Present: Don Bredle, Ken De Meuse, Andrea Gapko, Susan Harrison, Rose Jadack, Donald Mash, Cleo Powers, Connie Russell, Ronald Satz, Todd Stephens, Alex Smith, Jean Wilcox

Absent: Robert Hooper, Andrew Phillips, Nick Smiar, Jodi Thesing-Ritter

Guests: Kay Magadance, Andrew Soll, Ted Wendt

The regular meeting of the University Senate Executive Committee was called to order by Chair Harrison at 3:05 p.m. in Schofield 202

1. Without objection, minutes of September 3, 2002 approved as distributed with one change
   - Under Miscellaneous Business governance group official name substituted: Shared Governance Discussion Group

2. Open Forum
   - Chancellor Mash commented on student off-campus behavior discussion from University Senate meeting of September 10, 2002
     - Continued conversation with Chair Harrison and others following meeting
     - Issues identified at that meeting are dealt with regularly by administration
       - Continues to be a challenge – not frequently heard with passion exhibited at Senate meeting
       - Important to get students talking in different setting; view community separate from university
       - Other part is alcohol issue – those who are fairly reasonable in afternoon can by 3 a.m. forget all reason
       - University usually sends one or two people to Third Ward Neighborhood Association meetings
         - Receive agenda – university relationships usually one item
         - Currently talking about parking permit system that excludes nonresidents, not alcohol issue

3. Review of tentative agenda for September 24, 2002 meeting of University Senate
   - Nominating Committee will be announcing vacancy on Faculty Personnel Committee – faculty senator from any area
     - If nominations received soon, could be election September 24, 2002, but need to let Nominating Committee do their work
   - Consensus to approve tentative agenda with nominations listed if received in time for publication

4. Update on Nepotism Policy – Kay Magadance, Institutional Planner
   - In spring 2001, nepotism policy passed by University Senate held for further consideration by Chancellor Mash due mainly to objection by System to references to outdated policy
     - Modification of original action by ad hoc committee passed Executive Committee in May 2001
       - Main difference was addition of language to expand policy outside of immediate family as defined by System
     - Prior to presentation to full Senate, policy was forwarded to UW-System Legal Counsel for response
   - System still concerned that language goes beyond UW-System and Board of Regents policy
     - Changes suggested by System distributed
       - Consists of deletion of first paragraph and addition of paragraph at end using a reasonable perception approach to possible conflicts of interest
   - Biggest concern leading to original revision was instances where unclassified staff members live together but do not strictly fit the definition of immediate family
     - First paragraph was an attempt to cover those kinds of situations
   - System policy also does not seem to cover siblings, parents and other relatives not living in same household
   - New wording seems to leave responsibility for determining possible conflict of interest up to person making decision
Once Executive Committee agrees on wording with chancellor, then will have to go back to full Senate for approval, and then down to System prior to insertion into handbook.

Most campuses (except Superior where lengthy policy is in place) follow system policy.

Wording *appropriate UWEC official* open to interpretation.
- Can’t be designated because depends upon level of conflict.
- If within department, may be chair; if at higher level, may go up to Provost or Chancellor.

If last paragraph restated in passive voice, then would change so some third party perceiving conflict would consult with appropriate UWEC official.
- That approach, however, takes away responsibility of person with conflict.
- Could add additional sentence to the effect that if unclassified staff person reasonably perceives a conflict, they have responsibility to raise the question.

Hard to believe more people not contesting this definition of immediate family.

Are numerous situations on file locally explaining these types of arrangements; but wording to cover those cases awkward.

Susan Harrison and Kay Magadance will work on wording and distribute suggestions prior to next meeting.

5. Open Discussion Topic for October 29, 2002

- Only suggested topic at Senate meeting (student behavior off campus) more appropriate at student forum with faculty invited.
- Workload issues also suggested during survey last spring.
- Related to workload issue is advising load.
- Some faculty have more than 100 advisees.
  - Unmanageable number; embarrassing because no way to get to know that many advisees.
  - Lose some strategic advantage of UW-Eau Claire with these bigger classes and larger advising loads.
- Is now system-wide committee on advising – Regents, Provosts, and United Council have identified as issue needing work.
- Enrollment has not increased for most part over last several years.
- Changes don’t result from growth, but possibly shifting of enrollment.
- Because instructional academic staff and new people generally don’t advise, load increases for remaining faculty.
  - Student/faculty ratio stands at 22 to 1; suggests faculty should have around 22 advisees.
  - Are some problem areas, such as criminal justice with 275 students and two faculty.
  - Unless change whole structure to advising people not in their major, problem difficult to solve.
- Since had lengthy, far-reaching Senate discussion a couple years ago, perhaps if consider topic again should focus on portion of advising.
  - Is ongoing issue; we get hammered on this every year by alumni in surveys.
  - Should perhaps include Retention Task Force as vehicle to focus discussion.
  - Could discuss value placed on advising, including preparation and training for advisers, professional development, and rewards.
  - First discussion was good, but perception is that nothing happened.
    - Perhaps should identify two or three things to work on – realistic suggestions to place value on advising.
- Consensus to tentatively set topic as some aspect of advising and work with Retention Task Force chair to focus discussion.

6. Miscellaneous Business

- Suggested changes to Officers of University Senate section of handbook distributed.
  - Will be official item on next Executive Committee agenda.
  - Trying to establish relationships between Senate Chair, Vice Chair, Faculty Representative and Academic Staff Representative.
    - To bring continuity to those positions and facilitate flow of information back to Senate.
  - Is important Academic Staff Representative be from Academic Staff Personnel Committee because so much of what discussed at System meetings related to personnel issues.
    - If change to Vice Chair-Elect, person would have chance during first year to come up to speed on personnel issues.
- Proposal would allow Academic Staff Representative to come from larger pool – academic staff members on Senate
  - When election takes place in such a small group, often ends up being only person who can manage to take on work
  - Also allows larger pool to do electing
- Proposed changes would make two representative positions parallel
  - Good way to cement leadership and provide continuity
- Proposal to be voted on at next Executive Committee meeting
- If changes pass Senate, would require constitutional amendment and go to full faculty and academic staff for ratification
- Would have to work out transition for Academic Staff Representative to be elected this December

7. Announcements - None

Meeting adjourned at 4:04 p.m.

Wanda Schulner
Secretary to the University Senate