The regular meeting of University Senate was called to order by Chair Harrison at 3:06 p.m., Tuesday, October 23, 2001 in the Tamarack Room of Davies Center.

1. Minutes of October 9, 2001 meeting of University Senate approved with one correction
   \* NovemberSeptember 11th in Chancellor’s Remarks

2. Chancellor’s Report – Given by Provost Satz
   \* Chancellor Mash not here today because attending symposium as chair of UW-System AODA Task Force
   \* Mailed letter to faculty and academic staff regarding National Collegiate Alcohol Awareness Week
   \* Events in conjunction with Homecoming emphasized getting people on campus
   \* Number of colleges, schools, and departments hosted advisory groups
   \* Luncheon sponsored by UW-Eau Claire Foundation included chancellor, provost and deans presenting university’s marks of excellence and update on external relations and fundraising efforts
   \* UW-Eau Claire Foundation Annual Meeting
     \* Announced most successful year ever; fiscal year ending June 30, 2001 raised around $3.4 million
     \* Introduced new board members from across country; most in attendance
     \* Will be public announcement of fundraising campaign sometime in 2002
   \* Homecoming weekend good
     \* Blugold victory in football; pre-game festivities went very well
     \* Alumni open house attended by 400 individuals
     \* Circle of Excellence dinner
   \* Seventh annual Tunnel of Oppression taking place in Towers Hall
   \* UW-Eau Claire placed third in nation for number of grads passing CPA exam
   \* Forensics team recently won Sugar Loaf Classic for eighth time in row
   \* One of our seniors elected as one of 28 athletes on 2001 Women’s Rugby All-American First Team
   \* 2002 Student Leadership Recognition Awards nominations due February 3, 2002
3. Chair and Faculty Representative Report – Chair Harrison
   ● Next meeting of faculty representatives November 2, 2001
   ● Next Board of Regents meeting November 8 and 9, 2001
   ● No open forum items at Executive Committee

4. Academic Staff Representative Report – Senator Wilcox
   ● Met in Madison on October 18, 2001
     ● Most discussion centered on how universities dealing with recommendations of Instructional and Research
       Academic Staff Report
     ● One representative putting together chart, will include in report when received
     ● Meeting in November will tackle titling issue portion of Instructional and Research Academic Staff Report

5. Announcements
   ● Lost souls encountered Thursday and Friday probably part of 425 daily visitors as result of Wisconsin
     Education Association Convention – please help them find their way
   ● Sculpture purchased with gifts from Charlie Bauer’s retirement now part of sculpture garden adjacent to Haas
     Fine Arts Center; dedicated during Homecoming
   ● Next Senate meeting in three weeks on November 13, 2001
   ● Next week Senate-sponsored open discussion with faculty and academic staff on shared governance and Senate
     organization

6. Reports of Committees
   ● Executive Committee – Chair Harrison
     ● Found first reading/second reading process of last meeting conceptually sound, but somewhat confusing
       ● Consensus reached that first reading include
         ● Report on motion, with time for questions and clarification
         ● Motion on floor for debate
         ● Amendments made, debated and voted upon
         ● Vote on main motion postponed without objection until next meeting, unless rules officially
           suspended
       ● At second reading, debate will resume on main motion, additional amendments introduced, and vote
         on main motion taken
       ● Allows sufficient debate and time to confer and gather information, while following parliamentary
         procedure

Without objection, above procedure will be used during 38th session

   ● Inquiry received about status of additional Hibbard parking spaces approved as part of parking resolution in
     spring of 1997
     ● Discussed events transpiring since parking changes and current situation
     ● Consensus of committee not to pursue these spaces, but note Physical Plant Planning Committee free
       to investigate next time parking under review
   ● Guidelines established for handling requests to bring items to open forum in Executive Committee
     ● Any individual member of university community may attend meetings in person to present open forum
     ● Any member of committee has right to bring item received for open forum forward in name of
       individual during open forum or under miscellaneous business
     ● Open forum items with anonymity will not be accepted
   ● Provost Satz consulted with committee on vacancy in Academic Affairs resulting from resignation of
     Associate Vice Chancellor Dwyer
     ● During last search for Associate Vice Chancellor, two separate positions (chief information officer and
       budget officer) combined for efficiency
     ● Did not prove successful
     ● Current proposal is to search for Assistant Vice Chancellor of Information Technology Management
       and Chief Information Officer and second position of Budget Officer in Academic Affairs
   ● Handbook requires consultation with Executive Committee when administrative changes having
     university-wide effects are contemplated
Question raised at meeting as to whether consultation should take place without specific notice on Executive Committee agenda

To facilitate quick start for search and screen process (particularly for CIO position), Executive Committee, with four noted abstentions, accepted discussion of October 16th as required consultation with item to be placed on Senate agenda as part of this report to allow opportunity for people to speak to issue

During closed session, Associate Dean Shaw heard comments from committee on appointments to student misconduct committees and academic grievance committee

Next meeting November 6, 2001

Responses to questions and comments on report

- Positions in Academic Affairs were held by Bill Smethells as Associate Vice Chancellor for Information Technology and Peggy Gausman as Budget Officer; Tom Miller also Associate Vice Chancellor at that time
- Tom Miller and Bill Smethells returned to classroom; Peggy Gausman moved to College of Arts & Sciences
- Replaced by Steve Tallant as one Associate Vice Chancellor; other positions combined and filled by Associate Vice Chancellor Dwyer
- Determined last spring with directors of ITM and Associate Vice Chancellor Dwyer that CIO responsibilities and budget responsibilities were too much for one individual
- Currently also four positions vacant in ITM, although those not administrative; some may be redirected toward technology and instruction upon recommendations of task force investigating issue
- When all positions filled, will be net loss of administrative positions

Faculty Personnel Committee – Chair Keniston

- Here to give you sense of what committee doing, concerns we know exist, and hear concerns you may have
- Next meeting November 2, 2001
- Currently completing issues from last year
  - Final authority of departmental personnel committees – investigating in terms of state statute, system rules, and Eau Claire policies in preparation for continuing discussion
  - Draft report on workload completed; expect to have final report by end of semester
- Beginning to talk about following issues centering on Chapter 5 of Handbook for possible rewording and consideration
  - Fate of written comments in evaluations of faculty and administrators
  - Rules on membership of Personnel Committees
  - Description and functions of Personnel Committees – lack of mention that Faculty Personnel Committee actually looks at personnel policy

Academic Staff Personnel Committee – Senator Wilcox

- Meet October 24, 2001
- Looking at membership of Academic Staff Personnel Committee (particularly in regard to academic staff with faculty status) and handbook language for references to Nonteaching Academic Staff
- Brown Bag for instructional academic staff on October 25, 2001 will be continuation of orientation to talk about governance, mentoring, professional development opportunities, and what System Instructional and Research Academic Staff Report means for them

Academic Policies Committee – Senator Lozar

- Acted on three proposals today which will come to this body shortly
- October 30, 2001 will meet to consider proposal to revise general education and three counter-proposals

Physical Plant Planning Committee – Senator Wagener

- Meet November 2, 2001

Budget Committee – Senator Carpenter

- Meet first week in November

Compensation Committee – Senator Wick

- Meet November 2, 2001
- Continue discussions on alternative pay plan and equity policies

Nominating Committee – No Report

Technology Committee – Senator Lang
• Met with Jim Lowe, Director of Computing and Networking Services and Media Development, Marion Ritland, and Chip Eckardt to discuss progress toward achieving UW-Eau Claire’s technology goals
  • IT directors putting together Request for Proposal (RFP) to bring in consultants to look at our functionality and make recommendations for where to go from here
  • Passed out three documents (distributed to senators)
    • Draft outline of RFP
    • Questionnaire being distributed to administrative offices to aid editing RFP
    • List of type of information and data systems that will be looked at and contact for each
  • Please share with people in departments and units
    • Concerns about specific functions that we have now and want to keep, or that we don’t have that would facilitate work, should be forwarded to these contacts
    • Or take concerns to college technology committees or Senate Technology Committee
  • Consulting groups will forward proposals including costs for consideration

7. Special Report – Task Force on question of establishing a Learning Technology Development Center (LTDC) – Chair Marty Wood
  • Provost charged task force with identifying services that best meet needs of instructors integrating technology to enhance student learning and to propose organizational structures to provide those services
  • Task force now gathering information and making comparisons among possible organizational structures
  • Will determine broad goals and draft mission statement for such a center and make additional recommendations as we see fit
  • Response to questions and comments from floor
    • Task force composed of three faculty from College of Arts & Sciences, two each from Colleges of Business and Professional Studies, one from Library, and two support staff members (one from CNS, one from MDC); ex officio and staff resource members include directors of CNS and MDC, Library, and Associate Vice Chancellor and Chief Information Officer
    • Task force differs from Technology Committee advisory to Provost because to look at specific topic in depth, report back, and then dissolve
    • Didn’t specifically ask task force to come up with LTDC, but organizational structure to accomplish similar goals with no preconceived notion what that should be
  • Will keep in mind many others, in particular academic staff, use learning technology extensively without specific representation here
  • Senators Wendler and Goulet members of task force so can keep Senate posted
  • At conservative end, task force could conclude all services needed already provided by what we have; at radical end, could decide exact opposite
  • Important to look at issue
    • Last year CITI advisory committee discussed hiring an instructional design specialist, but felt before hire new person was good idea to find out what already here and what to do with it; short of outside consultant this may be best way to accomplish
    • National expert on this kind of center here for professional development activities last fall commented we have all component parts, but not brought together to maximize benefit

8. Unfinished Business

Academic Policies Committee – Second Reading on Partial Foreign Culture Credit
  • To summarize, currently have foreign language/foreign culture credit for full semester study abroad programs
  • Question is whether to accept study abroad programs less than one semester in length for partial credit
  • Motion includes proposal on how to determine percentage of foreign language/foreign culture credits given

Motion 38-AP-02
  Moved and seconded by Academic Policies Committee (9-0-0) that the University Senate approve the proposed policy which defines what percentage of the Foreign Language/Foreign Culture requirement can be met by short-term study abroad programs.

Debate:
• Requirement that students be enrolled at least half-time to be eligible for financial assistance most likely to be satisfied given criteria proposed and university policy that no more than one credit be granted per week

Vote on Motion 38-AP-02: Motion PASSED by University Faculty members of University Senate

TEXT OF MOTION:
Percentage of the Foreign Language/Foreign Culture Requirement
Met by Short-Term Study Abroad Programs

Short-term study abroad programs can meet one-third or two-thirds of the Foreign Language/Foreign Culture requirement, depending on the length of the program and the three cultural immersion criteria listed below.

A) Program Length
1) Programs 1-3 weeks in length can meet 1/3 of the FL/FC requirement if they score 5 points or more on the cultural immersion criteria. A total of 15 points is possible, 5 in each of three categories

2) Programs of 4-6 weeks in length can meet 2/3 of the FL/FC requirement if they score 10 points or more on the cultural immersion criteria, and 1/3 of the FL/FC requirement if they score 5-9 points.

B) Cultural Immersion Criteria
1) Foreign Language: programs earn
1 point if they are in a non-English speaking country, and
1 point if they have some language instruction, but not for credit
1 point for each academic credit of foreign language instruction in the program, for up to 3 additional points

Total points possible: 5

2) Contact with local culture: programs earn
1 point if they have a homestay for part of the program OR
2 points if they have a homestay for the full program
1 point if students do internships or service projects in the community
1 point if excursions give student directed interaction with local people (e.g., organized discussion with a group of local students)
1 point if classmates are from countries other than the U.S.

Total points possible: 5

3) Instruction by faculty from host country: programs earn
1 point if local faculty give lectures in course taught by our faculty
3 points if half of courses are taught for academic credit by local faculty
5 points if local faculty teach all courses

Total points possible: 5

Motion from Floor of Senate postponed from meeting of October 9, 2001

Motion 38-US-09
Motion amended by Mover Senator Pitts (accepted by seconder) to read the University of Wisconsin – Eau Claire University Senate is opposed to the recent reduction of the pay increase from 4.2% to 3.2% in the first year of the biennium which was recommended by the Joint Committee on Employee Relations of the Wisconsin Legislature.

Debate
• Motion not directed anywhere; not threatening, just expresses opinion
• Feel even 3.2% pay increase is misrepresented – if follow regent guidelines receive about two-thirds of that because have to account for merit plan
● Not new issue – public has sense that if 5.2% increase, that all get 5.2%; really get body of money reflecting
that 5.2% increase that is distributed based on compensation plan – some get significantly less, some more
● Don’t see this motion as actually addressing that issue
● President of System publicly saying this good pay plan allows us to draw and retain faculty and staff of quality
is misleading especially after assurances they would fight for 4.2%
● Social security increases of 2.5% this year and 3.5% next year significantly higher than 2.12 and 2.81 of solid
performance figures for university
● Favor motion and would like to see it sent off campus after receiving personally Xeroxed letter from governor
stating he is excited
  ● About future of UW-System schools maintained with his support of economic stimulus package
  ● And state-provided resources enabling System to retain and attract top-notch faculty and academic staff in
every field and every classroom
● Support motion – have group of people here committed and loyal to educational process being abused; our
integrity based upon ability to say we are being abused
  ● Have legislature that doesn’t get work done on time
  ● Ill-advised giveback of money in time of surplus; that money now gone
  ● Have suggested “dean-for-a-day-program” to chancellor to take advantage of system policy of paying 82%
of administrative salary when administrators return to classroom
  ● Unions of state can settle on our backs because we did not cost state one extra cent this year
● In telephone conference call, President Lyall indicated important to thank legislators and JCOER; that is
impression put forth by System rather than we object
● See governor’s letter as wonderful insult suggesting state has done something for us when in fact it was
students; think motion kind of weak
● To clarify, state has withdrawn GPR-funded 1% increase leaving 3.2% increase financed by tuition; in second
year GPR funds reduced from 2% to 1%, student portion remains, reduction being financed by phase in of
increase
● One of main reasons cited for reduction is economy simmering down; we are one of growth agents of that
economy, so should emphasize higher education to keep economy growing
● Would like to thank students for pay raise

Vote on Motion 38-US-09: Motion PASSED. Statement on record

9. Miscellaneous Business

Compensation Committee
● Compensation Committee recommends making only relatively minor changes to existing pay plan policies

Comments and Response to questions from floor
● People getting promoted to professor last year received $1100 less than proposing this year
● Worked almost entire last year to develop comprehensive pay plan that would unify current alternative pay
plans and standard plan under one set of policies and procedures
  ● Were unsuccessful in coming to conclusion on that, but continuing those discussions
● Revisions include increased salary adjustment for promotion, increased salary minima to reflect recent pay plan
 increases, reduction of table to reflect only actual 4.2% increase, and end section describing two-part phase-in
● Amounts under merits in Non-Teaching Academic Staff Funds are relative portions of pay plan from which will
distribute one extra merit award, two extra merit awards, or three extra merit awards
● Explicitly stated at System Compensation Committee meeting that 1/3, 1/3, 1/3 UW-System policy regarding
distribution of pay plan dollars did not allow across-the-board increases
  ● Could, like other institutions in state, get around 1/3, 1/3, 1/3 rule by saying everyone will be evaluated on
10-point scale and everyone gets a 10
● Have not done on this campus because committee and faculty at large, when surveyed, not interested in doing
that way
● Chapter 37 faculty (joined in at merger with numbers dwindling) by state statute assigned Associate Professor
rank and forbidden from promotion to higher ranks, so explicitly excluded from receiving promotion dollars
Compensation Committee discussed issue, but felt uncomfortable recommending a promotion increase associated with some other mechanism because of personnel-related matters with unclear answers and establishing precedent awarding promotion dollars when promotions not given.

Faculty person receiving solid performance would get approximately 1.4% in July and 1.4% in January, which would not even total 2.8%, really like 2.1% over course of entire year; serious difference here.

Some on Compensation Committee would be reluctant to turn reins over to someone external to this university, say to System, or ask them to hire a professional to do it even though takes work and resources this way.

Salary minima increased by two-thirds of last two pay plans – seems like larger jump than really is because didn’t do it for one year; applied same increment formula to both faculty and teaching academic staff.

Letting number of extra-meritorious performers dictate amount of award rather than letting amount of award dictate number of extra-meritorious performers has been discussed by committee for long time.

- Surveys, until recently, indicated faculty/staff would prefer fixed dollar amount
- Believed they understand as size of bucket shrinks, fewer of those awards given out
- Latest survey suggests may be tendency now toward embracing variable amount
- Trying to build that into overall model of comprehensive pay plan

Strongly recommend getting wording for suggested changes in prior to meeting in three weeks rather than trying to create something when it comes to floor.

First three paragraphs of pay plan on promotion, educational attainment, and salary minimum do not come out of pay plan but out of university budget even though included in pay plan.

Salary adjustment for promotion significantly raised over last few of years.

- Rationale is to address compression as people move through ranks
- Idea is to give large enough increment to move them away from starting salaries
- This one of few opportunities to make significant impact on salaries after hire
- Practice does, however, worsen compression for those already at full rank or grade
- To address that, looking at associating salary increase with post-tenure review
  - Also a possibility to address concerns raised by Chapter 37 faculty

Difference this year between people recommended vs. receiving extra-merit will be approximately 25% - same as difference between 4.2% and 3.2% because originally modeled based on 4.2% increase.

Are not currently quotas for extra-merit recommendations but targets based on size of bucket; supervisors generally sensitive to remaining near target for morale reasons.

If everyone recommended shared in bucket for awards, would probably not be precipitous drop because not everyone recommended.

Perhaps if changed model, vast majority would be recommended and would be more dramatic decrease in amount of merit award.

Surveys have supported fixed dollar amounts for merit awards over past few years.

- Want to be sure if get extra merit this year, it would be similar to someone who got it last year or will get next year
- Changed amounts for nonteaching academic staff to $400, $800, and $1200 because beginning pot was smaller than that for faculty, so fewer individuals getting merit awards when amount set at $650 – now match faculty in that 2/3 of staff recognized annually

Even though increases to salary minima funded from base, being phased in gives opportunity to adjust budgets more gradually.

Recommendation that salary increase be phased in came from JCOER.

- Phase-in is result of state decrease of GPR funding from 2% to 1% in second year
- Because of phase-in savings, base salaries at end of second year will be increased by 4.2%

Flexible merit amounts depending on number of recommendations could lead to watered-down criteria.

Compression and longevity components are formula driven and so no request necessary; equity must be requested by individual.

Motion 38-CP-01
Moved and seconded by the Compensation Committee (6-0-0) to recommend that the 2001-2002 UW-Eau Claire Salary Plan be revised as shown and submitted to the Chancellor as the recommended 2002-2003 Salary Plan.

Without objection rest of debate on motion postponed until next Senate meeting.
Technology Committee
38-TC-01 – *Report on Software Transition* – Senator Lang

- Issue dates back to last spring; were rumors of immanent transfer to *PeopleSoft* accompanied by concern about cost and functionality

- As committee spoke last spring with IT directors and Associate Vice Chancellor Dwyer became clear that at some point would have to transfer because of need to interface with UW-System software and also the nature of technology – software and hardware change and simply can’t stay with one forever

  - Two issues concerned committee
  - Functionality – homegrown system does wonderful things we rely on daily; don’t want to lose that
  - Cost – any change will have cost in dollars and positions, precipitous changes without research can have very large costs

- Committee convinced late last spring that best to bring in external consultant to explore costs before making change

- Wanted to recommendation that and wanted to give administration time to identify right person

- Sent attached memo May 15, 2001 to Associate Vice Chancellor Dwyer and now asking you to vote in support of that recommendation

- RFP for consultant passed out with committee report indicates administration moving on this recommendation

Discussion

- Would hope consultant engages in interviews with primary users and administrators, meaning faculty and academic staff

- Assume will attempt to get qualified and independent consultant

- Cost of consultant won’t be known until proposals come in; at that time will look at price, specific proposal, what System might be offering, and what best fits needs

- According to Provost Satz, will not be doing if proposals come in at half million dollars; want to determine whatever money is spent is going to be spent effectively

  - Looking at combination of dollars that would not take away from academic programs

  - Should view as part of planning process; allows analysis up front before taking steps

*Without objection, will hear motion and vote on it at next meeting*

Meeting adjourned at 4:59 p.m. without objection

Wanda Schulner
Secretary to the University Senate