Present: Ken De Meuse, Andrea Gapko, Susan Harrison, Robert Hooper, Rose Jadack, Tim Lane, Donald Mash, Jane Pederson, Cleo Powers, Ronald Satz, Kathie Schneider, Nick Smiar, Todd Stephens, Jodi Thesing-Ritter, Jean Wilcox

Absent: Rodd Freitag

Guests: V. Thomas Dock, Maureen Mack, Ted Wendt

The meeting was called to order by Chair Harrison at 3:05 p.m. in Schofield 202

1. Without objection, minutes of February 5, 2002 approved as distributed

2. Open Forum – No items brought forward

3. Review of tentative agenda for February 26, 2002 meeting of University Senate
   • Without objection, agenda approved as distributed

4. Discussion of spring semester Senate Open Discussions
   • Executive Committee meeting scheduled for week before spring break will probably not be necessary; also have fifth Tuesday in April available for possible Senate Open Discussions
   • Many topics suggested on surveys, but no single topic repeatedly requested
   • Possibility of Chancellor holding a Roundtable similar to those held periodically for students
     • Chancellor more than willing if think would be helpful and useful
     • Could hold this one on March 19th
   • April 30th would be good date to discuss results of state legislature action on budget and impact
     • Could incorporate institutional planning, goals, and priorities into such a discussion
   • By consensus
     • Chat with the Chancellor and Friends to be held March 19th as opportunity for any member of the University Community to present ideas and ask questions of the administration in an informal setting
     • Senate Open Discussion to be held on April 30th, with theme being Establishing Institutional Priorities within the Current Budget Environment

5. Miscellaneous Business – None

6. Announcements
   • Katherine Schneider is UW-Eau Claire nominee for Regents Academic Staff Award
   • March is Women’s History Month – will be information out shortly
   • Chancellor Mash to be on National Public Radio’s The West Side with Mary Jo Wagner today

7. Meeting of full committee adjourned at 3:19 p.m.

8. Subcommittee of University Faculty members of Executive Committee convened at 3:19 p.m. to consult with Chancellor on revised language from ad hoc committee for final authority
   • Committee referred to in third to last line of handbook copy in draft report should be Faculty Complaint and Grievance Committee not Department Personnel Committee
   • Department chair, rather than DPC chair, has ultimate responsibility as immediate supervisor of employees to ensure each faculty member sees department evaluation criteria
   • Comments from members of ad hoc committee
     • Very happy with language that is substantially stronger than current language
     • Fits College of Business process; no additional changes recommended
• Cons of Recommendation in draft report changed to “None apparent to committee”
• Compelling reasons matches language in other personnel portions of Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook
  • Hard to define term without specifics
  • Puts onus of responsibility on chancellor; must be able to articulate the reasons, which much be major
  • Because same phrase occurs elsewhere in handbook, has been approved by System legal previously

MOVED by Senator Hooper and seconded to send motion forward to full University Senate for approval of proposed changes to Criteria for Review of Faculty Performance in handbook

Motion PASSED by vote of 10 for, 0 against

TEXT OF MOTION

Criteria for Review of Faculty Performance
2. Department Criteria

The Review of faculty performance shall include, but is not limited to, consideration of teaching effectiveness, academic advising ability, scholarly activity, and service to the University, the profession and the public. The Department Personnel Committee (DPC) of each department or functional equivalent with input from the Department Chair shall develop and approve a written evaluation plan which further that defines each of these general criteria and describes the relative emphasis to be given to each criterion. The emphasis may vary depending on needs of the department, individual interests, and the stage of a faculty member’s career. The plan shall be reviewed and accepted by the Departmental Personnel Committee, Department Chair, Dean, and Provost and Vice Chancellor. The criteria shall be used by the Department Personnel Committee, Department Chair, Dean, and Provost and Vice Chancellor in performance reviews. Upon approval by the DPC, the plan shall be submitted to the Department Chair, the Dean, and the Provost and Vice Chancellor who shall review the plan and, if it is determined to be acceptable, approve it in writing. The Department Chair shall distribute the approved plan to department members, thereby informing them of the agreed upon criteria. The Department Personnel Committee, the Department Chair, the Dean, and the Provost and Vice Chancellor shall use the agreed upon criteria in considering performance reviews.

The Departmental Evaluation Plan shall be reviewed annually by the Department Personnel Committee. Changes in the plan shall be reviewed and accepted by the Department Personnel Committee, Department Chair, Dean, and Provost and Vice Chancellor. The Department Personnel Committee shall annually review the Department Evaluation Plan and revise the plan as deemed appropriate. Revisions shall be approved in the same manner as the original plan. The Department Chair shall inform the department in writing of any agreed upon changes revisions in the plan. (US 12/91)

If at any point during the development or revision of the plan, the Department Personnel Committee, the Department Chair, or the Dean cannot reach an agreement over any aspect of the plan, the next higher level (Department Chair, Dean, or Provost and Vice Chancellor) shall attempt to informally mediate any differences and to secure agreement so that the plan may move forward. If the Provost and Vice Chancellor’s effort at informal mediation fails, the Faculty Complaint and Grievance Committee shall be convened by the Chancellor to examine the issues and to make a recommendation to the Chancellor concerning that portion of the plan for which an agreement could not be reached. The decision of the Chancellor is final. When the Faculty Complaint and Grievance Committee recommendation is supported by ¾ of those voting, the Committee can expect that its recommendation will be supported except for only the most compelling reasons. (US 3/02)

Meeting adjourned at 3:34 p.m.

Wanda Schulner
Secretary to the University Senate