The meeting was called to order by Chair Harrison at 3:02 p.m. in Schofield 202.

1. Minutes of November 21, 2000 approved without objection as distributed

2. Open Forum Issue
   - Question raised as to where faculty and staff with disabilities go for accommodation or advocacy
     - System now have, with Americans with Disabilities Act coordinator, works great majority of time
     - When history of animosity, difficult to determine where to turn
     - Most people unaware of accommodation problems
     - Would like to see committee or other entity responsible for faculty/staff members with disability
       - Must be careful of structure so don’t hurt them
       - Would like to see comparable structure such as one that currently helps students
     - Current ADA coordinator is Jerry Witthoft, Director of Personnel Services
       - Problem is no money or clout to go along with title
     - Members of committee have advocated for disabled in past with good results
       - Took time, research, and effort
     - Provost Satz cannot comment on particular case since currently in litigation
       - Knows of no instance where faculty/staff/student has brought problem to appropriate office, that it has not been taken care of

3. Review of tentative agenda for December 12, 2000 meeting of University Senate
   - Special Report on Economic Summit by Senator Kolb moved after Chair’s Report to ensure timely delivery

4. Discussion of available assistance for disabled faculty/staff
   - Current Advisory Committee on Persons with Disabilities maintains strong student orientation
     - Proactive approach used for students
     - For faculty/staff, approach more reactive
   - American Disabilities Act requires reasonable accommodations be made
     - Coordination for ADA under Personnel Services
     - Legally have to take care of these issues, but is second issue of advocacy
       - Most people clueless about this until personally involved
       - Would assume rightly falls under Human Resources Department
     - Perhaps need to flesh out function of committee in regard to faculty/staff and proactive approach
   - Employee health also deficit on campus
     - Health Services for students; nothing for faculty/staff
     - Possibly disabled advocacy could fit under same umbrella organization
     - Most other big employing organizations provide such services
     - Disabled employees need someone to think about them, just like disabled students do
     - Disabilities not necessarily known when hired
       - Some result from aging
       - Not necessarily easily discernable
- Current committee was created and functions for students; not intended for staff
  - Already someone from Personnel Services on that committee
  - Recommend reinforcing role of advocacy for faculty/staff to committee
- Problems experienced can have more to do with timing than accommodation
  - Since no dedicated funds or personnel, can take a year or more to get needed equipment
  - No urgency currently in process
  - No one with this as primary task
    - Need to get in line to very busy person
  - Needs are being met at very basic level
    - Push not what will enable to do job best, but what have to have
  - Money not from identified pot
- Seems system, policies, and structure set up for students
  - Why make new and parallel when mechanism exists?
  - Just add faculty, academic staff and classified staff to present system
  - Focus and people can make changes
- Consensus to take what have and broaden focus
  - Suggest looking at everything and making changes, not just committee
- Currently ADA coordinator collects forms, does not advocate
  - No one able to be knowledgeable on every disability
  - ADA coordinator also evaluates situation relative to ADA requirements
  - May not be an advocate for individual requests; but is for reasonable accommodation and for funds
- Strongly object to way discussion going
  - Currently on committee; do not think committee sees role as employee advocate
  - Is role of Personnel Services; providing for staff should be a personnel issue
  - Committee has enough on plate dealing with students
- More than just advocacy because takes lots of time to do equipment and other kinds of research
  - Very complex
  - Not just putting equipment on desk, but also about getting training
- Every disability is different
  - Cannot expect for one person to have all expertise
  - See role of ADA coordinator as knowing where expertise is and plugging person into that system
  - May only need to be reemphasized
  - Financial support where necessary
- Lots of problems, one being changing technology
  - Impossible to expect someone to be able to cover that
  - Would also fall under role of some technology committees
- Figures on faculty and staff making requests unknown
  - Currently about 400 students out of population of 10,000
- Chair Harrison suggested perhaps should do two things
  1) Talk with Director of Services for Students with Disabilities to find ways needs of disabled faculty and staff could be determined
  2) Need to reaffirm and communicate that ADA coordinator is person for faculty and staff to go to
    - Paying particular attention to technology needs
- Rounds have been made in past by Joe Hisrich and CNS people
  - Met with units and departments to assess
  - Referrals can come from heads of those units and departments
- Currently working on laboratory and classroom modernization funding with many plans to make both more physically assessable for disabled
- University and System need to take disabled into account in decision making
  - Learning Space adopted despite problems with access for visually impaired
  - Vice Chancellor Soll indicated all three products being considered were equivalent in that regard
- Provost will share discussion with Advisory Committee on Persons with Disabilities when meets with them next
  - To emphasize faculty and staff have needs which must be met as well
Vice Chancellor Soll to talk with ADA coordinator to impress this upon him also
• Make aware role should be broader than just paperwork
• Awareness campaign also recommended so supervisors would have idea where to start
• Technology training requests taking up to a year not acceptable
  • Being busy not adequate response to request for training
  • Bring up problem with technology people, then ADA coordinator to expedite

5. Follow-up on faculty workload open discussion and possible January University Senate meeting
• Open discussion in University Senate last Tuesday was best attended by senators and visitors of all meetings during this chair’s tenure
• Seems to have missed one thing
  • Discussion and setting of priorities; where to spend time
  • Can’t be all things to all people – so must set priorities
• University Senate meeting possible on fourth Tuesday in January to discuss this issue in addition to motions coming forth from committees
• Notice gap between what being said and reality when up for promotion, tenure
  • Told continuously it is the teaching
  • At evaluation, often talking about research and publications
• Question need for another discussion – to what end?
  • Provided Faculty Personnel Committee exchange of ideas and allowed for venting
  • Need a consequence and not just talking
  • Provost also giving comments to committee
• Believe balance between teaching, research and service should be established by each department
  • Not sure what purpose of such a meeting would be
  • Provost must accept criteria and explicitness of DPC plan
  • Do not want to give up “state’s rights”
• Might be worth look
• What exactly are expectations for things like faculty/student research collaboration?
  • Would be nice to know university-wide expectations and priorities
• Because there are so many variables, difficult to put in writing
  • Depends on discipline, college, and where in career, whether program accredited, etc.
• Frustrating when faculty feel not enough advocates
  • See advocate model in union environment, would not suggest that
  • Thought Senate was supposed to be faculty advocate
    • Hopefully changing so faculty would feel it is
• Should always go back to mission statement
  • Currently seems adding to laundry list
  • Need to stop and look at resources when look at new causes
    • List getting longer, resources are not
  • Could list priorities, what we could do well
• Think long laundry list is great – diversity allows to do lots of different things
  • If narrow it down, might exclude people
  • DPCs should define criteria, but do have to be responsive to workload
• Diversity good, but need to know institutional priorities so can make directed decisions
  • For example, if teach overload, should it be for certificate program or freshmen GE course?
  • Should be able to go back to mission statement
• List is getting longer, more knowledge – keep adding things, reluctant to give any up
  • Now seem in task-oriented mentality
  • No time to talk to one another about what is going on in our heads
  • No time to be thoughtful and creative
• Chancellor would welcome conversation and discussion
  • University does have ambitious agenda
  • Continued that even when resources not forthcoming
  • Do not want to get overextended
• Faculty have choice whether to teach overload; some happy to do that
• Certificate programs or freshmen courses?
  • Easy call – GE needs
  • However, most courses for certificate programs already being taught, just packaged differently
• Administration aware of load – not pushing overload on anyone
  • Everyone already working full time
  • Have said no growth in enrollment plan unless additional resources
  • Some management flexibility to do little more; can’t do more without resources
  • Not a research institution, however, collaborative research is integral part of teaching process
• Happy to reassure administration not indifferent
  • We are in this together
  • Not looking to push people to limit for no apparent reason
• Service is in mission; not a change, but new look
  • Gives opportunity to go back and solve resource issue
• Consensus to have meeting in January
• Little other business
• Faculty Personnel Committee is looking at workload – perhaps should let committee do work
• Planning Committee is looking at mission – would come through shared governance to change
• Questions to lead discussion
  • Direction and priorities of university and how relates to workload
    • Doesn’t exclude academic staff
    • How departments and expectations fit into mix
    • Roles and rewards – part workload and compensation, but also what looking for in job
    • How much overload required just to offer curriculum?
      • Course availability big problem – transition to do better job
      • Many reasons for overloads – needs, interests, demands of colleagues (such as sabbaticals), illness or death, assignment to another area
    • Not exact science
      • This spring front-loaded classes using best judgment of what needed
      • Always adjustments
  • Two suggestions for raising intellectual climate of university
    1) Get food out of library
    2) Get a real bookstore – not book-rental store
  • Representative conversations across departments results in general consensus that certain kinds of service count more than others
    • Had to curtail community service because doesn’t count as much
  • Good idea, like many public elementary schools, to keep mission statement in front of you
  • Will distribute final form of mission statement
  • Distribution of planning document

6. New Business – None

7. Announcements
• Quick or virtual meeting on December 19th to approve questions for January meeting

Meeting adjourned at 4:56 p.m. without objection

Respectfully submitted by,

Wanda Schulner
Secretary to the University Senate