University of Wisconsin - Eau Claire
University Senate Executive Committee

Minutes from September 19, 2000
Volume 37, Number 2

Present: Rodd Freitag, Andrea Gapko, Susan Harrison, Tim Lane, Tim Leutwiler, Barbara MacBriar, Donald Mash, John Melrose, Cleo Powers, Lori Rowlett, Ronald Satz, Kathie Schneider, Todd Stephens, Jean Wilcox

Absent: Margaret Hallatt, Nick Smiar

Guests: Tom Dock, Ted Wendt

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

1. Minutes of September 5, 2000 were approved without objection as distributed

2. Open Forum Issues
   - Dean Wendt brought up issue of final exam policy
     - Policy clearly stated in Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook with listed exceptions
     - Common wisdom among faculty apparently that as long as dean does not know can cut deals
     - Prepared to make strong statement to faculty concerning adherence to policy
     - Perhaps policy should be reexamined
       - Chair Harrison will put final exam policy on agenda and notify dean when it comes up
   - Some members of faculty wondering why university has not issued statement regarding Boy Scouts discriminatory policy in light of university support of United Way
     - Can earmark organizations to be funded when making contribution
     - Research indicates difference for other organizations is made up with unearmarked funds
     - Dunn County has come out with statement that if no change in policy, will withdraw from United Way campaign next year
     - UW-Eau Claire leadership has had conversation about this policy
       - Chancellor Mash has personally reviewed pros and cons
       - Is issue on which reasonable people might disagree so hard to come to university position
   - Similar issues
     - Health insurance for partners is clearly UW-System decision
     - Have changed local policy so domestic partners may secure Blugold cards
     - Chancellor was taken to task last year over chalkings incident – did respond to that
     - About a week ago, considered banishment of ‘preachers’ from campus
       - Thin line between free speech and name calling and inciting
     - These are all sensitive, subjective issues over which people can disagree
   - However, do welcome suggestions
   - Another option for charitable giving also supported on campus
   - United Way comes through campus mail with letter from chancellor so definitely perception of endorsement
     - Clearly supportive including follow-up letters if donation not forthcoming
   - Issue will become part of Chair’s Report for Senate meeting Tuesday
     - Will open for brief discussion at that meeting

3. Tentative agenda for September 26, 2000 meeting of University Senate
   - Senate is body for approving University Faculty and Academic Staff meeting minutes
   - Senate also body for filling university-wide committee vacancies
     - Appropriate group in Senate votes for nominees for various faculty and academic staff vacancies
     - Again, College of Business has one nominee for election to Senate vacancy
• Also checking on status of coaches in athletics listed under units less than 4
• Senator Lozar, from Academic Policies Committee, has requested input from Senate on academic misconduct
  • Will include short discussion at Senate meeting
• Discussion of Service Recognition for Chancellor to share ideas and get response

4. Continued Discussion of Guidelines for Centers on Campus
• Purpose twofold
  • Basic ground rules for establishment of centers to cover funding, space, personnel and other issues
  • Make sure all centers undergo periodic evaluation process
• In some areas, such as Nursing, mechanism already in place
• For review, could list those centers now in existence not currently undergoing evaluation and determine where
  logical for those to be reviewed
• If centers have existing review process, would be exempt from these guidelines
  • Currently two review processes
    • Department
    • Other units
    • Are current centers that do not fall under auspices of either
• UW-System rules cover only designated Centers of Excellence; just report on others
• Would include entities not specifically listed as centers, such as institutes, clinics, programs, and projects that
  act as center
• Current draft of guidelines seen as work in progress
• Some see guidelines as unnecessary because mechanism already in place starting at school or department level
  • However, pet projects can be started; faculty involved can leave and projects remain on books
  • Idea is to create consistency and maintain quality associated with UW-Eau Claire
• Some see as centralization of process including another layer of paperwork and approval
• Provost would like institution to assist not impede establishment of centers

MOTION by Senator Gapko and seconded to endorse the established Guidelines for the Establishment of
Centers, Institutes, and Related Units as drafted under the auspices of the Associate Vice Chancellor for
Academic Affairs and Director of Graduate Programs and to review process at end of one year to determine
if effective
• Friendly amendment to delete references to directors in draft guidelines accepted

Motion PASSED as amended

5. Neutral and Confidential Interpretation of Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook
• Due to length of meeting, item delayed for two weeks; to be placed on agenda for next Senate Executive
  Committee meeting

6. Selection of Topics for Forums to be held during Senate meetings
• Due to length of meeting, item delayed for two weeks; to be placed on agenda for next Senate Executive
  Committee meeting
• Will still be time to publicize topic for October meeting

7. New Business – None

8. Announcements – None

9. Moved and seconded at 4:27 p.m. that the committee go into closed session under Wisconsin Statute 19.85(1)(f)
  to consider appointments to the University Planning Committee.

Motion passed unanimously by roll call vote as follows: Susan Harrison – yes; Tim Lane – yes; Tim Leutwiler
  – yes; Barbara MacBriar – yes; Lori Rowlett – yes; Ron Satz – yes; Todd Stephens – yes; Cleo Powers – yes;
  Kathie Schneider – yes; Andrea Gapko – yes; Jean Wilcox – yes; John Melrose – yes; Rodd Freitag – yes
Committee heard nominations from Chancellor Mash and discussed vacancies and candidates. The Chancellor will appoint nominees to membership on the University Planning Committee.

10. Subcommittee of faculty senators on Executive Committee reconvened at 4:32 as published in original meeting agenda for consultation with chancellor regarding aspects of motion titled Final Authority of DPC Plans passed by University Senate at the May 9, 2000 meeting that were unacceptable
   - Guests V. Thomas Dock and Ted Wendt reentered meeting
   - Academic staff members of committee welcome to stay but free to leave
   - If modifications negotiated, will go back to full University Senate
   - Chancellor Mash comments
     - Reviewed Senate action and discussion on that motion
     - Believe role of dean and provost in promotion and tenure decisions is central to that action especially when DPC and department chair agree
       - Then only role for dean and provost is to look at process and determine if previously accepted plan followed
       - Highly unusual stance for DPC and department chair to deal with substance and dean and provost to deal only with process
       - Are countless examples when dean and/or provost step in and send back to department
       - Didn’t hear much discussion about when internal political or personal issues affect DPC decisions
     - Issue too important to approve and implement without clarification of what it means

Committee Discussion
- Perhaps should investigate Ken Davidson lawsuit to determine if relevant
  - Provost felt specific cases with specific issues would not be relevant
- Any action passed and approved is subject to further review and must be approved by Board of Regents
  - Possible this would be in violation of System and Board of Regent guidelines
- If DPC says no, process goes not further
- Disagreement often fault of plan not being specific
- Why would anyone want to be dean or provost without authority to make personnel decisions?
- Possible to send issue back to Faculty Personnel Committee to work on
  - Would return to Executive Committee since this body charged with negotiations with chancellor
  - But Faculty Personnel Committee did their work; this committee is charged with negotiations
- This section talking about reappointment but eventually talking about promotion and tenure
- Any changes in personnel guidelines undergo legal review; possible to get review on proposed changes

MOTION by Senator Powers and seconded to postpone action until information concerning legality of proposed change obtained from System General Counsel

Motion PASSED

Continued Discussion
- Question asked if acceptable to System General Counsel, would chancellor still not sign
  - Chancellor responded ‘sole responsibility’ on part of DPC and department chair was sticking point
- Also would be interested in depth and breadth of issue
  - How much of problem it is, and for whom
  - Believe it comes down to adequacy of personnel plans; should be fixing other end of this
- If plan already approved, this should not be problem, only a safeguard
- Have been cases when some felt additional criteria outside approved plan applied at higher levels
  - Would be under purview of Faculty Complaint and Grievance Committee
- Proposed changes go against grain of majority of higher education institutions in United States
- Cannot look at particular cases because these are personnel issues which cannot be discussed in open session
- Checks and balances are in place; must be cautious if tinker with one part of process not whole thing
Meeting adjourned at 4:52 p.m. without objection

Respectfully submitted by,

Wanda Schulner
Secretary to the University Senate