Members Present:


Members Absent:

Randy Beger, Ken De Meuse, Bruce Dybvik, Betty Hanson, Sean Hartnett, Larry Honl, Gretchen Hutterli, Fred Kolb, John Melrose, Kathie Schneider, Nick Smiar, Rebecca Wurzer

Guests:

Kris Anderson, Margaret Cassidy, Gina Duwe, Bernard Duyfhuizen, Debbie Gough, Carole Halberg, Dale Johnson, Allen Keniston, Robert Lopez, Karl Markgraf, Andy Phillips, Mike Rindo, Alex Smith, Andrew Soll, Steve Tallant, Ted Wendt

The regular meeting of University Senate was called to order by Chair Harrison at 3:04 p.m. Tuesday, March 12, 2002 in the Tamarack Room of Davies Center.

1. Without objection, minutes of February 26, 2002 meeting of University Senate approved as distributed

2. Chancellor’s Remarks – Chancellor Mash
   • Beginning with next University Bulletin, blurb on budget will be shorter with references to longer articles available on website
   • Events leading to regents’ decision to suspend admissions
     • Governor’s original budget proposal would reduce UW System budget by $50 million
       • For UW-Eau Claire, that meant $1.8 million
       • Since state facing extraordinary circumstances, although very painful and difficult, we could work with that reduction
     • Wednesday and Thursday last week, Joint Finance Committee action added an additional reduction of $22 million
       • For UW-Eau Claire, that added another $1 million reduction next year
       • As a result, regents, in consultation with chancellors, called a time out on enrollments until a better sense of what the dollars would look like developed
     • Then Saturday, Assembly Republicans released their approach to the budget shortfall, which added another $60 million in reductions to UW System
       • This would mean approximately $800,000 in reductions this year and approximately $4 million next year for UW-Eau Claire
     • Impact of enrollment suspension at UW-Eau Claire
       • Had all deposits we needed by March 1st to fill freshman class; might be bigger because yield might increase
       • Good news is don’t have to deal with as many admissions questions since class full
       • Bad news is students are coming this fall and we will be working with reduced budget
Looking at other ways to keep enrollment, total FTE, at manageable level
- Control transfers, special students, part-time students, etc.
- For fall of 2003, must seriously consider shrinking size of freshman class
- Cannot be expected to maintain level of quality and services accustomed to here without resources

Have been interviewed by Leader-Telegram in last few days
- Necessary to speak about budget reduction as being real to UW System because seeing quotes suggesting somehow everything will be okay, or dollars will only affect administration, and not quality or level of service and instruction to students
- That is just not true; additional cuts are straw that broke camel’s back
- Need to be talking about level of service to our student and quality we intend to maintain
  - Because most of our cost is personnel, only way to get to number discussed is not filling positions
  - Means we don’t offer as many sections, we don’t offer courses as frequently, we have bigger classes, and we have workload issues
- Started from modest base – did not have lot to give when this began
  - UW System leanest public university system in country in dollars spent on administrative costs
  - State support (not tuition) for last ten years basically flat against inflation
- Public will not be sympathetic to pay plan and salary issues
- Need to stay on message
  - In terms of students, what we do, what we provide
  - What it means for the Chippewa Valley, for Wisconsin
  - What it means for our workloads, and how that relates to absence of quality
  - Things we won’t be able to do and provide because we don’t have staff

Will have other opportunities in next few weeks and months to talk further on budget as we know more
- Many people working on managing so come out of this as whole as possible when final number known
- Process has long way to go
  - Must get through Assembly, controlled by Republicans
  - Then through Senate, controlled by Democrats
    - Majority Leader Chvala has given assurances that UW System will not have budget reduced to extent being proposed – difficult to know how that will happen
  - Governor waiting in wings with as strong of veto authority as any governor in country
  - Anything could happen – political process can be frustrating

3. Chair and Faculty Representative Report – Chair Harrison
- Heard at Faculty Reps meeting that any new program proposal requiring dollars or reallocation will be held at System until budget situation settled
  - Has implications for performing arts program we recently passed
- URL for System website for legislative updates on bottom of chair’s report

4. Academic Staff Representative Report – Senator Wilcox
- Meet in Madison on March 14th
- Supposed to talk about instructional academic staff and workload issues; suspect we’ll cover other issues

5. Announcements
- Chat with the Chancellor next Tuesday in Schofield Auditorium – opportunity to share ideas and suggestions and to ask questions of chancellor and other administrators

6. Reports of Committees
- Executive Committee – Chair Harrison
  - Discussed procedural ruling made by chair at last Senate meeting
  - Next meeting April 2, 2002
- Faculty Personnel Committee – Chair Keniston
  - Next meeting March 19, 2002
  - To have read-through of final draft of report on workload
  - Continue to talk about issues related to forming DPCs and changing departmental evaluation plans
- Academic Staff Personnel Committee – Senator Wilcox
Next meeting after spring break
Chart Jan Morse designed to communicate how instructional academic staff personnel policies fall under both academic staff and faculty rules included in packet

- Academic Policies Committee – Senator Lozar
  - Next meeting March 19, 2002
  - Items on agenda
    - Inclusion of Performing Arts and Dance prefixes in General Education Category IVA
    - Creation of Hmong prefix (HMNG) for proposed Hmong language course
    - American Sign Language satisfying foreign language/foreign culture requirement

- Physical Plant Planning Committee – Senator Stuettgen
  - Supported increases in parking fees and uniform 6 p.m. end time for all guaranteed faculty parking enforcement as proposed by Parking and Transportation Services
  - Did not support request by Continuing Education to increase enforcement hours behind Water Street building
  - Considering proposal reconfiguring hard surface behind Zorn Arena to allow better access for major events
  - Recognize noncompliance in nonsmoking areas at entrances to academic buildings is problem
    - Considering proposal to make UW-Eau Claire campus smoke-free
  - Next meeting March 19, 2002

- Budget Committee – Senator Carpenter
  - Next meeting March 15, 2002 to assess budget

- Compensation Committee – Senator Wick
  - Next meeting March 14, 2002
  - To consider final draft of comprehensive pay plan to be shared at next Senate meeting

- Nominating Committee – Senator Wendler
  - Next meeting immediately following Senate meeting
  - Invitation out regarding Senate Chair-Elect position; please respond
  - Response to question from floor
    - Other committee positions filled in fall
    - Survey sheets, on which to note interest in committees, to be distributed prior to next meeting
    - Expiration of terms on Senate committees available on website

- Technology Committee – Senator Lang
  - Met with Provost to discuss report from LTDC advisory committee
  - Next meeting April 2, 2002 to discuss with Jim Lowe progress regarding administrative systems

7. Special Report – Comprehensive Campaign Video – Foundation President Carole Halberg
  - Met with Campus Campaign Steering Committee and gave brief report on Campus Campaign
  - Phenomenal success to date with about 40% participation of employed staff
  - Strong support close to home sends powerful message to alumni and friends
  - Emeriti faculty to hold special drive for faculty development and enhancement
  - Having significant success as well
  - Kickoff of Comprehensive Campaign comes on April 26th
  - Series of events on campus and announcement of larger goal
  - Material distributed
    - Campaign executive summary showing basic structure of campaign – widely distributed
    - Small, simple bulleted item clearly defining comprehensive fundraising campaign
    - Campaign case book, to be available close to campaign kickoff, will highlight things we do at this university and our marks of excellence
    - Most of money to come from individuals, but also seeking gifts from corporations and other foundations
    - Campaign largely donor driven – in terms of how much money and what it can be used for
    - This first campaign setting stage for increasingly ambitious fundraising
  - Main purpose of showing video is to get reaction
    - Mike Rindo, who joined us in October, has for most part been producer of video
    - Will be taking video on road and mailing to selected alumni and friends
    - May stimulate interest in donating to campaign
8. Unfinished Business

Academic Staff Personnel Committee – Second Reading – Academic Staff Personnel Committee Membership
Motion
Debate Continued:
- Speak strongly in favor of motion
  - Goal was inclusion
  - Academic staff at UW-Eau Claire extremely diverse group with many different voices that need to be heard
  - Trying to make committee look more like overall academic staff makeup in university community
- Since is change to Senate constitution, all senators vote

Vote on Motion 38-AS-02: Motion PASSED without dissention; to go forward to full University Faculty and University Academic Staff for ratification

TEXT OF CHANGES (to page 3.13 of 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.

Academic Policies Committee – Second Reading – Admission Policy Revisions
Debate Continued:
- Support motion to revise standards, but wonder if go far enough
  - Surprised standards have not been revised since 1987, probably past due
  - Know we are talking about moving slowly on this, but do we want to be perceived as No. 3 institution based on standards (behind Madison and LaCrosse)
  - Probably best to talk about sooner, as opposed to later, for making requirements more stringent
- Taking this in steps to have time to talk with counselors and assess impact before move to more stringent policy
- Still leaves door open for exceptions
- Speak against motion – word elitist comes to mind
  - UW System founded on education for the masses
  - Have private colleges with very high standards unreachable by large percentage of high school seniors; UW System designed to fill void
  - Do not feel this should be used as enrollment management tool
  - In very small or very large schools, class rank may not mean much
  - Debate ongoing as to whether SATs and ACTs true measure of students’ ability to succeed in college
  - See as good move for UW Colleges to help their enrollment figures
  - Feel excluding too many students from even applying at UW-Eau Claire
- Students with ACT of 23 and high school rank above 50th percentile with required units that apply by December 1st guaranteed admission
  - Students with lower ACT scores will be admitted; for example, this year 54% of our students have ACTs of less than 23
  - Not an absolute, just first cutoff
- Favor motion
  - As APC discussed, came away with understanding this as way to reallocate resources to better go after high quality students
  - Would be about 1400 less admits than Admissions deals with now
  - Impressed by process required and that not ratcheting up standards too high
- Have opportunity to work with students below criteria and admit on discretionary basis
  - Then, on December 1st, begin to look at size and quality of class and make decisions about next step
• Also look at rigor of coursework, breadth of coursework, GPA, and other factors
• Hope that access doesn’t become problem
• Also have opportunity to make exceptions
• Not all spelled out in catalogue because more process than policy

• On issue of access, variety of ways of providing opportunities for students in Wisconsin
  • Colleges are one way; universities have relationship with colleges in terms of transfer
  • Opportunity to improve quality of freshman class, and at same time, provide other vehicles for looking at individual cases meriting attention
  • Continually compare ourselves to LaCrosse; they are moving forward; this is step for us to move forward
  • Main goal not to exclude, and not necessarily to ratchet up standards although quality is also at issue, as much as to clarify what it takes for a student to get into this university
  • Goal not necessarily to reduce number of staff or cost savings, but to eliminate some activities and redirect those resources to different activities to do a better job of recruitment of targeted high-ability students than we are doing now
  • To clarify admissions processing
    • Standard admit to UW System is somebody who meets those exact criteria, we call them SA
    • Also have SB, SC, and SD categories; all other students we deem successful fall into those categories
      • Might have lower class rank, but higher ACT, or vice versa
      • Still considered standard, just not SA
    • About 1100 students fall within top 50% with only 21 or 22 ACT, so would not have been admitted under these criteria
    • Paragraph IV says we have option if you don’t have the class rank, or don’t have the ACTs, to not even make an exception, but to deem you successful and still standard admit you

Amendment 38-AP-12-a1
  Moved by Senator Ho and seconded that the last sentence of the Admission of Home-School Students read: “Students must present at least a score of 23 in each of the four ACT test subscores.”

Debate
• Sentence read awkwardly and reflected on our ability to do mathematics – redundant to require both ACT composite of 23 and sub scores of at least 23
• Are acting on whole document as it will appear in catalogue
• Oppose holding home schoolers to higher standard than other students
• Not changing from what approved before, just putting in actual ACT score instead of using average freshman composite scores
  • That way does not fluctuate so much year to year
• Don’t believe we should be holding home schooled students to higher standard; would prefer to say must present with a 23 composite score as required of other students
  • Assume because don’t have class ranking, hold them to higher standard
  • At one time sub scores were not all 23 or higher, but checked, and all sub scores of students both this year and last year average 23 or higher
• All students required to have units

Vote on Amendment 38-AP-12-a1: Amendment PASSED by vote of University Faculty Senators

Continued Debate on Main Motion:
• Raising bar for admission when have always done extraordinary job at this institution of taking hard-working ordinary people and helping them become extraordinary
• Concerned making it harder for certain students to get in, but give students already here but not doing the job tremendous numbers of opportunities to stick around
• More concern nationally about what criteria to use – our own School of Education has gone to portfolios
• Getting caught up in numbers and statistics; don’t want to eliminate students, who might be very successful here, based on numbers
• Want to be able to support this, but my gut is not feeling good
• We keep saying we are a regional institution so have some obligation rather than being the best of the best
• Also concerned this will discriminate against males in high school because GPA established early on and data indicate young men mature differently and aren’t as competitive
• Recognize importance of continuing education for everybody, not just elite
• Many other opportunities within UW System
  • Milwaukee has much lower standards than UW-Eau Claire, as does Oshkosh
  • When UW-River Falls shuts down admissions, still haven’t completed their freshman class
  • Don’t have resources to allow everybody who wants to get into UW-Eau Claire to come here
• Not saying students without these criteria will not be admitted, just may take longer
  • Don’t see motion as denying anybody admission to UW-Eau Claire, simply saying we are going to seek out best and brightest applicants and make sure we get them, then can go to next qualified pool, and then next
• This year had 6500 applicants
  • If use this criteria, 3400 would be accepted
  • Over last ten years, have about 50% yield, so 1700 would come here
  • Generally freshman class is between 2000 and 2100
  • Remaining 400 places filled at discretion of Admission Office from students not strictly meeting criteria
• Believe this to be fair combination of scores
  • Work with students daily – students falling below these criteria struggle much more at this institution
    • Not correct to admit people who aren’t able to compete at UW-Eau Claire level
    • If standards clearer, students in public schools may work harder in high school to attain admission
    • Are other options within Chippewa Valley for students who do not attain this level
  • Most athletes and musicians do meet these requirements, those that don’t are more exceptions than discretionary admits
    • Music Department has not asked for single exception in last ten years
  • Under normal times, without Board of Regents suspension of admissions, students would have plenty of options, not only the colleges, but other universities
• Sensitive to idea of elitism; Wisconsin has always been in forefront of providing higher education to as many people as possible
  • In current fiscal climate, increasingly clear state may not value that anymore
  • Must position ourselves to be able to do best we can with resources available
  • If people of Wisconsin want kind of access to education touted since the Civil War, then going to have to put out resources for it – right now, not forthcoming

Vote on Motion 38-AP-12: Motion PASSED without dissent by vote of University Faculty Senators

9. Miscellaneous Business

Academic Policies Committee

Report on General Education Revisions – Senator Lozar

• Process started when provost called department chairs together to discuss issues related to course availability
  • Department chairs group formed to develop recommendations regarding general education
  • Recommendations forwarded to Academic Policies Committee in spring of 2001; committee has been discussing, with few breaks, since that time
  • Out of four recommendations, APC developed five motions
• Current general education program first appeared in 1978-79 catalogue; before that was general studies program
  • In early 1980s, APC did extensive assessment of GE including surveys of current students, alumni, and faculty, and extensive study of student transcripts
    • General satisfaction expressed for GE program at that time
    • Concern about courses included led to creation of guidelines all GE courses must meet
  • In 1991, revised GE program as part of redefinition of baccalaureate; what currently in effect
• Response to questions on report
  • Committee did ask for response to working group proposal and received three formal counter-proposals: one from Student Senate, one from Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee, and one labeled Arts & Sciences Chairs
  • Committee reviewed those proposals but did not incorporate into final motions
• Overview of motions and how fit together
• Working group proposed introducing more flexibility into current categories I through IV
  • Proposed range of 9-12 credits in categories II, III, and IV, rather than current 11
  • Range would allow students to take six optional credits in new category V
• Proposal also decreases number of required disciplines in categories III and IV to two
• Since 1978, has been interest on part of professional schools and colleges to have courses included in GE program (professional courses were part of previous general studies program)
  • Under redefinition model could be included as IDIS courses
    • Not considered desirable because lose their identity
  • Consequently, category V created to allow professional courses with appropriate prefixes
• Desire to have oversight committee include more than current Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee members, partly because of inclusion of professional courses in GE program, resulted in motion #3
• Motion #4 applies equally now or with revisions
  • Currently have university-wide GE requirements defined at beginning of catalogue
  • Also have wide variety of GE requirements specific to various degrees
  • Makes it difficult for students to navigate from one program to another
  • Thus, recommended that all schools and colleges review their requirements to make sure unnecessary obstacles not being created
• Motion #5 recommends tracking what is actually happening as result of above revisions
  • Each department to review and report annually on effects on course availability

Report on Minimum Credits & Number of Subcategories – Senator Lozar
• Recommends changes in distribution of disciplines within four GE categories
  • Change is largely in categories III and IV with range of 9-12 credits from at least two subcategories
• Other change is cross-listed courses are credited to GE category and subcategory of home department
• Limit of ten credits from any one course prefix reworded from department because not all courses concomitant with department
• Response to questions on report
  • Crediting cross-listed courses to home department has little effect on programs such as AIS and WMNS
    • Only purpose is for giving general education credit – no other implications for those majors or minors
  • If passed, implementation would be with publication of 2003-2004 catalogue
    • Must be prepared for requests from students to switch to this less prescriptive catalogue
  • No more than 10 credits in one course prefix so don’t end up with minor for general education
    • Limit includes prefixes with courses in more than one GE category

Motion 38-AP-13
Moved and seconded by Academic Policies Committee (9-1) that the University-Wide General Education requirement be revised as shown below.

A student must earn a total of a minimum of 39 credits. Up to ten credits from any one course prefix may be counted toward General Education requirements. Cross-listed courses with prefixes such as AIS and WMNS are credited to the GE Category and subcategory of the corresponding home department courses.

Category I: Communications
  A minimum of 6 credits required

Category II: Natural Sciences
  9-12 credits from at least two subcategories. At least one course must be a laboratory science course

Category III: Social Sciences
  9-12 credits from at least two subcategories

Category IV: Humanities
  9-12 credits from at least two of the five subcategories
Debate

- Means could end up with just six prefixes in categories II, III, and IV – is that general enough for general education?
- Comment committee and work groups for work
  - Must vote against mainly because goes against what Student Senate suggested
  - At liberal arts/general education institution, should require students to get as much breadth as possible; motion sacrifices breadth for depth
- That is why committee vote was not unanimous
- Favor motion, breadth issue could be taken care of by adequate advising
  - Says at least two subcategories, doesn’t limit it to two subcategories
- Programs that deviate from these requirements cannot make them less restrictive or less demanding than university-wide requirements
- Could make it three subcategories, which still brings it down from current four
  - If appraise every year, could determine if really want to go down to two from there
  - Could be hard to go back up once go down to two
- Favor motion – does not necessarily reduce breadth, just reduces forcing breadth
  - Gives opportunity to take minimum of six different subcategories; may be plenty broad for lot of students
  - Opens door for two courses in an area of interest which may be better for their general education than putting them in a course they hate just to get their degree
- Favor motion for several reasons
  - No student can graduate from School of Nursing with 120 credits because of proscriptive nature of current GE requirements – average number of credits for graduating students in this program is 140
  - Many students desire to study abroad, but course options at site abroad may not fit nicely in our GE requirements thus extending their program
  - Best possibility for as many students as possible to graduate closer to the 120 credits we state constitute our baccalaureate education can be achieved by revising these categories
- Goals of baccalaureate were never meant to be met in entirety by GE requirements, meant to be met by total curriculum; GE is subset of liberal arts based education we provide here
- One of important goals of liberal arts education is teaching students critical thinking skills so they become problem solvers and make good choices in their lives
  - Giving students opportunities to make choices very important in educational environment
  - This proposal gives students choice, and that is how they learn to make choices
- As it stands now, students never get chance to take second course for further depth in area of interest
  - If they do, they will never finish here
  - Ten credit maximum keeps them from getting minor in GE, but still allows choices for depth students have told us they want

Motion 38-US-16

Moved by Senator Hooper and seconded that the agenda for the next Senate meeting be reordered to move this discussion of general education to the beginning of the meeting

Vote on Motion 38-US-16: Motion PASSED without dissention

GE requirements become first order of business at the next meeting

Must introduce any motion at the next meeting in order for it to have two readings before the end of the semester

Meeting adjourned at 5:03 p.m. without objection

Wanda Schulner
Secretary to the University Senate