Members Present:


Members Absent:

Randy Beger, Terry Classen, Karen Havholm, Larry Honl, Gretchen Hutterli, Jane Linton, John Melrose, Damian O’Brien, Jeanine Rossow, Nola Schmitt, Nick Smiar, Sheila Smith, Roger Tlusty

Guests:

Laura Dean, Bernard Duyfhuizen, Meg Dwyer, Dave Gessner, Steve Kurth, Laura Lambert, Kathy Mitchell, Jan Morse, Andy Phillips, Connie Russell, Andrew Soll, Steve Tallant, Ted Wendt

The regular meeting of University Senate was called to order at 3:08 p.m., Tuesday, October 24, 2000 in the Tamarack Room of Davies Center. New senators Terry Classen and Mehdi Sheikholeslami were introduced.

1. Minutes of September 26, 2000 meeting of University Senate approved as distributed

2. Remarks by Chancellor Mash
   - Limited course availability impact on freshmen and relationship to retention
     - Provost working with group and department chair task force to find solutions
       - Meet Thursday and will be additional follow-up with other parts of campus community
   - Director of Admissions search extended by few weeks to further enhance pool of applicants
   - College of Professional Studies dean search now underway
   - Work of Foundation continues
     - Assets topped $20,000,000 for first time
     - About $1,500,000 annually supports our work
     - Results of feasibility study done by campaign consulting firm
       - Not ready to begin campaign of size proposed
       - Continue work to get things in place
       - Not question of whether will do campaign, but when
       - Recommendations from consultants
         - Short term – focus on two areas
           - Scholarship support to continue to attract better students
           - Faculty development ranging from endowed chair to supplemental travel
         - Long term
           - Follow-up on alumni and friends outside area with capacity to give
             - Know about them as result of electronic screening by consultant
             - Cause these individuals to think about why they might give
             - This weekend going to St. Louis to meet with at least two of these individuals
     - Commission on the Status of Women
     - Discussed at Senate Executive Committee
● UW-Eau Claire Commission resurrected
  ● Working with Barbara Stevens to respond to UW-System Report on status of women
  ● Change in leadership
    ● Kate Lang now chairing commission
  ● Looking at membership of group to make sure representative
  ● Will be visited in November by newly hired head of women’s issues from System
● Newly-consolidated Continuing Education unit moving to Water Street location in November
  ● Scheduled retreat with facilitator to continue team-building
  ● Idea is to provide better access and do better programming from that location
  ● Facilities people looking at vacated spaces very carefully to solve space needs on campus
● Graduate faculty approved graduate council bylaw revisions
  ● Associate Vice Chancellor Steve Tallant now chair of Graduate Council
  ● Moving toward better coordination, marketing and support of graduate programs without departments
    losing control of individual graduate programs
  ● To change trend of declining graduate enrollment
● Provost surveying other UW schools on salary-related matters to gain better understanding of issue

3. Chair’s Report – Chair Harrison
● Chair’s Report included with agenda packet
● At November 14th Senate meeting, will discuss draft System Report on Status of Women and draft response
  from UW-Eau Claire Commission on Status of Women
  ● Two phases
    ● UW-Eau Claire Commission asking for input for response
      ● Will be Special Report item at next Senate meeting
    ● Open discussion scheduled for spring to look at final System Report
  ● Links to complete System draft report and to UWEC draft response on Senate web site
● New Student Senate Liaison – Laura Lambert
  ● Does have speaking turn at University Senate
● Vice Chancellor Andrew Soll’s response to senators’ concerns over Phillips Science Hall remodeling
  ● Several weeks ago concern brought to light relative to ceiling height in some renovated classrooms and
    laboratories
  ● Major challenge to run mechanical systems (duct work and pipe work) through rooms for enhanced
    heating, ventilating, and air conditioning systems as well as plumbing for increased laboratory space
  ● Craftsmen in field must install systems shown schematically on drawings to achieve best possible result
  ● At certain stage, identified that coordination and supervision in field would not end in satisfactory result
    ● Architect-engineers from state division of facilities development came to campus
    ● Went through room by room with chairmen
    ● Architects worked on solutions, presented those to chairmen
    ● With possible exception of one room, reasonable consensus that solution proposed was best possible
    ● Probably not ideal since dealing with 35-year-old building with structural restrictions, but workable
      solutions
    ● Feel significant progress has been made and dialogue established with all key players for remaining
      problematic room to meet programmatic objectives set for building

4. Report of Academic Staff Representative – Senator Hallatt
● Refer to faculty reps report as agenda for academic staff reps meeting basically same agenda as faculty reps

5. Committee Reports
  ● Academic Staff Personnel Committee – Senator Hallatt
    ● Meet October 26, 2000
    ● Agenda in pink sheet
  ● Budget Committee – Senator Carpenter
    ● Meet October 31, 2000
  ● Executive Committee – Chair Harrison
    ● Next meeting November 7, 2000
    ● Looking at procedures used to appoint faculty and academic staff representatives to UW-System and UW-
      Eau Claire committees not covered by current constitutional procedures

Faculty Personnel Committee – Senator Mack
- Meet October 31, 2000
- Agenda includes faculty workload and provost communication
- Considering language changes to procedure of evaluation of department chairs
- Will be receiving email survey regarding faculty workload
- Next open discussion in Senate on faculty workload

Nominating Committee – Senator Bushnell
- Reviewed charge
- Urge Senators to contact committee members if interested in serving on particular committee
- Will keep name on file

Physical Plant Planning Committee – No report

Technology Committee – No report

Academic Policies Committee – Senator Lozar
- Meet October 31, 2000
- Discussing final exam policy

Report on Credit-Bearing Certificate Programs – Senator Lozar
- Comes from Associate Deans by way of Provost
- New venture for university although some departments have been doing for a while
- No uniform standards exist for accredited certificate programs
- Part of rationale for proposal to establish standards
- One of primary concerns, not with details of proposal, but how fits in at primarily liberal-education university
- More market or career-driven programs being proposed here
- Also number of unanswered questions regarding faculty load
- Committee felt proposal on whole was worthy, so forwarded
- Response to clarification questions from floor
- Certificate program puts existing courses together so library and technology resource adequacy would be covered when individual courses originally proposed
- Two populations might be served
  - Those with degrees
    - Second degree may entail more than want or need
    - Bunch of courses on transcript not sufficient
    - Certificate program more valuable to them
  - Continuing students
    - Arts Administration program proposed by Art Department supplies background in theatre as well as administrative courses
- Students with baccalaureate degree coming back for additional coursework not eligible for financial assistance
  - May be able to help if working toward certificate
- Rationale for lack of specificity in motion (high academic standards, departments determine admission requirements)
  - Programs cover wide array of areas
  - Originally proposed minimum GPA of 2.5 seen as too high for some programs
  - Thus proposed that departments set own standards
  - Vagueness would become more specific in individual programs approved
  - Professions may also require high academic standards and ensure evaluation
- Standards #6 and #7 included to require certificate-bearing program students put in certain amount of time at UW-Eau Claire
  - Residency requirement for bachelor’s degree much lower proportion of credits
  - Faculty members also determine whether courses transfer in
- Rationale for item #6 for 12-18 credit programs primarily so students would be required to complete reasonable chunk of credit here
  - Would eliminate some proposed programs with six credit requirements

Motion 37-AP-01
Moved and seconded by committee (8-1-0) to recommend the proposed policy statement on credit-bearing certificate programs be approved
Amendment 37-AP-01-a1

Moved by Senator Wick and seconded to strike item #6 under standards: Certificate programs should be no less than 12 credits for undergraduate certificates (9 credits for graduate certificate programs) and not more than 18 credits.

Discussion:
- Computer Science Department proposed programs to industry that would be eliminated if #6 remained
  - Programs well-received
  - Asked not to create artificial barriers, just what important
  - Possibly require more than just taking courses; might require passing exam to get certificate
  - Not interested in half-minor
    - Interested in many cases in smaller area
    - Would like freedom to offer that
- Speak for amendment
  - Look at population in Chippewa Valley want and need to serve
  - Fit those needs
- Speak against amendment
  - Against industry setting kinds of programs and curriculum we offer and how should be taught
  - Came up in Academic Policies Committee
- Industry rationale for supporting six-credit certificates instead of just taking courses is extra control of quality
  - Isn’t just passing course at a C, or C-, or D+ level, but take exam that “certifies”
  - Very interested in these programs
- Tout ourselves as liberal arts university where students get broad education, not technical college
  - Want industry to help us promote each others agenda
    - But at same time, need to hold ourselves to certain standards
  - Six credits could be two classes – not very advanced course of study
- These types of programs might be addressed through continuing education/outreach programs, not academic policies
  - Many examples of certificate programs at other institutions and at UW-Eau Claire
    - Currently no guidelines
  - Looking at programs to be available to our own students and to continuing students as well
  - Our certificate programs would be ones we put together
    - Come out of department or unit
    - Come from faculty although may work with some other entity to design
- Support amendment to maintain flexibility to support needs of professional audience
  - Twelve credits may or may not be appropriate for some populations we serve
  - Putting up credit limits means also making financial decision as well
  - While are pedagogical institution, would approach issue in terms of adult consumers
- Are advantages to students coming to university for as little as six credits
  - Returning students can provide enrichment for other students
  - If new, good way to wet feet
- Industry not wanting obstacles to programs they want, does not sound like departments working out standards by which programs should be set up
  - Popping in here for six credits to get a raise or training to move up in organization or move is not same as getting feet wet at UW-Eau Claire in our liberal arts education
  - Would like to see at least 12 credits
- Concern proliferation of certificates available for business and people outside campus community can only serve to dilute faculty and time to serve undergraduate population
  - Not aware of anything in proposal addressing how to handle additional workload
- If you drop item #6, and leave in #7 (At least 50 percent of the credits applied to the certificate program requirements must be taken through UW-Eau Claire), could have only one course come from UW-Eau Claire and be granted certificate from here
  - Really problematic unless revise #7 as well so if certificate is less than X credits, all have to come from here
In favor of amendment
- Don’t see a 6-credit, plus examination, programming certificate in Computer Science endangering our bachelor of arts degree or status as liberal arts university
- Suspect will have problems until resolve larger question of role of certificates and adult education in liberal arts school
- Against amendment because unless we assure highest standards of quality in certificate offered, going to lose out in this highly competitive field
- Mostly matter of packaging courses already in curriculum
- Students in these programs indistinguishable from other students on campus

Speak against amendment
- Potential for student with 3-credit transfer course to take 3-credit course and leave with certificate with our seal on it
- Financial aid could go to working adult coming here for three credits rather than student in another program

Speak in support of amendment
- Need to maintain very high standards, but should be up to individual departments to make those decisions
- Creating policy that controls department decisions of this type inappropriate
- Important to get incredible pool of expertise at this university out to people who could benefit from it
- Overall program of certification does
- Typically would think 12 credits is a good standard; yet can imagine in some departments six does make sense
- Have to trust departments to use some type of measure that gives certificate meaning
- Some policing would come through credibility of certification recognized by department and by community directed toward
- Item #7 could be at least 50%, but no less than six credits

Motion 37-US-08
Moved by Senator MacBriar and seconded to recess meeting until after open discussion on compensation

Motion 37-US-08 APPROVED without objection

6. Open Discussion on Compensation (scheduled to begin at 4:00 p.m.)
- Blank comment forms for anonymous comments to Compensation Committee distributed
- Introduction by Senator Wick, Chair, Compensation Committee
  - Goal to understand concerns about compensation on this campus
  - Hope allows to make progress on development of beneficial pay plan
  - One of primary roles of Compensation Committee is to recommend how to divide up pie
    - Arguments that pie just too small are valid, but not helpful for this role
    - Would like comments on how to divide up pie we have

Discussion:
- Current state regulations (to date have not issued new ones) include 1/3, 1/3, 1/3 policy
  - One-third of pay plan increase must be distributed on merit (UWEC extra merit or outstanding teaching)
  - One-third must be distributed to everyone, except those with disciplinary action
  - One-third can be put with either third above for distribution to everyone or based on merit considerations
  - Historically at UW-Eau Claire, 2/3 goes to everyone, 1/3 distributed based on merit (extra merit, outstanding teaching and equity at UWEC)
  - Also 0.5% in Chancellor’s Discretionary Fund; has been left in pay plan to date at our institution
- What UW-Eau Claire calls merit, System calls solid performance
- Across-the-board actually below merit, means no pay increase; generally one to two individuals per year
- Compression considered merit by System
- Formula for compression
  - Compare local salaries of assistants, associates, and full professors
  - Compare resulting ratios to ratios of national data
    - If your ratio smaller than national data, compressed
  - Compression dollars divided relative to how much you are compressed
    - Automatically initiated, does not need to be requested
• Also choice of three types of alternative pay plans on campus administered at department level
  • Models are approved; models could also be changed
• Other institutions vary widely
  • Madison goes 2/3 towards merit/market; 1/3 toward solid performance
  • More of comprehensives fall in line with our model
• Provost to date not able to find alternative pay plans at other schools
  • School of Nursing discontinued alternative pay plan after careful analysis
    • Made significant difference in pay increases
• Alternative pay plans available in Provost’s Office
  • Basically pay increases for salaries of people included, without mandatory equity of 0.2%, come to
department/unit to be divided
    • Governed by same rules
    • Three alternative pay plans are giving it out in flat dollar amounts, percentage amounts, or combination
• Is sense of what upcoming budget looks like, but hesitate to base much on that because very speculative number
  • Also do not know for certain that 1/3, 1/3, 1/3 rule will be continued
• One-third rule came about five years ago
  • Board of Regents responding to legislature making sure paid on basis of performance as in business world,
not straight across board
  • One-third rule was major compromise between comprehensive and research institutions
• Media Development Center very satisfied with alternative pay plan
• Not aware of limit on number recommended for extra merit
  • Extra merit awards are fixed dollar amount
  • Have limited funds so number of awards limited
  • Could not extend to everyone; but does not have to be that way
  • All policy says is must evaluate people and differentiate increases based on differentiable performance
    • If all deemed perfect, could all get same raise
  • As currently set up, could not do that
• Spring compensation survey not completely analyzed; results will be distributed when complete
• One faculty member found getting “merit” increase when really baseline increase insulting
  • Solid performance would be better term
• Dean Wendt indicated “graying” professors fully support recruitment initiatives
  • Must understand this creates more salary disparity it terms of compression
  • Although concerned about meritorious people getting some sort of meritorious compensation, more
concerned about compression that happens every single time someone hired
  • Will get lot worse very quickly because lot of gray professors
• Told when came here to get money up front because money and raises after that very difficult to come by
  • Could assume new faculty coming in at decent salary so not eligible for extra merit increases for first few
years – would allow increases for older faculty in compressionary situations
  • Could put 2/3 into compression if that is what want to address
    • Could probably get that through as merit/market
  • Be aware those new people potentially very marketable and may leave quickly
• Some new hires not properly mentored when came in
  • Accepted offered salary
  • Being advised to leave for semester when complete doctorate to allow renegotiation of salary upon return
• This is significantly above-average institution
  • Happy for people who have above-average salaries compared to any standard
  • Ought to reinforce high achievers
  • Also ought to compensate all of us who have contributed over years of dedicated service to making this an
above-average institution
    • Chose to stay here because of commitment to students and to profession
  • Great that new people coming can get a whole lot of stuff, but compression is serious problem
  • Need to figure out way to compensate loyal and dedicated people as continue to add more and more to
workload
• Need to look at whole package of compensation
  • 100% for travel if represent this university
  • Compensation for taxi service and safe hotels in safe neighborhoods
• Most frustrating thing about discussion is end up pitting ourselves against each other because pie only so big
  • Must take money from younger faculty to give to older faculty; or high merit to low merit
  • Still getting underpaid compared to all regional states

• Compression demonstrated in faculty
  • Also interested in information from any unit demonstrating compression for nonteaching academic staff
  • For last two years has been no compression factor because not able to adequately demonstrate compression in that population

• Would like committee to consider most common model followed at other institutions
  • Maximize flexibility afforded department chair by giving fraction of pay package to distribute as they see fit while retaining other fraction to be administered by deans, provost, and chancellor

• Senator Wick indicated committee has looked at other models with more authority for departments
  • Alternative pay plans give almost all authority to departments
  • If make decision closer to people doing work, can give flexibility to decide who is extra-meritorious and divide it up
  • Pay plan ought to reflect what we value, so looking for what we value
  • Always problem of balance

• Chancellor comments
  • With exception of current 5.2% pay plan, were number of lean years with little money
  • Advocating for highest possible salary dollars a priority
    • Has to do with how you present case of why important to keep salaries up, recruit and retain people, and what this means for Wisconsin
    • System trying to position us to make stronger case for better salary
    • Can have longer discussion to talk about some of those things like economic impact
  • Given current approach, only time to make significant impact at entrance
    • Have to continue offering best possible salary at hiring to everybody
    • Also need to consider those who have been here for awhile
    • Remain at top of comprehensives in promotion increases
    • Chancellor’s 0.5% discretionary funds
      • Listening carefully for ways could be directed within pay plan to speak to most compelling issues
  • Nothing can affect morale more than salary issues
    • Plan very complicated; takes intelligence and perseverance to understand
    • Can create a sense of distrust about what going on
      • Alternative vs. standard plans
      • What provost really does when final salaries come to him for merit and other adjustments
  • Perhaps something to be said for simpler plan
  • Need to be managing pay plan, but also morale attached to it
  • Need to improve our situation; administration will not sit and look on like bystanders

• Suggest decisions be made closer to those who supervise people
  • Sometimes go through lot of layers before decision make
  • Results in cases where supervisor recommends extra-merit but person does not get and someone not recommended for extra-merit in area gets
    • Very demoralizing
  • Would not change 1/3, 2/3 because, more than compression, just staying even with board is critical to some
  • Giving discretion to someone to upset the 2/3 now going to everyone would really harm morale in some departments
  • Also need to address workload – another morale issue and very serious problem
    • Concerned with certificate programs affect on workload
    • Not only about money getting, but also amount of work being asked to do for same compensation
  • Talking money and everyone is on short end; need to work off same set of statistics
    • Should start by attacking numbers – rank-specific, discipline-specific, and UW-System-specific salary types of information
      • Talking about what being measured against
      • For same job, same work could look at UW-System
    • Can’t do any of this planning if don’t have numbers
  • When talking compensation, benefits need to be included in collection of data
    • Others with higher salaries paying out more, sometimes much more, for benefits
• No clear indication from survey, or previous one five years ago, of priorities
  • Most important and least important of components in plan
  • Currently see want more money in every category – can’t do that
  • If want to address compression, what would want least addressed
    • Let Compensation Committee know

Motion 37-US-09
  Moved by Senator MacBriar and seconded to defer discussion on motion from APC to the first item for the next Senate meeting as per policy

Vote on Motion 37-US-09: Motion PASSED

• Recognize that main motion gives final authority for a new program to Academic Policies Committee
  • Currently all minors, majors, and new programs come through Senate
• Without objection, all remaining items on agenda, including Special Report on United Way and resolution on compensation, will be moved to next meeting in three weeks
  • Senate discussion on United Way not going to affect any change in campaign this year so delay not crucial

7. Announcements – None

Meeting adjourned at 5:02 p.m. without objection.

Respectfully submitted by,

Wanda Schulner
Secretary to the University Senate