The regular meeting of the University Senate Executive Committee was called to order by Acting Chair Gapko at 3:04 p.m. on Tuesday, February 21, 2006 in the Presidents Room of Davies Center.

1. Minutes of February 7, 2006 approved as distributed

2. Open Forum
   - Proposed policy on disciplinary procedures for serious criminal misconduct has been referred to Faculty Personnel Committee to begin formulation of response to system
     - Committee to hold open forum on topic on February 23, 2006
     - Flyer to be distributed by campus mail tomorrow; email to also go out
     - Current document pertains to faculty; expect exactly same thing to come forward for academic staff
     - Provost Tallant recommends Academic Staff Personnel Committee begin looking at issue now also
     - Response will come back to University Senate; would expect Senate to pass some kind of resolution

3. Review of tentative agenda for February 28, 2006 meeting of University Senate
   - Meeting cancelled due to lack of business
     - March 14, 2006 meeting will include
       - Report from Faculty Personnel Committee on proposed policy on disciplinary procedures for faculty
       - Motion from Physical Plant Planning Committee on smoking policy

4. Continued Discussion of Academic Program Chart
   - Senator Wick discussed chart with Dean Christian and Senator Hollon; will discuss implementation with Senator Russell when consensus reached on philosophy of process
     - Will discuss revised role of Academic Policies Committee when in agreement about revisions
     - Due to much unintended interpretation, chart modified to more closely match intent, which is to allow institution to be more nimble
       - Would no longer be linear process
         - If everyone is basically in agreement, would be no need to announce and hold open meetings of several entities to approve changes
         - If there were any objections to proposals, would default back to current process giving everyone opportunity to respond to changes at open meetings
     - Came up with new symbols
       - “V” requires official vote to support proposal
       - “A” means must be official acceptance of proposal through formal or informal means
       - “I” requires entity to be officially informed of proposal for the record
       - Bold boxes indicate facilitating office responsible for forwarding proposal to Academic Affairs for action and dissemination
     - Intent was not to stifle ability to be involved
Discussion

- Seems definition of “A” should also include possibility that proposal will be rejected
- “A” not intended to be rubber stamp – if item not a no-brainer, then move to more formal process
- In UW-System boxes, “V” should be changed to “A”
- One change is that proposals that are rejected at one level, could still go on to next level
  - Originator would probably be different case, i.e., courses not approved at department level would probably not go forward
  - Similar to personnel actions where negative vote goes forward; for promotions, those denied at one level are dead
  - Will have to be clarified when “no” goes forward and when it does not
- Colleges set up infrastructure they want to follow – process is not intended to exclude either faculty or administration from decision making
- In current process, administrative decisions are separate from faculty shared governance decisions
- Don’t believe decisions should go to APC and college simultaneously – could conceivably get APC approval without college approval
  - Even if APC approves, still need resources from college
- Shared governance group looked at process because present system is slow, redundant, and cumbersome; but maybe proposed one is just more confusing
  - Even if process remains the same, certainly could simplify chart
- Process seems to be mixing committee procedures and actions; determining which things go on agendas would imply tacit approval in some cases
- Already pretty nimble with course approvals
- Will be changing current system – APC function will change – now no checks and balances between colleges
- This would seem to convert APC to university-level curriculum committee; adds another layer
- When Art Department wanted to change name to Art & Design, one faculty member in department objected
  - Became long process for simple thing – seems process could definitely be streamlined
- Nimbleness is good goal – another way to accomplish that goal would be signoffs
- One of difficulties is communication between departments and colleges, for example, when one department discontinues a course that is a prerequisite in another department or college

Acting Chair Gapko suggested examining chart section by section to determine where problems are and where agreement could be reached

- Study Abroad Programs section was acceptable as distributed
- Departments, Schools/Colleges, and Other sections were okayed with changes
- There was a question in Degree section about distance education
- There were questions in Majors section about how recent changes in system policy would affect establishment of new majors
- Some things not included on chart, but everything does not have to be – such as departments moving to different colleges
- Seems like things that are really reorganization need to go through all steps with nonbinding recommendations going forward
- Chart only indicates those steps that have to occur; does not preclude other communication or examination by other entities
- All actions are circulated to all faculty and academic staff
  - If any objection, item referred to University Senate
  - Senate could refer to APC or elsewhere
- Ideas are disseminated to chairs and opinions solicited
  - If no one cares, why have meeting after meeting
  - If anybody cares, then hold open meetings
- Not sure other faculty will be okay with consolidating power at APC and deans
- Proposal says more voice, but only when people care
- University Senate also recommends to chancellor, so is another step there
• Will make modifications discussed today and bring back to committee for further discussion
• Would be helpful to redefine APC consistent with vision here; perhaps should also be complementary chart for when proposal rejected at some level

5. Discussion of Administrators Voting on Committees
• As long as looking at functions of APC to be discussed at next meeting, will look at this issue at same time

6. Miscellaneous Business
• None

7. Announcements
• None

Meeting adjourned at 4:39 p.m.

Submitted by,

Wanda Schulner
Secretary of the University Senate