Present: Judy Blackstone, Gloria Fennell, Mitchell Freymiller, Andrea Gapko, Susan Harrison, Robert Hollon, Rose Jadack, Vicki Lord Larson, Jennifer Lee, Bruce Lo, Steve Majstorovic, Scott Robertson, Connie Russell, Steve Tallant, Michael Wick

Absent: Todd Stephens

Guests: Donald Christian, Jan Morse, Andrew Soll, Michael Weil

The regular meeting of the University Senate Executive Committee was called to order by Chair Harrison at 3:02 p.m. on Tuesday, December 6, 2005 in the Presidents Room of Davies Center.

1. Minutes of November 15, 2005 approved as distributed
   • Without objection, discussion of academic calendar 2007-2008 added to agenda

2. Open Forum
   • Discussion of numerous recent editorials in Eau Claire Leader-Telegram regarding university system
     • Most editorials have been critical although few looking at university in positive light
     • Dean Christian striving to show area legislators accomplishments of students and faculty; also copying Leader-Telegram editor to get more balanced news stories out there
     • Seems to be national trend to beat up on universities; need to keep perspective and focus on educating next generation
     • Few years ago, legislative liaison was giving regular reports to University Senate; could be requested to again keep us abreast of current legislation
     • Legislative update put out by system also available; provost will forward updates to deans and directors
     • Question about employee policies regarding inclement weather and how that might affect final exams
     • University only closed three times in over 20 years; chances of being closed during exams minimal
     • Policy is basically if you can’t make it, don’t show up
     • If don’t come, will be able to make up whatever missed

3. Review of tentative agenda for December 13, 2005 meeting of University Senate
   • Approved as distributed with removal of Executive Committee motions

4. Proposed Changes to Student Academic Grievance Procedures
   • According to Associate Dean of Arts & Science Weil, reasons for proposing changes were to clarify how grievances are initiated and to address time limits when grievance occurs at end of semester
     • Timetable applies to academic year; however, if faculty and student available, expected to follow timetable during summer as well
     • Associate Dean of Student Development Thesing-Ritter, unable to attend committee meeting, also endorses changes
   • Comments and discussion by committee
     • Although procedures are student related, brought before committee for review and consultation because faculty so involved in process
     • Changed time for formal grievances to come forward from calendar year to 15 days to be consistent; year seemed too long
     • Fifteen days may not be sufficient if student seeking legal counsel for formal process; makes it different than other steps in process where 15 days sufficient
     • Have two full years in which to make grade changes; 15 days seems awfully short for formal action
• Are instances of students showing up with parents and lawyer to grieve grades or protest not being admitted to professional programs; not difficult to imagine lawyers in formal grievance process
• Not obligating faculty, not under contract, to show up in summer; should make every effort, but no ramifications if don’t show

5. Discussion of Academic Calendar 2007-2008
• Executive Committee previously approved 2007-2008 academic calendar and held for approval of revised guidelines by University Senate
  • Guideline #13 revised during approval process to read: A full day of classes should be held on Monday after the Spring and April breaks to maximize the number of full five-day weeks unless 13 full-five day weeks exist.
  • Following revised guidelines would result in calendar as distributed with removal of classes on Monday after Easter
    • Changes class days in spring semester to 43 MWF, but maintains 13 full five-day weeks of classes
  • Revised calendar would still be presented to full senate for information
• Discussion
  • Still 13 full weeks, but would be losing a second Monday of classes, which becomes problematic in lab courses; would argue to leave calendar as previously approved
  • First week of classes, including Martin Luther King Day, not counted as one of full weeks of classes
  • Disclosure upon registration that students would be required to attend different lab during first week of classes would be impractical because of demands on labs and lab capacity; would also be cumbersome language
  • Guidelines approved by senate indicate there should be no classes held Monday after Easter; are guidelines, but passed with clear understanding that if possible, they would be followed

MOTION by Senator Hollon to amend calendar to follow guidelines seconded.

Debate
• Week after spring break would become non-functional for lab courses
• Affects not only sciences, but also art and social work classes, and nursing clinicals
  • Also makes two week discrepancy for courses meeting on Monday evenings
• Issue is having to drive back to campus on Easter Sunday
• Believe Eau Claire is only school in system with that Monday off
• Concerned that senate passed guidelines and we may choose not to honor them; wonder then what point was
• Believe we were entrusted to follow guidelines; if we can’t do that, it should go back to senate
• This precise issue was brought up at full senate meeting; vote was taken
• Could follow guidelines for this calendar and revisit if outcry ensues
• Possibly could change calendar even after sent to system in January; only complication would be if anything had gone to print
• Maybe in future, could schedule spring break after Easter
  • Might result in static from faculty who have requested seven weeks of classes, then mid-terms, then break

Vote on Motion: Motion PASSED by vote of 9 for, 3 against.
• Will report decision and discussion to senate when disseminate information

6. University Senate Operation for Spring
• Consensus reached to hold first senate meeting in spring on fifth Tuesday of January in place of previously scheduled open discussion
  • Would allow cancellation of senate meeting of January 24, 2006 during week of chancellor finalists’ campus visits
• Chair Harrison has accepted position of acting Associate Dean of Student Development to cover incumbent’s maternity leave
Chair Harrison will be stepping down from senate for duration of that maternity leave; will remain in associate dean position for entire second semester, but will return to senate chair position when 12-week leave over
Consensus reached to have vice chair step in for duration of leave and work out with chancellor how to arrange for reassignment

7. Change in University Senate Procedure
Since senate rule of first and second readings continues to be suspended, and in light of interest in streamlining governance process, perhaps rules should be changed to make second readings the exception, rather than the rule
Could at any time postpone vote to next meeting
Would require senators come to meeting prepared to vote on new business; would reduce time available to discuss issues with constituents
Would not necessarily make more agile; think last few years with two readings have been better
Would prefer to keep current rule; can still suspend to make curricular decisions, make catalogue deadlines, or when little debate
Consensus reached to leave senate procedures regarding first and second readings in place

Group comprised of chancellor, provost, senate chair and vice chair, faculty representative, and academic staff representative thought could speed up mundane actions by revising chart and process in Chapter 7 of *Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook*
Still numerous questions to be answered and details to be worked out, but thought it better to involve all players early in change process
Revised using principle that wanted process more agile, but not more closed
- Actions shared with entire faculty body; if there are objections, then proposal goes to University Senate for action
- Removed college curriculum committees from process, although colleges still able to elect to use that process
- Elevated APC to university-wide committee to monitor mission, goals, and vision of university and decrease duplication from university perspective
- New majors would go to system first, then through campus process for implementation only, eliminating dual approval process
- All recommendations would go to provost and vice chancellor
  - If not supported by Academic Affairs, then consultation process kicks in for consensus building, not simply trump card
- Bold boxes indicate responsibility to forward action to Academic Affairs – usually Senate Office or Deans’ Offices, not always last one in process
- Is provost’s responsibility to disseminate to chairs, registrar, etc., and to implement action
- Presently looking for philosophical approval, then will work on implementation of process

Discussion
Provost as voting member on APC does not make sense since provost also has final veto
- Does need to be at committee meeting for input and to listen to debate
Without college curriculum committees, process becomes removed from those familiar with guidelines, particularly for professional programs
- Role of those committees vital and should be included
If any objections raised, action goes to University Senate, so checks and balances exist
Colleges can also make own procedures for use within college
Commend effort as this campus has cumbersome curricular process
- Process seems to lack early link between planning and resources – important that those discussions take place early in process
- Eliminating and establishing departments without dean in process does not seem right
Better to address budget up front, rather than find legitimate need, come up with great academically sound program, but nix because no resources
Tough decisions need to be made – want to elevate those decisions to authority watching vision, mission and goals university-wide – doesn’t mean colleges not involved
• Want to get all information to that point, then make philosophical, not turf, decisions
• Want to be asking right questions, not just money questions
• Will be tough challenge for APC – may not end up more agile as amount of time APC would have to
  spend on items may mean not getting to some of them at all
• APC would be spending less time on lesser issues that would now be settled at lower levels
• Need to put articulation agreements on chart
• Doesn’t make sense for Executive Committee to spend lots of time on this issue before taking to senate; if
  senate does not support concept, then wasting our time
• For-the-record items established as way for senate to look at items; without objection, enter into record
  • Formal process for objections, which would then elevate issue to University Senate level
• Would anticipate it taking two supporting senators to object – one to sponsor issue and one to second it for
  discussion
• Would require culture of collegiality and trust
• Could get some interesting problems with programs that cross multiple colleges if process too independent
• If function of APC changes, maybe membership should also change so people who really want to be on
  committee, and not just senators, eligible for membership
• Need to discuss role of college and dean
• To continue discussion of issue at next Executive Committee meeting in February

9. Miscellaneous Business
• None

10. Announcements
• None

Meeting adjourned at 4:41 p.m.

Submitted by,

Wanda Schulner
Secretary of the University Senate