May 8, 2001

Members Present:


Members Absent:

Randy Beger, Terry Classen, Gene Decker, Margaret Hallatt, Debra King, Carol Klun, Jane Linton, Mona Majdalani, John Melrose, Rick Mickelson, Vicki Reed, Lori Rowlett, Richard Ryberg, Ronald Satz, Kathie Schneider, Roger Selin, Mehdi Sheikholeslami, Nick Smiar, David Steele

Guests:

Mary Ellen Alea, Margaret Cassidy, Bernard Duyfhuizen, Meg Dwyer, Deborah Gough, Carole Halberg, Carol Hale, Dan Langlois, Kathy Mitchell, Jan Morse, Andrew Phillips, Walter Reid, Sarah Schuh, Andrew Soll, Sarah Van Tassel, Karen Welch, Ted Wendt, Marty Wood

The regular meeting of University Senate was called to order at 3:06 p.m., Tuesday, May 8, 2001 in the Tamarack Room of Davies Center.

1. Minutes of April 24, 2001 meeting of University Senate approved as distributed without objection

2. Chancellor’s Remarks – Chancellor Mash
   - Student Senate voted to continue differential tuition after annual review of how that million dollars used to enhance academic program here
     - Recommitted for another year
     - Important source of revenue that can’t, and don’t, take for granted
     - Student Senate talking about whether to consider possibility of investing even more
   - Fall enrollment looking very strong
     - Showing some signs of better retention
     - One manifestation of retention is housing situation as indicated in Spectator editorial
       - Even with adding 325 spaces in new residence hall, filled to capacity and looking at motels
       - Good sign to have that kind of residence hall demand; program is best I have ever seen
       - Might also suggest options out in community aren’t as good as they might be
       - Will be upperclassmen, not freshmen, living in motels if used in fall
   - Will be honoring approximately thirty retirees at reception on Monday
     - Adding service recognition to that program; please join if able
   - Wish to clarify letter Bobby Pitts wrote to editor of Leader-Telegram
     - Have talked to Bobby Pitts
     - Was very good letter dealing with very important issues on campus
       - Salary levels
       - Ability to compete when recruiting faculty
       - UW-System’s state financial support
- Institutional governance
- Collective bargaining
- Mention today to clarify reference made to portion of pay plan being used to pay higher entering salaries to new hires
  - That does not happen; pay plan is divvied up among current faculty at percentage rate specified by System
  - Pay higher entrance salaries to new hires for very good reason explained to you before
- Do have morale issue in part around salary; can’t simply not talk about it
- People here for a while hearing we are trying to pay higher entering salaries also need to know we are trying to do something about compression issue
  - Talked about some of those things last meeting
  - Last thing I want veterans to think is that money is being siphoned from pay plan to recruit entering faculty; that is not happening

- Comment by Senator Pitts
  - Only today, found in minutes of last meeting; page 2, second bullet up from item 3 notes, “Salary for new hires comes out of pay plan dollars”
  - I thought that was it, but point was not to complain; point was to make them feel sorry for us

- Chancellor’s response
  - I understand that, and maybe I didn’t answer question quite properly
  - We have pay plan dollars come to us; we divvy those up according to compensation plan among people currently on payroll
  - 5.2% increase is average above aggregate salaries
  - They take snapshot of payroll in October
  - When we do new hires, not touching pay plan per se
  - However, when we bring in new faculty at higher entering salaries, those higher entering salaries are part of calculation for increases the next year
  - Not exactly what salary savings refers to, that takes couple different forms
  - Concern that there isn’t impression pulling money out of pay plan to pay higher entering salaries; we are not doing that
  - It does affect base budget
    - Could argue that if didn’t pay high entering salaries, would be more money to buy something else
  - Clearly suggested getting salary averages up is a priority; managing budget accordingly
    - Some higher entering salaries result from salary savings when senior faculty person replaced with someone paid more junior salary

- Lot of work occurring on campus; trying to restore grounds beautiful look of past few years
  - Additional sidewalks going in where major paths worn through grass
  - Sod may or may not be in place before graduation

- Graduation is May 19th – two ceremonies
  - Regent Jose Olivieri will be commencement speaker; five alumni to be recognized at awards dinner

- Recommend article in April 27 issue of Chronicle of Higher Education
  - Provides sense of role we have and task of communicating what we do and how we do it to engender better support
  - Title is State Government and Colleges: Clash of Cultures; very well done, worth reading

3. Chair’s Report – Chair Harrison
- Appreciate hard work this year; Senate accomplished a lot
- Committee chairs reminded to get copies of committee minutes to Senate Office
- Be sure to indicate interest in Senate committees on Senate surveys to aid Nominating Committee
- Chair’s report highlights faculty reps meeting held last Friday and current legislative matters
- Item not in report is call for nominations for program coordinator for Wisconsin Higher Education Eisenhower Professional Development Program
  - Forty percent position with person remaining on home campus
  - Competitive grant program to improve mathematics, science, and other course teaching at K-12 level in Wisconsin public and private schools
  - Funding provided by grant to UW-System by US Department of Education
4. Academic Staff Representative Report – Senator Wilcox
- UW-System Academic Staff Leadership Conference
  - July 26 and 27, 2001 in Stevens Point
  - Provost supports attendance of six academic staff members
  - Information available from Senator Wilcox and web site

5. Old Business – Assessment Procedures Motion from Academic Policies Committee
- According to Robert’s Rules, motion taken up where left off; speakers list starts fresh
- Reintroduction of assessment motion by Senator Lozar
  - Issues raised by speakers at previous meeting were reason discussion of assessment in APC took so long
  - Not doing assessment not an option; question is how to do with least disturbance or imposition
  - Proposed procedure will only be assessing baccalaureate, not individual majors
  - Proposal responds to lack of participation by students in assessment of baccalaureate
    - Conclusion on whether doing what we say we are doing based on very tenuous data
    - Goal is to increase awareness of assessment process in order to increase participation
  - Eleven goals approved at time baccalaureate redefined distributed
  - Assessment Committee looking at attainment of these goals
  - Current process provides folder to entering freshmen in freshmen experience or English 110 classes
    - Folder contains
      - Eleven goals of baccalaureate with specific instructions for kinds of papers that might be included
      - Sheets included which students attach to papers related to specific goal (sheet on goal about understanding numerical data distributed)
      - Couple of papers to come from freshmen classes, others from anywhere in career
    - Proposal asks that faculty
      - Indicate on official syllabi which goals course relates to
      - Indicate to students during course any assignments that would be good for student to add to folder
        - Procedures do not ask to add different assignments than currently required
        - Only to suggest placement in folders
      - Remind advisees to keep up with portfolio
    - New imposition for faculty is asking that in capstone courses or experiences presentation of portfolio be a course requirement
      - Additionally indicate that students, as part of capstone experience, can be called upon to participate in other forms of assessment such as interviews, focus groups, surveys, and so on
    - Already similar requirements in place for faculty
      - Policy dictates that freshmen have an exam or other substantial evaluation by fourth week of semester
      - General education courses must meet certain criteria
      - Asking for one more

Discussion
- Although all first semester seniors should be participating, those students indicate they do not all have folders and are not all participating in university-wide assessment
- No motivation for students to put anything in portfolios since participation does not affect graduation
- Individual faculty do offer bonus points in senior courses for adding to departmental portfolio
- Proposal coming forward because students often unaware of process
- Speak in favor of proposal
  1. Not working now
    - First question from freshmen students is what happens if I don’t do it
    - To be honest have to say nothing
  2. Very important that start serious conversations about what education is about
    - Have history majors that get good jobs; do so because can articulate how liberal arts education applicable to business
    - See assessment in terms of figuring out how to make those connections
- Support assessment
  - Still find proscription toward faculty and staff troublesome; faculty held accountable
Object to numbers 4 and 5 in proposed procedures for assessment

- Faculty collect portfolios that were not necessarily developed in their course and move those portfolios over to another group to assess and give back
- Why faculty suddenly paper pushers without value added?
- While do obviously have constraints on what done in courses, rarely in form of what assignments given; taking away freedom of faculty to decide what appropriate for assignments in capstone experiences

**Amendment 37-AP-06-a1**

Moved by Senate Wick and seconded that items #4 and #5 be struck from the proposed procedures

4. **Students in capstone courses and alternative capstone experiences in the majors will be required to participate in some part of assessment of the baccalaureate such as exit interviews, focus groups, or surveys.**

5. **To complete the capstone course or alternative capstone experience in the major, students must present the portfolio documenting their work related to the goals of the baccalaureate degree.**

**Discussion**

- Faculty would not be assigning exit interviews; proposal just states entire senior class is subject pool, could be asked to participate in focus groups and surveys and so on
- Students will be invited to participate so would like see faculty support this expectation for students
- Fine, but why being placed on faculty
- Value is being able to assess eleven goals of baccalaureate
  - Only providing place where can be collected
  - Let student know will be asked to participate
  - Capstone is one place bringing seniors together
  - Does not have to be part of grade
  - Fact that some students will not have portfolios also tells us something
- If no consequences to not doing, just adding another meaningless rule; don’t need more of those
- Meaningless noise because can’t stop graduation, but faculty supposed to require it
- Should not be faculty member’s responsibility because happen to be teaching capstone course
- All programs within university have either capstone courses or alternative capstone experiences so would be inclusive sample
- Against amendment, see proposal as gentle, potentially effective way to accomplish assessment
- Can argue about whether or not these goals belong in catalogue; but currently have them
  - Therefore, as faculty obligated to assess them
  - Seems small imposition in capstone course to just collect documents that evidence whether or not students have met goals
- Don’t have culture of assessment on campus now, seems to be step in right direction of trying to create that culture; should at least try
- North Central Accreditation Agency wants us to assess these goals; something we have to do; seems to be something to try
- Can’t help but think must be some other way to get these things collected
  - Why not make it part of degree audit?
- If you want to collect something, put out a box; more to it here than collection, so against it

**VOTE on Amendment 37-AP-06-a1:** TIE vote 14 for, 14 against by University Faculty members of Senate

Proposal to divide the question and recount accepted without objection

**VOTE on Amendment 37-AP-06-a1 deleting Item #4:** Amendment DEFEATED by vote of 13 for, 16 against by University Faculty

**VOTE on Amendment 37-AP-06-a1 deleting Item #5:** Amendment PASSED by vote of 16 for, 13 against by University Faculty
Continued discussion on main motion as amended

- Portfolios assessed by Assessment Committee; exit interviews done by volunteer faculty
- Difficult for scoring committee to determine if content meets goals of baccalaureate since goals not measurable
- Proposed procedures before you because APC sensed university not ready to revisit eleven goals of baccalaureate to make them measurable; this was less difficult move forward
- Beginning week of June 4th, goals of baccalaureate will be assessed based on portfolios available
  - Will use people with expertise in evaluating writing and analysis of evaluative criteria
- Seems backward
  - Critical thinking skills and writing skills in specific course may be looked at out of context by someone with different take
  - Any given faculty member won’t know if work students putting in portfolios will demonstrate to evaluator that goals have been met
  - Hard to support proposal with activity unattached to criteria
- Assessment Committee at beginning of discussion did ask for revisiting goals
- After Assessment Plan approved by University Senate in 1992, goals further defined with outcomes
  - From those outcomes, established rubrics, holistic scoring mechanisms for faculty to use for portfolio papers across disciplines
  - Rubrics worked on by Assessment Committee with faculty consultation
- Not comfortable using limited resources for process, such as in #7 and #8
  - Salary resources to pay faculty during summer
  - #8 could be sinkhole of resources; not sure process mature enough for this to be appropriate now
- APC also concerned about #8 so is stated very weakly, encouraging development of electronic portfolio process; not a near-future project
- #7 done in summer as matter of when faculty have time
- Course outlines are required in all courses as stated in Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook

**Amendment 37-AP-06-a2**

Moved by Senator Lang and seconded that **portfolios be added as option to item #4**

**Discussion**

- If say required, what do you do if not done and who policing
  - If truly not required, then should say encouraged
- Special Education uses exit interviews and different approaches to determine achievement of departmental goals
  - Not required, but faculty believe in them and students know we believe in them, so not a problem
  - Department very interested in finding out if we are achieving what we think we are achieving

**Motion 37-US-26**

Moved by Senator MacBriar and seconded **to postpone assessment discussion to a future meeting**

**VOTE on Motion 37-US-26:** Motion DEFEATED by University Faculty vote of 12 for, 17 against

**POINT OF INFORMATION:** Items on agenda requiring disposition today

- Titling and integration of Instructional Academic Staff would have to be dealt with today in order to have effect on report being written
- Mission statement revisions
  - Goal is to present to Board of Regents at October meeting in Eau Claire
  - Would have to pass today to get all necessary steps in timeline completed by October

**VOTE on Amendment 37-AP-06-a2:** Amendment PASSED by University Faculty vote of 19 for, 7 against

**VOTE on Motion 37-AP-06 as amended:** Motion PASSED by University Faculty vote of 18 for, 11 against
TEXT OF MOTION AS AMENDED

Proposed Procedures for Assessment of Student Outcomes in the Baccalaureate Degree

1. A session during CUBE Fest will be established to introduce new freshmen to the goals of the baccalaureate and to assessment of student outcomes.

2. Freshman Experience courses will continue the discussion regarding the goals of the baccalaureate and will explain to students the importance of keeping copies of papers and other work which demonstrate their attainment of goals of the baccalaureate. The means that students can use to store the papers will also be explained: e.g., as part of the portfolio in the student's major if the major requires the portfolio, as a separate baccalaureate portfolio if no portfolio is required in the major, or electronically.

3. Departments and programs will contribute to student awareness, student attainment, and university assessment of the goals of the baccalaureate degree in the following ways.

   The official course syllabi will indicate the goals of the baccalaureate that the courses help students to attain. College/school curriculum committees will monitor the inclusion of this information in the course syllabi.

   The course outlines given to students at the beginning of each course will identify the goals of the baccalaureate that the courses help students attain. Faculty are encouraged to indicate on the course outlines which papers and other work required in the course can be used as evidence of attainment of the goals. Departmental curriculum committees (or their equivalent) will develop mechanisms to monitor such inclusion.

   Faculty will remind their advisees and students in their courses to save papers and other work showing their attainment of the goals of the baccalaureate.

   Departments will be asked to report on their participation in assessment of the baccalaureate in the annual administrative meetings and in the self-studies that they prepare for the seven-year cycle of department/program reviews.

4. Students in capstone courses and alternative capstone experiences in the majors will be required to participate in some part of assessment of the baccalaureate such as exit interviews, focus groups, surveys, or portfolios.

5. The University Assessment Committee will continue to follow its plan for a four-year cycle of assessment of the goals of the baccalaureate. Student portfolios documenting work related to the goals of the baccalaureate will be collected toward the end of every term during which capstone courses or alternative capstone experiences are scheduled. The portfolios will be used to assess the goals of the baccalaureate according to the following four year cycle:

   Year 00-01 Goals 3, 4, 5, and 8
   Year 01-02 Goals 3, 4, 5, and 6
   Year 02-03 Goals 3, 4, 5, 7, and 11
   Year 03-04 Goals 3, 4, 5, and 10

Other means of assessment such as exit interviews and surveys will be completed according to the following four-year cycle:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Standardized tests (essay, math)</th>
<th>Exit interviews</th>
<th>Student Opinion Surveys</th>
<th>Alumni survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00-01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-02</td>
<td></td>
<td>Exit interviews</td>
<td>Student Opinion Surveys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-03</td>
<td></td>
<td>Exit interviews</td>
<td>Student Opinion Surveys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03-04</td>
<td></td>
<td>Exit interviews</td>
<td>Student Opinion Surveys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Each spring a "scoring committee" of 12 faculty will be selected such that the faculty have expertise in the areas of content and skills of the goals being assessed that year. The "scoring committee" members will receive payment for their work during a period of one week during the summer. During the week the committee members will receive training to develop an understanding of assessment and to learn scoring procedures and will score the papers and other work in the portfolios related to the goals of the baccalaureate.

7. The University is encouraged to develop an electronic portfolio process that will assist students with development and collection of their papers and other work.

Old Business – New Instructional and Research Academic Staff Titles

- Background – Senator Wick
  - On March 27th, University Senate voted to endorse titling structure for instructional and research academic staff
  - At that meeting, many faculty remained silent because not involved in academic staff governance
  - Faculty Personnel Committee subsequently asked to look at retitling
    - Committee unanimously agreed not to support revised titling structure
    - Stuck in position of needing to respond in way inconsistent with way Senate as a whole already had
  - Request that Senate rescind previous action and encourage split vote between faculty and academic staff to get clearer picture of where support lies
  - No desire to dictate or improperly influence academic staff in shared governance, just concerned that when faculty asked to respond, response was inconsistent with silence heard at previous Senate meeting

Motion 37-US-27

Moved by Senator Wick and seconded to rescind the resolution (passed March 27, 2001) endorsing the new instructional and research Academic Staff titles as stated in the final report of the System Working Group on Instructional and Research Academic Staff dated March 16, 2001

Discussion

- Mentioned about splitting – would have to rescind first and then bring up for vote by University Faculty and University Academic Staff respectively

VOTE on Motion 37-US-27: Motion DEFEATED by vote of 17 for, 21 against

Motion 37-US-28

Moved by Senator Wick and seconded that faculty vote to not show support for the new instructional and research Academic Staff titles as stated in the final report of the System Working Group on Instructional and Research Academic Staff dated March 16, 2001

Discussion

- After reading report and responses from number of institutions around System, concern that use of Instructional Professor series will have serious consequences regarding tenure and filling faculty positions
  - Clearly stated in report that intent is to fill faculty positions with faculty
  - However, have already been shown documents from System indicating this modified professor series can be used, indeed is encouraged to be used, to save money
  - Madison faculty have opposed new structure as potentially eroding tenure in System
  - Document claims part of national trend; in-depth study shows not following trend, but setting precedent
  - Information available to Faculty Personnel Committee distributed to Senators
  - Support motion – people on other campuses have strongly opposed this retitling
    - Language talks about individuals with appointments of 50% or more who are renewable or indefinite
    - Does nothing for salary; does nothing to help in recruiting
    - Bad system that gives dedicated people on this campus a nice title; but that is about it; on other campuses it hurts in many, many ways
Weakens structure of shared governance, secure faculty positions, and sense of camaraderie
- Structure and format, just as faculty and academic staff structure, confusing to general public
- Unfortunate did not hear previous speakers prior to vote; assumed rescinding would go through so did not discuss more
- Strong feeling in department that academic staff are second class citizens, or worse
- Titles ought to allow academic staff to be recognized for what they do
- Tenure under attack around country
  - Could become case of hiring these people instead of tenure line
  - Legislators may become confused about who faculty are when this group doing same job for less
- Like to say that here courses are taught by professors, and if you go to Madison, you will be taught by teaching assistants; now at Eau Claire will be confusing the issue
  - To save money, will hire someone as full-time teacher
  - Can pay lot less, because just instructional
  - Does not raise position at university
- Faculty here both teach and do research
  - Important and helpful to students
  - Can build on that instead of tearing it down
- Do have four ranks for faculty: instructor, assistant, associate, and full
  - Instructor title used very infrequently
  - Fear further confusion with professorial ranks if use this titling

POINT OF ORDER: Chair’s opinion that motion to reconsider vote on rescinding motion endorsing draft IRAS titling could be handled only after dispose of motion on floor

Continued discussion
- Would like to see academic staff in better situation here
  - On other hand, titles may blur distinctions to bad effect
  - Would like to hear opinion of academic staff on this issue
- Think incredibly unfortunate that committee, after all that work, came up with those titles
  - Does not address concerns that raised whole issue in first place
  - Perhaps need to ask committee to go back to drawing board on this issue
  - Original intent of retitling so strong that puts academic staff in terrible position
- Intention not to pit faculty against academic staff; would like to know what teaching academic staff think
- Regardless of vote, outcome will be incorporated in provost’s response to System; this one of many steps
- Motion would not negate entire report; only speaks to titling, not integration
- Present titling remains a problem because nowhere to advance

VOTE on Motion 37-US-28: Motion PASSED by voice vote of University Faculty

POINT OF INFORMATION: Actions that Senate takes today will be noted in report to System; included will be that faculty do not support the revised titles

Motion 37-US-29
- Moved by Senator Leutwiler and seconded to reconsider the full Senate vote on rescinding the motion endorsing the draft IRAS titling revisions

Discussion
- Any motion passed at this meeting can be moved and reconsidered at this meeting
- Seems information presented since took that full Senate vote for rescinding may make a difference

POINT OF ORDER: Mover must have voted on prevailing side of original motion. Motion 37-US-29 out of order

Motion 37-US-30
- Moved by Senator La Salle and seconded to reconsider the full Senate vote on rescinding the motion endorsing the draft IRAS titling revisions
Discussion
- Motion only about titling, would not be rescinding support for integration since not part of original motion
- Not voting last time does not mean could not vote this time

VOTE on Motion 37-US-30: Motion PASSED by voice vote

Reconsideration of Motion 37-US-27
Motion by Senator Wick and seconded to rescind the resolution (passed March 27, 2001) endorsing the new instructional and research Academic Staff titles as stated in the final report of the System Working Group on Instructional and Research Academic Staff dated March 16, 2001

Discussion
- Original motion only about titling; not opposed to entire report
- Titles add to confusion, in favor of rescinding motion
- Lecturer series of titles apparently has more levels than we actually use, including distinguished lecturer
  - Could use these levels, and have instructor levels so teaching academic staff would feel have lots of levels that could actually be attained
  - One of complaints is if become a senior lecturer after five years, never go anywhere after that even if here 15 or 20 years
  - Can imagine other possibilities

VOTE on Motion 37-US-27: Motion PASSED by voice vote of full University Senate

Motion 37-US-31
Moved by Senator Lozar and seconded that the University Senate encourages UW-System to continue to work with the institutions to reach a mutually agreeable titling structure for Instructional Academic Staff

Discussion – None

VOTE on Motion 37-US-31: Motion PASSED by voice vote of full University Senate

6. Committee Reports

Without objection, agenda reordered to take on most urgent issues first

- Academic Staff Personnel Committee – Senator Wilcox

Motion 37-AS-02
Moved and seconded by Academic Staff Personnel Committee (9-0-0) that the University Senate endorse and the UW-Eau Claire administration support the report and recommendations of the integration subgroup as stated in the report titled Instructional and Research Academic Staff Working Group – Report to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs – March 16, 2001

Discussion
- Simply to endorse integration portion of report

VOTE on Motion 37-AS-02: Motion PASSED by voice vote of University Senate

- Executive Committee – Chair Harrison

Report on Mission Statement Revisions – Senator Gapko
- Revision of mission statement recommended by University Planning Committee and brought to Executive Committee
- Proposed to update and emphasize strengths and distinctions of UW-Eau Claire
- Executive Committee discussed editorial changes to statement
- Felt changed format reads better and provides more information about our mission
Motion 37-SE-06
Moved and seconded by Executive Committee (13-0) that the proposed changes to the Select Mission of the University of Wisconsin – Eau Claire be accepted

Discussion
- Second and third paragraphs don’t seem like mission statements, seem like advertisements
- See second and third paragraphs more like preamble rather than mission
  - Mission would be the four bullets
  - Could move first paragraph to right before bullets and start with paragraphs two and three
  - Editorial change accepted by Committee; made without objection
  - Helpful clarification addressing above concerns
- Wondering about rationale for word immediate in last bullet
  - Some discussion in Planning Committee about region meaning Midwest vs. immediate service region, area of public interaction with university
  - Problem with interpretation down road
    - Could potentially impact financial or professional support university provides for faculty or others conducting research, developing programs, doing inservice, or other types of collaborative, consultative activities beyond immediate region
    - Have heard talk of refiguring missions: leaving Madison and Milwaukee with more global mission and targeting local universities with more limited mission

Amendment 37-SE-06-a1
Moved by Senator Mack and seconded to remove the word immediate in the fourth bullet

Discussion
- Speaking against, just means are going to concentrate here, doesn’t limit
  - Boundaries are limitless, but focus is local
- Support amendment considering interest in online education and borderless, regionless reach
- Amendment amended by mover to delete words of the immediate region and the the before cultural; accepted by seconder
- Do not understand what that would mean
- Removing of the immediate region completely changes meaning of that part of mission
  - Are considered a regional comprehensive university; should have as part of mission some responsibility to that region
  - In sympathy with motivation; but to develop is a transitive verb that requires an object; just took that out
- Support deleting immediate, leaving in region; we are, in fact, a regional university

VOTE on Amendment 37-SE-06-a1: Amendment DEFEATED by voice vote

Amendment 37-SE-06-a2
Moved by Senator Drucker and seconded that phrase before bullets “The University provides:” be deleted and the four bullets start with:
- To provide …;
- To provide …;
- To support and encourage …; and
- To support cultural …

Discussion
- Minimizes wordiness
- Urge Senate not to act as copy editors on document
  - Just approve content and give it to administration to clean up
  - Things do not always turn out well when written by committee
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- Do favor amendment; cleans it up and is helpful

**VOTE on Amendment 37-SE-06-a2:** Amendment PASSED by voice vote

Continued discussion on main motion
- See inclusion of community service as part of experiential learning in paragraph on University’s focus as way of putting Service Learning into mission statement
  - Disagree with rushing through something including community service when will be discussing next year
  - Good that include faculty/student research collaboration
- Issue discussed was Service Learning; however, community service includes more than that
  - Volunteer Program has been around since 1977
  - Huge amount of emphasis on student, faculty, and staff volunteering that goes beyond range of Service Learning and existed long before Service Learning
- When see community service, see whole picture, not just Service Learning
- Faculty/student research not required for graduation, so this does not mean community service is, just saying people do it here
- Fourth bulleted item says including outreach and community service programs
  - Paragraph above interpreted as Service Learning
  - Service in mission twice, don’t think that is coincidence
  - Think it is here to try to shape discussion on Service Learning

**Amendment 37-SE-06-a3**
Moved by Senator Syverson and seconded **that the second paragraph read, “The University’s focus is a liberal arts based education across the curriculum in all programs. The University also places a special emphasis on experiential learning, such as international studies and faculty/student research collaboration.”**

Discussion
- Suggestion to combine the first two sentences accepted as friendly amendment
  **Combined with the University’s focus on a liberal arts based education, the University places a special emphasis on experiential learning, such as international studies and faculty/student research collaboration.**

POINT OF ORDER: Still a quorum

Continued discussion
- Do not oppose change in language; against removing community service
  - Students participating in plays or musical events, which are experiential learning, provide service to community
  - Think reading too much into that
- Another suggestion: **“The University’s focus is a liberal arts based education across the curriculum in all programs. The University also places a special emphasis on experiential learning, such as international studies, and faculty/student research collaboration.”**
  - Accepted as friendly amendment; more concerned about content issue
  - Agree community service in that paragraph partially motivated by desire to make sure Service Learning has life on campus
  - Community service would still remain in fourth bullet; would not support removing it entirely
  - Delaying motion would negate possibility of presenting new mission at Board of Regents meeting held here on campus in October
  - Could still present to regents at another time
  - Need three or four months minimum for change process
- Experiential learning has very specific meaning; would not seem to include international studies
  - Recommend: The University also places a special emphasis on experiential learning, international studies, and faculty/student research collaboration

POINT OF INFORMATION: Nothing else on agenda has to be done today
Motion 37-US-32
Moved by Senator Langer and seconded to postpone action on this motion at point of amendment until fall

VOTE on Motion 37-US-32: Motion PASSED by vote of 18 for, 9 against

TEXT OF MOTION AS AMENDED

Select Mission of the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire

The University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire is a comprehensive university whose purpose is to foster the intellectual, personal, and social, **and cultural growth and** development of its students. The University provides an academic environment designed to encourage faculty-student interaction and promote excellence in teaching **and** learning, scholarly activity, and public service. **Its residential setting fosters personal and social development through a rich array of co-curricular activities.**

The University’s focus is a liberal arts based education across the curriculum in all programs. The University also places a special emphasis on experiential learning, including community service, international studies, and faculty/student research collaboration. UW-Eau Claire is the University of Wisconsin System’s Center of Excellence for Faculty and Undergraduate Student Research Collaboration.

In addition to the **University of Wisconsin System Mission** and the **Core Missions of the University Cluster Institutions**, the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire has the following select mission:

- (a) The University **To** provide undergraduate education in a broad range of programs, based on a strong general education component emphasizing the liberal arts and sciences, with degrees in the arts and sciences, allied health fields, business, education, nursing, and other areas which **that** grow clearly from undergraduate strengths and meet identified **identifiable** regional and state needs;
- (b) The University **To** provide graduate education, at the master’s and specialist levels, in programs which **that** grow clearly from areas of undergraduate strengths, and meet identifiable regional and state needs;
- (c) The University expects **To support and encourage** scholarly activity, including research, scholarship, and creative endeavor, that **supports enhances** its programs at the associate and baccalaureate level, its selected graduate programs, and its special mission; and
- (d) The University provides outreach and community service programs which foster **To support** cultural, educational, and economic development of the **immediate region** in a variety of ways, including its **outreach and community service programs.**

TEXT OF CURRENT AMENDMENT ON FLOOR
Second paragraph: The University’s focus is a liberal arts based education across the curriculum in all programs. The University also places a special emphasis on experiential learning, such as international studies, and faculty/student research collaboration.

Meeting adjourned at 5:14 p.m. without objection.

Respectfully submitted by,

Wanda Schubiner
Secretary to the University Senate