Members Present:


Members Absent:

Randy Beger, Terry Classen, Tim Ho, Larry Honl, Gretchen Hutterli, Fred Kolb, Tim Lane, Jane Linton, Mehdi Sheikholeslami

Guests:

Laura Dean, Tom Dock, Bernard Duyfhuizen, Kay Magadance, Susan McIntyre, Sue Moore, Andrew Phillips, Connie Russell, Andrew Soll

The regular meeting of University Senate was called to order at 3:03 p.m., Tuesday, January 23, 2001 in the Tamarack Room of Davies Center.

1. Minutes of December 12, 2000 meeting of University Senate approved as distributed

   Introduction of new Senators:
   Rose Jadack – Adult Health Nursing
   Bobby Pitts – Art Department
   Kent Syverson – Geology Department

2. Chancellor’s Remarks – Chancellor Mash

   • Legislative agenda
     • Governor Thompson will give State of the State address on January 31st; Governor McCallum to deliver budget message on February 14th
     • Next week contingent from Chippewa Valley to go to Madison for annual two day Chippewa Valley Rally
       • Teams of five individuals visit every legislator
       • Talk about priorities and issues in Chippewa Valley
       • Support of universities (UW-Eau Claire and Stout) part of agenda
     • First UW Day in Madison March 7th
       • Way to get UW-System in front of legislators and staffers
       • UW-Eau Claire to have interactive booth
     • Talking to legislators in preparation of coming legislative session
       • Met with all legislators representing region individually; also with Speaker Jensen and others
     • Stress importance of management flexibility
       • Gained ability to spend revenues as generated in last legislative session
       • Not position flexibility
       • One without other does not work well
Reinforce importance of keeping salaries healthy
- Thank for 5.2% annual increase in current biennium
  - Has made difference
    - Hearing from deans that more often securing top choice in faculty recruitment
    - Health Insurance from day one also factor
  - Stress need to continue to put solid biennia together for impact
    - Importance of good salary plan for coming biennium (roughly 4.2%)
- Message that increases to operating budget can be modest, but must be steady
  - Even though best UW budget in 15 years, was modest increase last biennium
    - 3.4% increase when national average was 7%
    - In coming biennium, need 3.7%
- Tuition revenue
  - Current tuition competitive and reasonable when compared to peer groups – down near bottom
  - Second largest revenue stream
  - Have to raise tuition reasonably and index to financial aid to take care of students with need
  - TAUWP to bring consensus occasionally agrees not to support tuition increases if United Council will support strong salaries
  - Democrats against raising tuition; Republicans see need to bring tuition to reasonable level
- UW-Eau Claire great buy
  - Need funding to make even better buy
  - Support for university and its work ultimately about region and State of Wisconsin; not about us
  - Will report regularly as legislative session unfolds
- Approximately week ago, state asked state agencies to return 0.5% of budget
  - UW-Eau Claire to send back roughly $31,000
  - Can handle from university reserve because managed dollars wisely
  - No programs or initiatives affected in any way
- Public position
  - Not happy, but understand
  - Positioning for upcoming legislative session in positive manner
  - Probably hold off on some technology investments and other things
- In University Bulletin – Strategic Planning Process Drives Creation of Professional Development Program
  - Significant investment being made in new program for faculty and academic staff
  - Investing and targeting resources to right things; those most valued by you
    - Determined when Provost and others met with each department to review annual report submissions
  - Part of strategic planning process in place
  - Better funding, along with better management, will mean more dollars to invest
  - In next week or so, letters calling for preparation of annual reports will go out to department chairs and unit heads
    - Reports not due for several months
    - Process to begin with faculty and staff discussions about needs; not prepared in isolation
    - Not constrained by resources
      - Process now has component of what could you do with more money, time, space, or other resources
  - Response to question from floor
    - Spring enrollment about 91.5% of fall; pretty much where thought would be
      - Approximately 8,700 FTE
      - Not through counting – will pick up few more
    - Enrollment up for summer, up for fall, up for Winterim

3. Chair’s Report – Chair Harrison
- Campus visits for two university-wide searches now taking place
  - Dean of College of Professional Studies
Executive Director of Enrollment Services and Director of Admissions
All Senators invited to attend public forums of all candidates
Senate Executive Committee specifically scheduled to meet with candidates for Dean of College of Professional Studies; Senators invited to attend
Note – fall break set for Friday, October 4, 2002
Chair’s Report provides information from Provost in response to earlier request for workload data
Response to question from floor
Early fall break date of October 4th result of long discussion with Admissions
Felt almost impossible to go with October 18th or Fridays before and after
Senate gave permission in motion for October Friday around 18th, 4th was only October date left

4. Academic Staff Representative Report – No Report

5. Committee Reports

- Academic Policies Committee – Senator Lozar
  - Next meeting January 30, 2001
  - Discussing assessment
- Academic Staff Personnel Committee – No Report
- Budget Committee – No Report
- Compensation Committee – No Report
- Executive Committee – Chair Harrison
  - Next meeting January 30, 2001
  - Meet with CPS dean candidate followed by regular business meeting discussing dual degrees
- Nominating Committee – Senator Bushnell
  - Will be replacing one member of Academic Policies Committee for spring semester
  - Contact committee if interested
  - Position may be filled from any area
- Physical Plant Planning Committee – Senator Stuettgen
  - Next meeting January 30, 2001
- Faculty Personnel Committee – Senator Mack
  - In process of setting meeting time for second semester

Report on Nepotism Revision – Senator Mack
- Issue brought to committee in early fall; asked to investigate problem regarding conflict of interest
- Determined current policy vague
  - After looking at policies from other institutions, felt could make policy more specific
  - Thought should broaden language since understand may be in position of hiring more spouses and partners in future
- Response to question from floor
  - Committee member researched and looked at models of other institutions; policies generally more specific

**Motion 37-FP-01**
Moved and seconded (5-0-0) by Faculty Personnel Committee that the UW-Eau Claire policy on nepotism be modified as attached

Discussion
- Editorial change accepted to add article *and* in last line of revised policy
  - “performance evaluation, and granting tenure”

**Vote on Motion 37-FP-01**: Motion PASSES

**TEXT OF MOTION:**
Nepotism Policy (page 5.6 in Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook)

The University of Wisconsin System acts in accord with the public policy of the state to encourage and foster to the fullest extent practicable, the employment of …properly qualified persons regardless of their age, race, creed, color, handicap, sex, national origin or ancestry. (Wis. Stats. 111.31)

In selecting persons for employment, the applicant best qualified and available to perform in the position should, without exception, receive the offer of employment. No restriction is placed on hiring persons related through affinity or consanguinity. However, to avoid possible conflict of interest, which may result from peer judgment or administrative review procedures, two people so related must not participate either formally or informally in decisions relating to the other person that can result in financial or other tangible personal benefits or where there exists the potential for such a relationship to exert a substantial and improper influence on those decisions. Examples include but are not limited to: hiring, retention, performance evaluation, and granting tenure, to hire, retain, grant tenure, promote, or determine the salary of the other person.

Report on Reviewing Department Chairs/Library Directors – Senator Mack

- Received recommendations for revision of existing policy regarding evaluation of department chairs and library director
  - Based on one actual and one referenced problem on campus
  - Problems apparently stem from vagueness of policy
    - No specific direction of how data collected, collated and recorded in report
  - Revision provides better direction to ensure confidentiality of all parties participating in review process
  - Demographic data to be included as part of report
    - Number of people responding by rank and percent of appointment
  - Revision includes statement that members of department may request meeting with dean
  - Response to questions from floor
    - Same issue may be referred to Academic Staff Personnel Committee if desired
    - In chair’s opinion, vote on both motions will be by all Senators
      - Although brought forward by Faculty Personnel Committee, influence not restricted to faculty
      - Current motion covers only chairs and library director (considered faculty), but does say deans survey and interview faculty and academic staff
    - Does not apply to unit heads – other review processes in place for units
  - Adding word draft before report in four places in motion accepted as editorial change
  - Destroying data section not changed, so would not require legal opinion

Motion 37-FP-02:

Moved and seconded (6-0-0) by Faculty Personnel Committee to recommend the University of Wisconsin – Eau Claire policy on reviewing a department chair (on page 5.80 of the Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook) be modified as attached with the inclusion of the word draft before report in the first 12 lines of the revision (four instances)

Discussion:

- Demographic data would not be identified for each comment; could not be tracked back
  - Would just include numeric summary of number of people participating, rank, and percentage
  - For protection of confidentiality
- See contradiction between demographic information collected and confidentiality because of small size of some departments
- Can cluster demographic data differently to maintain confidentiality
  - May clump associate and full professors together to protect, for example, identity of single full professor
- According to motion, demographic data only in survey from dean, not in report
  - Says specifically raw data and verbatim comments cannot be distributed
  - Also dean to make every reasonable attempt to protect confidentiality of reviewers
- Don’t see need for additional language
- Committee requiring evidence of demographic data on survey
- Deans would get information
  - Whether to include in report or not would be up to individual dean weighing confidentiality
  - Some feeling that without demographic data, could have majority of input from part-time or adjunct faculty
  - Committee heard input about this
  - Felt important information to gather
- Request for meeting with any faculty or academic staff member part new with this revision
  - Might have approached dean and given input in any case; does it need to be in policy?
  - Committee felt important to put in policy; not mandated but to reinforce that could request
- Do we need to write confidentiality to be maintained?
  - Is it not presumed? How big is problem?
    - Committee heard of one problem with confidentiality; may have been another
    - For evaluation to have merit, confidentiality must be respected for all involved
    - Mistakes are made
    - Can to better job of writing policy to provide better direction
- Question value of demographic information in evaluations because no idea what to do with that data
  - How is dean to interpret?
  - Risking confidentiality for limited value of demographic information
  - Adjunct faculty different enough in role from regular faculty that would not use same instrument to survey
- Don’t see reason to gather demographic data
  - If concern is confidentiality, could indicate specifically applies to sharing of demographic data without adding that survey must include demographic information
  - Adding /title after rank accepted as editorial change to include academic staff

Amendment 37-FP-02-a1

Moved by Senator Scott and seconded that “demographic information on the rank/title and percent appointment of the reviewer and” be striken from the revision and that portion of policy left unchanged

Discussion:
- Individual colleges refer back to university policy on data they collect if no guidelines of own
  - This would be umbrella policy; college and school policies could not conflict
- Demographic information could be used to identify problem chair/director has with particular group
  - Might not detect if data indicate four people out of department of 15 have serious concerns
    - Different implication if all four of same rank
- Departments going through normal demographic change as people retire could have problem like that
  - As changes happen more often, might be nice to have such data
- If important to know what different groups saying, need to change what asking to deal with specific group/issue
  - Much better approach than using broad questions and finding out who answered which way
- Surveys often too general; then treated as though they have given data they haven’t
- Concern that if understand that might be identified in some way, not going to fill out survey
  - Best way for dean to find concerns in operation of department is to meet and openly discuss with people in that department, not survey and find out who answered how
- Only demographics being asked are rank and percent appointment as if only those important
  - Why age, gender, sexual orientation, and race left out?
  - Support amendment because proposal avoids some more difficult demographic questions

Vote on Amendment 37-FP-02-a1: Amendment PASSED

Continued Discussion on Main Motion
- Part of responsibility of professionals is involvement in review of peers and supervisors
  - Understand risks of people in unprotected positions
  - Respect need for confidentiality, but part of our job to do whether puts us at risk or not
- As amended, does not say demographic information cannot be collected
  - Making assumption dean going about process in principled and sound way
• Why all these extra statements?
• Too proscriptive if dean doing job
• Will vote in favor because has been confusion in past
• People operating in good faith distributed verbatim comments and names so evidently not clear enough
• Also support
  • Some need for clarification as to what happens to data once collected
  • Have been couple of situations where verbatim data circulated back
• Concerned motion is going forward without addressing whether deans are collecting and distributing information of demographic nature

Motion 37-US-15
Moved by Senator Leutwiler and seconded that Motion 37-FP-02 be referred back to committee for language concerning demographic information

Vote on Motion 37-US-15: Motion PASSED

Motion 37-US-16
Moved by Senator Mac Briar and seconded to move additional business to next Senate meeting

Vote on Motion 37-US-16: Motion PASSED

6. Open Discussion of Direction and Priorities of the University and their Relationship to Workload
• Last discussion on workload extended toward our future, our goals, our direction, and how do we get there from where we are now
• Opening Remarks – Chancellor Mash
  • On November 28, 2000, sat through discussion on workload
    • Good, informative, helpful discussion to gain perspective
    • Where institution has been and where now
  • University works very hard – individuals work very hard – administration knows that
  • Workload is issue of inadequate resources
    • Not supported over years, yet continue to do things by taking on additional responsibilities and working harder
    • Neither System nor University have a policy for setting workload
  • Policy statement in handbook on full-time teaching load indicates faculty assigned to other appropriate professional activities, such as curricular development, student advising, pursuit of external grant support, research projects (generally involving students), coaching, directed or independent study with individual or small groups of students, or other scholarly creative activities will have teaching loads reduced
    • Can add to that list involvement in capstone courses, freshman year experience, and whole range of other things many of you doing
    • But no way to do workload reduction without dollars; can do only so much with overload
  • Are other challenges, but resources at crux of issue
    • Announcement of professional development funds significant – part of that was release time
      • State funding, tuition revenue, private support, and managing dollars we have strategically enabled initiative
    • Management flexibility issue where positions controlled in way not typical state-to-state
      • Need to continue to work to change – now also a System priority
    • Working diligently in focused way to impact all areas
    • Positioning ourselves for better sustained support, particularly from state revenue
      • Sometimes misunderstood; where moving; what trying to do
      • Must be moving, making changes that will create basis for support
    • Primary work of university and reputation for excellence built on traditional (in a classic sense) approach to teaching and learning
      • 90% of enrollment
Must maintain quality
- Means liberal-arts based approach to that work
- At same time, need to embrace change and be institutionally nimble enough to do both
  - Move forward in careful, prudent, strategic manner while positioning to make changes
    - Extend reach to educate more students and other things
- Mission in place for years talks about undergraduate education in traditional sense, but also about a regional continuing-education center, and about service
- Examples
  - Certificate programs doesn’t mean stretching resources further
    - Adding a dimension to level of service, continuing education, meeting needs, and positioning ourselves for better support
    - Packaging courses already taught in different way
    - At some point may add a course or two to fill out program, but that is curricular decision made at department level
  - Priority for System to reach out more aggressively to part-time market
    - Haven’t been serving that aspect of established role and mission well
    - Question is how to reach out when already teaching full loads
      - Use management flexibility, generate additional resources, and change course times while figuring out how to get more support in place to offer level of service striving for
      - Are faculty wishing to teach an overload – not in position to force additional course load on individuals
      - More interactive with region we serve, better support of goals of state decision makers, forging partnership with Stout and technical college
        - Concern that would be doing more and perhaps becoming more like Stout or technical college
        - Actually partnership forged to protect our role, mission, focus, and resources
    - Better support will come; then will be better able to address workload issue in ways not available now
      - As work for better support, need to continue progress here
      - Build on tradition and embrace change
      - Make changes in careful, prudent way
      - Based upon sound management and strategic planning have identified priority of faculty development and put $300,000 program in place even without support from state
  - Can’t lose sight of what trying to do and communicate vision of future that can position us for ongoing progress and get us resources to get there
    - Make sure resource base for core functions not harmed
    - Keep appreciation for workload and issues highlighted here
    - Sessions Provost has on regular basis with deans and deans with faculty create communication that keeps us all on same path
    - Workload problems did not happen overnight; will not fix overnight
      - See improvements not far down road (not taking 10 years)
      - Next legislative session could get us moving toward modest but steady support referred to earlier
- Comments on Senator Kolb’s report on Economic Summit attended
  - Picked up on responsiveness expected of UW-System as posturing for state to see potential if UW-System gets funding to do work in knowledge-driven economy
  - Based on what he heard, Senator Kolb said he would rather be Chancellor Sorenson (from Stout) than Chancellor Mash; have talked with Senator Kolb about that
    - He saw resistance to this position in certificate-program discussions
  - Don’t agree that our type of liberal-arts based institution can’t deliver in same way as Stout
    - Sense business people in this economy looking for liberal-arts based graduates, not just to do accounting or chemistry, but to think, act independently, work as teams, coordinate, and make other around them better
- Kinds of things liberal-arts based curriculum provides

Discussion
- Appreciate what you said in terms of relationship to where we are going and resources
  - At individual level down in trenches, don’t necessarily feel that way
  - Other members in department asked to work overloads to cover external grants providing release time because no money to hire or no FTE
  - Puts stress on departments
- Senator Kolb indicated it was clear to him that Madison had been decoupled from rest of system
  - Concern is resources; workload really comes down to resources
    - What is likelihood of comprehensives continuing to get appreciable resources and not be penalized from decoupling?
- Chancellor Mash responded shaking-up process begun by Madison Initiative is going on
  - Madison is a different institution – different roles, different issues
  - Also Milwaukee Idea
    - Attempting to build great university there to come closer to large, dynamic cities of Chicago and Minneapolis/St. Paul
    - Don’t think comprehensives will all look alike
    - Key opportunity in terms of own destiny and new flexibility and how we chart our course
    - Would rather be sitting here in Wisconsin’s Technology Valley than another part of state
    - Geographical position and economic circumstances enable us to do things to further enhance role and mission we value
- Senator Kolb’s comments as reflected in University Senate minutes of December 12, 2000 on Senate web site
- Appreciate continuation of forum and change in titling to include academic staff
  - Are no measures for “full” load in nonteaching academic staff
  - Seems more work being added, no direction given about what to take out
  - For example
    - In area of career services, workforce development becoming priority
    - If out at meetings on development of workforce in Chippewa Valley, not in office helping students
    - Creates inner conflict and conflict within office when increasing responsibilities without additional resources
- Developing good programs with hope that funding will come causes strain on entire system
  - Marketing campaign for Community Registration Night seemed more aggressive than in past
    - At same time, have large backlog of regular students looking for courses
      - In November, were asked to create as many seats as possible to give students already here spots
      - Then in January, deans came back asking for more seats for community registration
  - Not just at university level; also at departmental level
    - Departments think can get additional positions if develop currently-favored certificate programs
    - Urge to have firm commitment for money before programs started
- Department told several years ago would be no more resources or positions
  - If workload really difficult, take measures internally to manage – so reduced enrollment
  - Haven’t gotten more positions or more resources, now talking about increasing enrollment
    - Mixed and conflicting message for faculty
      - Considering ten more graduate students a year enough to send people in department over the edge
  - Seems in danger of university being in reactive position
    - Think part of reason is have not defined, nor confirmed belief in, liberal arts
    - Get message from outside that education is a product
      - React when something new comes along by putting in new programs – certificates, more majors, and more minors
      - Leads to thinking of students as products
    - Don’t even necessarily think money is coming, we just think this is what we are supposed to be doing
    - Fear losing sight of liberal arts
      - Liberal arts curriculum and liberal-arts based curriculum different things
        - Diminishing liberal arts a bit
• Part of thing we do, not the thing we do
  • Getting core sense of our mission would clarify and keep us from being reactive and still allow flexibility
  • Provost does not know of attempt to generically increase enrollment
  • Different feeling at regent’s meeting when Madison says something vs. other schools
    • With other schools can tell they are posturing to sell themselves (this is dynamic program and things are happening here)
    • Madison is just like, “we’re Madison, this is the way it is”
    • Seems go forward with promises of programs without dollar figure attached
      • Would be beneficial for them and for us to say if we want to service the community, it will take this much money
  • Maybe step toward equity in workload would improve situation
  • Heard in last discussion “full” is defined differently in different departments
  • Equity important, but since resources at this university fixed, flexibility is key to being able to rearrange pieces of puzzle to make things work
    • Would strongly oppose any initiative to impose set of standards for all departments
    • Need to trust department chairs and unit heads to make correct decisions to use limited resources
  • If concern is being great undergraduate institution, why scrambling for resources to develop graduate programs
    • Would prefer to strive for institution that graduates students other graduate institutions would kill to get for their graduate programs
    • Don’t have power, moxie, or ability to demand things to take on role and provide same things as Madison
    • Today through use of technology and distance education can get undergraduate degree cheaply without stepping foot on campus
      • Would miss process of maturity, and of contact, and other things only available by being present at this institution
      • Opportunity to mix with part-time adult students bringing experience to classes and workshops
        • Can mentor as well as participate as students
    • Could begin to look at paradigm of education and say perhaps we needs some changes
      • Entrepreneurial program in School of Business has integrated classes and done things in different way with some success
      • Model could be used in international business and other areas
      • Prepare students for future and to become effective people
      • Could produce majors untouched anywhere in country for price of a bus
        • Thirty miles from an institution with technical training (Stout) and we have one of the best business schools in area
        • Why not trade students back and forth?
  • Don’t think faculty should be doing all advising
    • Good at informal advising about which graduate programs might want to consider
    • Probably more practical ways to figure out how to meet particular mathematics requirements and slogging through rest of degree audit
      • Takes lot of time and energy and outside area of study
  • Would like us to do better job of articulating what liberal arts means and marketing our liberal arts institution
    • Most students never heard of liberal arts; didn’t know we were liberal arts institution
    • Come in wanting a job; don’t understand issue of connecting classes
    • Don’t see students or parents understanding what we think our mission is
    • Would like to see a liberal arts committee thinking about being best liberal arts institution possible
      • Connecting across disciplines on ongoing basis
  • Changing advising arrangement would take major rearrangement of resources at institution level – may be worthy of discussion
    • Have discussed including symposium/forum about meaning of liberal arts before classes begin in fall
      • Academic Policies Committee and Assessment Committee jointly talking about mission statement of university, goals of baccalaureate degree, appreciation for and meaning of university education
      • Dialogue in those meetings not widely distributed
  • Part of wonderful liberal arts experience is determining which math is best for a particular student
Should be able to figure out why your major has to take all things in catalogue to make perfect liberal arts degree
  • If you can’t figure it out, then shouldn’t be liberal arts

Should continue freshman seminar
  • Opportunity to orient, motivate, and get message to students and parents early

Advising still big issue
  • May need to streamline or more realistically define effective advising, particular for those with lots of advisees

Need focused priorities; not try to do every great idea that comes along
  • Need to give up idea of being excellent in every single area; may not be reasonable objective given restrictions
  • Need to look harder through students’ eyes
    • Do better job of communicating in terms of big picture, in terms of developing their own goals, and in terms of them taking responsibility

To use information discussed today (graduate program or not; what is liberal arts; increasing enrollment) may need to start whole new process to get at some of these ideas
  • So don’t get strategic plan in place before we settle some of these issues

Meeting adjourned at 5:08 p.m. without objection.

Respectfully submitted by,

Wanda Schulner
Secretary to the University Senate