Members Present:


Members Absent:

Randy Beger, Marcia Bollinger, Jack Bushnell, Joel Duncan, Bruce Dybvik, Betty Hanson, Sean Hartnett, Gretchen Hutterli, Barbara Mac Briar, Vicki Reed, Richard Ryberg, Nick Smiar, Roger Tlusty, Karen Welch, Karen Woodward, Rebecca Wurzer, Steve Zantow

Guests:


The regular meeting of University Senate was called to order by Chair Harrison at 3:04 p.m. Tuesday, February 26, 2002 in the Tamarack Room of Davies Center.

1. Without objection, minutes of January 22, 2002 meeting of University Senate approved as corrected
   - Page 5, under Executive Committee Report on Change References to Academic Staff, first bullet
     - Category Academic Staff as Teaching Academic Staff and Category Academic Staff as Nonteaching

2. Chancellor’s Remarks – Chancellor Mash
   - Budget for current year and next
     - Talk more about process and keeping lines of communication open than about specifics because don’t have specifics yet
     - Since few things mentioned at meeting of January 22, 2002, have learned little more
     - Lot of speculation floating around – small stuff being talked about as though it is salvation to large budget issue
     - Will continue to supply regular information and updates in University Bulletin
     - If governor’s budget reform proposal passed as submitted, would mean $500,000 reduction this year and $940,000 next
       - Much speculation at this point that changes will be made during legislative process
       - Currently planning on level of reduction of governor’s proposal, but also looking beyond in case ends up worse
       - Process involves deans, chairs, unit heads, and Senate Budget Committee
     - Now talking to area legislators about key issues
       - How we would be impacted
       - Importance of quick decision-making process
       - Importance of governor’s proposal with regard to tuition increase for next year
Making clear to legislators that budget reduction of the size being discussed on top of a tuition freeze for next year would be devastating
Tuition freeze of prior biennium was back-filled with state dollars
Tuition freeze next year does nothing to help with state’s deficit but doubles size of budget reduction on campus
Tuition increase largely funding pay plan both this year and next; not insignificant issue

UW-System resisting talk that if municipalities and others must make bigger reductions or freeze hiring, university should do that as well
Talking directly to governor and legislators about that
Based on what now know, will not be laying off people at university
Next Bulletin will explain where 220 positions UW-System told to eliminate coming from
Were referred to as layoffs, but would just not fill some positions that were coming our way
Looking at attrition, deferring filling vacancies, and other decisions to avoid layoffs
Still tying to find out extent to which early retirement programs being considered
Will continue to communicate on regular basis and try to identify issues
Will attempt to address any other questions as they arise

Response to questions from floor
Looking at every vacant position as potential way to help get through budget challenge
Don’t want to give impression that somehow we’ll figure out how to do budget reduction of size suggested without suffering; we are going to suffer, just trying to minimize damage
Going to protect core functions of institution (instruction and services) to extent possible
Possibility of delaying registration for fall semester a few weeks until amount of reductions clearer suggested at chair’s meeting
Has been considered but will not delay registration
Not clear that will know much more in two to three weeks regarding size of budget reduction
Registration currently goes pretty far into semester, to extend any further would be problematic

UW-System on record, and chancellor agrees, that if reductions go beyond governor’s proposed levels, may shrink size of entering freshman class to extent possible
Why important for legislature to act quickly
Cannot continue to do everything we anticipated doing without serious impact on quality and workload
Watching all of this very carefully
At this point, will leave some positions unfilled for period of time
Interesting problem – had been concerned for some time that didn’t have enough position flexibility, now may not be able to fill positions because don’t have dollars even though we have authorization for positions
When announcement made that UW-System asked by DOA to cut 220 positions, we had anticipated 18 additional positions for next year – simply will not fill some of those
Not clear yet what’s going to happen
Anticipate Chippewa Valley Initiative will be cut in half
If make decision to defer filling positions, will do everything to make sure able to fill at some other point; how heavy-handed things get in relation to tenure track positions depends on how bad budget situation gets
Reductions going back to state not to system
Complicated issue with little clarity at this point, but may have to give FTE back to keep amount used for fringe benefits (can be as high as 30%)
Matter of putting ourselves in best position to decrease impact on ability to staff
On other hand, 30% is lot of money that would certainly reduce impact across campus
Being very cautious how we approach this issue in conversations with UW-System and state
Operate under budget that includes dollars and positions allocated by System
Positions not specifically allocated for tenure track faculty versus instructional academic staff; is for us to manage which positions
At this point, looking at accomplishing savings through attrition and careful decisions about which positions have to be filled
Over time will gain more flexibility of which positions to leave unfilled long-term, but initially will have to look where we can to achieve required savings
Decisions on positions will not be arbitrary; will be process of consultation
• Asking each unit head for recommendations about vacancies within their unit
• Some units have little flexibility because of small size of unit or availability of positions
• Only way to get significant budget cut, when salary approximately 86% of university budget, is to look at salary lines
• Will continue to share information as find out nature of final numbers

• On positive revenue side
  • Campus campaign going well
  • Faculty and staff making gifts to Foundation increased from about 10% to over one-third
  • Will have opportunity to view comprehensive campaign video at next Senate meeting
    • Will take on road around country, including to emeriti
  • Efforts to do things to help ourselves important
  • Week ago Monday, addressed Student Senate about reviewing amount of differential tuition
    • Has remained at $100 per year per student since 1996
    • Perhaps should think about as way of supporting campaign
    • When in front of alumni and friends in large numbers, will be able to talk about strength of commitment at home
    • Some would say probably worst time to do this, I say perhaps best time in terms of punctuating need for these efforts

3. Chair and Faculty Representative Report – Chair Harrison
• March 19th will be informal time to ask questions of Chancellor in Schofield Auditorium
• Open discussion at end of April will look at topic of setting priorities of institution in light of budget environment

4. Academic Staff Representative Report – Senator Wilcox
• Discussion at meeting in Madison last week revolved around budget issues
• Pink sheet distributed with name tags from David Miller of UW-System University Relations
  • Gives context of situation and messages that need to be conveyed, particularly to legislators
• Ironic, given university’s role in stimulating economy, that cutting budget just when needed most
  • Cutting university budget like eating your seed corn
• UW-Eau Claire nomination for Regents Academic Staff Award this year is Kathie Schneider

5. Announcements
• Probably one of more important shows in Foster Gallery in last several years will be retrospective of George Hagale’s (emeriti art faculty) work and his collection of prominent artists’ work

6. Reports of Committees
• Executive Committee – Chair Harrison
  • Subcommittee of University Faculty members of Executive Committee consulted with Chancellor Mash on revised language suggested by an ad hoc committee for final authority on personnel evaluation plans – language coming forward today
  • Next meeting on March 5, 2002
• Faculty Personnel Committee – Chair Keniston
  • Next meeting March 5, 2002
  • Looking at several issues
    • Policies surrounding tenure and promotion
    • Question of which set of rules apply to promotion and tenure when hired under one set that is eventually changed via annual review process
    • Policies concerning constituting DPCs
      • Smaller departments cannot always constitute legal promotion and tenure subcommittees
      • Concerns about procedures in those cases
    • Language defining academic staff with faculty status in consultation with Academic Staff Personnel Committee
      • Issue in own right
      • Also impinges on academic staff representation on Faculty Personnel Committee
So-called Safransky Standard
- All throughout system, university and/or faculty senates passing resolutions suggesting Safransky Standard be eliminated as a criterion in dismissals of tenured faulty
- Have not yet reached any kind of resolution or even consistent point of view on committee; would like to hear others points of view
- Chair Harrison will ask at reps meeting Friday about getting legal opinion on matter

- Academic Staff Personnel Committee – Senator Wilcox
  - Next meeting February 28, 2002
  - Motion today on Academic Staff Personnel Committee make-up
  - Also looking at murky area of instructional academic staff with and without faculty status
    - Some personnel rules fall under faculty; some under academic staff
    - Working together with Faculty Personnel Committee

- Academic Policies Committee – Senator Lozar
  - Approved four items relating to international education
    - Change in range of credits for Hessen exchange program making summer programs possible
    - New four-week summer program in Chiang Mai, Thailand
    - Possibility for student teaching option in London
    - Study abroad program in Alnwick, England
  - No meeting next week

- Physical Plant Planning Committee – Senator Stuettgen
  - Procedures now available for recognition of faculty and staff groups not directly affiliated with program or department
    - Gives access to university facilities
    - Application forms available from Business and Students Services Office or online
    - Began ongoing review of Campus Physical Development Plan 2003-2009
  - Report by Parking and Transportation Services Office
    - Excellent relationship with Eau Claire Transit
      - Ridership consistent on eleven routes that primarily transport students around campus and city
      - Off-campus parking permit requests reduced 25% since bus routes added in 1997
    - Extensive work to be done this summer on Roosevelt Avenue behind Phillips Hall
      - Will necessitate some closure of access to that lot; more information as time draws closer
    - Pedestrian crossings repainted and more clearly marked in Phillips lot area
  - Report from Facilities Planning and Development on UW-Eau Claire recycling
    - Costs dropped from high of $102,000 to approximately $10,000 per year
    - High compliance due to convenience of disposal options and awareness/conscientiousness on campus
  - Riverbank Stabilization Project Update
    - Study being requested to determine stability of geological structure of riverbank itself
  - Next meeting March 5, 2002 – taking up more parking and smoking issues

- Budget Committee – Senator Carpenter
  - Two agenda items at meeting of February 15, 2002
    1) Review of organized activities and auxiliary budgets for 2002-2003
      - For information since previously approved by Student Senate
      - Campus parking fees will be going up next year
    2) Status of state budget
      - For this and next year, may be required to cut and give back as much as $1.7 million
      - Going to be painful because cutting base budget dollars, not one-time adjustment
      - Real pain likely to come in next biennium when must deal with reduced base
      - Nothing will be held sacred
  - Next meeting March 15, 2002
  - Response to question from floor
    - No change foreseen in equity adjustments because part of approved pay plan

- Compensation Committee – Senator Wick
  - Meeting frequently to finish comprehensive pay plan for faculty and instructional academic staff
  - Next meeting February 27, 2002
Hope to finish plan and begin merging with administrative and professional academic staff plan to bring forward to Senate soon

Nominating Committee – Senator Wendler

No report

Technology Committee – Senator Lang

Next meeting March 8, 2002

To discuss LTDC Advisory Committee Report with Provost Satz

7. Special Report – Commission on the Status of Women – Commission Chair Lang

Website now available to check on what commission doing

Current initiatives

1) Women’s History Month
   • Schedule of activities coordinated with departments and units and Women’s Studies

2) Domestic partner benefits
   • Working group remaining in contact with System and participating in discussions
   • Seven out of ten of Big 10 schools providing domestic partner benefits
   • Any action must be taken at system level

3) Work/Life Group supporting Jan Morse, UW-Eau Claire Work/Life Coordinator, with program plans
   • Piloting lactation program beginning in June; nursing students now working on promotional materials

4) Campus Safety Program
   • Working to reinstate a self-defense class for credit
   • Creating public service announcements
   • Conducting research with regard to safety issues on campus in preparation for applying for Department of Justice grant this spring
   • In 2001, all UW-Eau Claire officers participated in a first responders investigative strategies for sexual assault program and one attended a sexual assault prevention conference

5) Women in Science
   • UW-Eau Claire continues to participate in Women in Science program
   • Physics Department participating in National Science Foundation sponsored research study conducted by Colorado College on increasing participation of women in undergraduate physics

6) Continue to support Women’s Studies

7) Talking with Wisconsin Women in Higher Education about strategies to get more women in leadership positions

8. Unfinished Business – None

9. Miscellaneous Business

Executive Committee

Report on Final Authority on Personnel Evaluation Criteria – Senator Hooper

• Senate passed motion on final authority on May 9, 2000
  • That action was not approved by chancellor
  • Senate rescinded original motion and sent issue back to Faculty Personnel Committee

• Faculty Personnel brought revision back to Senate, which was passed last spring
  • Again, that action not approved by chancellor

• Issue taken back to Executive Committee; ad hoc committee appointed
  • Ad hoc committee worked out agreement that felt stood chance of being approved

• Major concern for all was abdication of chancellor’s authority in original and revised proposals

• After motion distributed, further recommended to strike the Department Personnel Committee, the Department Chair, or the Dean cannot reach an and add cannot be reached after agreement in last paragraph
  • Subcommittee supports this minor editorial change
  • Needed because not in balance with next part of same sentence; this is to clarify intent

Motion 38-SE-05

Moved and seconded by Executive Committee (10-0) that the following wording revising page 5.18 of the Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook be approved and forwarded to the Chancellor
Criteria for Review of Faculty Performance

2.  Department Criteria

The Review of faculty performance shall include, but is not limited to, consideration of teaching effectiveness, academic advising ability, scholarly activity, and service to the University, the profession and the public. The Department Personnel Committee (DPC) of each department or functional equivalent with input from the Department Chair shall develop and approve a written evaluation plan which further details each of these general criteria and describes the relative emphasis to be given to each criterion. The emphasis may vary depending on needs of the department, individual interests, and the stage of a faculty member’s career. The plan shall be reviewed and accepted by the Departmental Personnel Committee, Department Chair, Dean, and Provost and Vice Chancellor. The criteria shall be used by the Department Personnel Committee, Department Chair, Dean, and Provost and Vice Chancellor in performance reviews. Upon approval by the DPC, the plan shall be submitted to the Department Chair, the Dean, and the Provost and Vice Chancellor who shall review the plan and, if it is determined to be acceptable, approve it in writing. The Department Chair shall distribute the approved plan to department members, thereby informing them of the agreed upon criteria. The Department Personnel Committee, the Department Chair, the Dean, and the Provost and Vice Chancellor shall use the agreed upon criteria in considering performance reviews.

The Departmental Evaluation Plan shall be reviewed annually by the Department Personnel Committee. Changes in the plan shall be reviewed and accepted by the Department Personnel Committee, Department Chair, Dean, and Provost and Vice Chancellor. The Department Personnel Committee shall annually review the Department Evaluation Plan and revise the plan as deemed appropriate. Revisions shall be approved in the same manner as the original plan. The Department Chair shall inform the department in writing of the any agreed upon changes in the plan. (US 12/91)

If at any point during the development or revision of the plan, the Department Personnel Committee, the Department Chair, or the Dean cannot reach an agreement over any aspect of the plan, the next higher level (Department Chair, Dean, or Provost and Vice Chancellor) shall attempt to informally mediate any differences and to secure agreement so that the plan may move forward. If the Provost and Vice Chancellor’s effort at informal mediation fails, the Faculty Complaint and Grievance Committee shall be convened by the Chancellor to examine the issues and to make a recommendation to the Chancellor concerning that portion of the plan for which an agreement could not be reached. The decision of the Chancellor is final. When the Faculty Complaint and Grievance Committee recommendation is supported by ¾ of those voting, the Committee can expect that its recommendation will be supported except for only the most compelling reasons. (US 2/02)

Debate

- Favor motion
  - Represents spirit of what intended all along
  - Stronger than any previous motions sent forward

- Concur, six ways that proposed language different and stronger than what currently in handbook include
  1) Includes input from department chair when DPC developing and revising criteria
  2) Provides for written approval of agreed-upon criteria of DPC
  3) Identifies in writing that DPC plan to be used in evaluation of faculty is approved plan
  4) Provides for conflict resolution process whereby mediation initiated to resolve any obstacles and/or provide alternative language
  5) In event informal mediation fails, instructs chancellor to convene Faculty Complaint and Grievance Committee to examine issue and make recommendation
  6) In writing, includes provision used elsewhere in handbook that when Faculty Complaint and Grievance Committee puts forward a recommendation by a ¾ vote, the chancellor is expected to support it except for only the most compelling reasons
    - Compelling reason used in UW-System Chapter 12.03 under language on individual layoffs; example provided was immediate cutoff of funds
    - Still not defined, but is example
  - Current motion addresses many concerns Faculty Personnel Committee had about current policy and provides additional tools for faculty to use for resolution of disagreement
• Authority is given to DPCs for approval of promotion criteria
  • Handbook clearly specifies how that authority delegated within DPC to appropriate subcommittees
  • Does not say assistant professors will be setting criteria for professors
  • In this respect, wording of revised document no different than handbook
• Very complicated matter worked through together over long period of time
  • Proposal acceptable to ad hoc committee, to Provost, to Chancellor, and has been consultation with System legal

38-SE-05-SR – Moved by Senator Lozar and seconded that rules be suspended to allow item to be voted on today – rules suspension PASSED by 2/3 vote

**Vote on Motion 38-SE-05:** Motion PASSED by University Faculty members of University Senate without dissent

**Academic Staff Personnel Committee**

**Report on Academic Staff Personnel Committee Membership** – Senator Wilcox

NOTE: Chair Harrison ruled since this is change in constitution, and Senate owns article of constitution for University Senate, motion will be voted on by full University Senate and then goes forward to full University Faculty and full University Academic Staff for approval

• Intent of motion to make Academic Staff Personnel Committee look more like academic staff and provide representation for all aspects of that staff
  • Challenging because academic staff complex with administrative and professional academic staff, instructional academic staff, and instructional academic staff with faculty status
• Presently, instructional academic staff 35% of all academic staff
• Response to question for clarification on report
  • Approximately 25, out of about 110, instructional academic staff have faculty status

**Motion 38-AS-02**

Moved and seconded by Academic Staff Personnel Committee (7-0-1) that the following changes be made to the membership of the Academic Staff Personnel Committee, and these changes be reflected on pg. 3.13 of the Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook:

3. The Academic Staff Personnel Committee

  a. **Membership:** The committee includes nine members: four University Academic Staff academic staff senators, **one of whom must be instructional academic staff,** elected by the University Academic Staff academic staff members of the Senate, four academic staff, **one of whom must be instructional academic staff,** elected by the academic staff, at large, and one administrator selected by the Chancellor. **Two Three seats must be held by instructional academic staff members and five seats must be held by administrative or professional academic staff members.** Members shall serve three-year terms. If the term of the Academic Staff Representative, on the Academic Staff Personnel Committee expires, then he/she becomes an ex officio (and voting) member of the Academic Staff Personnel Committee for the remainder of his/her term of office as Academic Staff Representative.

**Debate**

• Concerned that particular group represented on both Academic Staff and Faculty Personnel Committees
  • Instructional academic staff with faculty status included in academic staff (lower case) and University Faculty
• That population has to abide by rules and policies of both academic staff and faculty so should have voice
• Complicating factor is instructional academic staff with faculty status have governance rights with faculty but still hold personnel rights with academic staff
  • Yet some academic staff personnel rules that affect them involve faculty for evaluations in their department
  • Truly a foot in both camps
• Solution would not seem to be to further muddy waters, but to clarify where these people go for rules that govern their employment; would prefer grass roots approach to clean up waters rather than stir them
• Concern because as written, instructional academic staff without faculty status could not be represented at all
Are still instructional academic staff being given faculty status – done at time of appointment and still happening

38-AS-02-SR – Moved by Senator King and seconded that rules be suspended to allow item to be voted on today – rules suspension DEFEATED by vote of 17 to 31

Debate of Motion 38-AS-02 to continue at next meeting of University Senate

Academic Policies Committee

Report on Admission Policy Revision – Senator Lozar

• Proposal brought forward by Office of Admissions with two-fold purpose
  1) Bring up-to-date some language, such as foreign students now referred to as international
  2) To clarify and raise standards for admission of freshmen into standard admission category
     • Currently catalogue says applicants graduating in upper 50% of class pretty much admitted automatically
     • Students, counselors, and others understand that to mean if you are in upper 50% of class, you will be admitted regardless of ACT score; in practice, do look at ACT scores
     • Proposal uses double criteria for standard admission category, both high school rank in class and ACT scores

Responses to Questions for Clarification of Report

• Students who would no longer qualify under these standards are currently bumping better people
  • Particularly during spring semester when more selective schools are turning down good students
  • By then our freshman class already closed; unable to admit those students
• Dual criteria where have upper 25% and lower ACT is recognition of hard workers who don’t necessarily do well on tests
  • Would also like to see some of really bright students who screwed up in high school get a shot
  • Chances of seeing those students in front of A&S Academic Retention Committee on suspension much greater than hard workers
  • Can get in under IV as exception, but would like to see in standard category to capture people with truly outstanding ACT scores
• To give particular consideration for people who have been disadvantaged, routinely meet with other entities on campus to look at students who don’t fit typical 18-year old paradigm
  • Special populations that need more flexibility – students of color, nontraditional students, athletes, local and gifted students
  • Number of such slots under professional discretion, but in UW-System only five percent of admission decisions can be exception based
  • Can use placement tests, letters of recommendation and other forms to assess ability to be successful here
• Admission standards here have not been changed since 1987
  • Although other institutions are setting class rank at 40%, do not want to jump too far on short notice
• Seeing more home schoolers as part of general trend; do very well at universities because come well prepared
  • Require subscores of 23 for home schoolers because do not have high school rank in class
  • Seems to disadvantage home schoolers
  • In talking to former Director of Admissions, understood somewhat lower score on one of them would not necessarily kick you out
• Transfer students from CVTC generally limited to 15 transferable credits; review them like other transfer students
• Pretty much tell students if they apply by priority date and match criteria, they will be admitted
  • If see there are large numbers, will start to tweak a bit to slow process down
  • Tentatively admitted until provision of final transcript and official ACT scores
  • Dates appear in other admissions publications, not in catalogue – that more process oriented, not policy
• Units also count before anything else, do have to be in upper 50% with ACT of 23, but first required to have 17 units with 15 of those in grades 9-12
• If subscores are averaged to get composite score, do not have to state both composite of at least 23 and 23 in each subcategory
• Five percent allowable exceptions filled as admissions progress, don’t wait until end
Five percent is at point three weeks after start of semester
Could probably take 12% because know will lose some
Take as many as feel will be successful
Ran lot of numbers of different paradigms to find most efficient way of raising bar tightening requirements without dropping too many students off
Could easily fill class with those students meeting upper half and 23 on ACT
Of students admitted as of February 1, 1117 would not get in if apply this criteria
Does not include exceptions
Out of 4300 admits
Since target is around 2000, hoping some of those won’t show up
If reduce pool too significantly, yield might be lower
Trying to be more strategic in identifying students we want and recruiting them
More intensive recruitment of high ability students
While might lose bottom part of pool, hoping will free us up to increase our yield of the top
These standards would apply to freshmen coming in who haven’t completed any coursework after graduation; students who transfer in with less than 30 credits are considered transfers
Typically decisions on exceptions are made among senior admissions staff in conjunction with other offices on campus
Occasionally will be one-on-one basis
Will always be somewhat of crap shoot because everyone is going after best students and students are making multiple applications
Trust that raising and clarifying standards will not result in losing out to other institutions
Based both on national consultants and experiences on other Wisconsin campuses, have reason to believe stiffening up requirements would result in increase of qualified applicants
Hoping to get this in next catalogue to get word out and move ahead, see what happens, and then take next step
Current transfer policies requires transfer students with under 30 credits to meet freshmen admission standards; anytime change freshmen admission requirements, indeed changing transfer requirements

Motion 38-AP-12
Moved and seconded by Academic Policies Committee (10-0) that the following change in criteria for the admission of freshmen to the Standard Admission Category be approved

Applicants must present the required combination of rank and ACT or SAT I test score. Applicants must rank in at least the top 50% of their graduating class AND present an ACT composite score of at least 23 or SAT I score of at least 1090. Or applicants must rank in the top 25% of their graduating class AND present an ACT composite score of 22 or SAT I score of 1050.

38-AP-12-SR – Moved by Senator Selin and seconded that rules be suspended to allow item to be voted on today and meet catalogue deadline – rules suspension DEFEATED by University Faculty members by vote of 15 to 14

Debate on Motion 38-AP-12 to continue at next meeting of University Senate; without objection entire GE discussion first reading also moved to that meeting

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

Wanda Schulner
Secretary to the University Senate