Present: Judy Blackstone, Selika Ducksworth-Lawton, Gloria Fennell, Andrea Gapko, Robert Hollon, Vicki Lord Larson, Bruce Lo, Steve Majstorovic, Connie Russell, Steve Tallant, Michael Wick

Absent: Mitchell Freymiller, Susan Harrison, Rose Jadack, Jennifer Lee, Scott Robertson

Guests: Donald Christian, Sue Moore, Katherine Rhoades, Pam Scheible, Andrew Soll

The regular meeting of the University Senate Executive Committee was called to order by Acting Chair Gapko at 3:02 p.m. on Tuesday, March 7, 2006 in the Presidents Room of Davies Center.

1. Minutes of February 21, 2006 approved as distributed

2. Open Forum
   - Post-tenure review salary adjustments came up very suddenly without much warning or time for preparation
     - Some faculty upset, but calming down
     - Provost Tallant acknowledged post-tenure review salary adjustment process this year would be extraordinarily problematic
       - Will be pressed to complete process; consolation is everyone in first cohort on equal plane
       - Needed to compile five groups of faculty to balance cohorts; had to start somewhere
       - Opting out and then picking another group another year not an option
     - Can request post-tenure review in any given year; will only be option of salary adjustment once every five years
     - Faculty promoted to full professors in June will become part of current cohort up again in five years

3. Review of tentative agenda for March 14, 2006 meeting of University Senate
   - Approved as distributed with addition of Special Report on Garfield Avenue Redevelopment and motion from Academic Staff Personnel Committee (ASPC) on Response to UWS 7 Procedures for Dismissal of Faculty in Special Cases
     - Report on ASPC motion to be emailed to senators Friday or Monday prior to meeting
     - Even though draft policy only applies to faculty, academic staff also asked to respond because anticipate same procedures applying to them once faculty policy finalized
     - At faculty representatives meeting last Friday, Regent Spector, a lawyer, indicated policy would be put in place so important to provide feedback to make policy acceptable
       - Responses voiced at faculty representatives meeting included
         - Inappropriate for provost to have that much power; recommended there be a committee formed for suspensions without pay or dismissals
         - Draft policy requires self-incrimination and allows dismissal based on our evidence; seems trampling constitutional rights
     - Draft responses from faculty and academic staff not in conflict but use two separate approaches
       - Plan to send both documents down to Madison
     - Senate Technology Committee has concerns about present mission and would like to hear discussion on that topic by whole senate
       - Current duties unclear in handbook functions
       - Part of problem is number of technology committees, both formal and informal, with different lines of reporting and different factions
       - Should look at connection of senate and college committees; some issues very well addressed by college committees
• Lack of clarity of mission reflects nature of technology – it’s a mess
• Issue can be looked at in shared governance group also
• Will be looking at functions of APC if Academic Program Change Action Chart revised; Budget Committee also currently considering their function

4. Continued Discussion of Academic Program Change Action Chart
• Registrar’s Office raised questions in email to committee members about notice of changes and nonlinear process, along with data on changes this academic year
• In proposed process, all items would be approved at level of Academic Affairs
  • Would then be submitted to Registrar’s Office for publication in catalogue
  • Would probably have to hire someone in Academic Affairs to oversee process
• In proposed process, many course actions would end at college level, but still go on to Academic Affairs
• Executive Committee should step back and look at philosophy and fundamental questions that need to be answered
  • According to data provided by registrar, most actions take place at college level
  • Infrequent college level meetings identified as one bottleneck for proposals requiring senate action
  • Perhaps best practices of various colleges could be shared – such as scheduling weekly meetings and canceling those that are unnecessary
• Have three concerns on proposed process – gleaned from discussions with faculty in building
  • Want linear process; nonlinearity allows too much potential for bottlenecks
  • Department or school reorganizations are not non-controversial; want to know on chart where controversial proposals go
    • Even if say only non-controversial items follow this path; still believe meetings necessary
  • Want to know that at college level power not consolidated with one or two people
• Perhaps revision of program change process is exercise in futility
  • Had heard current process not running smoothly; if conclusion is that change would not be good, let’s not change for sake of changing
  • If it would not make university more nimble, flexible, efficient and effective, makes no sense to change
• Faculty worried about voices not being heard – still have feeling were not heard in reorganization of colleges a few years back because process was not followed
  • Wasn’t that old process didn’t work; process was not followed
• Been told not flexible by faculty and deans – were looking for way to be more efficient, effective, nimble and flexible
  • This was one of models that came up
• Some problems did arise during reorganization of colleges; now there are capable people in administration of each college able to answer questions and carry out roles effectively
• Persons coming up with proposed revisions not wedded to change
  • Is faculty governance issue; if can’t agree when all agree, then perhaps need to keep old process
• Flow chart for proposed process distributed
• Every process is problematic and controversial to someone; what need is collegiality
• In past, sat on some of these committees
  • Not a problem to get through several non-controversial items in quick order
  • Faculty worry that something controversial will fall through cracks
• Could look at other ways to make process more efficient, such as easier forms that don’t ask for unnecessary information
• Curriculum committees allow venue to get together and influence others’ opinions or air differences; without meetings lose that opportunity
• Are ways to streamline current chart; better communication of how entire process works would also help
• Interim associate deans and reorganization caused unique circumstances at time when many program changes also were required; now permanent people in place in all colleges
• Some people see process for new major cumbersome and convoluted; wouldn’t even consider it
• Some people won’t do anything
• Problems in old process seem to lie outside of chart in departments and colleges – are ways to make those more nimble without throwing away entire process
• Perhaps should look at current bottlenecks in process and specifically fix those
• Consensus reached by committee to abandon proposed revision of Academic Program Changes Chart

5. Discussion of Administrators Voting on Committees
• Will be first agenda item at next Executive Committee meeting in early April
• Proposal prompted by provost wondering why he would vote on APC, for academic reasons, and then when same item got to chancellor’s desk and he was asked for input, come down on other side for other reasons such as resources
  • Provost ultimately has voice at chancellor’s level; think faculty should be able to vote at committee level free of provost’s view
  • Provost still needs to be on APC for information and perspective that brings to table
• At most other institutions in system, administrators do not vote on committees

6. Miscellaneous Business
• None

7. Announcements
• Details of memorial service for Ron Satz will be released when finalized

Meeting adjourned at 4:07 p.m.

Submitted by,

Wanda Schulner
Secretary of the University Senate