University of Wisconsin - Eau Claire
University Senate Executive Committee

Minutes from March 6, 2001
Volume 37, Number 11

Present: Rodd Freitag, Andrea Gapko, Margaret Hallatt, Susan Harrison, Tim Lane, Tim Leutwiler, Don Mash, Barbara Mac Briar, John Melrose, Cleo Powers, Lori Rowlett, Ronald Satz (via speaker phone), Kathie Schneider, Nick Sniar, Todd Stephens, Jean Wilcox

Guests: Meg Dwyer, Andrew Soll

The meeting was called to order by Chair Harrison at 3:06 p.m. in Schofield 202.

1. Without objection, minutes of February 20, 2001 approved as distributed

2. Open Forum Items - None

3. Review of tentative agenda for March 13, 2001 meeting of University Senate
   - Motion from Academic Staff Personnel Committee seeking endorsement of proposed Instructional/Research Academic Staff titling only item of business
     - Timing for motion not critical, although may be some discussion
     - Could be first motion for next meeting
   - No open discussion planned for March 13th; March 27th meeting starts open discussion topic of baccalaureate degree, service learning, and general education requirements

MOVED by Senator Leutwiler and seconded that the March 13, 2001 meeting of University Senate be canceled

Motion PASSED

4. Discussion of Request for Non-Senator Membership on University Senate Academic Policies, Budget, and Technology Committees
   - Copy of statement of support from Andrew Phillips of Computer Science with proposal distributed and read

Discussion
   - Standing Technology Committee formed to watch for technology issues with curricular and personnel implications to make certain shared governance involved with policy decisions in these areas
     - To open committee to non-senators defeats and expands purpose of committee
   - Took being on Senate to gain respect for purpose of University Senate
   - Oppose opening to non-senators; of three justifications listed two not forceful, other weak
     - Closed session only allowed for few very specific issues, not policy decisions
   - These three committees only ones besides Executive and Nominating without elected non-senators serving
   - At times shortage of senators to fill all committee positions; this would mitigate problem
   - Talked at length about committee membership when last restructured Senate (spring 1998)
     - Decision at time for majority or all of committee to be senators
     - If not enough senators to staff committees, then may need to increase size of body
   - See value in requiring Senate membership because representative body
     - Opening up committees may not result in more people forthcoming from groups needed for positions difficult to staff
   - Not sure where stand on issue, but see inconsistency in committee structure as problem
   - All committee structures open for changes at restructuring
     - Membership on Academic Policies Committee not addressed other than to remove restriction on Library member being senator; is only one senator from Library and that representative already required to sit on Budget Committee
• Budget Committee perceived to have too many non-senator members so changed to increase number of senators
• Technology Committee restricted to senators because of proposed purpose
• Personnel Committees did not believe changes necessary at time of restructuring
• History of formulation of personnel and compensation committees with elected at-large membership unknown
• Probably not time to get constitution changed this spring; so consensus to report discussion to Senate as part of Chair’s Report, garner comments from senators, send copy of minutes to Andrew Phillips, and further discuss as necessary

5. Report on Awards Committees
• Chair Harrison discussed Advising Award process
  • With Chancellor’s Office in regard to possibility of adding to alumni survey sent out for teaching award
  • With Student Senate in regard to possibility of combining with Owen Marshall Advising Award
  • Eventually discovered this year process will be through Faculty Awards Committee much like scholarship and service awards
    • Can be nominated by faculty, academic staff, classified staff, or students
  • Award currently for faculty only; professional advising staff not eligible
  • Professional advising staff would be eligible under Nonteaching Academic Staff Performance Award for excellence in performance of their responsibility of advising, i.e., doing job
  • See limiting to faculty as unfair to full-time advising staff
  • Currently one person usually spearheads nomination process for each nominee – could be anyone, but see faculty as having edge over students in that regard
  • More difficult for colleagues to know how faculty advise students
  • Academic Advising provides advisers for approximately 2,000 undeclared students
    • Big percentage of students left out if those advisers not eligible
  • Advising Award resulted in part from Senate discussion last year
    • Chancellor then approached Foundation Board about establishing award
    • Seen as fourth part of faculty responsibilities of teaching, scholarship, service, and advising; other three segments already recognized with awards
    • Lateness of suggestion put award process out of sync with rest of awards; now revisiting
  • If were to use students, should be current students, not alumni
  • Many students only deal with one or two advisers; not much to compare
  • If professional advisers eligible for award, would not be level playing field with faculty performing multiple responsibilities; professional should win every time
  • Shared governance has no clear role in respect to awards funded by Foundation
    • Does not mean could not have input
    • Belaboring discussion because looking at voting to put this award under jurisdiction of University Faculty Awards Committee
    • Maybe should look at possibility of additional academic staff awards to reflect number of academic staff on campus
    • If broaden awards, difficult to determine criteria
• Other question whether to include University Faculty Awards Committee in constitution
  • Nonteaching Academic Staff Awards Committee now in constitution; although seen as parallel, Faculty Awards Committee only in section on grants and awards
  • Would require constitutional change that must go before entire university community
  • Believe committee should appear some place where people able to find it
  • Setting procedure for awards not part of constitution, does not need to be addressed simultaneously

MOVED by Senator Gapko and seconded that two changes to the constitution be proposed: 1) to include University Faculty Awards Committee as proposed in #6 on handout; and 2) to clarify appointment process for Nonteaching Academic Staff Awards Committee as proposed in #4 on handout and that reference to full-time be removed from grants section of handbook in relation to awards and awards committees
Motion PASSED 15-0-0 (motion not split here to go to University Senate; would be split on Senate floor to reflect changes to faculty and academic staff portions of constitution)

6. Profession Development Program
   - Provost Satz responded to questions brought up in open forum at previous Executive Committee meeting
     - As far back as letter of application for position of Provost, professional development of both faculty and academic staff listed as priority
     - Remained priority on each listing of goals/objectives and/or initiatives since that time
     - Meetings between chancellor, provost, and staff with department and units heads reaffirmed priority
   - Decision made to use unallocated and Foundation money to fund activities aimed at this priority and setting up one-stop shop to facilitate development activities
   - Is not set-aside money – much of that being returned to department/units via deans’ offices
   - Actually only $160,000 dedicated from this money
     - $30,000 in travel support
     - $50,000 to support specific projects
     - $50,000 for curricular redesign
     - $30,000 for guest lecturers
   - Other items have no dollar amounts listed and may come from separate funds
     - Faculty acculturation
     - Enhancement of existing programs for University Research and Creative Activity, including Time Reassignment Incentive Programs
   - Don’t exactly know how reported total came to be $300,000
   - Committee to be established because NET relates to faculty development for teaching improvement and Academic Staff Professional Development Committee relates only to academic staff
     - Both of those committees to remain intact
     - Similar committee disbanded in the mid-1990s served university well by fostering collaboration and communication
     - Deal with only single issue because time consuming to review proposals
   - Twenty percent release time for new faculty will be instituted where possible
     - Where not possible, will try to find other ways to reach same goal
     - May also be effective to provide release time for mentor
   - Will establish working guidelines for committee by end of first year
     - Faculty, teaching academic staff, and nonteaching academic staff eligible for funds
     - Provost has right to overrule committee if does not perceive fair distribution
   - List of nominees for positions on committees distributed
     - Nominees came from deans and staff
     - During consultation today will take additional suggestions
     - Concern expressed whether enough academic staff on committee to give fair share and fair chance at funding

7. Miscellaneous Business – None

8. Announcements – None

9. MOVED and seconded at 4:53 p.m. that the committee go into closed session under Wisconsin Statute 19.85(1)(f) to consider appointments to Professional Development Advisory Committee

Motion passed unanimously by affirmative roll call votes as follows: Lori Rowlett; Tim Lane; Barb Mac Briar; Andrea Gapko; Kathie Schneider; Margaret Hallatt; Jean Wilcox; Rodd Freitag; Cleo Powers; Tim Leutwiler; Nick Smiar; Susan Harrison and Ron Satz (Don Mash, John Melrose, and Todd Stephens had previously left meeting in progress)
• Comments on appointments, additional nominations, and recommendation that composition of committee more closely reflect campus population by changing from seven faculty and two academic staff to six faculty and three academic staff heard by Provost Satz

Meeting adjourned from closed session at 5:02 p.m. without objection

Respectfully submitted by,

Wanda Schulner
Secretary to the University Senate