Members Present:


Members Absent:

Randy Beger, Marcia Bollinger, Gretchen Hutterli, Debra King, Carol Klun, Fred Kolb, Tim Lane, Kate Lang, Robert Langer, Jane Linton, Barbara Mac Briar, Mona Majdalani, Rick Mickelson, Mark Olsen, Vicki Reed, Mehdi Sheikholeslami, Nick Smiar, Roger Tlusty

 Guests:

Erin Brandt, Bernard Duyfhuizen, Justin Hentges, Kathleen Mitchell, Andrew Phillips, Connie Russell, Andrew Soll, Steve Tallant

The regular meeting of University Senate was called to order at 3:04 p.m., Tuesday, March 27, 2001 in the Tamarack Room of Davies Center.

1. Minutes of February 27, 2001 meeting of University Senate approved as distributed

2. Chancellor’s Remarks – Chancellor Mash
   • Provost’s working groups appointed in fall working on several issues: course availability, drop/add policy, service learning, and general education (GE) requirements
     • Three now reported back to Provost
       • In process of reviewing
       • Will eventually follow up through appropriate channels
     • GE work group specifically looking at
       • Simplification of GE graduation requirements
       • Reduction of number of upper-division credits required for graduation
     • Fourth group, working on course availability, will review GE report and eventually issue own report
   • On course for best private fund-raising year ever
     • In addition to actual gifts that will be reported at later date, new connections being made
   • Joint Finance Committee of state legislature will be meeting all day tomorrow at Chippewa Valley Technical College
     • In process of getting time early on agenda to set tone
       • Will comment on critical issues for University
         • General base funding support
         • Position flexibility
         • Importance of strong pay plan
         • Chippewa Valley Initiative
         • Tuition impact on students and absence of proposal by governor to increase financial aid
Clearly budget activity now in hands of legislature
  - Will focus attention there to build upon governor’s proposal

UW-Eau Claire has by far largest National Student Exchange Program of any comprehensive in System
  - Opportunity for students to spend entire semester at another university in this country
  - For fall, have placed nearly 50 students
  - Pay tuition here
  - Diversifies experience

Nominations now being received for several faculty and staff performance awards sponsored by Foundation

Spring Academic Staff and Spring Faculty meetings to receive additional nominations for committee vacancies to be held on April 11, 2001

Encourage suggestions for workshop discussion topic ideas for August period before classes start
  - Email to Provost
  - Liberal arts education one topic already included

Response to question from floor
  - In National Student Exchange Program, may go to university with more expensive tuition, yet pay at our rate
  - Mary Ryan-Miller, coordinator of program, working to increase publicity

3. Chair’s Report – Chair Harrison

Key items in long report
  - Request made at Executive Committee to allow non-senators to be elected to positions on Senate Academic Policies, Budget, and Technology Committees
    - After reading through proceedings of Executive Committee, contact Senate Office if further discussion of item by full Senate desired
    - Would especially appreciate hearing from chairs of committees
  - Faculty Representatives spent considerable time discussing use of PeopleSoft administrative software for System
    - Chair’s personal commentary on issue
      - Started inquiring about functionality of PeopleSoft software after hearing comments like
        - “We can certainly tweak our current system to meet your requests, but don’t expect that option if we go to PeopleSoft”
        - This department wants a certain curriculum, but they can’t have it that way if we go to PeopleSoft
      - Discovered, much to my surprise, not only frustration from faculty at other institutions using PeopleSoft, but that many were fearful about speaking out about problems
        - Some reported staff told to keep quiet and just deal with problems regardless of cost
        - Staff were keeping quiet; told some of them feared for losing job
          - Was told once, “I don’t have tenure; I am not saying a word”
      - Nothing more frustrating than encountering an atmosphere filled with fear and intimidation
        - This type of atmosphere and way of doing business unprofessional and uncalled for anywhere
        - This, along with fact that a regent at a previous meeting stated he wanted to be kept aware of universities dragging feet in changing to this system-wide software, made me decide someone had to speak out
          - At last Faculty Rep’s meeting in early March, during discussion with Regent Vice President Randall, I urged regents to proceed with caution in quest for all institutions to convert to PeopleSoft
            - That opened the door; reps around the table started to open up and share frustrations of faculty on their campuses
            - Soon obvious that conversion to PeopleSoft has cost millions of dollars; more than anyone imagined, and actually reduced available features for users
      - Feedback received since that meeting saddens me more
        - Told open discussion greatly appreciated
        - Received email directly from person not using listserv for fear being monitored
Hearing System upset and reacting to intensity of rep’s conversation
If open lines of communication and trust were the norm, wouldn’t be concern for what being said
This atmosphere shouldn’t exist at System and shouldn’t exist at Eau Claire
Hope to continue to strive for open, trusting working environment
Response to Provost Satz’ query as to whether implying atmosphere exists at Eau Claire
Yes
Would prefer not to give particulars in open discussion and need to maintain promised confidentiality, but will say there have been concerns in technology; fear that comments made may affect peoples’ jobs
Are not considering conversion to PeopleSoft on this campus, so most of major concerns are on other campuses
Am saying shouldn’t have that atmosphere here and need to strive to keep it open
Provost Satz hoped that was not case here and indicated about to undergo strategic planning process in technology requesting open discussions to obtain feedback and opinions from across campus
Tomorrow NET is hosting Provost’s Dialogue on Faculty Roles and Rewards in President’s Room
Remainder of chair’s report provides budget information – following are few proposed changes in statutory language worthy of note
System requested authority to create GPR positions as needed within budget constraints; governor’s proposal required System to annually request wanted positions and does not include ongoing pay plan/fringe benefit costs
Concern at System that if this goes through, will be worse off than now
Evening and weekend courses – governor’s proposed language requires 15% of all course sections for credit that do not exclude undergraduates be offered during evenings, weekends, or by electronic means starting with 2002-03 academic year
System to fight this provision because would cause major problem
Governor proposed creation of new Department of Electronic Government
New agency with authority to transfer any whole or fractional number of authorized full-time equivalent positions having responsibilities related to information technology or telecommunications functions from any executive branch agency to department of electronic government and to also transfer funding source for any such position
New agency could take University technology-related positions and funding
This is another area System will fight
Chair’s report includes comparison of governor’s recommended funding of $92+ million and regents’ request of $199+ million
If more funds become available as legislative session ensues, System’s economic stimulus proposal (unveiled by President Lyall at last regents meeting) shows priority areas where extra funding would go
This where Chippewa Valley Technology Initiative comes in
University Faculty Nominating Committee still seeking nominations
Tenured faculty member for Complaint and Grievance Committee
University Faculty member for Social Committee
University Faculty member to run for senator at-large
No restrictions on two senator at-large positions; can be from any area
Contact Wanda Schulner, University Senate Secretary, or Scott Whitfield, Physics and Astronomy, Chair of Faculty Nominating Committee

4. Academic Staff Representative Report – Senator Hallatt
Academic Staff Rep’s meeting very similar to that reported for Faculty Reps
Board of Regents recognizes two academic staff persons for System Excellence Awards yearly
Dr. Deborah Gough from Academic Advising nominated by UW-Eau Claire administration
After difficult decision, awards went to academic staff at UW-Center-Marathon County and UW-Milwaukee
Chair Harrison announced that last night at Student Senate, Paula Stuettgen was recognized as Student Advocate of the Year

5. Committee Reports

♦ Academic Policies Committee – Senator Lozar
  • Two items from last APC meeting
    • Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction changed new licensure rules to indicate developmental levels rather than grade level designation
    • Grades 1-9 became “middle childhood through early adolescence”
    • Catalogue revisions to reflect change necessary; APC has no choice in matter
    • Approved proposals for three credit-bearing certificate programs in Department of Political Science
  • Campaign Consulting
  • International Affairs
  • Legal Studies
  • Next meeting April 3, 2001

♦ Budget Committee – No Report

♦ Compensation Committee – Senator Wick
  • Subcommittee continues to meet every Monday morning – 10:00 a.m., Eagle Room, Davies Center
  • Working on comprehensive pay plan that modifies and integrates standard and alternate plans
  • Hope to bring it forward to full Senate this semester

♦ Executive Committee – Chair Harrison
  • Next meeting April 3, 2001
  • Last meeting discussed
    • Including language in faculty section of constitution to reflect existence of University Faculty Awards Committee and language clarifying eligibility of members on both faculty and academic staff awards committees
    • Will be on next Senate agenda
    • Function and make-up of newly created Professional Development Advisory Committee; those being considered for appointment by Provost reviewed in closed session

♦ Faculty Personnel Committee – Senator Mack
  • Next meeting April 17, 2001
  • Met today – will be forwarding two motions to Senate
    • Resolution on collective bargaining
    • Policy on department criteria in personnel plans

♦ Nominating Committee – Senator Bushnell
  • Nominations to come forward at next Senate meeting for University Senate Vice Chair
  • If interested, contact Senator Bushnell, Wanda Schulner, or any other member of Nominating Committee
    (Senators Bollinger, Boyum, Harms, Rowlett, and Schmitt)
  • Nominee must be academic staff

♦ Physical Plant Planning Committee – Senator Stuettgen
  • Next meeting April 10, 2001
  • Met this morning
    • Preview of Riverbank Preservation plan
    • Discussed first draft of Space Use Document

♦ Technology Committee – Senator Goulet
  • Next meeting April 3, 2001
  • To meet with Information Technology Directors and representatives to discuss strategic plan
  • Anyone with specific issues may contact any member of committee (Senators Bollinger, Goulet, Hartnett, Lang, Majdalani, Raleigh and Tlusty) or come to that meeting

♦ Academic Staff Personnel Committee – Senator Hallatt
  • Next meeting March 29, 2001
Report on Academic Staff Titling – Senator Hallatt

- In spring of 1999 as result of Twenty-First Century Study, began looking at use of Instructional Academic Staff on UW campuses
- System working group made recommendations that will be forwarded Board of Regents
- Committee recommends UW-Eau Claire support revised academic staff titling
  - Allows more growth in titles
  - Allows career progression
  - Title makes difference in applying for grants and writing recommendations for students

Motion 37-AS-01
Moved and seconded by Academic Staff Personnel Committee (10-0-0) that the University Senate endorse and UW-Eau Claire administration support the new instructional and research Academic Staff titles as stated in the draft report titled Summary Prepared for Faculty Representatives February 2, 2001 and included in the UW-Eau Claire Academic Staff Representative’s Report for the February 27, 2001 meeting of University Senate

Discussion
- Since request is for University Senate to endorse, vote will be by both faculty and academic staff senators
- Instructional professor series strikes me as awfully close to tenure-track positions
  - Particularly part about terminal degrees, 50% or more appointment, renewable or indefinite
  - Seems to be increasing academic staff positions while eroding tenure-track faculty positions
  - Understand reasons and concerns of academic staff, but seems to create two-tiered system within same job
- Final report just released removed reference to terminal degree requirement for appointment, now just required for promotion; may change feeling slightly
- Also made very clear in report that instructional positions of ongoing faculty-type should be filled as tenure-track faculty positions
  - Supported by committee for entire system, even campuses where currently all undergraduate classes taught by academic staff
- Speak for motion, but wondering if also being said with dollars
- Final report further recommends
  - New salary minima be established for new title series
  - Each institution use new titles as delineated in title definition
  - System provide training to academic personnel officers, but implementation handled by each institution
  - Staff meeting criteria for new title series be moved laterally to new title series; does not require salary adjustment except staff must be paid at least minimum
  - Salary reviews and advancement within title series be handled under normal processes established at each institution

Vote on 37-AS-01: Motion PASSED

6. Special Reports
- Farewell Remarks – Student Senate President Justin Hentges
  - Student Senate also awarded Student Senate Advisor of the Year honors to Barbara Wimunc-Pearson of Music & Theatre Arts
  - Full changeover of leadership in Student Senate takes place this coming Monday
  - Thank Chair Harrison and Wanda for time to speak and help over past few years
  - Will officially state opinion on few issues present this year that will continue to be present next year and years to come
  - Technology
    - While attending this institution witnessed surge in technology uses, including email, power point, web pages, and research and other projects using World Wide Web
    - Must keep working to bring not only new, but better technologies to campus; but must not be afraid to say an old technology may still be the best
When making changes, must ensure equality in product and usage for everyone on campus and guarantee benefit to students

Service Learning
- Controversial since program first started; some of controversy may stem from way program brought forth
  - Program now here; should let past grudges go
- Bottom line is valuable for students
  - Benefits to community and university as whole secondary to what students get from program
- Provost’s workgroup on service learning developed list of solutions to some of the problems
  - Should look at these options with open mind and vision for future, not with pessimism
- Need to build up, not destroy, a program

Diversity
- Perhaps most important issue on campus, yet one many pay only lip service
- University should embody diversity in subjects, activities, faculty/staff, and students
- Key to liberal arts education
- Have made progress, yet need to do more; must emphasize and promote equality
- Most respond to racist remarks; many turn away and don’t speak up when remark is homophobic
- Can say we promote diversity, but must also show it
- Can say we believe in equality, but must also want it
- Cannot leave anyone behind as move forward
- Must take all measures to ensure equal access, equal rights, and equal life for students
- Must not tokenize person or group of people
- Must use teachable moments as they arise to teach equality; to teach liberal education
- More comfortable now on campus than over three years ago before I came out, however, cannot become complacent with that feeling

Thank you for your help, guidance, and inspiration over past year
- Am true testament to liberal arts education
- Came to this university shy, timid, and unable to speak about opinions in coherent manner
- Leave office very outspoken and very grateful for experiences at this university
- As John Ruskin said, “The highest reward for a person’s toil is not what they get for it, but what they become by it”

Response to question from floor
- Will be studying abroad in Australia next semester and will be graduating next spring

Vice Chancellor Soll (prior to his report) thanked Erin Brandt, Vice President of Student Senate, for playing big role in some advances occurring this academic year
- Her vision, leadership, and partnership with President Hentges and others has been outstanding

Riverbank Stabilization Project – Vice Chancellor Soll
- Project over summer to stabilize south bank of Chippewa River from property line at Ecumenical Religious Center downstream to Putnam Parking Lot
- Started as flood control project
  - Some thought about building flood wall since part of campus in 100-year flood plain; thought may improve situation and remove some portions of campus from flood plain
  - Engineers, DNR, and others looking at that possibility determined it an impractical solution
  - Flood wall might actually prohibit waters coming around ends onto main campus from returning to river
- Still needed to address issue of stabilizing riverbank
- Severe erosion threatening both Garfield Avenue along south bank and utility lines next to road, principally steam lines from upper campus power plant to buildings across river
- Project to stabilize and reestablish solid south bank able to stand up to day-to-day current, and flood conditions thereby protecting campus infrastructure
- Project funded through State Division for Facilities Development
That entity also responsible for running project; design work done in consultation with university and Department of Natural Resources (DNR)

DNR looking carefully for any impact on river upstream and/or downstream from campus, river flow, wildlife, vegetation, etc.

Received seven bids this afternoon; six within budget

Expect project to begin immediately after commencement

Barring unusual weather conditions, project should completed before classes start in late August

Expect traffic on Garfield Avenue to be maintained in reasonably normal manner

Project involves stabilizing severely eroded and undercut portion of riverbank

Removal of majority of vegetation on riverbank including root systems and other organic material that could decay and create unstable conditions

Recontouring bank to slope more gradually out to river with compacted earth

Covering new slope with riprap to provide protection against mechanical erosion from water

Reestablishing landscaping and vegetation on top of riprap in form of trees, shrubs, native grasses, etc.

Installing sidewalk on north side of Garfield Avenue, running from footbridge west to across from Katharine Thomas Hall

Addition of sidewalk will be enhancement for pedestrians and also vehicular traffic

Building small observation deck with railing and bench providing nice vista up and down river

Wear like everyone to understand need for removing current vegetation from bank

More than adequate money included in budget to reestablish vegetation along bank once stabilized

Display showing photo of current riverbank taken from north side of river and computer simulation of same riverbank at project completion can be viewed in Vice Chancellor Soll’s Office

Response to questions from floor

Not much addition to south bank; very little at ground level, but will taper steep drop-off there now

Shame to lose so many trees, but many threatened now because of erosion and undercutting

Could lose many during course of flood

Leaving them in place prevents creation of good, solid, stable bank to hold up for long run

Sufficient money in project for reestablishing vegetation in way to stand up against flood conditions

Big chunks of cement now on bank to be removed

No impact on Putnam Creek – project ends at Putnam Parking Lot before creek

Senator Hartnett from Department of Geography has been mapping river channel for years as Faculty/Student research project

Serious concern about decreasing width of river and increasing drag by adding riprap in area where good deal of channel exists; not problem today, but during few days of peak flow each year, could be very significant

Although decrease in width of channel will be low, that’s where water really moves in a river

Is history of such projects in Milwaukee resulting in floods in residential areas upstream

Would proceed very cautiously

Senator Classen, Director of Facilities Planning and Management, indicated subjects such as drag, change in cross-section, and effect of change of elevation in a flood were discussed during design

Ayres & Associates, with experience in this area, did engineering

DNR (Gary Lepak and Dan Coich) reviewed design

Apparentely Ayres satisfied DNR those issues sufficiently addressed by design

Ideas and concerns can be shared with Vice Chancellor Soll and/or Facilities Planning and Management Director Classen

7. Miscellaneous Business for Next Agenda – None

8. Announcements

Next meeting April 10, 2001

9. Open Discussion on General Education (GE) Requirements and the Baccalaureate Degree
In early fall, set Senate open discussion topics for year; at about same time, chairs and deans discussing areas related to baccalaureate degree that could be improved

- Four task forces established by Provost
- One, under leadership of Associate Vice Chancellor Tallant, focused on GE requirements
- Policy changes resulting from task force suggestions will eventually go to APC and then before full Senate
- Today have unique opportunity to discuss thoughts and ideas about GE requirements to provide APC with sense of how Senate feels before they work on suggested policy changes

To begin discussion – Associate Vice Chancellor Tallant

- Background – through last summer and fall, Provost worked with departments, chairs, and staff on number of issues related to course availability and degree requirements
  - As a result, Provost created department chair’s task force to look into these issues and make recommendations
  - Reviewed at full meeting of all department chairs, deans, and Provost’s staff on October 26, 2000
  - Following October meeting of chairs, deans, and Provost’s staff, four working groups established
  - Working group for GE requirements assigned two different tasks
    - Look at simplification of GE requirements
    - Look at reduction of 43 upper-division credit requirement
  - Group first identified current GE requirements in categories II, III, and IV as major impediments to advising and course selection for students
    - Eleven-credit requirements viewed as unrealistic given lack of courses offered for fewer than three credits
    - Breadth requirement tended to reduce advising flexibility, scheduling flexibility and to minimize advising interaction between students and faculty.
    - Emphasis currently on meeting university requirements, not on thoughtful course selection to enhance personal growth
    - Reducing GE component would not add more seats, but would shift registration pressure to upper-division elective courses within major
  - Department Chair Task Force recommended changes to Provost
    - Number of GE credits required for graduation be changed from 39 to 33
    - No changes for GE Category I
    - GE Category II Natural Sciences: Reduce to nine credits, at least one lab science, and reduce subcategories from four to three
    - GE Category III Social Sciences: Reduce to nine credits and decrease from four requirements in seven subcategories to three
    - GE Category IV Humanities: Reduce to nine credits including at least one course from three of fourteen disciplines
    - Upper-division requirement of 43 credits be reduced make it divisible by three – either 39 or 42
  - In November, Provost asked Working Group #1 to review Department Chair Task Force recommendations and submit appropriate draft response to him during March
  - Working Group
    - Chair Steven Tallant, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs
    - Jack Bushnell, Department of English
    - Deborah Gough, Advising and Academic Testing
    - Jack Pladziewicz, Chemistry
    - Roger Tlusty, Department of Foundations of Education
    - Bob Sutton, Department of Management and Marketing
    - Craig Smith, Student
  - Report submitted to Provost two weeks ago

- Process used to come to recommendations
  - First asked, is there indeed a problem?
  - Is there a need to simplify GE requirements?
  - Do GE requirements contribute to increase in credits to degree and in time to degree for students?
• Is plan so complicated that it is difficult for students and advisers? Are mistakes made because of that?
• If confirm problem exists, wanted to look at other models for general education
  • How do we compare?
  • Are we proscriptive or liberal in letting students decide what they want?
• If were to make any recommendations, wanted philosophical basis
  • Establish guiding principles to make recommendations
  • Not just to change it to change it
• Finally, determine what practical implications recommendations would have upon departments
  • Some concern that if reduced requirements, some departments might go out of business
  • Group looked at data on how individual departments affected if recommendations came to fruition
• Working group came to same conclusions chair’s task force did
  • Do have problems with GE requirements
    • Leads to course availability problems
    • Leads to time and credit to degree problems
    • Need to look at simplification
• Looked at other models
  • On continuum of liberal (1) to proscriptive (10) in terms of what you have to take, UW-Eau Claire probably a nine
    • Very few schools with number and types of requirements we have
    • At other end of continuum, Brown University (liberal arts, ivy league) students chose liberal arts plan – they develop everything
    • Madison somewhere in middle with liberal arts foundation at undergraduate level, some requirements, but students make more choices
• Working Group #1 discussed philosophical basis for GE requirements at liberal arts based institution
  • All agree general education fundamental to liberal arts education
  • However, no common view within university community as to what exact requirements should be
    • Various groups within university balance breadth and depth differently
  • Given overall importance of general education to substance of baccalaureate degree and impact of requirements on course availability, full and robust discussion of requirements recommended
    • View report as prelude to discussion
  • Consensus on philosophical understanding does not mean will be view of entire university
• From review of College of Arts & Sciences policy statement on applying for GE designation, description of GE requirements and academic goals of university from 2000-2001 UW-Eau Claire catalogue became clear are number of important and desired institutional outcomes
  • Two outcomes critical to providing best liberal arts based education
    • Develop critical thinkers
      • Critical thinkers effectively solve problems
      • Good problem-solvers make good decisions
      • Good decision-makers usually live productive lives and make significant contributions to society
      • Result is good employers and employees, as well as good citizens
    • Instill desire for life-long learning
      • Because life is dynamic, individuals must continue to learn throughout lives to remain critical thinkers and effective problem solvers
      • Must teach them to learn: how to learn given subject and to keep learning
  • General education much more than which courses to take; also process of choosing courses and making life decisions
    • Since process taking place within comprehensive university learning community, all faculty, academic staff, classified staff, and students become part of process and share responsibility for quality of learning inside and outside classroom setting
Working group developed four guidelines for making recommendations:
1) Meet content and process goals of liberal arts education (teach students how to make choices and be responsible for those choices)
2) Simplify degree requirements
3) Reduce course availability problems
4) Provide opportunities for students to make thoughtful choices and decisions

Then ask how recommendations impact certain departments:
- Looked at historical data to gauge impact of changes on departments offering GE courses
- Changes in GE III and GE IV requiring students take four subcategories took effect in 1995
  - Made assumption if reduce requirement, student credit hours in some departments would go down
  - Then should have been increase in student credit hours in departments when requirements enacted
  - Looked at 1993 to 1999 data by each semester and each year
  - Impact from changing degree requirements seen in only two departments
    - Variable may have been related more to FTE than changing degree requirements; more staff added to those departments
- Do not believe evidence there to support that reduction or simplification would impact many departments
  - Only requirement change that significantly affected course enrollment was foreign culture
  - However, working group just looking at GE
- Group came to conclusion that simplification in order and made recommendations to Provost
  - Not going to share specific recommendations today
  - Discussion today should not be biased by our recommendations
  - Those recommendations will come through shared governance process
  - On April 12th, Provost Satz will meet with department chairs to present his package and start process
- Wonderful opportunity today to start engaging in dialogue

Response to questions from floor:
- Don’t remember which two departments affected in 1995, but again, didn’t seem to be result of change in baccalaureate as much as addition of staff
- Upper division credit requirement within general education applies only to College of Arts & Sciences and School of Human Sciences and Services; since not university-wide requirement, not looked at
  - If university changes requirements, but certain colleges, departments, or degree programs continue to impose additional requirements, changes will not accomplish much
- Provost Satz indicated change process began year ago during chairs retreat
  - Agreed to talk about issues, develop plans, and bring forward to appropriate governance
    - Could be in departments, could be in colleges, or could be through APC
  - Next step on this issue is meeting of April 12th
- Goals established as part of redefinition of baccalaureate degree not part of charge; group did look at and discuss, but not addressed in report
- Did not review vehicles used by students and advisers, i.e., degree audit, just looked at requirements
- Discussed efficiency issue of moving people through courses; group believed simplification would enhance progress through required lower division courses (where registration pressure appears most severe) to upper division courses in major (where in most departments, probably more capacity to absorb students)
  - Ought to be discussed in broader setting as may be departments where may not be case
- Hopefully these changes will lead to making whole process more efficient and easier for students and advisers to follow
- Report just concerned with general education, not foreign culture, diversity, wellness, or service learning; did discuss because came up, but were not in charge given
- Group recommendations universal, across-the-board recommendations, did not differentiate bachelor of science vs. bachelor of arts; colleges and schools can still have own requirements even though hope would be careful in that
Discussion from floor on issue of general education

- Like new GE requirements and downsizing; concern that may become turf war in Arts & Sciences with departments fighting for share of GE
  - Think will be seen as great changes in requirements for business school, think going to be hard sell in College of Arts & Sciences
- Concern is new GE credits are university-wide minimum requirements, what kind of flexibility will schools and colleges have?
  - School of Education requires four-credit political science course and four-credit educational psychology course to get license to teach, making eight credits in two subcategories; most students to satisfy foreign culture have to take another three-credit GE III course; so for education majors reduction to nine credits no effective change
  - If take into consideration as create university-wide program, certainly would help large constituency in education to get out of here more quickly
- Education majors told up front choices are restricted because of Department of Public Instruction (DPI) for licensing; not sure in building plans for university that can account for all those types of variations
- Over last 30 years since have seen one thing after another added, bit by bit, and then redefinition, and GE requirements became more and more proscriptive, anything done to simplify will be welcome
  - Have to ask, three years from now will it matter which course was taken? Are specific requirements necessary?
  - Recommendations also allow general student more in-depth view of process in another area
- May need more information on changes DPI planning for credentialing requirements prior to our changes
  - Figure different way of putting education-related courses into students’ programs rather than counting them as GE
- Mentioned two broad desired outcomes for students – critical thinking and life-long learning – becoming effective communicators another category of almost equal status; need more practice and more exposure
- We need to worry about what our requirements are first; stick to our goals and philosophy with our majors
  - When and if DPI changes come along, departments or schools can make necessary changes to comply
  - UW-Eau Claire in perfect position if DPI changes to require students first get BS or BA and then get certified
- Need to be careful how respond to DPI requirements; but this is good opportunity to deal with undergraduate difficulties and obstacles
  - Doesn’t feel like truth in advertising when tell advisees to take 11 credits in categories when are no two-credit courses
  - In some comprehensive majors, especially in nursing, struggle to get foreign language opportunity that will be meaningful for students and useful in their profession
- Since not a normal school, our needs greater than DPI requirements; will need to find way to get School of Education worked into GE program
  - Short-sighted not to recognize and address DPI demands while looking at liberal arts issue
  - Either must comply now, or wait until decertification and then comply; recommend now
- Provost Satz acknowledged diverse opinions on these issues and indicated process would be slow, inclusive with lots of dialogue, and face problems openly and honestly with recognition that serious problems exist
- Chair Harrison expressed appreciation to working group for amount of research and thought put in process

Meeting adjourned at 4:54 p.m. without objection.

Respectfully submitted by,

Wanda Schulner
Secretary to the University Senate