Present: Mitchell Freymiller, Andrea Gapko, Susan Harrison, Patricia Kleine, Jennifer Lee, Scott Lester, Brian Levin-Stankevich, Scott Lowe, Rick Mickelson, John Pollitz, Sheila Smith, Linda Spaeth, Marie Stadler

Absent: Ned Beach, Beth Hellwig, Geoff Peterson,

Guests: Marty Wood

The regular meeting of the University Senate Executive Committee was called to order by Chair Harrison at 3:09 p.m. on Tuesday, September 21, 2010 in the Presidents Room of Davies Center.

1. Minutes of September 7, 2010 approved as distributed

2. Open Forum
   ● Welcome new members Marie Stadler and Ned Beach

3. Review of tentative agenda for September 28, 2010 meeting of University Senate
   ● Approved as distributed
   ● May be potential item after special session
     ● No objections

4. Decision about position related to Administration and Facilities – REMOVED from agenda

5. Miscellaneous Business
   ● None

6. Announcements
   ● Since Dwight Watson has left to be the Dean of Education at Northern Iowa
   ● Concern about who will oversee Teacher Education as Dwight had numerous responsibilities
   ● After affirmation from the College of Education and Human Sciences
     ● There will be an Associate Dean
     ● The department will also have a Chair

7. Consultation with the Chancellor regarding personnel related to facilities oversight. Pursuant to Wisconsin State Statutes 19.85 (c) the committee went into closed session for the purpose of discussing position changes.

MOVED and seconded that the committee go into closed session under Wisconsin Statute 19.85 (1)(c) to discuss position changes.

Motion PASSED unanimously without objection from the following voting members: Mitchell Freymiller, Andrea Gapko, Susan Harrison, Jennifer Lee, Scott Lester, Scott Lowe, Rick Mickelson, John Pollitz, Sheila Smith, Linda Spaeth, and Marie Stadler

8. Adjournment of regular meeting at 3:25
9. University Faculty members of the Executive Committee convened in special session for consultation with the Chancellor regarding the status of the Materials Science motion and consideration of the request for action to be taken and closure brought to the motion rather than wait for the results of an Ad Hoc Committee

- Chair has had requests to bring closure to this motion
- Can do this by amending the original motion or let it go forward and allow it be approved or not
- The senators just heard from the Chancellor at the last Senate meeting regarding this
- By going this route it creates an either/or situation but it really isn’t an either/or situation
- Don’t want to create a process by which we quickly proliferate departments in every disciplinary area we go into on campus
- Chancellor would like to see a way of having equity of peer review
- If there is a way to create equity for faculty review processes without proliferating administrative units in the campus then would like to pursue and look at other models and see what other campuses have done
- Academic Policies Committee members are generating ideas because they themselves might either like to be part of interdisciplinary unit moving forward or they know of others coming up
- Clear discussion of how ones are/would be assessed
- Departments may be defined, redefined, merged or disappear
- Hesitate to have it portrayed as a “no” when there might be a 3rd option
- Haven’t looked at all the other options
- Other than applying for grants there is nothing that can be thought of in terms of a down side for Material Science
- Material Science wants to move on to the next solution
- Good reasons for forming new departments but we don’t know if we know what those are right now
- But many things can go wrong
- Many recently created departments have not turned out well
- Material Science faculty wanted to find a way to hire people and to have people be comfortable and be attracted to come
- If our rules will permit us to tenure people in an interdisciplinary program without giving it a chair and etc. (apparatus of a department) then we could experiment with what are good ideas
- Putting resources into interdisciplinary programs and seeing what happens might be a good way to go

Viewed as 2 items:

- The motion itself and the issue
- If one lets the (previously passed by Senate) motion go forward then one could still work on the issue that way the procedural part is taken care of but the university can still go forward to work on the structural part
- There are no modifications that would make sense
- Recommended that no modifications be made to the motion
  - Then motion in its original format is the one that the Chancellor will respond to
  - Would bring closure
- Compelling reasons to still have the Ad Hoc committee work on this issue
- The more clarity that there is would really help people
- Would be nice to have closure for the Ad Hoc’s committee sake so they don’t have things hanging over their heads and they can just “work” and have freedom instead of also worrying about this situation
- Good idea to have a timeline on the Ad Hoc committee
  - Then report back to Senate or APC on the committee’s recommendations
  - Attentive to collective bargaining
  - Mindful of maintaining status quo
- Executive Committee could recommend a motion to not make any recommendations on current motion as it stands and suggest it will be returned to Chancellor on final action and that we would like report from Ad Hoc to the University Senate by the end of the year
- No modification is the simplest way and not have it tabled or withdrawn is the easiest way to bring closure according to process
  - This allows the Ad Hoc Committee the freedom without having any strings attached
- Worth it to have the range of organizational structures available when we sit down for collective bargaining
Compelling reason to come to a solution
Need to have the committee in place/created/formalized/developed
Unit is more appropriate wording as are not looking how to access the Director of Assessment, for example, or interims
Talking about interdisciplinary academic units
Is a more definitive answer
Important to have a Department Chair on the committee
Want a range of individuals who really have a stake in this as they will be more involved/excited
The only thing that stymies this is not whether such units can exist but whether there is any governance related problems (statutes) in having those units conduct personnel evaluations
Faculty are given primary authority in evaluating personnel
Faculty want to discharge that
The question with these units is: Who constitutes the decision making body among the faculty
Can it be the interdisciplinary unit
Other aspect involves people who already have a unit identified and the question is really more of one of criteria: What will be the criteria applied to these people when this body makes its decision
What are the most appropriate criteria to evaluate one by
Ask them to present to the Senate the criteria for the development for such alternative units as well as the management of governance and personnel within those units
The criteria for the development and sustainability of such alternative units and personnel and governance needs

MOTION by Senator Pollitz that the Provost create and charge an Ad Hoc Task Force for departmental alternatives for interdisciplinary units within 30 days and for that Task Force to report to the University Senate no later than the last meeting of the University Senate in April 2011, seconded and PASSED without dissention.

More than how do we create these but how to help individuals in other circumstances
Material science did everything according to the books/governance in order to become a department so is this process going to be the same or do we also need a different process in order to implement
This would fit into the motion
Stay away from anything that relates to DEP - are department decisions
Really a question of how faculty that have in a sense “dual citizenship” are evaluated
Already have a model
Some departments are not going forward in the traditional sense
Have a nice way of handling the assessment of those that fit in this category
Ad Hoc Taskforce and the Provost can figure out the details of the charge so the committee has some freedom

10. Adjournment of special session

Meeting adjourned at 4:16 p.m.

Submitted by,
Tanya Kenney
Secretary of the University Senate