with the college reorganization and other minor edits.
    Vote. Motion passed unanimously.
10. Election Committee - Call for Nominations – Ana Vande Linde (Attachment 17)
    ∗ The Election Committee is waiting for PRC to update their bylaws before sending out the Call for Nomination notices.

    ∗ Election Committee Chair Vande Linde reminded senators to get the consent of anyone they nominate.

  11. FS/FSEC Bylaws – Nelu Ghenciu (Attachment 18)
   Motion to approve: (Bates-Maves/Vande Linde)
   Discussion:

    ∗ The Faculty Senate and Faculty Senate Executive Committee updated their bylaws with the college reorganization and other minor edits.

   Vote. Motion passed unanimously.

  12. CAHSS Senator and FSEC member, Daniel Ruefman has resigned.

    ∗ Chair Ghenciu asked the senators of CAHSS to nominate an individual to serve on the FSEC for the remainder of the year – per the membership bylaws.

    ∗ The CAHSS members nominated Lopa Basu to represent the college on the Executive Committee for the remainder of the academic year.

   Vote. Basu was approved unanimously.

IX. Information Items

  1. Faculty Senate Dashboard (Attachment 19).

  2. Faculty Senate and Executive Committee meeting dates changed due to bad weather. The next Executive Committee meeting will be February 23rd and the next Faculty Senate meeting will be March 8th.

  3. CEHHHS Dean search is currently reviewing applications.

  4. CSTEMM Dean search is currently reviewing applications.

X. Adjournment
  Meeting adjourned at 4:06 PM.

UW-Stout Administrative Procedure

Office: Administrative & Student Life Services
Number: AP058
Subject: Clothing Purchases
Effective: January 5, 2016
Last Revision: February 9, 2016

I.   PURPOSE

The purpose of this procedure is to define clothing or uniform purchases made for university faculty and staff for business purposes and what implications there are for supplying clothing for faculty and staff on taxable income.

Clothing given to a UW-Stout employee as a prize, award, or gift must follow UW System policy F46 Prizes, Awards, and Gifts.

II.   REFERENCES

Clothing Purchase Authorization form

UW-System Policy F46: Prizes, Awards and Gifts

University Identity Standards

III. DEFINITIONS

Provided Clothing – Typically a shirt or outer garment with an approved logo and department name on it. This type of clothing is typically given to personnel when it is deemed to be in the best interest of the department for this person to be identified with the department but not necessarily by name. These types of clothing typically are not worn outside of the workplace; however, there is no particular limitation to this action.

All provided clothing for employees must be approved by a director or chair of a department, and must be deemed a business necessity and not a reward for employees. Once a determination is made for provided clothing, the value of these items must be documented and added to the employee's taxable income. Clothing that costs $40 or less per person will be considered de minimis and excluded from the employee's taxable income.

Uniform – Typically delivered by a contractor and is supplied to staff working in an environment which either special clothing is needed or clothing can be damaged. Uniforms are not to be worn outside of work both by policy and by the nature of the clothing. They can also be distinguishable by having the employee's name affixed to the garment. Plastics clean room coats, safety glasses, hard hats, protective footwear, and safety vests are a few examples of clothing considered under the definition of uniform.

Uniforms, which are not taxable, must be worn as a condition of employment, must be worn for business use only and have limitations in place to prevent or discourage wearing of the uniform outside of the work environment.

IV. RESTRICTIONS

According to the Uniform Guidance for Federal Awards, §200.445 "Goods or services for personal use" states that: Costs of goods or services for personal use of the non-Federal entity's employees are unallowable regardless of whether the cost is reported as taxable income to the employees.

V. PROCEDURES

1. The department purchasing *provided clothing* must complete a clothing purchase authorization form prior to making the purchase. Approval by a director or chair of a department must be obtained, prior to sending form to the Director of Accounting Services for approval. Approval for the purchase of uniforms is not required.

2. After approvals are obtained, the department requestor should contact the Purchasing Office (x2453) to determine the appropriate payment method (Purchase Order, P-Card, Direct Payment,) and next steps.

VI. RECORDS

Accounting Services will have primary responsibility for record keeping and ensuring compliance with this procedure.

VII. APPROVALS

Tracey Bauer   02/15/2016

Tracey Bauer   Date
Director of Accounting Services
Business & Financial Services

Kimberly Schulte-Shoberg   02/16/2016

Kim Schulte-Shoberg   Date
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Business & Financial Services

Philip Lyons   02/16/2016

Phil Lyons   Date
Vice Chancellor
Administrative and Student Life Services

Appendix: Program Review Log

Review Date	Changes Made to Program	Reviewed By
12/10/15	Original version.	Kim Schulte-Shoberg
02/09/16	De minimis limit increased from $20 to $40; Section VI Records added.	Kim Schulte-Shoberg

Appendix B

Clothing Purchase Authorization Form

The purpose of this form is to document clothing purchased for employees that may be considered taxable to the employee receiving the clothing.

DIRECTIONS: IF THE COST OF CLOTHING IS $40 OR LESS PER PERSON, COMPLETE ONLY *SECTION I* BELOW. IF THE COST IS GREATER THAN $40 PER PERSON, COMPLETE THE ENTIRE FORM.

Section I

_____
Requestor Signature   Date

_____
Department Name

_____
Director/Chair Signature   Date

_____
Director of Accounting Services Signature   Date

_____
Requestor Email / Phone

_____
Funding String

Business Justification:_____

_____

Proposed Method of Payment: ☐ Purchase Order   ☐ P-Card   ☐ Direct Payment

Cost of clothing per person: _$_____ (cost of clothing + shipping / quantity)

Section II – Employees who received clothing

Name of Employee	Employee ID#	Cost of Clothing (Inc. Shipping)

*Use additional forms if the number of employees exceed the number of lines available.

Clothing Purchase Authorization Form

The purpose of this form is to document clothing purchased for employees that may be considered taxable to the employee receiving the clothing.

DIRECTIONS: IF THE COST OF CLOTHING IS $40 OR LESS PER PERSON, COMPLETE ONLY *SECTION I* BELOW. IF THE COST IS GREATER THAN $40 PER PERSON, COMPLETE THE ENTIRE FORM.

Section I

Requestor Signature   Date   Requestor Email / Phone

Department Name   Funding String

Director/Chair Signature   Date

Director of Accounting Services Signature   Date

Business Justification:

Proposed Method of Payment: ☐ Purchase Order   ☐ P-Card   ☐ Direct Payment

Cost of clothing per person: $ (cost of clothing + shipping / quantity)

Section II – Employees who received clothing

Name of Employee	Employee ID#	Cost of Clothing (Inc. Shipping)

*Use additional forms if the number of employees exceed the number of lines available.

Draft as of 2/1/16

Draft Schedule for HLC Visit to UW-Stout

MARCH 28

Time	Session 1	Session 2	Session 3
8:30 - 9:45am	Opening Meeting ATTENDEES: Chancellor, Strategic Planning Group, HLC team LOCATION: Great Hall C-Student Center		
10:00 – 11:00am	TOPIC: Assurance Argument ATTENDEES: Stout Assurance Argument Team, HLC team LOCATION: Great Hall C-Student Center		
11:15am – 12:10pm	TOPIC: Criterion 1 -- The institution's mission is clear and articulated publicly; it guides the institution's operations. ATTENDEES All Stout faculty/staff/students invited LOCATION Great Hall A- Student Center	TOPIC: Criterion 3 -- The institution provides high quality education, wherever and however its offerings are delivered. ATTENDEES All Stout faculty/staff/students invited LOCATION Great Hall B- Student Center	TOPIC: Open – Drop-in appointments ATTENDEES All Stout faculty/staff/students invited LOCATION White Pine-Student Center
12:10 – 1:15pm	Lunch ATTENDEES: Stout Student Association and HLC team		
1:25 - 2:20pm	TOPIC: Criterion 2 – The institution acts with integrity; its conduct is ethical and responsible. ATTENDEES All Stout faculty/staff/students invited LOCATION Great Hall A- Student Center	TOPIC: Criterion 4 – The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs, learning environments, and support services, and it evaluates their effectiveness for student learning through processes designed to promote continuous improvement. ATTENDEES All Stout faculty/staff/students invited LOCATION Great Hall B- Student Center	TOPIC: Open – Drop-in appointments ATTENDEES All Stout faculty/staff/students invited LOCATION White Pine-Student Center

2:30 – 3:25pm	Tour of facilities ATTENDEES Klebesadel, Smolarek, Gust, and students TBD	TOPIC: Criterion 5 - The institution's resources, structures, and processes are sufficient to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its educational offerings, and respond to future challenges and opportunities. The institution plans for the future ATTENDEES All Stout faculty/staff/students invited LOCATION Great Hall B- Student Center	TOPIC: Federal Compliance ATTENDEES Stout Federal compliance team: Drzakowski, Dye, Correll, Boisen, Rodriguez, Konsela, Yates, Schulte-Shoberg, Walter, Naatz LOCATION Great Hall C- Student Center
3:45 – 4:45 pm	TOPIC: Update (connect on any information requests and additional meetings needed the next day) ATTENDEES HLC Chair and Chancellor Meyer LOCATION TBD	TOPIC: Open -- Faculty meeting ATTENDEES Stout Faculty, including Faculty Senate LOCATION Great Hall B- Student Center	TOPIC: University and Community ATTENDEES Representatives from the City of Menomonie LOCATION Great Hall C- Student Center

MARCH 29

Time	Session 1	Session 2
9:00 – 10:00am	TOPIC: Area of focus #1 ATTENDEES TBD LOCATION Willow/Walnut-Student Center	TOPIC: Open – Staff meeting ATTENDEES All Stout academic staff and university staff, including Senates LOCATION Great Hall B- Student Center
10:00 – 11:00am	TOPIC: Area of focus #2 ATTENDEES TBD LOCATION Willow/Walnut-Student Center	TOPIC: University and UW System ATTENDEES UW System Regent LOCATION White Pine-Student Center
11:00am – 12:00pm	TOPIC: Program Advisory Committees ATTENDEES TBD LOCATION Willow/Walnut-Student Center	
12:00 – 1:00 pm	TOPIC: Exit meeting and Lunch ATTENDEES Chancellor Meyer, Lyons, Guilfoile, Drzakowski, Wahl, Krimpelbein (Chancellor's Cabinet), Rodriguez LOCATION Willow/Walnut-Student Center	

To view a more-detailed schedule, click here.

What to expect at the open forums for the Higher Learning Commission visit

On March 28 and 29, reviewers from the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) will visit campus and speak with faculty, staff, and students to verify that UW-Stout meets the following Core Components:

1. Mission
   The institution's mission is clear and articulated publicly; it guides the institution's operations.
2. Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct
   The institution acts with integrity; its conduct is ethical and responsible.
3. Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources and Support
   The institution provides high-quality education, wherever and however its offerings are delivered.
4. Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement
   The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs, learning environments, and support services, and it evaluates their effectiveness for student learning through processes designed to promote continuous improvement.
5. Resources, Planning and Institutional Effectiveness
   The institution's resources, structures, and processes are sufficient to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its educational offerings, and respond to future challenges and opportunities. The institution plans for the future.

Evidence that the university meets the Core Components is provided in Stout's assurance argument [https://www.uwstout.edu/parq/intranet/upload/UW-Stout-HLC-assurance-argument_final-02-15-16.pdf], which the reviewers will read and attempt to corroborate during their visit.

The reviewers will hold an open forum for each of the Core Components, as well as an open forum for all faculty and an open forum for all staff. All open forums are open to all faculty, staff, and students.

- The reviewers will hold an open forum for each Core Component. They will also hold an open-topic forum for faculty and an open-topic forum for staff.
  (All forums are open to interested faculty, staff, and students. The room set-up for all forums will be lecture style. The tentative schedule is at http://www.uwstout.edu/parq/upload/Draft-Schedule-for-UW-Stout-Visit-BRIEF.pdf.)
- The reviewers would like to talk with as many people as possible; therefore, it is important that all faculty and staff attempt to attend one or more forums.
- The reviewers will not expect that you can speak to everything in the Assurance Argument, but they will expect that you can speak to the areas that directly impact your work.
- The reviewers will probably prepare a series of questions for each forum, covering areas where we are doing well and where we have opportunities for improvement. We will not know those questions in advance.
- Questions should be answered honestly. Please use this as an opportunity to highlight strengths and respond thoughtfully to questions about opportunities for improvement.
- Most of the open forums will involve two members of the HLC review team, including the chair/lead reviewer for that Core Component.

The HLC review team includes the following people:

1. Dr. Gar Kellom, Director of Student Support Services, Winona State (Core Component 1 chair)
2. Dr. Algerian Hart, Graduate Program Coordinator, Western Illinois University (Core Component 3 chair)
3. Dr. Jolanna Kord, Assistant Provost for Institutional Research and Assessment, Emporia State University (Core Component 4 chair)
4. Dr. Anne Blackhurst, President, Minnesota State University Moorhead (Core Component 2 chair)
5. Dr. Bret Danilowicz, Dean of Arts and Sciences, Oklahoma State (Core Component 5 chair)

Sample questions

Criterion 1:

- How does that mission relate to the work you do on a daily basis on campus?
- How does the mission serve to provide a framework for budget decisions on campus? Can you give an example?
- The mission of the institution has a clear career focus. What specific steps does UW-Stout take to ensure that career outcome rates continue to exceed 95%?
- At a time of declining state resources, how does the institution work to ensure that it continues to offer the student support services needed to advance the mission of the institution?
- What would the typical student say if we asked them what the mission of UW-Stout is?
- What role do Program Advisory Committees play in advancing the mission of UW-Stout? Could you give some specific examples of how these Program Advisory Committees advanced the mission?
- What is the University doing to advance its mission of supporting "Diverse Students, Faculty, and Staff"? There is quite a bit in the document regarding increasing the diversity of the student population, but I didn't see too much in terms of increasing diversity in faculty and staff.

Criterion 2:

- There has been a great deal of press regarding budgetary issues in Wisconsin Higher Education. How have the budget cuts affected the ability of UW-Stout to carry out its mission?
- What roles does the Board of Regents play in helping the institution achieve its mission?
- How have the recent changes in Wisconsin regarding tenure for faculty affected the ability of the institution to achieve its mission?
- Does UW-Stout adequately protect academic freedom for students and faculty?
- Do all students receive guidance regarding the ethical use of information resources, or is it only students who work with the writing center, or connect with the library?
- How does the institution ensure that all students who participate in grant-funded research take Responsible Conduct of Research Training?

Criterion 3

- How does the University ensure that instruction is at the appropriate level- i.e. that undergraduate-level coursework reflects the rigor expected for those programs?
- Is there a systematic process on campus to ensure that courses offered in a distance, hybrid, or face-to-face format provide the same learning outcomes, and the same level of student success in achieving those outcomes?
- The general education program appears to be somewhat of a cafeteria model of courses; how does the institution ensure that students are developing the knowledge and skills expected, regardless of the courses taken?
- How are the GE Program objectives and the GE category definitions related?
- What is the timeline to converting all assessments to the longitudinal process in general education?
- Why is there a dramatic difference in student self-reports of experiential learning (50%) as compared to the institutional figure of 86%?
- What proportion of students participate in research or other scholarly or creative activity on campus?

Criterion 4

- How effective is your program review process? Does it regularly lead to program changes? Is it time-consuming in relation to the perceived value?
- Can you provide an overview of the process that leads to assurance that courses accepted in transfer meet appropriate standards, and prepare students for additional coursework?
- How are course pre-requisites enforced when students register for classes?
- How do you know that your General Education program is effective in achieving the intended student learning outcomes?
- In academic programs, where do you feel most programs fit on a scale from non-compliance to compliance to actively using the assessment process for further program improvement?
- What additional steps is UW-Stout planning to take to further increase student retention and graduation, and lower the opportunity gap in graduation outcomes for Underrepresented Minority Students?

Criterion 5

- In the Assurance argument, there is a description of a plan to move to a three-college model. Please describe that process, and how it aligns with meeting budget reduction targets.
- Now that College reorganization has taken place, where is the discussion right now regarding changes to base allocations across the University?
- To what extent will the planned comprehensive campaign address some of the University's recent budget challenges?
- What are the most significant challenges the University faces in terms of its physical plant infrastructure?
- Provide an overview of how planning, assessment, and resource allocation are tied together at UW-Stout.

- Can you describe provide some additional examples of how reflection on data on student learning has led to changes in operations at the University?

**UW-STOUT
PRINTER ANALYSIS
OCTOBER 2014**

The purpose of this analysis is to estimate the potential cost savings that may result by reducing the number of individual office printers/copiers and increasing the use of Multi-Functional Printer/Copiers (Convenience Copiers). Consultant, EO Johnson, performed a review of all the printer/copier activity in the Administration Building. Based on the the data from EO Johnson's review and UW-Stout's actual expense data from April 1, 2013 through March 31, 2014, Business & Financial Services extrapolated the potential cost savings to the campus.

ADMINISTRATION BUILDING	CONSULTANT DATA AND ACTUALS FROM 4/1/13 - 3/31/14				CONSULTANT RECOMMENDATION				
	Inventory	Volume (Clicks)	Monthly Cost (Toner/Paper/Maintenance)	Cost per Use	Inventory	Inventory Inc/Dec	Volume (Clicks)	Monthly Cost	Cost per Use
Convenience Copier (MFD)	9	23,788	$1,070	$0.04	9	0%	38,506	$1,733	$0.04
Printer	39	20,500	$2,107	$0.10	11	-72%	5,782	$594	$0.10
Total	48	44,288	$3,177	$0.07	20		44,288		$0.05
Monthly Total Cost	$3,177						$2,327		
MONTHLY ADMIN BLDG SAVINGS							$850	27% Savings	
ANNUAL ADMIN BLDG SAVINGS							**$10,202**		

ALL CAMPUS	
Admin Bldg as % of Total Campus Toner Cost	6.9%
Annual Admin Bldg Saving from above	$10,202
Admin Bldg as % of Total	6.9%
ANNUAL CAMPUS SAVINGS	**$148,885**

THE FOLLOWING DATA IS BASED ON THE CONSULTANT'S ESTIMATES OF PERSONNEL TIME, COST OF INVOICING, AND ENERGY USE. BFS IS UNABLE TO VERIFY THE DATA WITHOUT PURCHASING THE CONSULTANT'S SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION.

Consultant Estimate of Annual "Soft Costs"	*Admin. Bldg*	*Total Campus*
Toner ordering, maintenance issues (personnel, invoicing, etc)	*$6,660*	*$97,195*
Annual energy savings from eliminating non-energy star printers	*$1,708*	*$24,926*
ANNUAL SOFT COST SAVINGS	*$8,368*	*$122,121*
ANNUAL SAVINGS FROM ABOVE	*$10,202*	*$148,885*
TOTAL ANNUAL SAVINGS	**$18,570**	**$271,005**

Proposed policy for current faculty and instructional academic staff on multi-year contracts:

Faculty assigned to teach graduate level courses meet HLC guideline B.2 Faculty Roles and Qualifications. In instances where these criteria are not met, there is an exception process to assign faculty or instructional academic staff to teach graduate level courses if they meet the following criteria for equivalent experience:

- Have a degree equivalent to the level they are teaching at, plus 5 years of professional experience relevant to the content they are teaching, including tested/documented experience and advancement or recognition in the field. Evidence should include peer-reviewed publications, documented recognition of scholarly activity and/or in-depth knowledge specific to the field of study.

The exception process to assign a faculty member to teach a graduate level course happens at the point of workload assignment. The workload worksheets prepared by budget managers and completed by department chairs will include a column for requesting an exception. In these cases, the department chair will also attach an evaluation of the instructor explaining why he or she merits an exception. When the Dean signs off on the workload assignments, as part of the regular workload process, this will also serve as approval for the exception.

February 10, 2016 Graduate Education Committee Meeting
Changes in red.

7.0 EXCEPTIONS TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL POLICIES COMMITTEE:

The committee acts on requests for exceptions to Graduate Policy (*excluding load limit*) and makes recommendations to the ~~Assistant/Associate Vice Chancellor~~ Director of Graduate Studies on requests from students for exceptions to Graduate Policy (see 8.0). The ~~Assistant/Associate Vice Chancellor~~ Director of Graduate Studies officially approves or denies the request from the students. (REV. 3/2007) (REV. 2/2016)

8.0 EXCEPTION TO GRADUATE POLICY

Requests for exceptions to Graduate Policy (excluding those for Load Limit) are made in writing to the Committee on Exception to Graduate Policy (see 7.0) using the Graduate Policy Exception Request form. (REV 03/2007)

8.1 **Exception to Load Limit Policy – Master's and Education Specialist**: Requests for exception to the Load Limit policy for greater than 2 credits during a semester (above 18 total), or 1 credit during a 10 week Summer Session (above 11 total) follow an *expedited exceptions process* wherein overload requests are approved by the program director and Director of Graduate Studies who review the student's registration and transcripts, as well as a written rationale provided by the student on the Graduate Policy Exception Request form~~,~~. ~~and make recommendations to the Assistant/Associate Vice Chancellor~~ The Director of Graduate Studies makes the final decision regarding the request. The Credit Overload form signed by the program director must be submitted to the Registration and Records Office at the time of registration. (REV 3/2007) (REV 11/2015) (REV 2/2016)

8.2 **Exception to Load Limit Policy – Educational Doctorate**: Requests for exception to the Load Limit policy for greater than 2 credits during a semester (11 credits) or summer (8 credits) follow an *expedited exceptions process* wherein overload requests are approved by the program director and the Director of Graduate Studies who review the student's registration and transcripts, as well as a written rationale provided by the student on the Graduate Policy Exception Request form~~,~~. ~~and make recommendations to the Assistant/Associate Vice Chancellor~~ The Director of Graduate Studies makes the final decision regarding the request. The Credit Overload form signed by the program director must be submitted to the Registration and Records Office at the time of registration. (4/24/13) (REV 11/2015) (REV 2/2016)

of qualifications which are not contained in the application. Appeals of promotion decisions must follow the above process at all levels before consideration can be given through the positive action procedure. Any promotion committee (or the chancellor) receiving such an appeal memo is required to respond in writing to the applicant and to the chair of the preceding level committee describing its disposition of the appeal.

Promotion: Informing Applicants of Final Action

The chancellor will inform each candidate whose application has reached this level whether or not he/she is being recommended for promotion. Because system action comes several months later, this is not final action. As soon as the board of regents acts, each person promoted will be informed of the official promotion by letter from the chancellor.

Promotion: Criteria For Promotion

The following criteria will be used in recommending applicants. Reference to the policy statements will aid use and interpretation.

Promotion: Professional Performance

1. Excellence of performance must be judged present in all persons recommended for promotion. Carrying out professional duties as detailed in the applicant's job description, service to the university community through committees and university organizations, and contributions to the profession are of primary importance in judging professional performance. UW-Stout's performance appraisal system is designed to provide annual appraisals of each person's performance by his/her supervisor.

Promotion: Educational Preparation and Experience
(Revised Approved 11/26/96-Faculty Senate)
(Approved 1/8/97-Chancellor)
(Rev. 5/11/99-Faculty Senate; Approved 6/29/99-Chancellor)

2. The following combinations of education and experience are described for each rank. (A description of the educational preparation codes is found under Educational Preparation Code.)

    a. Associate Professor

    A person may be promoted to the rank of associate professor if he/she has the following qualifications:

- Educational preparation code 2; three years completed at the rank of assistant professor at UW-Stout at the time of application; AND
- At least six years of teaching and/or relevant work experience OR
- Educational preparation code 1; three years completed at the rank of assistant professor at UW-Stout at the time of application; AND
- At least five years of teaching and/or relevant work experience.

    b. Professor

    A person may be promoted to the rank of professor if he/she has the following qualifications:

- Educational preparation code 1; or MFA; AND

- At least ~~seven~~ ten years of teaching and/or relevant work experience, and ~~five~~ four years completed at the rank of associate professor at UW-Stout at the time of application;
- While activities from the last five years are considered most important, persons applying for promotion to FULL PROFESSOR may include significant activities from earlier years.

Promotion: Affirmative Action

3. UW-Stout is committed to affirmative action in all procedures, including promotions. The same criteria will be applied to all faculty members in judging promotions; when there are equal qualifications on the specified criteria, women/minorities will be given preference if affirmative action is needed in the particular area. Questions regarding affirmative action or requests for assistance should be directed to the human resources office.

Promotion: Timetable

The specific timetable for each year will be announced early in the fall. The intention is that the department (Level I) and college (Level II) committees will complete their work during the second quarter, and the all-university committee (Level III) and the chancellor will complete their work during the third quarter.

Promotion: Combined Promotion to Associate Professor and Tenure Process
(Approved 5/15/14-Faculty Senate, Approved 5/21/14-Chancellor)

This section applies only to faculty going up for promotion after August 25, 2014. As a general rule, faculty appointed at the Assistant Professor level are promoted to Associate Professor simultaneously with the granting of tenure. Assistant professors who are employed by UW-Stout but not yet tenured as of August 25, 2014 can choose to either (a) apply simultaneously for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor according to the procedures described below or (b) apply for promotion to Associate Professor prior to the tenure decision according to the procedures indicated in the previous section.

1. Faculty members will be promoted to the rank of Associate Professor at the time tenure is approved by the Board of Regents, or as soon as possible thereafter providing that they meet the appropriate degree, time in rank, and experience criteria.
2. Faculty members whose tenure is approved but who do not meet the degree, time in rank, and experience criteria for Associate Professor at the time tenure was approved will be granted tenure.
3. Faculty members whose tenure is approved but who do not meet the degree, time in rank, and experience criteria for Associate Professor at the time tenure was approved will be promoted to that rank as soon as possible after they meet those criteria.
4. For subsections (1) and (2), immediately above, the process for implementing these promotions shall be by administrative action of the Office of the Chancellor.
5. Early promotion to Associate Professor (prior to tenure) is an option only by exception, as prescribed in Chapter 3B.
6. Individuals cannot apply separately for promotion to Associate Professor during the academic year of their tenure decision.
7. Candidates should carefully review the criteria for both tenure and promotion since the information submitted for tenure consideration also serves as the material under review for promotion to Associate Professor.
8. Prior to its review of the tenure and promotion application, the initial level of review will ascertain whether the candidate has satisfied the degree, time in rank, and experience for promotion to Associate Professor.
9. All simultaneous tenure and promotion applications will be reviewed, considered, and appealed through the regular renewal process, as prescribed in Chapter 3B.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-STOUT
APPLICATION FOR PROMOTION

Question 1: Salutation of Faculty Member (Dr., Ms., Miss, Mrs., Mr.):

Question 2: Faculty Member

Question 3: University Office Telephone
Extension

Question 4: Office Location to Receive Notifications

Question 5: Seeking promotion to the rank of:

Question 6: Percentage of Time Assigned to this Unit. Applicants with split assignments (Department Chair positions are not considered split assignments outside of the department) must apply for promotion in every unit in which they have an assignment that exceeds .30 FTE

Question 7: Promotion by Exception: Are you applying for promotion by exception to the FASLA Promotion Policy

Yes

No

EDUCATIONAL PREPARATION

Question 8: Highest Degree Earned

Question 9: Date Highest Degree Earned (Year/Month)

Question 10: Highest Degree Institution

Question 11: Current Education Preparation Code Number

Question 12: Do you hold the Educational Preparation Code listed for the rank applied for?

Question 13: Have you engaged in graduate work since the last degree?

Question 14: If you have engaged in graduate work since obtaining your last degree, describe that graduate work. (If no, write N/A.)

TIME IN RANK

Associate Professor requires a total of 5 years of experience, 3 of which must have been completed at UW-Stout.

- Example: 5 years at the Assistant Professor level at UW-Stout.
- Example: 3 years at the Assistant Professor level at UW-Stout and 2 years of relevant work experience for which you were given credit with your initial appointment ast UW-Stout, for a total of 5 years of experience.
- Example: 3 years at the Assistant Professor level at UW-Stout and 2 years in higher education or other educational institutions for which you were given credit with your initial appointment at UW-Stout, for a total of 5 years of experience.

Full Professor requires a total of ~~7~~ 10 years of experience, ~~5~~ 4 of which must have been completed at the Associate professor level at UW-Stout.

Question 15: Original Appointment to UW-Stout Faculty: (Rank/Month/Year)

Question 16: Has your rank changed since your original appointment?

Question 17: If your rank has changed since your original appointment, what is your current rank and what date was that change effective? (Current Rank/Month/Year). (If you rank hasn't changed, write N/A.)

Question 18: Do you meet the time in rank requirements listed for the rank applied for? (See FASLA Handbook, pages 3-126)

Question 19: Do you have the years of experience required for the rank for which you are applying? (See FASLA Handbook, pages 3-126)

Question 20: Years (.5 FTE or more) at UW-Stout (exclude current year) as Faculty. List specific years and the total number of years.

Question 21: Years (.5 FTE or more) at UW-Stout (exclude current year) as Academic Staff. List specific years and the total number of years. If none, answer N/A.

Question 22: Years in higher education or other educational institutions for which you were given credit with your initial appointment at UW-Stout. List specific years and the total number of years.

Question 23: Years in relevant work experience for which you were given credit with your initial appointment at UW-Stout. List specific years and the total number of years.

PERFORMANCE

Question 24: Summary of Performance Ratings for the Last three years of Active Employment (Do not include current year). If tenured, use the three most recent years.

	Most Recent Year	Previous Year	Next Previous Year
Performance is judged to be above that described in the range acceptable for this position.			
Performance is judged to be well within the range described as acceptable for this position.			
Performance is judged to be below that described in the range acceptable for this position.			

Question 25: Have you been on leave of absence during the past three years?

Question 26: If you answered yes in Question 25, which year(s)? If you did not take a leave of absence in the past three years, write N/A.

I CERTIFY THAT THE ABOVE INFORMATION AND THAT CONTAINED ON THE ATTACHMENTS IS CORRECT. I UNDERSTAND THAT MY APPLICATION WILL NOT BE CONSIDERED UNLESS I HAVE PROVIDED ALL OF THE INFORMATION REQUESTED ON THIS APPLICATION FORM.

Signature of Applicant for Promotion and Date

I have reviewed the education preparation code, time in rank, experience, and performance ratings as stated above.

I find them to be correct

I have found discrepancies with care circled and initialed. I have also notified the applicant of these discrepancies.

Signature of Immediate Supervisor and Date

Work Harassment Subcommittee Meeting 2-8-16

The recommendation by the subcommittee is for the work harassment statement and procedure (below) be included in:

- Chapter 5 of the FASLAH (page 240), between the Racist and Discriminatory Conduct Policy and the Non-Discrimination on Basis of Disability Policy. This Chapter includes faculty and academic staff.
- The "Employment Policies and Procedures" section of the University Staff Handbook, after the Sexual Harassment paragraph.

UW-Stout Workplace Harassment Statement
In addition to prohibiting discriminatory harassment of employees based on a protected category defined in the Sexual Harassment and Racist and Discriminatory Conduct policies, the university prohibits harassment per se. Harassment is defined as severe or pervasive workplace verbal or nonverbal behavior directed at another that would cause a reasonable person in the victim's position substantial emotional distress and undermine the victim's ability to work. The behavior also must actually cause the victim substantial emotional distress and undermine the victim's ability to work.

This statement shall not be applied to violate academic freedom and freedom of expression or interfere with a supervisor's authority to appropriately manage their work unit. It also does not create any rights that do not exist under law.

Procedure
"Complaint procedure" means the process through which UW System administrators (other than the director supervisor), students, university staff members, faculty members, academic staff members, or members of the public may allege that a university employee has engaged in conduct that violates the rules or policies of the institution, or which adversely affects the employee's performance or obligation to the university.

Issues that may be addressed include, but are not limited to:
- Intentional physical harm or intimidation
- Bullying
- Abusive language or swearing
- Lack of respect or being discourteous to others
- Breach of confidentiality

Note: If the issue involves witnessing or experiencing an act committed against any person, group, or property which discriminates, stereotypes, harasses, or excludes anyone based on some part of their identity, report it to the campus EEO/AA Officer.

1) Informal: The process of gathering information either to help establish a suspicion of discrimination or retaliation or to attempt to resolve a disagreement without following a formal complaint process.

2) Formal: The process of reviewing evidence of alleged discrimination or retaliation and making a determination as to whether or not either has occurred and, where appropriate, providing a resolution to the complaint. This process is established by the respective governance groups of the campus (note to reference the sections in the handbooks).

Complaint Options
A. Employees may at any time seek advice and assistance on a resolution from the Office of Human Resources (OHR), who may assist with a resolution either before or after a formal/informal complaint is filed.
B. Should an individual choose to, a formal complaint can be filed at any time within allowable deadlines.
C. An informal or formal complaint form shall be filed with the OHR no later than 180 calendar days after the alleged misconduct on the UW-Stout Complaint Form (LINK). The complainant will be asked to:
    a. Explain the nature of the complaint and the specific circumstances at issue;
    b. Identify specific witnesses, if applicable, who may provide supporting evidence;
    c. Provide complainant contact information (phone, email); and
    d. State the specific and recommended resolution sought.
D. A representative from the OHR will review the complaint and within [20] calendar days from the filing date.

Upon reviewing the informal complaint, the OHR:
• Will determine follow-up action and notify the complainant;
• May interview or collect written statements or communications from the complainant
• May notify the appropriate administrator, dean, or director that an informal complaint has been initiated;
• May contact the individual (respondent) accused of discrimination to discuss the alleged harmful act;

- May contact any witnesses identified, and perform interviews or collect written statements or communications;
- Develops a proposed resolution, if appropriate, within [fifteen (15)] calendar days of acceptance of the informal complaint. If appropriate, the complainant is advised that she/he may file a formal complaint; and
- May notify the appropriate administrator, dean, or director of the final status of the complaint.

Informal complaints must be filed within [180 days] of the most recent alleged harmful act; or within 365 days for sexual harassment.

The OHR representative will complete the investigation within [60] calendar days of the filing date. Possible actions include:
- Dismissing the complaint;
- Referring complainant to the formal complaint process;
- Determining other appropriate steps; or
- Invoking appropriate disciplinary action.

At the conclusion of the informal investigation, the director of OHR or designee will prepare a written finding. These findings will be provided to the complainant, with a copy to the employee supervisor, and the respondent (if any). If the complainant is not satisfied with the outcome, s/he will be directed to the formal complaint process.

Please note: an informal complaint filing will not exclude a complainant from filing a formal complaint if so chosen at a later date (within legal parameters). Formal complaints result in a written determination and therefore cannot be further pursued in an informal process.

UW-Stout
University Staff Complaint Form
(To be used for complaints against a University Staff Member)

Today's Date:	

Contact Information

Name:	
Department (if UW-Stout Employee):	
Email Address:	
Phone Number:	

Type of Complaint

Formal
Informal
Unsure

Complaint Details

University Staff Member's Name (person about whom the complaint is filed):	
Date of Incident:	
Location of Incident:	
Description of Incident:	Provide as much detail as possible. Include witness information and other supporting documentation.
Recommended Resolution Sought:	
Complainant Signature	
Received Date:	

For HR Use Only	
Received Date:	
Received By:	
Action Taken:	
Date Resolved:	

Bylaws of the Planning and Review Committee

(Rev. 4/16/96) (Rev. 3/10/04) (Rev. Faculty Senate 5/6/08; Approved Chancellor 6/17/08) (Rev. Faculty Senate 3/6/12; Approved Chancellor 4/7/12) (Rev. Faculty Senate 3/4/14; Approved Chancellor 4/3/14)

Organization

1. Membership

    a. The committee shall consist of twenty (20) regular members and four (4) alternate members as follows:

    (1) Twelve faculty or academic staff members elected from the colleges, threefour from each of the fourthree colleges in the university, elected by the faculty and academic staff of their respective colleges.

    (2) One member from who is part of the graduate faculty, elected by the faculty and academic staff.

    (3) One member nominated by a distance education program director, elected by the faculty and academic staff.

    (4) Three faculty or academic /staff at large elected by the faculty and academic /staff.

    (5) Two student members chosen by the University Student Senate for one, two or three-year terms.

    (5)(6)   One ex-officio member from the Office of the Provost who will act as a resource person.

    (6) Fiveour alternate members. There will be one alternate faculty or academic staff elected to represent each of the colleges and one at large faculty or academic staff alternative. These individuals would serve only when regular members are unable to attend a scheduled meeting or if the standing position remains unfilled through elections.

    (7) One ex-officio member from the Office of the Provost who will act as a resource person.

    b. All members (except students) shall serve three-year staggered terms of office.

2. Quorum

    a. A quorum shall consist of 50% of its seated voting members.

3. Meetings

    a. Meetings will be scheduled at least once per month during the academic year, and will be in a manner that allows members to attend regularly.

    b. The first regularly scheduled meeting of the academic year will be the organizational meeting for the Planning and Review Committee.

    c. The Provost's Office shall be responsible for informing the program directors of programs being reviewed in any academic year and scheduling a meeting with them, the deans, department chairs and the chair of the PRC prior to the review.

4. Officers

    a. Each year at its organization meeting, the committee shall elect a chair and a vice chair from the seated members on the committee. This organizational meeting will be chaired by the Chair of the Faculty Senate until the newly-elected officers are installed.

    b. The terms of office shall be one year in length with the possibility of re-election.

    c. The general duties of the officers are outlined in <u>Robert's Rules of Order</u>.

    d. In addition, the chair shall develop a schedule of activities for the year subject to approval by a majority vote of the members present.

Conduct of the Meetings

1. Meetings shall be conducted in accordance with <u>Robert's Rules of Order</u>.
2. Decisions and recommendations shall be made by a majority vote of the quorum.

Responsibilities of the Committee

1. The committee shall review the information regarding the UW-Stout academic plan provided by the Provost's Office during each academic year.
2. The committee shall review ~~entitlements to plan~~ <u>Notices of Intent</u> and shall recommend Faculty Senate approval or rejection of such plans.
3. The committee shall review the procedure and policies in the program audit and review process.
4. The committee shall receive and react to communications from the Faculty Senate or the Senate Executive Committee.
5. The committee shall review and consider the collected program audit information which shall be provided by the Office of Planning, Assessment, Research and Quality. The committee shall review all undergraduate and graduate degree programs on a seven-year schedule. The committee shall forward its findings, stipulations, suggestions, and observations to the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate.

Revisions

1. Recommendations for changes in the bylaws shall be distributed to the committee members at least two weeks prior to consideration by the committee.
2. Recommendations to the Faculty Senate for changes in the bylaws shall be approved by a vote of at least 50% of the seated voting members.

FACULTY SENATE DASHBOARD FOR 2015-2016
Status Indicator Colors: Green (Good) , Yellow (Minor Issues), Red (Major Issues), Gray (Complete), no color (not yet started)

Charges/Other		Staff Responsible	Charge Requested	Request Approved by FS	Results or Recommendation Presented to FS	Final Recommendation Approved by FS	Recommendation Approved by Chancellor	Recommendation Implemented
Elections		Confirm Elections Needed	Communicate Upcoming Elections	Call for Nominations	Distribute Ballots	Collect Ballots	Count Ballots	Send Congratulations Letters
Spring Elections - Senators, Standing Committees, University Committees		Senate Office	2/24 & 25/2016	2/29/2016	DUE 3/29/2016	DUE 4/11/2016	DUE 4/15/2016	DUE 4/18/2016
Senate Evaluations of Administrators (Deans for 2016)		Senate Office	Daily Email, Email to Administrators & Email to faculty and staff - DUE 4/15 & 16/16		DUE 4/20/2016	Evaluation Ends - DUE - Noon, 5/1/16	Secure meeting with chairs and Administrators - DUE - 5/15/16	
All University Policies		Staff Responsible	Policy Requested	Request Approved by FS	Draft or Recommendation Presented to FS	Final Recommendation Approved by FS	Recommendation Approved by Chancellor	Policy Added to Website/Other
All University Policy on Children in the Workplace		Lopa Basu		DUE 3/1/2016	2/2/2016	2/9/2016	2/15/2016	
All University Policy on Volunteers	Red	Ted Harris			DUE 4/30/15			
Consideration of 3-Policy Consolidation (alcohol related)	Yellow	Ted Harris		Due 4/1/2016				
Program Revenue (PR) Reserve Fund Balances		Nelu Ghenciu		12/31/2015	Draft Submitted			
Non-All-University Policies		Staff Responsible	Policy Requested	Request Approved by FS	Draft or Recommendation Presented to FS	Final Recommendation Approved by FS	Recommendation Approved by Chancellor	Pollicy Added to Website/Other
Bullying/Hostile Work Environment Group - Update Handbook	Yellow	Amanda Brown/Tim Shiell			DUE 3/1/2016			
Standing Committee Work		Staff Responsible	Task Start	Request Approved by FS	Draft or Recommendation Presented to FS	Final Recommendation Approved by FS	Recommendation Approved by Chancellor	Policy/Recommendation Implemeneted/Added to Web-site
Definition of Merit		PPC	2/9/2016		Due to Chancellor 5/5/2016			
Faculty Merit Pay Process Recommendation		PPC	12/4/2015	12/16/2015	12/15/2015	Forwarded to Chancellor Meyer		
Sabbatical Recommendations for 2016-17		PPC	11/17/2015	2/9/2016				

Named Professorships Recommendations- (Dahlgren/Schneider)			Apps DUE to Dept. Chairs-2/13/2016; Dept. Com. Recom due to College Gov.-2/27/2016; College Gov. due to Faculty Senate-3/13/2016		Named Professorship Committee Recommendations DUE to Chancellor - 4/7/16, Notification of Awards - 4/17/2016			
University Committee Work	🚦	Staff Responsible	Task Start	Request Approved by FS	Results or Recommendation Presented to FS	Final Recommendation Approved by FS	Recommendation Approved by Chancellor	Recommendation Implemented
Budget Model Review Committee (102 allocation model) - Phil Lyons	🟥	Forrest Schultz & Stephen Salm	10/18/2013		12/9/2014			
Instructional Workload Committee	🟨	Ana Vande Linde & Jeffrey Sweat						
Library Director Search Committee		Jeanette Kersten/Ruth Nyland	12/1/2015	Due - 5/1/2016				
College 1 - Dean Search Committee		Jen Grant	12/15/2015	Due - 5/1/2016				
College 2 - Dean Search Committee		Julie Bates-Maves	12/15/2015	Due - 5/1/2016				
PRC/AIM/PV Streamlinig Committee		Nelu Ghenciu and Mitch Ogden		Due - 5/1/2016				

NOTES/LEGEND:
(1) Request dates are typically during FS Executive Meetings, otherwise on regular FS Meeting dates or closest date
(2) Status Indicator Colors: Green (Good), Yellow (Minor Issues), Red (Major Issues), Gray (Complete), no color (not yet started)
(3) Approved All-University policies – policies that either already exist as university policies (on this website: http://www.uwstout.edu/parq/policies-sequential-index.cfm) or policies that the Chancellor has indicated via a memo