The regular meeting of University Senate was called to order at 3:04 p.m., Tuesday, March 28, 2000 in the Tamarack Room of Davies Center.

1. Minutes of March 14, 2000 meeting of University Senate approved as distributed without objection with corrections
   - Page 4, TESXT OF MOTION AS AMENDED
   - Page 5, Vote on Amendment 36-US-8-a1: Amendment DEFEATED PASSED

2. Remarks by Chancellor Mash
   - Final North Central Accreditation Report prepared by site team received
     - Very pleased with report
     - Report will be distributed and posted on web site
   - Provost’s Office planning opening activities for academic year 2000-01
     - New calendar begins one week earlier in fall
       - Two weeks prior to start of classes
       - Opening meeting August 21, 2000
       - Professional development activities planned
       - Ability to get to things never had time to cover before
   - Andrew Soll, Vice Chancellor for Business and Student Services, to present budget information today
     - More information can only improve discussion and decrease distrust
     - Create common vocabulary to decrease misunderstanding
   - Time away from campus during past week
     - In Arizona
       - Hosted alumni gathering in Tucson
       - Another reception at home of foundation executive committee member in Phoenix with friends of university
• Golf outing and picnic with Ken Anderson, former head coach of men’s basketball at UW-Eau Claire, for alumni and friends in area

• In Mondovi
  • Attended dinner and spoke to group at church to discuss regional public university
  • All wonderful people with immediate connection to university

• Talk about what we are doing here
  • Kind of university we have been
  • How we are trying to do more interactively with citizens and businesses in region

• Also good places to talk about our challenges and how they might help advance agenda
  • Not just fundraising directly
  • Gives them information to speak on our behalf to legislators, governor and others about importance of investment in higher education

• Asking Alumni Office to organize more alumni gatherings
  • If traveling and interested in representing university at such a gathering, get in touch with Alumni Office to organize meetings of alumni in area of travel

• Response to questions from floor
  • No update on possibility of academic year employees using 12-month pay plan
    • Still hopeful this will be option
  • When visiting various groups off-campus almost always hear positive things about university, rarely hear anything negative
    • Tendency to think everything is terrific
    • Part of my message is it’s been a tough decade
      • Wisconsin not keeping pace with neighboring states
      • Have been able to maintain quality by doing various things
      • University cannot sustain this in future unless resources available
      • Have real challenges and need some help

3. Chair’s Report – Chair Harrison
• Student Senate voted last night 21-9 to clarify Service Learning requirement to include only service to community outside university
  • Will bring forward for discussion when received
• Legislative Update #3 indicates response of legislature to concerns of students
  • Requesting increase in number of student regents to two
  • Require governor to select one from recommendations made by elected representatives of student governments at institutions within UW-System
  • Watch development closely as currently no provisions for regents directly representing faculty or academic staff

4. Report of Academic Staff Representative – Senator Hallatt
• Written remarks distributed with name tag
• Response to question from floor
  • Feedback from March 24th meeting on teaching academic staff not yet available
    • On agenda for next meeting in April

5. Committee Reports
  ♦ Academic Staff Personnel Committee – Senator Hallatt
    • Meet March 30, 2000
  ♦ Budget Committee – Senator Knight
    • On March 16th, approved additions to 2000-2001 operating budget
    • Next meeting April 27, 2000
      • To look at final form of that budget
  ♦ Compensation Committee – Senator Wick
    • Meet April 3, 2000
Discussing
- Distribution of 1999-2000 pay plan
- Proposed survey for faculty and academic staff

Nominating Committee – Senator Stuettgen
- Met this morning to discuss nominations for Senate Chair Elect

Physical Plant Planning Committee – Senator Stuettgen
- Meet April 4, 2000

Ad Hoc Technology Committee – Senator Lang
- Invited to attend College of Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee meeting March 30, 2000
  - Web-based courses on agenda
  - Have learned cannot prevent selling of class notes unless legislative act changes definition of academic misconduct

Executive Committee – Chair Harrison
- Meet April 4, 2000
  - Will adjourn at 4:00 that date to Cargill Technology Center
    - Participate in focus session providing information to be used in campus marketing planning process
    - Purpose of plan is to help UW-Eau Claire attract higher caliber and more diverse student body
    - Faculty Personnel Committee and Academic Policies Committees also invited

Faculty Personnel Committee – Senator Mack
- Meet April 4, 2000
  - Report on Promotion Appeal Procedure – Senator Mack
    - For departments without sufficient qualified members to form Department Personnel Committee or Promotion Subcommittees
      - Many departments in this situation
    - Looked at ways to resolve issue
      - Heard from departments with alternative ways to form committees
        - Motions relating to that seemed to create more problems than they resolved
        - Concluded it was appeals process that was flawed
    - Currently if insufficient numbers for promotion subcommittee
      - Department chair consults with qualified members
      - Chair makes the decision
      - Current appeal procedure calls for going to department chair
      - Real problem was appealing to person who made decision in first place
    - Questions from floor
      - Way written implies promotion subcommittee exists
        - Seems may need to write second appeals procedure to cover when no subcommittee
      - Statement earlier in text of handbook states promotion subcommittee or its functional equivalent shall be referred to as the promotion subcommittee
        - In cases where no subcommittee can be formed, functional equivalent could be department chair
      - Allows process for appeal to move around chair and go to next higher level
      - Same would be true when chair seeking promotion
        - Could appeal to next highest level above dean
      - Prevents from appealing to person who made original decision
      - If other members qualified, but not enough to form subcommittee, other ranking members voice heard only through consultation, no vote

Motion 36-FP-3
Moved and seconded by committee (6-1-0) that changes be made to August 1999 edition of Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook on pages 5.25 and 5.26 under Appeal Procedures: Promotions Subcommittee Decisions to provide for an alternative appeal process

Discussion
- Person voting against motion in Faculty Personnel Committee more interested in strategies to form a promotions subcommittee when insufficient qualified members in department
Inequities cited in cons refers to different processes in different departments depending on number of qualified members for promotion subcommittees
If promotions subcommittee, current process stands; if no promotions subcommittee, then next highest administrative person to hear appeal
Proposed policy indicates where begin appeals process, more than one possibility
Feel motion creates administrative conflict for dean
- Directly involved in external independent review of chair’s decision based on promotion criteria established by department because consultation with chair is removed
- Trying to prevent appeals process from starting with very individual who made the decision seeking to appeal
- No intent from Faculty Personnel Committee to eliminate dean from picture

Amendment 36-FP-3-a1
Moved by Senator Wick and seconded that the last line of the motion state “shall make a report and a recommendation to the next highest administrative level not involved in the appeal.”

Discussion
- Can continue to appeal to next highest level if not satisfied

Vote on Amendment 36-FP-3-a1: Amendment PASSED by faculty senators

Continued discussion of main motion
- Concerned people outside committee may see department chair as functional equivalent of promotion subcommittee
  - Usually functional equivalent referred to library because not academic department
- Concerned will not be implemented way intended
- Trying to clarify that would require significant rewriting of entire section of handbook
  - Throughout section refer to promotion subcommittee even though one may not exist
  - Current practice is whoever acting as that promotion subcommittee
  - Should probably be placed on agenda of Faculty Personnel Committee
- Previous language indicated final recommendation was with Chancellor, but language removed
  - Assumed to continue on up line as all other decisions do

Vote on Motion 36-FP-3: Motion PASSED by faculty senators

TEXT OF MOTION AS AMENDED:
The administrative review shall be conducted by the Department Chair and the Dean of the College next highest administrative level not involved in the contested decision. During the course of this review, it shall be the responsibility of the faculty member to show cause why the issue of his/her promotion should receive further consideration. If, after reviewing the statement of the faculty member, the qualifications of the faculty member, and the facts relating to the promotion subcommittee’s review, the Department Chair and the dean of the College agree that the individual faculty member merits further consideration, they may direct the promotion subcommittee to reconvene and to reconsider the issue on its merits. After reconsideration the promotion subcommittee shall submit a report to the Chair and Dean reviewer including a recommendation and the justification for the recommendation. After considering the subcommittee’s report, the Chair and Dean reviewer shall make a report and a joint recommendation to the Provost and Vice Chancellor, who shall in turn make a recommendation to the Chancellor next highest administrative level not involved in the appeal.

- Will forward motion and also refer to Faculty Personnel Committee to look at clarification of whole section

Report on DPC Officer Terms – Senator Mack
- Issue brought before Faculty Personnel Committee
- Currently Department Personnel Committee required each year to review Departmental Personnel Plan
  - No language limiting term of DPC chair
- Questions on Report
  - Not intent of committee that officers could not be reelected
  - Concerns came from departments who have DPC chairs “for life”
Two years seen as upper bound
   • After two years would have to be opportunity to reelect
   • Takes effect when signed by Chancellor
   • Applies only to DPC officers
     • Term limits of other positions (i.e. department chair) not discussed by committee
   • Perhaps motion should be asking for election, not for term limits
   • Could be handled at local level
   • Have provision in handbook for chair to convene DPC as necessary for purposes of organization
     • Allows group of faculty to approach chair to convene DPC for purposes of election

Motion 36-FP-4
Moved and seconded by committee (6-0-0) that page 5.9 under Membership of the Department Personnel Committees of the Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook be revised to read: The Department Personnel Committee shall elect a chair and a secretary, each to serve a two year term, and each of whom shall sign all official documents and communications from the committee.

Discussion
   • Have not had time to talk about this; not appropriate to act on today
   • Every department on campus has right to decide how and when to elect own officers
     • This group has no business telling them how to do it
   • Against motion, our department had chair for life, but we had election every year
   • Against, time factor more of burden for two years than for one, would be more difficult to find someone to serve
   • Committee concerned no language in handbook indicating must be another election
     • Once done, no guarantee there will ever be another election

Amendment 36-FP-4-a1
Moved by Senator Langer and seconded that “two year term” be changed to “term of not more than two years”

Discussion
   • Friendly amendment by Senator Pitts to change to “term of not more than three years” accepted
   • Some departments are on three year rotation
     • Nothing magic about two year term
     • Seems limit of some sort necessary
   • Guarantees at least every three years there would be an opportunity for an election
   • Would be more applicable to simply state elections will be held annually, no need to specify term limit
     • Could elect same person year after year after year
     • Still allow departments to control own destiny

Motion 36-US-9
Moved by Senator Scott and seconded to table Motion 36-FP-4

Vote on Motion 36-US-9: Motion PASSED by faculty senators
   • Takes someone voting in affirmative to bring motion back off table

   ♦ Academic Policies Committee – Senator Lozar
     • Meet April 4, 2000
     • To prepare for Senate discussion on advising

6. Discussion of Budget – Andrew Soll, Vice Chancellor for Business and Student Services
   • Revenue and Expenditure Budget Overview – Fiscal Years 1998-99 through 2000-01 distributed
   • Will work from macro level to specificity
     • Last two slides will get at heart of topic today
       • Distribution of funds in 1999-2001 biennial budget
Sources of funds for entire university budget
- Totals $125,000,000
  - Just operating budget, not including capital construction or renovation funds
- Four major sources
  - General Purpose Revenue – state tax dollars appropriated
  - Academic Fees – tuition
  - Operational Receipts – revenues generated by auxiliary operations
  - Gifts/Grants – majority federal student financial aid, also UW-Eau Claire Foundation
- Distribution does not change much over years
  - Small changes at margins
  - Related to items such as Chancellor’s Hall construction and debt service, tuition increase of 6.9%, etc.
- In response to question from floor, gifts/grants more sizable than academic fees because majority of gifts/grants is federal student financial aid which covers tuition and other living expenses
  - Not surprising they should be similar

Expenditures of $125,000,000
- Expended in nine categories as illustrated on handout
- Three-year comparison of expenditures similar to revenue
  - Not much change
  - Much of it related to Chancellor’s Hall
- In response to question from floor, federal direct loan program dollars reflected on both sides

General Operations Budget
- Focuses on activities related to prime mission of university
  - Instruction, instruction support activities, physical plant related to those core activities
- Two sources of funds are general purpose revenue and academic fees
- Legislation under consideration that would cap percent of total budget tuition can represent
  - Cap being considered is 38%, not including differential tuition at this point
- Three-year comparison
  - Reflects 6.9% tuition increase
  - Next year almost identical because of tuition freeze
- Expenditures distribution across eight different categories
- Research piece extremely small
  - Only separately funded research
  - Funding for Undergraduate Collaborative Research Program supported by differential tuition
    allocated to departmental budget so in instruction category
- Public service represents noncredit, self-supporting programs such as summer athletic camps
- Distribution over three-year period again flat
  - Illustrates limited opportunity to reallocate significant funds from one program to another
  - Instruction going up because labor intensive program reflecting 5.2% increase in pay plan
  - Physical plant not many people, primarily utilities, does not show same increase

Division by Expense Types
- Eighty-eight percent of budget goes to personnel costs
- Two percent goes to utilities
- Services and supplies also includes designated costs such as telephone
- Student aid program fixed because funds addressing designated programs created by legislature
- Permanent property includes library and equipment
- At best, small wedge of true discretion
- Again, very little change in three-year distribution

New Funding for current fiscal year as result of legislative action
- Pay plan funding – 5.2% for unclassified and some funds for classified staff although total not yet determined
- Most other items specific legislative initiatives
  - Requests submitted by system to legislature and governor
  - Money comes from system and immediately reallocated to various offices
    - Information technology and training
- Funds to increase efforts to train student technology workers and then hire to improve services
- Library reference materials acquisition
- Technology fee adjustment
  - Campuses (other than Madison) get 2% surcharge of tuition
  - Technology Committee including faculty, students and staff determine how used
- Study abroad student aid
  - New program for financial assistance to students wanting to study abroad
- Winterim and biennial adjustments result from no longer having to wait for additional tuition monies to be sent to Madison and then reallocated
- Liability/risk management assessment
  - System allocates and we return money to pay into self-insurance pool
  - No discretion over funding
- In response to question, to date have never fallen short of academic fee allocation projection
  - Believe if fell short by little bit, probably wouldn’t have to pay back
  - If fell short significantly, probably would have to repay in subsequent fiscal years
  - Now will get more up front instead of after the fact
- Projections of additional funding for next year
  - Pay plan adjustments for unclassified and portion of classified staff increases
  - Instructional technology training and staff is on top of funds we receive for current year
  - Library materials is additional funding for next year
  - Advising enhancement
    - Seeks funds to enhance advising effort of both academic and career advising
    - System initiative with certain amount allocated to each campus
    - Provost currently reviewing proposals for money and FTE
- Plan 2008
  - Diversity plan with major portion of funding for pre-college programs
  - Largely in hands of American Ethnic Coordinating Office
- Study abroad student aid program
- Position flexibility allocation
  - Addresses problem of operating under strict limits to number of positions available
  - Last year legislature authorized position flexibility
    - No dollars for salary or fringe benefits, just 1% position flexibility
    - Eau Claire allocation is 5.0 FTE
  - Portion to be used to reduce float
    - Fill more positions than allocated because always positions in flux
      - Assume even though more than allocated out there, at any point in time will be within limit if count only number of positions actually filled
    - More comfortable if reduce float slightly
  - In response to question, five positions not earmarked as certain type
    - How to use them is management decision
    - Lack of attached dollars does not necessarily mean will always be academic staff and not tenure track
    - Can use positions today looking at projections for tomorrow, such as retirements coming up
- Additional student access
  - Support 15 students at UW-Eau Claire with money and one position
- In response to question, money for advising enhancement not necessarily all for salary
  - Proposals could include salaries, LTE or student (peer advisors) funding, training, or services and supplies
  - Specific proposals in week or two
  - In response to question, differential tuition possible source of increased revenue because not frozen by legislative action
    - However, established by students, so would have to go back to students to look for increase
  - Have talked about increasing amount or changing basis, such as per credit hour charge
- Amount unchanged since differential tuition put in place
- Administration felt not right time to inquire because of 6.9% tuition increase
- Chancellor also forwarded proposal to System
- System forwarded to legislature
  - Proposal requests state matching dollars for differential tuition
  - If students willing to tax themselves for excellence of this institution, state ought to participate
- Hope provided sense of context for budget today
- Looking to use as effectively as possible
- Hope to increase budget at margins where have discretion to use as see fit
  - Hope to fund some of the wonderful ideas and new initiatives on campus
- Response to question
  - According to Bill Smethells, Interim Associate Vice Chancellor for Information and Technology Management
    - Ten students trained in pilot program in January and hired
    - Now evaluating that pilot program
    - Attempt is to get as much help as possible across campus, including classrooms and labs
  - Comment that as single user, help is much better this year than in past

7. New Business - None

8. Announcements
- Next meeting scheduled for April 11, 2000
- Topic for discussion to be advising

Meeting adjourned at 4:52 p.m. without objection.

Respectfully submitted by,

Wanda Schulner
Secretary to the University Senate