Members Present:


Members Absent:

Gene Decker, Brady Foust, Obika Gray, Karen Havholm, Jeremy Hein, Robert Knight, Timothy Leutwiler, Jane Linton, Barbara MacBriar, Joanne Mellema, Kristen Monaco, David Nelson, Mark Olsen, Richard Palm, Janet Quarderer, Kathleen Sahlhoff, Gyneth Slygh, Sheila Smith, Mary Stolder

Guests:

Laura Dean, Bernard Duyfhuizen, Meg Dwyer, Stephen Kurth, Andrew Soll

The regular meeting of University Senate was called to order at 3:03 p.m., Tuesday, May 9, 2000 in the Tamarack Room of Davies Center.

1. Minutes of April 25, 2000 meeting of University Senate approved as distributed

2. Remarks by Chancellor Mash
   - Enrollment Management presentation to Regents went well; appreciate positive comments and suggestions made at last Senate meeting
     - University Bulletin did good job capturing essence of message
     - UW-System in process of making a shift; looking strategically to generate better support for its work
       - Greater access
       - Serving part-time students better
       - Working more closely with business, companies, community organizations to meet regional needs
     - Creating partnership with State of Wisconsin
       - Public higher education as investment in state’s future
       - Legislature talking about producing human capital
     - Agree with philosophically
     - Same time keeping eye on aspect of work responsible for excellent reputation university has developed
       - Education of 18-23 year-olds studying full-time
         - Working closely with their faculty in and out of classroom
         - Getting great staff support
         - Engaging in rich co-curricular program available in residential setting
     - Could do better with other dimension, that of reaching out; have begun to position ourselves to do that
       - Consolidation of Outreach and moving across river for accessibility
       - Additional course offerings at graduate level
       - Certificate programs
       - Changing class times to accommodate part-time students
       - Confident going to be able to make this shift to broaden scope of work as well as anyone in system
     - Could have put forward much more ambitious growth profile
• What presented stretched us a bit; was predicated on using management flexibility granted by last legislative session
  • Little better funding, not a lot better, all targeted
  • Still position control issue to deal with
• Some regents at times have questioned why enrollment management plans not more ambitious; some regents looking for more growth and better service
  • Response was if universities could count on 3–4% annual increases in operating budgets for entire six year period of plan, numbers would look much different
  • State support is still critical
  • Management flexibility; working harder; working more creatively only takes us so far
  • Because it only takes us so far, it only takes Wisconsin so far

• Commencement coming up May 27, 2000
  • Each graduate gets four tickets
  • For first time will be showing ceremony off-site so possible for those without tickets to watch in Davies Center
• Andrew Soll to be presenting benefits package later in meeting today
  • Looking to systematically accentuate positive aspects of employment here
  • Need to put cogent, clear package in hands of people trying to recruit
• Also to hear from Provost on opening weeks of 2000-01 year
  • Begin week earlier next year meaning will not graduate so late in coming years
  • Have good end of semester, restful summer, come back energized in fall

3. Chair’s Report – Chair Harrison
• Read report at leisure, contact me if questions
• Chancellor’s Enrollment Management Presentation very well done and very well received
  • Regent Berry expressed appreciation for illustration of how budget affects reaching target
  • Heard comments on clear message and how parts of presentation could be used to educate legislators
• Please complete and return Senate Surveys to set agenda for next year and aid nominating committee in fall
• Thank you to Senators completing term with this meeting
  • Department Senators
    • Bobby Pitts, Art Department
    • Tim Leutwiler, Communication and Journalism
    • Richard Palm, Geography
    • Karen Havholm, Geology
    • Richard St. Germaine, History
    • Robert Knight, Music and Theatre Arts
    • Obika Gray, Political Science
    • Jeremy Hein, Sociology and Anthropology
    • John Melrose, Management Information Systems
    • Gyneth Slygh, Foundations of Education
    • David Nelson, Communication Disorders
    • Robert Scott, Kinesiology and Athletics
  • At-Large Faculty Senators
    • Susan Felber, Chapter 37 Faculty
    • Brady Foust, Arts & Sciences
    • Linda Cecchini, Library
  • Unit Senators
    • Margaret Hallatt, Housing and Residence Life
  • At-Large Academic Staff Senators
    • Kathy Mitchell, Business and Student Services, Unit of less than four
    • Connie Russell, Registration, Unit of less than four
    • Mary Ellen Stolder, School of Nursing, Any area
    • Mitchell Freymiller, Biology, Teaching Academic Staff
    • Laura Chellman, Health Services, Any area
4. Report of Academic Staff Representative – Senator Hallatt
   - No Report

5. Committee Reports
   - Academic Staff Personnel Committee – No report
   - Budget Committee – No Report
   - Executive Committee – Chair Harrison
     - Meet August 29th or September 5th barring need for Executive Committee to act on behalf of full Senate during summer
     - Plan governance workshop for September 12th meeting of University Senate
   - Nominating Committee – No report
   - Physical Plant Planning Committee – Senator Stuettgen
     - Meet May 16, 2000
     - Motion coming to Senate at workshop next fall
   - Ad Hoc Technology Committee – No Report
   - Academic Policies Committee – Senator Lozar
     - Meet May 16, 2000
     - Finish program reviews
     - Extend thanks to hard-working committee members

Report on Pre-Physician Assistant Program – Senator Lozar
   - University catalogue lists a number of “pre” programs
     - Basically advisory in nature for students interested in physical therapy, occupational therapy, chiropractic, etc.
     - Kind of courses they might take here to then transfer to another institution
     - Identify a person on campus to go to for more information about those programs
   - Proposing similar Pre-Physician Assistant Program
     - Students may be transferring to an undergraduate program somewhere
     - More likely preparing for admission to a graduate program

Motion 36-AP-16
   Moved and seconded by committee (7-0-0) that the University Senate approve the proposed Pre-Physician Assistant program

Discussion
   - Adviser Conklin in Biology Department would recommend to students which major would be appropriate

Vote on Motion 36-AP-16: Motion PASSED by University Faculty Senators

TEXT OF MOTION
Pre-Physician Assistant Program (Code pending approval)
Adviser: Assistant Professor D. Conklin (P-338) Biology

Most Physician Assistant programs are now at the graduate level (MS). Students should plan on completing a baccalaureate degree before applying to Physician Assistant graduate programs. Specific requirements for admission will vary among different programs, and students are encouraged to consult the specific program catalogue for these requirements. In preparation, students should take two semesters of chemistry, two semesters of physics, precalculus/calculus, biology courses including animal biology, microbiology, and two semesters of anatomy and physiology, psychology courses, and a communication course. Other courses may also be required. Consult with advisors for further recommendations and information, including information about regional program requirements.

- Compensation Committee – Senator Wick
  - Meet May 16, 2000
  - To discuss
    - Preliminary survey results
Alternative pay plan policy
Distribution of 1999-2000 salary plan

Report on Chair Stipend Process – Senator Wick
- Calls for Senate approval of resolution expressing extreme concern that chairperson salary stipend policy was developed, approved and implemented outside university shared governance structure
- During implementation of 1999-2000 pay plan, policy was drafted in which chairs of each academic department receive a $2,000 stipend
  - Out of base dollars, not part of 5.2% chunk we received
  - Dollars do not go with chair when leaving position, literally on year-to-year basis
- Development and implementation was outside shared governance structure
  - Compensation Committee not involved
  - Executive Committee not involved
- Not part of pay plan that passed through Senate
  - Compensation Committee does not object to chairs getting extra money for being chair; objects to process in which policy came in place
- Does not call for specific action
  - Does not ask that chairs pay back $2,000
  - Just saying we have shared governance; we expect it to be followed
- Fact that policy was not followed becomes part of permanent record

Motion 36-CP-2
Moved and seconded by committee (7-0-0) that the following resolution be approved by the University Senate and forwarded to the Chancellor of the University of Wisconsin – Eau Claire

University Senate Resolution

In Opposition To Establishing a Chairperson Stipend Policy Without University Senate Involvement

WHEREAS, Chapter 36 of the Wisconsin Statutes gives faculty and academic staff primary responsibility over all policies and procedures concerning faculty and academic staff personnel matters; and

WHEREAS, Chapter 3 of the University of Wisconsin Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook defines compensation as a personnel matter; and

WHEREAS, Article Three of the Constitution of the University Faculty and the University Academic Staff designates the University Senate as the deliberative body empowered to act for the University Faculty and University Academic Staff in matters of responsibility and concern; and

WHEREAS, the 1999-2000 Salary Plan recommended by the University Senate and approved by the Chancellor did not establish a Chairperson salary stipend policy; and

WHEREAS, the 1999-2000 Salary Plan implementation did establish a Chairperson salary stipend policy that distributes a $2000 stipend to each Chairperson; and

WHEREAS, the University Senate was not consulted concerning the development, approval, or implementation of a Chairperson salary stipend policy;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that the University Senate expresses extreme concern that a Chairperson salary stipend policy was developed, approved, and implemented outside the University’s shared governance structure.

Discussion
- This is local policy
- Provost Satz clarified how policy came about for information purposes
- Discussed in Deans Council meetings for number of years
• Recommended by several Provosts
• Approved on recommendation of Deans
• Previously no salary bump for chairs
  • Other universities compensate chairs variety of ways
    • Some use stipends
    • Some bump salary when become chair
      • Sometimes stays, sometimes goes back when chair goes back to previous position
  • Chair stipend at UW-Eau Claire was attempt to do something along those lines

**Vote Motion 36-CP-2:** Motion PASSED. Resolution to be forwarded

♦ Faculty Personnel Committee – Senator Mack
  • Meet May 16, 2000

Report on Final Authority of Department Personnel Plans – Senator Mack

• Revised copy of motion distributed
• Committee sought counsel of Provost and other faculty on matter
• All departments currently have approved personnel plan in place
  • Final authority interpreted to mean approval
  • Provost/Vice Chancellor has final authority with respect to personnel plan
• Need clarification regarding role of Department Personnel Committee (DPC), department chair and administrative line
• Two major issues discussed by committee
  • Who has responsibility to apply criteria DPC formulated and used to review faculty performance?
  • Who has responsibility to verify reviews conducted by DPC and department chair follow accepted personnel plan?
• Issue of applying criteria
  • Based on input from provost and faculty, committee believed departments want total responsibility for applying criteria they have written, published and have had approved by administrative line
  • Language should be clear so no one can appoint advisory committee or college-level committee which may apply different criteria or interpret criteria differently than department
• Issue of verification of criteria
  • Handbook currently silent on issue of verification
  • Proposed committee language limits administration to verifying only those criteria contained within department approved personnel plan
  • Only difference between yellow motion (distributed with agenda) and white motion (distributed at this meeting) is in paragraph #3 changing “shall have sole responsibility for verifying” to “shall verify”
• Response to questions from floor
  • Committee focused considerable discussion on “reviewed and accepted” as specified in Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook vs. “approved”
    • Understood all departments have approved plan
      • In past, used dialog between levels to clarify, provide additional information, or give examples, until consensus or agreement reached so plan accepted
      • No language in faculty handbook that says Provost/Vice Chancellor has authority to approve or reject plans
      • Review can mean make certain in compliance with faculty handbook and laws, or that disagree with specific criteria
        • Several examples shared with committee of departments going through process of plans not being readily accepted; questions were asked, additional information provided, and subsequently plans accepted and/or approved
        • “Review and accept” currently in handbook
          • Not being changed in any way
          • Not primary focus of what changed by this document
      • Provost noted only one example of plan coming forward this year that was returned to dean and department because portion violated state law; was subsequently corrected
    • Request for clarification or change could occur at any level
• Provost wished to clarify information requested by committee and responses; was asked three questions by committee as follows:
  • Who has responsibility for applying criteria for review of faculty performance at all levels?
    • It says that at all levels this plan shall be accepted: DPC, Department Chair, Dean, and Provost
  • Which personnel plan takes precedence during administrative review when plan changed or questioned?
    • Plan that has been accepted at all levels
  • Who has responsibility for verifying reviews conducted following accepted plan?
    • Everyone does – DPC, chairs, deans, provost
• Intent of proposal to put responsibility of making sure faculty meet criteria as put forth in departmental personnel plan at DPC and department level
  • Provide evidence and documentation that criteria met as opposed to not wanting to make hard decision and hoping someone further up line will
• Stricken sentence specifically written to say dean and provost have to use criteria in approved plan
  • Can’t change criteria in mid-review
  • Sentence written with specific purpose of protecting faculty
• Important to be clear what recommendation here is
  • Saying all levels will agree on criteria
  • If want to make changes, everyone has to agree
  • Proposed language says particular department (DPC and chair) makes qualitative decision as to whether faculty member meets criteria or not
  • No criteria necessary at administrative level because at that level checking that plan agreed to was followed; no qualitative judgment made in administrative ranks
  • Means evaluation of faculty member in specific discipline rests with people in that discipline, not with dean or others who may not have background in that discipline
  • Faculty have spoken on that issue when recommendation forwarded
• Initially Faculty Personnel Committee asked to clarify what final acceptance by the Provost indeed meant
  • As discussed with Provost, came to believe that accept is a nice way of saying approved
    • Until the Provost accepts plan, dialog continues until there is an approved plan
  • Obviously benefits all parties, particularly the department, if there is an approved department personnel plan in force
• Other issues surfaced
  • Who does reviewing?
  • Are there additional criteria that may emerge beyond department level?
    • Some felt in some cases may be additional criteria applied as case goes up administrative line
    • Heard some cases where perhaps that had happened
  • Faculty handbook did not make clear where responsibility lies
  • Also heard not having a personnel plan accepted was not commonly a problem
  • Issue seemed to be who has responsibility to vigorously apply criteria department has written
    • Came to believe that was department’s responsibility
      • Not pass it off
      • Help provide direct communication back to person
• Next issue was who involved in verification process
  • Proposal basically says no one of these people or groups involved has final authority over department personnel plans
    • Every department has agreed upon criteria
    • If those are to be changed, must be agreed upon by everyone
    • Stay with first plan until changes are agreed upon
    • No one, in essence, has final authority except probably the Chancellor
• Intent of proposal is for dean to basically have only ability to assess whether or not accepted criteria were used, for example
If plan calls for five refereed journal publications and person being recommended has two, dean could legitimately reject a recommendation for reappointment because department criteria were not met and request issue be addressed.

Would not be legitimate for dean to make value judgment on academic journals in which articles were published.

Issue was referred to Faculty Personnel Committee by faculty member, not brought up by committee.

Although must consider carefully how one change in wording affects whole document, believe committee looked at entire faculty handbook, not one paragraph, and considered issue seriously.

Rest of procedures outlined in handbook for contested decisions remain.

Nothing in proposed language would prohibit or establish college-wide committee to review tenure decision, currently in practice in College of Business to ensure some degree of uniformity.

Such a committee could not be involved in evaluation of faculty member, but could be involved in verification that evaluation took place appropriately.

Curious about how much of problem this has been: if this is a response to a concern, would like a little bit more information about the depth and breadth of the concern.

Faculty Personnel Committee not responsible to look at individual cases.

- Look at concerns that come out of process, no judgment about depth or breadth of that concern.
- Issue raised seemed to committee to be whether major responsibility for applying criteria at departmental level or moving toward school- or college-wide committees, or other types of arrangements.
- Felt should make language in handbook to clarify.

Point of Information – Movement toward such a committee would come through this body so preemptive strike would not be necessary.

- Don’t know history of College of Business structure.
- Assume change in review process would come through Senate.

Problem trying to fix straight-forward.

- Provost’s Office described current practice at meeting of Faculty Personnel Committee.
- Discussion with small sample of department chairs and faculty.
  - Some indicated qualitative decision made at deans’ offices based on recommendations from faculty members.
  - Few could give answer on process in which criteria used or not used up administrative channel.
  - Believe important issued requiring clarification.
- Clarification written up and approved unanimously by Faculty Personnel Committee agreeing it represented in essence what we were told was current practice.
- Has been issue for many years.

Seems individual decision may have been different based on this language.

Recommendation for promotion by department presumably based on accepted personnel plan criteria; dean disagreed on scholarship issue.

- Personnel plans not simple.
  - Do not say n publications in this set of journals.
  - Subject to interpretation.
- Dean would not be able to interpret criteria differently than department.

Faculty Personnel Committee felt if faculty person going through process of administrative review, place to start is approved department personnel plan.

- Have to focus on criteria accepted within that plan.
- Did hear instances where that may not have been case.

With proposed language, deans and provost do not evaluate criteria.

- They look at evaluation criteria they already agreed to.
- Determine if they believe criteria followed.
  - If not, recommend no and it goes up to another level of administration.
  - Next administrator looks to see if followed.
- Do not have separate set of criteria, nor evaluating faculty member based on these criteria.
- Evaluating only if DPC and department chair used these criteria and only these criteria.

Clarification written up and approved unanimously by Faculty Personnel Committee agreeing it represented in essence what we were told was current practice.
Motion 36-FP-5
Moved and seconded by committee (6-0-0) that Section UWEC 3.05 CRITERIA FOR REVIEW OF FACULTY PERFORMANCE of the Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook, 18th edition, 1999, page 5.18 be revised as follows:

2. Department Criteria

The review of faculty performance shall include, but is not limited to, consideration of teaching effectiveness, academic advising ability, scholarly activity, and service to the University, the profession and the public. The Department Personnel Committee of each department or functional equivalent shall develop and approve a written evaluation plan which further defines each of these general criteria and describes the relative emphasis to be given to each criterion. The emphasis may vary depending on needs of the department, individual interests, and the stage of a faculty member’s career. The plan shall be reviewed and accepted by the Department Personnel Committee, Department Chair, Dean, and Provost and Vice Chancellor. The Department Personnel Committee and the Department Chair shall have sole responsibility for applying the criteria to the review of faculty performance. The criteria shall be used by the Department Personnel Committee, Department Chair, Dean, and Provost and Vice Chancellor in performance reviews. The Chair shall distribute the plan to department members, thereby informing them of the agreed upon criteria.

The Department Evaluation Plan shall be reviewed annually by the Department Personnel Committee. Proposed changes in the plan shall not take effect until they have been reviewed and accepted by the Department Personnel Committee, Department Chair, Dean, and Provost and Vice Chancellor. Rejection of the proposed changes by the Department Personnel Committee, Department Chair, Dean, or Provost and Vice Chancellor shall invalidate the proposed changes and the previously accepted plan shall remain in effect. The Chair shall inform the department in writing of any the agreed upon changes in the plan.

3. Administration Criteria

The Dean and Provost and Vice Chancellor shall verify that the reviews conducted by the Department Personnel Committee and the Department Chair follow the accepted Department Evaluation Plan.

Discussion

Do not think in best interest of university to have deans have no ability to make independent judgment as to qualifications of person for promotion, tenure, reappointment, etc.

Makes deans role essentially nonexistent in process which is then totally changed

Cases where DPC and department chair do not agree based on same credentials, but on different evaluation on whether terms of criteria met

Particular case was articles not sufficiently different to constitute significant new body of knowledge material

Seems dean needs ability to again make that assessment or judgment of what fits criteria

Amendment 36-FP-5-a1
Moved by Senator Gunderson and seconded that in point #2, first paragraph, the bold sentence be deleted and the deleted sentence be reinstated

Discussion of Amendment 36-FP-5-a1

Against amendment

Worried current language ambiguous on how criteria used in administrative channels

Important so get same answer from my chair, other chairs, dean and provost

Clarification proposed attempts to capture practice

Dangerous move to make it ambiguous again

Issue behind amendment is to break tie between DPC and chair when give different recommendations

Dean needs power to make evaluative judgment not just verification in that case

Perhaps room to keep strong language committee has proposed but allow for unusual situation where DPC and chair disagree

Believe dean needs ability to make judgment on extent person’s credentials meet criteria

For example, when refereed journal articles are very similar
See conflict in that if sole responsibility for applying criteria rests with DPC and chair, they would have to agree; basically eliminates rest of in-line process

Previous example seems to indicate problem with plan itself
- Plan must define what scholarship is, what a publication is
- Should be worked out with revision of plan, not during personnel action
- Important communication continual
  - Must be opportunity each year for changes to strengthen and address different points of view in plan

Debating whether dean should have veto power over a decision made by DPC and chair
- Dean can now veto based on interpretation of performance review
- Bold language says dean can’t apply different interpretations to decision of DPC and chair; dean has to look at whether plan used to review performance was actually followed

Proposal would also mean provost cannot look at dean’s decision
- Currently have system of checks and balances
- Concerned about changing policy in effect for 20 years because of single complaint without careful consideration

Word sole means dean simply in role of bearing witness to process
- Dean then cut out of process; not the way it works now
- Currently dean, provost, and chancellor in position to bear witness but also make judgments
- Appears word sole is the sticking point

May be worthwhile to go back and investigate Ken Davidson lawsuit of about 20 years ago
- Very similar to what being discussed today
- All settled once in court of law; goes back a long ways

Intent of language is not to remove dean or provost from role of looking at whether criteria have been met by candidate
- If questions occur during process, dean or chair can ask for clarifying information before acting upon a recommendation
- Intent is to affirm that criteria cannot be changed during course of a personnel action
- Administrative review process still there
- This establishes where to start review; start with an accepted plan and go forward

Word sole does not eliminate dean, vice chancellor or chancellor from being involved in process
- Concern of committee and dozen or so faculty spoke to is what criteria does a dean from say history or music use to evaluate a computer scientist
  - How do they judge this research is not substantial?
  - Disciplines, particularly in Arts & Sciences, are so diverse that to claim one person can qualitatively judge whether person’s research, scholarship, instruction and service are of appropriate value is setting sights a little high
  - Faculty spoken to across campus thought people making decision should also be computer scientists, chemists, biologists, and so forth
  - Probationary faculty, for six years, have received indication from DPC and chair as to how doing
    - Do not receive from dean, provost, or chancellor
    - Then when come up for tenure, dean can say I don’t think you are doing that well
  - Very important to clarify who is making decision and based on what

Say a probationary faculty writes an article, publishes an article, repackages and repackages it ten times
- DPC says have written ten articles
- Dean questions that
- Is that question of evaluation or clarification?

Have to look at department personnel plan under scholarship
- What is written to define publications
- If that is an issue, department should amend scholarship section of personnel plan for better document
- To express those concerns at end of review is problematic

Agree that need to go back and rewrite section of personnel plan, but that does not solve problem of moment

Two possible scenarios
- First is no brainer where someone writes up one idea, switches a couple words and sends it to another journal with another focus – that is one article
- Second case with ten articles
• Believe it DPC’s job to say those ten articles constitute sufficiently different work to count as ten pieces of work
• Do not believe dean or anyone above dean could say based on my vast knowledge of this discipline, I believe that to be the same work
• Oftentimes articles based on same work fundamentally differ in focus when put in print
• Answer to that question should not be within dean’s purview but left to those in discipline

• Have had similar experience to one expressed earlier
  • Think need to make sure faculty are protected against arbitrary decisions
  • Not being apprised of your performance by the dean then having a sudden decision made is a danger
  • Has happened in more than one case

• Other side of that statement
  • By removing or limiting duties of deans, take on different type of risk in worst case scenario when department has made arbitrary decisions
  • This recommendation does not seem to allow for that kind of concern

Vote on Amendment 36-FP-5-a1: Amendment DEFEATED by University Faculty Senators

Continued discussion on main motion
• Speak in favor of motion
  • Faculty Personnel Committee has deliberated a lot
  • Contact with nontenured faculty as part of mentoring committee illustrates their concerns especially about clarification
  • Hear concerns about taking power away from dean and provost
  • We can talk about why we would want to fix what doesn’t appear to be broken
  • This motion makes the plan the really important first step
    • When plan gets forwarded to deans, needs to be looked at carefully and clarified at that point
    • Almost prevention kind of issue
    • Takes more work
  • Bit of concern on sole responsibility
    • If chair and DPC agree, then dean would just look to see if plan had been used to evaluate person
    • Still concern about when chair and DPC are not in agreement

• Against motion
  • Feel awkward defending deans and provosts but not clear on all consequences of this
  • What happens if dean and provost don’t agree on whether review conducted by DPC and department chair followed steps of accepted evaluation plan
  • Goes back to DPC to be reviewed?
  • Proposal says dean and provost shall verify; need to clarify
  • Seems made somewhat ambiguous policy work very well for about 20 years without major bloodshed
    • Think ought to risk it and go for this new revised ambiguous policy
  • Intent of addition of paragraph #3 is to put into language that there cannot be additional or other criteria applied at point of administrative review
    • If difference of opinion, provost could go to dean and sit down just as provost and dean might expect to do with department chair if significant issues brought to their attention and draft amendment to plan for future
  • See this as wonderful debate, but have concerns on couple of levels
    • Based on unanimous agreement by people in room at the time, this is supposed to represent practice from provost’s level on down
      • Frightening to see so much resistance to writing up policy that clarifies by matching practice
    • Look at this as if disagreement between chair and dean or dean and provost is new to process
      • All recommendations go to chancellor; final authority rests with chancellor’s office
      • Do not believe it to be of concern any more so with proposed language than with existing language as to what happens when people disagree
      • What to do then is clearly specified in other portion of handbook

• Previous speaker indicated this may have impact on clarity and specificity of personnel plans
  • As such, more open to supporting motion
  • Hopefully passage would move department to make clearer commitment about expectations and move away from own ambiguous policies
• Final authority on tenure rests with Board of Regents

Vote on Motion 36-FP-5: Motion PASSED by University Faculty Senators

• For information, changes to personnel rules do go all the way to Board of Regents; need to be verified at that level

6. Overview of Academic Year 2000-01 Opening Weeks Activities – Provost Satz

• Two draft documents distributed
  • First is draft of calendar for first two weeks of academic year
    • Put together by Jan Morse
  • Second is list of suggested workshops recommended by various folks for opening week and first couple days of the next week
    • Series of opportunities for faculty
    • Slated at different times during day
    • Workshops not integrated into calendar
    • Certain there will be additions
  • Idea was to take advantage of additional time for professional development planned activities
  • Planned for faculty, academic staff, and classified staff as well

• Response to questions from floor
  • Issue of advising will be part of leadership workshop for department chairs, unit directors, and deans
    • Also working on changes in personnel guidelines
  • Will follow up on idea of concluding two week period with faculty/staff picnic
  • Campus offices will be open the Saturday prior to start of classes as in previous years for students arriving at dorms over weekend; did not extend that to Saturday August 26th
  • Off-campus student advising simply to indicate dorms would not be open during August 28-31 period; will leave off phrase in final document
  • Community Information Nights – Thursday and Friday night could be added to calendar

7. Discussion of Benefits Package – Vice Chancellor Soll

• Draft of benefits of working at UWEC distributed
  • Request reactions and input so can turn into polished brochure
    • To be used principally during recruitment process of faculty and academic staff
    • Useful in retention efforts also
  • Catalog various elements that make UWEC a good place to work
  • First page – brief statements about university and community to capture flavor
  • Second page – cataloging of university provided benefits
    • Draft more detailed than final brochure
    • All listed here
    • Have to decide which most important to go in brochure
  • Third page – Special Programs and Services
    • Things that might be of interest to candidates for faculty positions
      • Research activity and support
      • Professional development programs
      • Technology available
      • Cultural, athletic, recreational programs and childcare
  • Last page – Catalogs quality of life benefits of living in Eau Claire and Chippewa Valley
    • Schools, housing, health care, cultural and recreational opportunities
  • Want to get in final form over summer
    • Email or call with ideas, comments, additions, deletions, etc.
  • Would also be great on web
  • Most of items on last page come from Chamber of Commerce or City of Eau Claire including ranking of schools
    • All will be subject to verification prior to publishing
  • Great start
8. New Business – None

9. Announcements
   • Differential tuition hearing sponsored by Academic Affairs Commission of Student Senate to take place in few minutes in Davies Center
     • Taken very seriously by students
     • Deciding apportionment of that money, not a small sum
     • Chance to watch Student Senate in action and how they fight for every dollar
   • Have great summer
   • Next meeting September 12, 2000

Meeting adjourned at 4:57 p.m. without objection.

Respectfully submitted by,

Wanda Schulner
Secretary to the University Senate