University of Wisconsin - Eau Claire
University Senate Executive Committee
Minutes from November 5, 2002
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Present: Don Bredle, Ken De Meuse, Andrea Gapko, Susan Harrison, Rose Jadack, Donald Mash, Andrew Phillips, Cleo Powers, Connie Russell, Ronald Satz, Nick Smiar, Alex Smith, Todd Stephens, Jean Wilcox

Absent: Robert Hooper, Jodi Thesing-Ritter

Guests: Bill Harms, Mitch Kilcrease, Andrew Soll, Ted Wendt

The regular meeting of the University Senate Executive Committee was called to order by Chair Harrison at 3:03 p.m., Tuesday, November 5, 2002 in Schofield 202

1. Without objection, minutes of October 15, 2002 approved as distributed

2. Open Forum Items – None

3. Review of tentative agenda for November 12, 2002 meeting of University Senate
   • Consensus to approve as distributed including items C and D under Miscellaneous Business from Academic Policies Committee, plus
     • Additional motion passed at APC meeting today on GE placement of CRMJ courses
     • Any business completed at Executive Committee meeting today

4. Reorganization of University Centers and Programs Staff – Vice Chancellor Soll
   • No major reorganization of University Centers and Programs Staff followed resignation of associate director and subsequent retirement of director because did not want to tie hands of new director
     • Consequently was interim restructuring to optimize efficient operation in absence of associate director and director
     • Bill Harms, Associate Vice Chancellor of Student Services, served as interim director
     • Last summer Mitchell Kilcrease came on board as new director
     • Looked at various units, position descriptions, and functions to create workable organizational scheme
     • Talked to subunits prior to proposing structure and returned with proposal to those subunits
     • Now asking for Executive Committee input
   • Three handouts distributed
     1) Old organization chart with names
     • Flat organization with number of individuals reporting to Associate Vice Chancellor Harms
     2) Interim organizational chart
     • Organized functional issues in three areas (programming, retail, and operational services), each with leader
     • Leaders kept area responsibilities and took on additional tasks previously completed by associate director and director, such as personnel responsibilities
     • Decreased number of people reporting directly to Associate Vice Chancellor Harms
     3) Proposed organizational chart focuses on functions, not individuals carrying out functions
     • Restructuring proposes six functional areas
     • Proposal results from series of meetings with staff and review of university mission and core values
     • Redefined Center mission and reestablished core values, then looked at what design could support
     • Hope to provide better services via good mechanism
     • Good buy-in from staff to proposed restructuring

• Comments and Responses to Questions
  • Issue brought as courtesy to Executive Committee for input; not required by Handbook
  • Position descriptions have been developed for each function
  • Will then overlay with existing staff; next step is more traditional organizational chart with names
  • Position of Assistant Director of Operational Services new
  • Tier of boxes under director are functions director provides
Boxes below six functional areas not necessarily discreet; everyone in that area plays role in meeting function
To implement restructuring immediately and revise as necessary as expansion of Davies Center progresses
Serve needs for today and evolve with building; increased flexibility will allow easier adaptation

5. Handbook revision issues recommended by Handbook Review Committee
   A. Addition of Length of Terms of Office bylaw to University Faculty and University Senate bylaws
      • Currently when have election for vacant positions with differing terms, person elected with most votes gets longest term
      • Putting this in bylaws would document current practice
      • Proposed wording same as current academic staff bylaw; changed to become grammatically correct

MOVED by Ken De Meuse and seconded that
   1) A new bylaw be inserted between #9 and #10 in the Bylaws of the University Faculty stating:

      Length of Terms of Office When terms of different lengths are being filled by election, the elected individual(s) receiving the most votes receive(s) the longest term(s).

   2) A new bylaw be inserted between #15 and #16 in the Bylaws of the University Senate stating:

      Length of Terms of Office When terms of different lengths are being filled by election, the elected individual(s) receiving the most votes receive(s) the longest term(s).

   3) Bylaw #10 of the University Academic Staff be modified as follows:

      Length of Terms of Office When different length terms of different lengths are being filled by election, the elected individual(s) receiving the most votes receive(s) the longest term(s).

Motion PASSED by vote of 13 for, 0 against. Bylaws changes become effective when passed by University Senate

B. Number of nominations required from various nominating committees
   • Robert’s Rules of Order require nominating committees to present one name per opening
   • Nominating committee presents slate; up to others to add to it
   • Current bylaws require nominating committees to come up with more than one nomination per vacancy

Discussion
   • Arm twisting required to get more nominations defeating purpose of having willing people run
   • Idea is that in open assembly anyone wishing to could come forward
   • Would include officers of Senate unless wording says differently
   • Support status quo – academic staff seems to have less difficulty finding people to run
   • Going with one name per opening limits opportunity because committee would find one nominee and stop
   • Might discourage others from putting name forward
   • Question is whether people will come forward or must dig for them
   • Without nominating committee contact many would be unaware elections going on; would need to increase publicity
   • Each nominating committee works as sees fit; sometimes not most efficient method
   • Committees given lists of all faculty and academic staff eligible for vacancies
   • Doesn’t feel right to have only one name come forward, especially for chair and vice chair
   • Issue raised repeatedly – question is whether to leave as is and suspend rules when there are not enough nominees, or to change requirements
   • Bringing forward only one name for each vacancy from nominating committee increases power of committee to influence membership on various committees
   • Other organizations work this way; lot of publicity goes out prior to elections
   • Many System Committees, such as University Insurance Board, come out with choices; favor that method
   • Current way, work is done in advance; no problem to suspend rules if becomes necessary

MOVED by Ronald Satz and seconded to retain status quo
Discussion

- Would like to see issue debated before full Senate
  - Executive Committee action to be reported to Senate under committee reports
  - Could be considered under miscellaneous business if anyone so desired

Motion PASSED

6. Miscellaneous Business

- Notes on Academic Advising Best Practices and Open Discussion to be posted on Senate website with URL published in Chair’s Report
  - Did receive good feedback on discussion
- At faculty representatives meeting, President Lyall brought up Citizens for Higher Education and asked reps to promote on own campuses
  - Consensus to share information in Chairs Report with copies of sign-up sheet (furnished by group) available

7. Announcements - None

Meeting adjourned at 3:55 p.m.

Wanda Schulner
Secretary to the University Senate