Members Present:


Members Absent:

Randy Beger, Bruce Dybvik, Marc Goulet, Betty Hanson, Jeannie Harms, Sean Hartnett, Gretchen Hutterli, Tim Lane, Rick Mickelson, Ronald Satz, Nola Schmitt, Mehdi Sheikholeslami, Cecilia Wendler, Karen Woodward

Guests:

Mark Clark, Bernard Duyfhuizen, Jan Larson, Kay Magadance, Andrew Phillips, Sarah Schuh, Andrew Soll, Spectator Staff Reporter, Ted Wendt

The regular meeting of University Senate was called to order by Chair Harrison at 3:04 p.m., Tuesday, October 9, 2001 in the Tamarack Room of Davies Center.

1. Minutes of September 11, 2001 meeting of University Senate approved with spelling correction
   - Under Academic Staff Representative Report – Olein changed to Olien

Minutes of August 20, 2001 meeting of University Faculty and University Academic Staff approved as distributed

2. Chancellor’s Remarks – Chancellor Mash
   - In month since September 11th, campus felt reverberation from tragedies
     - Lots of discussion, conversation; overall campus responded well
     - University is special place to make sense of things beyond comprehension and figure out right thing to do
       - What do best is become forum, listen, learn, teach
     - Have had comments and discussion related to speakers and issues
       - Some felt forum speaker Helen Caldicott should not have been allowed to speak on night of September 11th
       - Some feel forum speaker Palestinian scholar Naseer Aruri should not speak on November 12th
     - University needs to be place where reflection, conversation, and thinking can occur; will continue to offer forums
     - Will continue growing international education program here
       - Sent letter opposing legislation sponsored by Senator Dianne Feinstein from California that would freeze all student visas for six months
       - Now more than ever, need to be extending conversation on campus, off campus, and abroad
   - When Board of Regents here this past week, we presented our marks of excellence
     - Such things as collaborative research, international education, experiential learning, and service-learning
     - Terrific response from Regents; believe every regent left here feeling this is a very special campus
Pay plan
- Information in University Bulletin; also every faculty person and every academic staff member will receive letter laying out what we now know about pay plan
- Some dates
  - November 26th – date authorized to send salary letters to all faculty and academic staff
  - December 1st – checks will reflect increase from 3.2% pay plan approved for this year
  - December 12th – checks bringing pay up-to-date retroactive to beginning of contract
- Can reasonably say 3.2% pay plan increase is okay given deterioration of fiscal climate exacerbated significantly by events of September 11th
  - Actions in couple weeks prior to Joint Committee decision key to attaining that increase
  - Letters from faculty, academic staff, chancellors, and System important
- Turned out state really did back off of its support, with 3.2% of first year coming entirely from tuition increases and only 1% of phased in 4.2% in second year coming from GPR
- Mirror image of prior biennium when got 5.2% from GPR with tuition frozen in second year
- Only pattern here is every time we go after a pay plan, particularly if necessarily ambitious one, will continue to be a challenge
- Concerns from floor
  - Two powerful committees meet in nearly back-to-back sessions giving us absolutely no input in these decisions
  - University Senate Executive Committee represented us on this issue in support of 3.2% pay raise, followed by 4.2%
- Response from chancellor
  - University Senate, as well as university community, continue to push for best pay plan possible
  - Effort on part of faculty, academic staff, chancellors, and System caused governor to change what planning to do – could have been much worse because of power of governor’s veto
  - This is reasonable pay plan that was needed as part of continual push to bring us to at least average of peer group
- Additional concerns from floor
  - Why System did not continue to argue for 4.2% - students agreed to raise tuition for salary increases and now state decided not to support students’ efforts
  - Feel disvalued by State of Wisconsin; trying to put on happy face not helping at all
  - Do you believe after these two years, we will be equal to our peer institutions?
- Response from chancellor
  - Are some differences within UW-System because Madison and Milwaukee use different peer groups; comprehensives are farther behind
  - Chancellors have already begun talking with System about 2003-2005 budget request favoring comprehensives because have more catching up to do
- This weekend Parents’ Weekend; next weekend Homecoming
  - Attempting to encourage more alumni to return during Homecoming by scheduling of Foundation Annual Meeting, department advisory groups luncheon, and lot of different activities to create real interest in coming back to campus
  - All ought to consider taking in Homecoming activities – makes folks returning feel as though they are investing time wisely in work they do to support university
- Comment from floor
  - Board of Regents met here, but taking 30th Anniversary Celebration to another campus within one week doesn’t say much for their commitment to comprehensives
- Response from chancellor
  - 30 years ago this year, two systems in Wisconsin merged into University of Wisconsin System
  - Celebration scheduled Thursday night in Milwaukee – may be way to generate more publicity and attention since Milwaukee state’s largest city

3. Chair’s Report – Chair Harrison
- Executive Committee passed resolution and sent letters urging members of Joint Committee on Employee Relations to support proposed pay plan
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* Senator Black from JCOER responded he would have preferred 4.2% each year, however, university leaders urged support for slightly reduced plan because they were convinced it was as good as possible under current circumstances
* Executive Committee vote followed two emergency teleconferences (one with President Lyall) that were held last Tuesday
* System believed support necessary or worse possibilities might arise

**Comments from floor**
- Don’t think was need for Executive Committee to send encouragement to them; think we were misrepresented; think we should take it back
- Just came out of period of tremendous growth, probably best years Wisconsin has ever or may ever see
  - During that time, fell further and further behind peer groups
  - Don’t see much hope that state will play catch-up in bad times, when wouldn’t during good times
- Emergency phone conversation academic staff representative had with David Olien, Chuck McConnell and George Brooks leads to believe 3.2% and 4.2% probably best could hope for because worse things could have happened
  - Like decoupling faculty and academic staff or reduction to 1 to 2%
  - Do not see decoupling as empty threat – was on table at one time
  - At some point need to stand up and say enough is enough, we simply want fair representation

**Student Senate last night discussed changes to GE requirements proposed by task force; will be discussed in APC in next few weeks**

- In general, students supported changes, but did recommend increasing number of required subcategories from two to three in social sciences and humanities

4. Academic Staff Representative Report – Senator Wilcox
* Issues have been pay plan and instructional and research academic staff study and report
* In light of issues resulting from pay plan, and misunderstanding regarding academic staff function in higher education, included Academic Staff Briefing Book with report
* Next meeting in Madison on October 18th

5. Reports of Committees

**Executive Committee – Chair Harrison**
- Updated on procedures allowing for groups of faculty, academic staff or classified staff not affiliated with a department or unit, to become recognized on campus
  - Makes possible use of facilities without rental fee
  - Contact Vice Chancellor of Business and Student Services to request application
- Committee discussed request from Faculty Personnel Committee for exemption to requirement committee chairs be senators – resulted in motion coming forth later today
- Committee in closed session provided consultation to Assistant Vice Chancellor Lind on appointments to University Research and Creative Activity Council and Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee, to Chancellor Mash on appointments to University Planning Committee, and to Provost Satz on appointments to Service-Learning Advisory Committee
- Vote on letter sent to JCOER was unanimous

**Faculty Personnel Committee – Senator Wick**
- Item referred to committee regarding what is fair to disclose to other people during evaluation process
- Potential rewriting of faculty section of personnel rules
- Elected nonsenator chair

**Academic Staff Personnel Committee – Senator Wilcox**
- Resurrected and sent forward motion that died with end of session last year on salary recommendation timing
- Updating language in handbook – some requiring action of full Senate; some simply keeping up with administrative changes
- Assisting administration with report and initiatives on instructional and research academic staff report
  - Continuing instructional academic staff ad hoc committee
  - Brown bag on October 25th for instructional academic staff because many hired after orientation at start of year
- Committee meeting October 10, 2001
To discuss makeup of Academic Staff Personnel Committee and language used to refer to nonteaching academic staff

 Academic Policies Committee – Senator Lozar

- In Spring of 1999, Senate approved allowing students in University Honors Program to replace one of honors electives with AP course if test score was 4 or 5
- Partly retention issue because potential of losing some of best students to programs that do allow
- Partly resource issue as use of these courses could result in fewer sections of honors electives
- Senate required follow-up in two years because of concern about possible effect on quality of honors program
- Report from Honors Program Director Mickel and committee discussion seemed to indicate working well
- Committee requested additional report in four years as follow group of students through program
- Held discussions during past couple meetings on recommendations of GE Work Group
  - Encourage attendance and participation in APC meetings
  - Want to get as many opinions as possible on this very major issue
- Next meeting October 16, 2001

 Physical Plant Planning Committee – Senator Stuettgen

- Updated regarding status of riverbank stabilization project – on hold pending review by DNR
- Safety issues in progress
  - City decreased, by one space, parking on south side of Water Street at intersection with Second Avenue
  - Pedestrian safety during project in front of Hibbard Hall
- Next meeting October 18, 2001
- Items identified for future agendas
  - Long-range facilities usage plan
  - Further pedestrian safety issues
  - Transportation and parking concerns
  - Learning more about energy consumption, conservation, and recycling efforts on campus

 Budget Committee – Senator Carpenter

- Met and discussed committee role in establishing guidelines for planning reserve as well as approving base budget allocations and reallocations
- To meet in early November to review 2002 fiscal year budget status and begin to address decisions for 2003
- Several items identified likely to impact budgeting as go through planning process
  1) Not clear what our piece of systemwide $11 million utilities shortfall will be
  2) Where estimated $132,000 cost for paying first six months health care coverage to come from
  3) Paying for memberships such as accrediting agencies and special associations in light of emphasis on reducing those costs at system level (likely to approximate $20,000)
  4) Cost of WisNet fees and other technological hookup fees going up exponentially; costs now at $300,000 for campus, could go up to $600,000 or $700,000, although measures being taken to reduce
  5) Increased budget demands due to recruitment, start-up, and health care costs resulting from anticipated increase in retirements
  6) Technology issues, such as network access fees and Microsoft contract; current pricing structure will not be renewed
- Intend to meet more frequently this year to invite people in to talk about these and other issues

 Compensation Committee – Senator Wick

- Approved Recommended 2002-2003 Salary Plan; coming up on next Senate agenda
- Meet again Friday, October 19, 2001
- To talk about
  - Potential equity policies
  - Alternative pay plan policies
  - Start process for comprehensive salary plan for 2003-2004

 Nominating Committee – Senator Spaeth

- Senator Wendler elected chair; oriented members
- No scheduled meeting
Technology Committee – Senator Lang
- Elected Richard Ryberg and Marcia Bollinger to ITAC
- Next meeting October 16, 2001
  - Associate Vice Chancellor Dwyer and Director of Computing and Networking Services and Media Development Lowe to bring up to date on progress made this summer toward university IT goals
  - Discussion of draft software and hardware rotation plans

6. Election for University Academic Staff Nominating Committee Vacancy
- Nominations previously announced to greater University Academic Staff
- If no nominations from floor, election today; if nominations from floor, election to be held next meeting
- Nominations for University Academic Staff Nominating Committee
  - Janet Quarderer – Computer Science
  - Sharon Westphal – Psychology
- No additional nominations from floor

Elected to University Academic Staff Nominating Committee: Sharon Westphal

7. Miscellaneous Business
- At first meeting of year, order of business established
  - Report on motion will be discussed during first reading
    - Would include ideas discussed in committee, pros, cons, and history
  - At second reading (next meeting)
    - Would entertain official motion, hold debate, and vote
  - Two-step process gives senators more time to talk to constituents

Executive Committee
38-SE-01- RS (rules suspension) – Moved by Senator Pitts and seconded that rules be suspended to allow second reading, debate, and vote on motion today – Rules suspension PASSES 39-11
Motion 38-SE-01
Moved and seconded by Executive Committee (13-1-0) that a one-time exception to the rule requiring chairs of Senate Committees to be senators be granted for the University Senate Faculty Personnel Committee thus allowing a nonsenator to chair that committee for one year

Debate
- Committee has individual who has been a senator, familiar with Senate operations, with interest and time to lead committee; other senators on committee, because of other commitments, don’t have time to give
- Senator Wick, as member of committee, willing to give report at each Senate meeting to alleviate concern that no one here to give report

Amendment 38-SE-01-a1
Moved by Senator Pitts and seconded to require the chair of this committee or his/her designee to provide reports to the Senate at the University Senate meetings

Vote on Amendment 38-SE-01-a1: Amendment PASSED

Continued Debate on Main Motion:
- Support motion; urge others to vote in favor
  - Chaired Faculty Personnel Committee; is daunting task
  - If someone willing to take it on, use their expertise
- Favor requiring chairs to be senators, but this exception appropriate
- Particular committee made up of both senators and members elected at-large by full University Faculty
  - When committees just, or mostly, senators, not as much of problem
  - This member is elected member of committee

Vote on Motion 38-SE-01: Motion PASSED by two-thirds majority

Discussion of Order of Business:
- Seems more efficient to have debate at first meeting and at second meeting would just vote
  - Then have chance to talk to colleagues about what occurred during debate
  - So far, action we took today operated same way we did before; defeating purpose of change
- Once motion brought forward for open debate, must dispose of it in some manner
  - Would have to vote on it, table it, or postpone it
- First reading/second reading accepted so senators could get sense of issue and go back to constituents and think about it; not enough time between getting agenda and meeting to fully understand issue and get input from constituency
- No need to restrict discussion at first reading to clarification; without motion on floor can speak to good or bad (essentially pros and cons), elements within motion, viewpoints on motion, in addition to information and clarification
  - Only thing not allowed would be amendments, although could even suggest amendments that might be made next time
  - Second reading should go quickly unless new information
- Some motions brought before Senate fairly straight-forward
  - Have opportunity to ask questions, then suspend rules to take care of things fairly well agree on
  - Other motions will want to discuss and spend couple weeks talking to constituents
  - Process set in motion this year seems to provide for both
  - If not working to satisfaction, is right of this body to change order of business if desired

Academic Staff Personnel Committee
- No language in handbook to allow time for discussion between academic staff member and department chair/unit director should there be a discrepancy in salary recommendation
- Proposed paragraph would allow that time
- Parallel to language describing process for faculty salary recommendations
Discussion of 38-AS-01
- Faculty procedure may be written this way, but not what practiced
  - Generally get salary recommendations at same time going to dean’s office

38-AS-01-RS – Moved by Senator Schneider and seconded that rules be suspended to allow for second reading, debate, and vote on motion today – Rules suspension PASSED by two-thirds vote

**Motion 38-AS-01**

Moved and seconded by Academic Staff Personnel Committee (9-0-0) that the following paragraph be added to page 5.42 of the Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook. This paragraph would be added after the first paragraph in section titled Salary Recommendations.

The Salary Recommendation for a continuing academic staff member in his or her third and subsequent years of service shall be made to the academic staff member in writing by the Department Chair or Unit Director at least two weeks prior to the transmission of these recommendations to the Dean or Vice/Associate Vice Chancellor. First and second year academic staff will be informed of their salary recommendation after reappointment has been determined.

**Debate**
- Caution that moves time when letter would have to go out to around Christmas Day
  - Faculty and academic staff generally not here then anyway
- If same as for faculty, no additional time requirement here than for faculty
- Depends on when salary recommendations due in any given year
- Concern was that academic staff had no opportunity for discussion with their chair or director; after fact can go back through their chain of command if they have any questions; this would give an opportunity for that discussion to occur before final recommendation sent forward
- Unfortunate all department do not follow rules; should not take away opportunity for academic staff
- If falls on Christmas Day, could get recommendation done earlier
- Part of problem is notification to chair with information for making recommendations does not always come in consistent way
  - Timeline for getting recommendations to next level quite short
- Many academic staff people (since two-thirds nonteaching academic staff) here during that time
- Favor motion because trying to make academic staff rules and guidelines same as for faculty

**Vote on Motion 38-AS-01:** Motion PASSED without dissention by University Academic Staff members of Senate Academic Policies Committee

38-AP-02 – Report on Partial Foreign Language/Foreign Culture Credit – Senator Lozar
- Proposal comes from International Education Advisory Board concerning study abroad programs less than full semester length
  - Question comes up as to what these experiences can be used for
  - Might be used to replace one or two courses in meeting foreign language/foreign culture requirement
- APC recommending such courses be evaluated as meeting either one-third or two-thirds of foreign culture requirement based on degree of contact with the culture

**Discussion of 38-AP-02**
- Support encouragement of students to have these experience of shorter duration, but do see some cons
  - Lot of discussion of simplifying GE and catalogue; this is quite complex and would require interpretation, especially under item B
  - May be in English-speaking country (Canada), but where speak French (Quebec)
  - Question cost/benefit of this; cost of implementing this with significant budget challenges
  - Don’t see implementation plan – Registrar’s Office, deans’ offices?
- Criteria would not be listed in catalogue
- APC has been delegated responsibility to approve new study-abroad programs according to specific criteria
- Motion extends that responsibility to also approve programs of less than a semester duration
• Criteria would be used by International Education Advisory Board to estimate value of programs in terms of foreign culture requirement
• APC would then use same criteria to endorse foreign culture credit for that program or not
• Cost of implementing programs would be same as cost of implementing any other study-abroad program
• Director of International Education contacts these places; students bear cost of participating
• Questioning cost of managing record keeping, paperwork, and administrative costs
• Once programs established, would be listed in catalogue as satisfying so-many credits of foreign language/foreign culture requirement
• Intention that three-week experiences happen over Winterim; others would have to be in summer
• If listed in catalogue, may not be as much imposition on advisors as initially thought
• Whether or not in catalogue, certainly contributes to complexity of our system
• Still would like to be able to advise students in direct and concise manner as to why courses are worth one-third vs. two-thirds of requirement
• Support this as beginning point of discussion; would add couple considerations
  1) English-speaking countries can be clearly different in terms of their culture – would encourage inclusion
  2) Lot of these appear to be procedural or contact considerations, does that mean if same instructor brought here, it would be foreign culture experience – may need to introduce content-related considerations
• All proposals here are for canned programs with agreements made between this university and other institutions; it would be more complicated if individuals allowed to design their own experience
• Could possibly get credit for even these experiences by working with adviser, department chair, etc.
• Favor motion as opening door for international studies to students who might not take advantage or be able to go away for entire semester
• Faculty would not have to master this to advise students
• Defeating motion would discourage such programs
• Student going away for three weeks would be spending more time talking, listening, living, and experiencing other culture than required for three or six credits here; great idea to keep up reputation for study abroad
• Currently have nursing course for credit in Costa Rica; to clarify, this is matter of whether course would also meet part of foreign language/foreign culture requirement
• Half semester courses not covered in proposal forwarded from advisory board

Debate and vote on Motion to take place at next meeting – duplicates of report and motion will not be distributed

POINT OF INFORMATION: New Business covered under heading Miscellaneous Business, stated that way to conform to open meetings law and attorney general opinion

Motion 38-US-09:
Moved by Senator Pitts and seconded that the University Senate issue a letter to the State of Wisconsin Joint Committee on Employee Relations expressing displeasure at the recent 3.2%/4.2% pay raise, expressly the reduction of the pay plan to 3.2% in the initial year of the biennial budget

Debate:
• Point is not to embarrass anyone; just fair that every faculty and academic staff member here be able to communicate with JCOER about actions
• Lost about 25% of pay raise in first year and then said okay
• Intent to sample faculty to see if agreed with University Senate Executive Committee in their response to Joint Committee on Employee Relations

Motion 38-US-10:
Moved by Senator Mac Briar and seconded that this motion be postponed to the next meeting so we can have the discussion with our constituents before we vote

Discussion:
• Text of motion would go out in minutes

Vote on Motion 38-US-10: Motion PASSED without dissention
8. Announcements
   - Senate sponsored open discussion on governance and organization and structure of University Senate and Committees on Tuesday, October 30, 2001
     - Forward questions you would like distributed to help guide that discussion
     - Should Senate structure and use of shared governance on campus be changed?

**Motion 38-US-11:**
   Moved by Senator Wagener and seconded that in future meetings, announcements be moved to immediately before reports of committees

Discussion:
   - In current position, announcements quite often play to empty room

**Vote on Motion 38-US-11:** Motion PASSED

Announcements Continued:
   - Next meeting on October 23, 2001
   - Select mission of UW-Eau Claire to be revisited by University Planning Committee using Senate comments; edited version will come back through Senate

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

Wanda Schulner
Secretary to the University Senate