

## FACULTY SENATE MINUTES February 27, 2024

Present: Beyer, Belnap, Cole, Demezas, Elannani, Feldman, Fuller, Graf, Groves, Gutow, Hudson, Kim, Kreider, Kurtz, Loiacono, Manning, Otto, Panske, Purse-Wiedenhoeft, Schmitt, Siemers, Stuart, Szydlak, Tipps, Wagoner, Williams

Excused:

Absent: Matson

Guests: Josh Garrison, Caroline Geary, Kim Langolf, Alex Hummel, Ane Stevens, Karl Boehler, Danielle Juan, Tyler Cunningham, Ben Blaser. *Virtual Guests:* Monika Hohbein- Deegen, Vince Filak, Michael Bartlett, Orlaith Heymann, Eliza Farrow, Juyeon Son, Amy Knepple Carney, Sean O'melia, Jonathan Richie, Sheri Lense, Morgan Churchill, Michael Baltutis, Anthony Palmeri, Benjamin Artz, Larry Herzberg, Kelly Meyerhofer, Kimberly Hansen, Margurite Penick-Parks, Marianne Johnson, Corey Finkelmeyer, Ken Price, Jerry Thomas, Erik Krohn, Kyle Petit, Bryan Lilly, Adam Diller, Paul Van Auken, Nadia Louar, Andy Miller, Michelle Pietrzak, Shelly Michalski, George Thomas, Kathy Phillippi-Immel, Chong Moua, Allison Kunde, Robert Sipes, Aliosha Alexandrov, Amber Lusvardi, Robert Kunkel, Eric Kuennen, Kristine Nicolini, Julia Chybowski, Kathy Zuckweiler, Lindsay Morgan, Esther Eke, Kathleen Wren, Margaret Hostetler, Renee Anderson, Ashay Desai, Adam Ochonicky, Durmas Camlibel, Kristi Wilkum, Wendy Bauer, Julia Hodgen, Christopher Jones, Larry Carlin, Dale Feinauer, Erika Janssen, Ane Carriveau, John Beam, Alexander Kovzik, Rebecca Graetz, Susan Maxwell, Pawel Olszewski, David Krause, Stephanie Spehar, Rocio Cortes, Michelle Kuhl, Matthew Ringenberg, Stephen Szydlak, Jason Woldt, Lisa Schreibersdorf, Timothy Gleason

|   |                   |
|---|-------------------|
| Administration Representative:              | Provost Martini   |
| Senate of Academic Staff Representative:    | Bobbi-Jean Ludwig |
| University Staff Senate Representative:     | Lisa Mick         |
| Oshkosh Student Association Representative: | Caprice Swanks    |
| FDL/FOX Cities Campus Reports:              | Evan Kreider      |

### Minutes in Brief

At the February 27, 2024, meeting of the Faculty Senate, the discussion items were held first to give them priority. The discussion items that were discussed included: Faculty Referendum on University Restructuring; Faculty Referendum on a Vote of No Confidence; Chancellor's Discretionary Fund – Faculty Senate Response; and the Name in Use Policy and the Unmanned Aircraft 'Drone' Policy. Action Items included Forms C from APC. Several parts of the agenda will be moved to the following meeting as several of the discussion items took up nearly all of the meeting time. The meeting adjourned at 5:10 pm.

President Manning called the meeting to order at 3:10 pm.

- I. Welcome – President Manning welcomed everyone to today's meeting. She noted that due to the anticipated length of discussion for the first two "Discussion Items," we would likely devote most of our meeting time to addressing these. She recognized the many guests in attendance and reminded everyone that while guests wishing to speak may be called upon, Senator comments would be prioritized.
- II. Discussion Items
  - A. Faculty Referendum on University Restructuring  
President Manning shared some PowerPoint slides providing relevant passages from UWO's *Faculty Constitution*, the Proposed Restructure Referendum Process, and the DRAFT Resolution Language for Faculty Referendum on Restructure Models. Referencing the process document, President Manning noted that a 2/3

vote of the Faculty Senate is needed to initiate the referendum and that a simple majority vote of the Faculty Senate is needed to approve the resolution language.

Discussion topics included:

- Two open forums will be scheduled in order to give faculty a chance to ask questions and to share input with the Provost and the Transition Team;
- The proposed language for the resolution envisioned a ballot with three options for voters: to approve either of the two models or to choose the option worded as, "I forfeit my vote, as I have no preference and would rather accept either model."
- A lengthy discussion ensued, in which Senators voiced objection to the absence of an option to vote "no" to both models;
- Observations and suggestions made by Senators included that the third option constituted confirmation bias, that faculty must be given the opportunity to voice objection on the record, which objection should inform the campus narrative about the restructuring in the months and years to come, and that a ranked or serial voting model would be preferable;
- Several Senators voiced concerns about how the new administrative positions (including "Director" and "Area Coordinator") would impact existing mechanisms for faculty advocacy, where department chairs are able to represent the interests of a discrete department and discipline in any interactions with university administration, from deans to the Provost (etc.), and Senators also emphasized concerns about the lack of information regarding job duties and appointment structures for those in "Director" or "Area Coordinator" roles;
- Provost Martini noted that if the models and attendant new administrative positions are structured with the goal to identify new and efficient ways to meet our needs and achieve our programmatic and administrative goals, noting that the current model is not financially viable. He also noted that he appreciates faculty feedback, which will meaningfully inform future steps;
- Senators expressed concern about the possibility that adding a "no" option to the ballot would lead to a standstill and a failure to identify a path forward;
- Senators expressed concerns that the restructuring was enforced unilaterally by the administration without adequate time for necessary input;
- Senators requested a more complete cost analysis of the budgetary impacts of each model and their projected savings, emphasizing that such information would enable faculty to deliberate about the options from a position of greater knowledge;
- It was proposed that the Provost consider dividing the administrative and programmatic restructuring, allowing faculty to vote on the two independently;
- Concerns were voiced about whether or not the projected cost savings for each of the two proposed models are accurate;
- An Oshkosh Student Government representative also noted that the information that has thus far been shared is difficult to understand;
- Concerns were expressed that even a referendum will not result in the collective voice of the faculty being adequately heard.

Provost Martini noted that faculty have been involved throughout the process of identifying restructuring models, emphasizing his appreciation for their time and expertise, and adding that he was in favor of providing additional budgetary details about the cost savings associated with each model. He expressed the opinion that the faculty workload under either of the new models will remain roughly the same. He noted that he will continue to work collaboratively with faculty and will honor the spirit of Shared Governance.

President Manning then provided a brief summary of the discussion, identifying the key issues that require further clarification or discussion. These were: The need for clarification regarding 1) the administrative power structure for faculty below the dean's level in the new models, 2) appointment versus election of administrative positions, 3) the financial implications of each restructure model, and 4) the need to reconsider the make-up of the resolution (ballot) for the restructuring.

**President Manning took a straw poll to gauge whether Senators agreed with the takeaways noted above and whether, if answers or solutions were identified, Senators would be willing to move forward with the referendum; the majority was in favor.**

B. Faculty Referendum on a confidence vote in the leadership of Chancellor Andrew Leavitt

President Manning showed the Senate a series of Power Point slides that included the proposed referendum process and the draft resolution language for the referendum ballot. Senators were asked to bear in mind that the issue under discussion was not the desire for or opposition to a confidence vote but rather the process for the referendum, given that the Faculty Senate has been presented with a petition requesting a confidence vote that has been signed by 74 faculty members (or approximately 23% of the faculty) while, according to the *Faculty Constitution* (Article 1 Section 6), such an action can be initiated by a petition signed by 10% of the faculty. Senators were reminded that it is the Senate's obligation to identify a process by which this demand may be met. President Manning noted that she shared the text of the petition, as well as draft versions of the process and resolution documents with Chancellor Leavitt on 23 February. The meeting packet also contained a letter addressed to President Manning, written by Chancellor Leavitt following their 23 February meeting, and this letter was among the documents that informed the discussion.

Discussion topics included:

- Senators expressed concern that Chancellor Leavitt's letter questions the legitimacy of the Senate's action to initiate a referendum and asks President Manning to halt the process;
- Senators argued that the Chancellor's letter shows that he does not wish to hear what faculty have to say;
- Senators affirmed that the Senate is duty-bound to follow the referendum process, per the *Faculty Constitution*;
- The Senate discussed the valences of the word "policy," noting its definitional capaciousness, while also recognizing that there are legitimate elements to the Chancellor's consideration of the word's use in the *Faculty Constitution*;
- It was pointed out that the absence of a clear procedure for a confidence vote in the *Faculty Constitution* does not de-legitimize holding such a vote;
- The Senate discussed the process itself, which will involve 1) two Senate-hosted open forums, 2) a 6-day voting period (in which the ballot will be sent directly to UWO faculty, whose votes will be anonymized, 3) the Faculty Senate Elections Committee will tabulate the results, sharing them with President Manning, and 4) President Manning will announce the outcome to all faculty and to the Chancellor;
- The Senate discussed past confidence votes within the UW;
- Senators discussed whether all faculty will be required to vote (voting will be voluntary);

- Senators discussed the tenor of the Chancellor's letter to President Manning, whose tone and requests were deemed inappropriate, observing that a Senate response would be appropriate.

President Manning asked the Senate if it would like to consider this for an action item next time or elevate it to an action item today. Discussion made it clear that Senators wanted to move forward with voting on the resolution language.

**MOTION: Panske/Hudson moved to suspend the rules and elevate this discussion item to an action item. (24 Yes), (1 Abstention), (0 No) Passed**

**MOTION: Stuart/Belnap moved to approve this language for the Referendum on the Vote of No Confidence. (23 Yes), (1 Abstention), (0 No) Passed.**

*It was noted that only the faculty will be voting on this referendum.*

**FS 2324-17 The Faculty Senate approved the language for the Referendum on the Vote of No Confidence.**

C. Chancellor's Discretionary Fund – Faculty Senate Statement  
Discussion topics included:

- There is no best practice that requires the use of median;
- A review of the complete raw CUPA data is needed once we receive it;
- UWO HR didn't mandate the use of our process, and several Senators expressed frustration with UWO HR;
- The suggestion was made to the Chancellor by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee that UWO HR should admit that mistakes were made, that the analysis should be re-done, following the analysis and implementation process detailed in the Salary Equity Technical Document – Faculty (2023), and that affected base salaries should subsequently be re-adjusted.

**MOTION: Gutow/Belnap moved to suspend the rules and elevate this discussion item to an action item. (22 Yes), (0 Abstention), (1 No) Passed**

**MOTION: Belnap/Szydluk moved to endorse the Faculty Senate response to the Chancellors Discretionary Funds (with visual rhetoric). (23 Yes), (0 Abstention), (0 No) Passed Unanimously.**

**FS 2324-18 The Faculty Senate approved the endorsement of the Faculty Senate response to the Chancellors Discretionary Funds.**

- D. Name in Use Policy
- E. Unmanned Aircraft 'Drone' Policy
- F. Faculty Senate Committee – Committee Information Forms
  1. Improvement of Instruction
  2. USP
- G. Generative AI – Syllabus Language

III. Action Items

A. APC -Forms C

1. COLS: English MA – Remove GRE requirement
2. Did not move forward
3. COEHS: T&L - Discontinues ESL Major and Minor
4. COEHS: SE - New Emphasis within Special Ed Major
5. COEHS: LLSF – Remove EDL 755
6. COEHS: T&L – MSE req. course changes – ESL/Bilingual

7. COEHS: T&L – MSE req. course changes ESL emphasis

**ITEM 1 was pulled for further discussion. Due to the lateness of the meeting, it will be considered at the next meeting.**

**MOTION: Fuller/Kurtz moved to approve APC Forms C items 3-7. (24 Yes), (0 Abstentions), (0 No). Passed Unanimously**

**FS 2324-19 The Faculty Senate approved the following Forms C from APC: (3) COEHS: T&L - Discontinues ESL Major and Minor; (4) COEHS: SE - New Emphasis within Special Ed Major ; (5) COEHS: LLSF – Remove EDL 755; (6) COEHS: T&L – MSE req. course changes – ESL/Bilingual ; (7) COEHS: T&L – MSE req. course changes ESL emphasis**

- IV. State of the University - *Due to the meeting coming to an end prior to this part of the meeting, reports were requested following the meeting, and are noted below.*
- A. Senate of Academic Staff (Ludwig) – Highlights: No report
  - B. University Staff Senate (Mick) – Highlights: Discussion included the Deloitte report and downsizing the report to an hour for campus distribution, administration use of the 15% discretionary fund with the 2% raise next year, and if their Senate will be moving forward with the University Staff Professional Development Day.
  - C. OSG (Swanks) – No report
  - D. Access Campus/Collegium – FOX (Kreider) – Highlights: No report  
Access Campus/Collegium – FDL (Demezas) – Highlights: No report
- V. Minutes of February 13, 2024  
**The February 13, 2024, minutes will be considered at the next meeting.**
- VI. Presidents Report – *Due to the meeting coming to an end prior to this part of the meeting, reports were requested following the meeting, and are noted below.*
- a. Provost Administrative Staff – No report
- VII. Committee Reports – None
- VIII. Information Items - None
- IX. Items from Members - None

**President Manning thanked everyone for the input, energy, and literal sweat, (as the temperature was quite high in the room today).**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
April Dutscheck,  
Recorder