The meeting was called to order by Chair Harrison at 3:03 p.m. in Schofield 202.

1. Minutes of May 2, 2000 were approved without objection as distributed

2. Open Forum Issues
   - Concern of some faculty confused about intent and purpose of calendar change brought forward
     - Now two week contract period before start of classes
     - Transition summer resulted in one week shorter span between summer session and start of academic year
       - With similar 2001-2002 calendar, gap restored because shorter spring semester (now equivalent to fall semester) results in earlier Interim and summer sessions
     - Although some felt period was billed as advising opportunity, students were not on campus
       - First week intended for professional development as indicated in University Senate discussion last year
       - Time also allowed frequent department meetings where daily progress could be seen and real change on issues such as curriculum made
     - Provost reported two week period very busy
       - None of workshops, forums, retreats, and other professional development opportunities were required, but were well-attended
       - Some under contract were not present
     - Next calendar comes up for approval in early spring
       - Can ask colleagues what worked and what didn’t to plan for beginning of next academic year
       - May be helpful to “advertise” Senate meeting when calendar discussed
       - Senators do bear responsibility to communicate with constituency
       - Will be in Chair’s Report as part of Open Forum so may get additional feedback
   - University Senate brochures outlining committee responsibilities and listing senators to be distributed to all faculty and academic staff

3. Tentative agenda for September 12, 2000 meeting of University Senate
   - By consensus, Order of Business to remain same as last session
   - Due to major problems in development of electronic ballots, fall University Senate Committee elections will be conducted with paper ballots
     - By consensus, committee elections to be run serially with specific area results known to voters prior to election of any-area committee members
   - By consensus, Student Senate President Hentges to be moved up on agenda to speak after Chancellor
   - Will again face problem of limited nominations for some committee vacancies
     - Cases where specific representation required by constitution, but few Senators from those areas
     - Only one Senator from Library so election for position requiring Library representation impossible
     - Can vote to suspend rules by a two-thirds vote
   - Was discussed at time constitution changed that representation from specific areas on so many committees created problems when are few senators from those specific areas
     - Colleges and schools seem unwilling to give up representation on committees
• Changes passed Senate with those specific representations intact
• If continue to have to suspend rules, perhaps means those rules should be examined

4. Change in Title for Assistant Dean of Research
• Provost Satz distributed up-to-date organizational chart, current position description for Assistant Dean of Research, and proposed position description for Assistant Vice Chancellor for Research and Sponsored Programs and Director of the Center of Excellence
• Changes
  • Title
  • Few additional words to clarify
  • Matching verb tenses to other position descriptions on web page
• When Graduate Dean on campus, this position reported there
  • Has continued to report to same person despite position changes
  • But old title retained
• No sense of university-wide role from current title
  • New title more clearly states role and would be recognized off campus
  • Most closely parallels structures and titles on other campuses including comprehensives in state
• Do not need to discuss in closed session because talking about position, not person

Committee Discussion:
• Assistant Vice Chancellor title may overplay role of Office on campus
  • See as support assisting faculty and staff at non-research university
  • No problem with reporting to Provost
  • Believe would be perceived as increasing top-heavy administration even though no change in what doing
• Although that perception may be right; current title not appropriate either
  • Possibly Assistant to Provost in Research and Sponsored Programs would fit
  • Don’t want another long-winded title
  • Special Assistant to Provost would need System permission
• Seems job more of Director
  • Other directors report to Provost
  • Position of Coordinator of Research Services already exists
• Provost indicated salary would also change approximately 5% depending upon grade System assigns new title
  • Currently in Grade 7; could go to 8 or 9
  • Not purpose of change in title
  • Looked at titles in other universities in system
    • Are Deans in Graduate Schools, Associate Vice Chancellors and Directors
    • Specifically went with Assistant to not elevate too high
• According to Provost Satz, budget responsibility really more than Associate Vice Chancellors because administers differential tuition dollars, Foundation monies, 102- and 150- accounts

Continued Discussion
• Perhaps Director appropriate under Associate Vice Chancellor & Director of Graduate Programs
• Support Assistant Vice Chancellor because of university-wide impact
• Account-responsible people manage own budgets
  • This position in charge of distribution
  • Much of it soft money
• Position would not move on organizational chart
• Would probably be a Category C academic staff title
• Jan Morse has already checked within same grade for suitable title
• Office location would not change
• See both sides of issue; amazing work done by this office
  • Vice Chancellor title could be intimidating to nontenured faculty members
  • Provost Satz noted either Chris Lind or Don Zeutschel talk to all candidates interviewing for positions on campus
    • Not afraid people seeing title will be intimidated
• Most folks talked to were positive about change, indicated late in coming
• Perhaps would position to better work with peers off campus
• Simply looking for an appropriate title
• Support title change as attempt to value research and scholarly activity
• Perhaps should be over at level of Directors on organizational chart
  • Chart actually should have lines all over to show connectivity between all colleges and units
  • Has moved in various flow charts; none really fit
  • Office also is major support of professional development on campus
• Do not understand elevation of research to Assistant Vice Chancellor level when other programs such as
  Academic and Career Services, Continuing Education, Honors Program, Service Learning and other initiatives
  on campus at Director level
  • Here research supposed to be one of many activities, not a priority
  • Would add to perception on campus that research more important than teaching
    • Teaching supervised by deans
    • Service supervised by deans
  • This would not devalue other areas; is balance between three
• Provost Satz indicated director not title most often used on other campuses
  • Also playing national role
  • Those people usually Dean or Assistant or Associate Vice Chancellor
• Dealing with comparability
• Chancellor Mash has not gotten sense that university moving toward research institution
  • Most of research is at undergraduate level as indicated by Center of Excellence for Faculty/Student
    Undergraduate Research Collaboration
  • Here try to make connection between research and teaching
    • Used as powerful learning stimulant; mentored by role models
    • Not divorced from teaching
    • Part of strong teaching/learning environment
• Others in favor of title change
  • See as overarching office
  • Access to information from System
  • Crux is that office does job well, more important than title
• Chair Harrison reminded that this matter brought to Executive Committee for consultation under Handbook;
  remains administrative decision

Continued Discussion
• Length of title also important to some; part (Director of Center for Excellence in Faculty/Student Undergraduate
  Research Collaboration) could be in working title
• When announced, should phrase in positive way to make sure above communicated; work speaks for itself
• Provost used sponsored programs to broaden title and raise visibility
  • Do not want to change way in which operates
  • Currently strong campus support as evidenced by positive university-wide review
• Provost will gather for future meeting
  • Percentage of students benefiting from Faculty/Student Research Collaboration grants
  • Percentage of students benefiting from differential tuition that students pay
    • Includes freshmen experiences, capstones, many other activities
  • President of Student Senate has indicated in past that although differential tuition does not directly impact
    each and every student, all do have an opportunity to partake in those activities

5. Guidelines for Centers on Campus
• Draft of Guidelines for the Establishment of Centers, Institutes, and Related Units and list of all Centers in
  existence as of September 1, 2000 distributed by Provost
  • Have been asked how to establish Center for Chippewa River Studies
    • No guidelines currently exist
  • List of Centers up for interpretation; came from Deans
Some may be removed as reviewed within units
Will eventually be edited

Looked around state and drafted distributed document; shared with deans and associate deans
Would become a policy document on how to establish new centers and how to review existing centers every five years
System approval needed for Centers of Excellence, but not others
Point is to have policy when someone wants to create centers on campus to focus on particular issue
  Resolves some of liability, legal, fiscal, space and other issues and establishes way to review those centers once established
Issue of duplication (for example, with Stout new Center for Hmong Language Studies) does not come up because not system-wide centers, only local campus centers
Guidelines brought to Executive Committee meeting to start process through governance structure
Current centers grandfathered in but would still have to undergo review process every five years
Understand some centers fit in one of other two review processes
  Number fall in the cracks and are not reviewed
    For example, Morse 2000 and Center for Rural Issues
  What guidelines meant to cover
Need some control over how centers formed – not currently under review of any kind
Could require all to go through some other review process, alternate way to review
  Would like to avoid another bureaucratic structure if possible
  Could assign various centers to colleges or schools for evaluation
Will address again at next Executive Committee meeting
  Give time to read document
  Members with expiring terms welcome at meeting to be part of discussion if desire
  Think about how to merge to existing structures, how to review and how to establish
  Definition also

6. Senate Interest Survey with Issues for Coming Year Announcements
  By consensus, document to be distributed to all senators

7. Filling vacancies due to changes in assignments to proceed as follows by consensus
  At-large senators representing a specific college
    If assignment changes to different college, senate term ends and replacement elected from affected college via vacancy filling process
  New merged Continuing Education Unit large enough to warrant own senator – will be notified
  If assignment remains with college, but reassigned elsewhere, may continue in senate seat
  At-large senators elected from specific group
    If no longer majority assignment to that group, senate term ends and replacement elected from that group
    Will replace at-large senator from units of less than 4
      Look at frozen file numbers in October to see if Units of less than 4 representation should be decreased

8. New Business
  Consensus to talk to semester replacement senator about election to committee for single semester; if elected, would be replaced after semester

Meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m. without objection

Respectfully submitted by,

Wanda Schulner
Secretary to the University Senate