Members Present:


Members Absent:

Ned Beach, Randy Beger, Linda Carpenter, Ken De Meuse, Gene Decker, Jesse Dixon, Joel Duncan, Bruce Dybvik, Jeannie Harms, Sean Hartnett, Ann Hoffman, Gretchen Hutterli, Rose Jadack, Fred Kolb, Kate Lang, Gene Leisz, Barbara Mac Briar, Joanne Mellema, Rick Mickelson, Daniel Perkins, Kathie Schneider, Lori Snyder, Paula Stuettgen, Thomas Wagener, Karen Woodward, Rebecca Wurzer

Guests:

Margaret Cassidy, Pat Christopherson, Mark Clark, Gina Duwe, Dale Johnson, Tom King, Kay Magadance, Andy Phillips, Jack Pladziewicz, Marilyn Skrivseth, Craig Smith, Andrew Soll, Ted Wendt

The special meeting of University Senate was called to order by Chair Harrison at 3:09 p.m. Tuesday, April 30, 2002 in the Tamarack Room of Davies Center.

1. Unfinished Business

Academic Policies Committee – Second Reading – Motion #3 of General Education Requirement Revisions
University-Wide GE Committee

Motion 38-AP-15
Oversight of the General Education Program be changed as shown below:
A University-Wide Committee is to be established to develop criteria for General Education courses and to approve courses for inclusion in the General Education Program. The criteria will be forwarded to the University Senate Academic Policies Committee and the University Senate for approval. The Committee will consist of six members of the Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee, two members of the College of Business Curriculum Committee, and one member from each of the three School curricular review committees in the College of Professional Studies.

Amendment 38-AP-15-a1
Moved by Provost Satz and seconded to amend the motion to delete the word and in the second to last line and at the end of the last line add, and one student, with at least junior standing, appointed by the Student Body President in accordance with customary procedures

Debate
- Student Senate President would select a student and submit name to administration for appointment to committee; allows student representation on committee
- Student Senate originally passed resolution asking four students be appointed to committee – amendment is consensus between Academic Policies Committee and chair of Student Affairs Commission of Student Senate
Little student interest shown at APC meetings over last two semesters

**Vote on Amendment 38-AP-15-a1:** Amendment PASSED by vote of University Faculty Senators

**Continued Debate on Main Motion:**
- Not against university-wide committee in theory, but not in spirit of simplification
  - Actually adding layer
  - Composition of committee does not go far enough
    - Membership ought to be more representational of actual university community (seven from Arts & Sciences; four from other schools and colleges)
    - GE courses here represent between one-fourth and one-third of all arts and sciences courses
    - Most courses those faculty would teach anyway, so represent research interest
    - Faculty from professional colleges would have significant voice in arts and sciences curriculum
    - Problematic because reflects campus-wide participation in only one direction
      - Suggests only arts and sciences curriculum can benefit from insight and input of all faculty
      - Would suggest all school and college curriculum committees have members from all schools and colleges – gets everybody to the table
  - Adds significant workload to various members of current curriculum committees

**Amendment 38-AP-15-a2**
Moved by Senator Bushnell and seconded to delete the third sentence regarding membership and substitute this in its place: The Committee will consist of six faculty representatives from the College of Arts & Sciences, two faculty representatives from the College of Business, and one faculty representative from each of the Schools of the College of Professional Studies. These representatives will be chosen by existing shared governance processes established through the bylaws of the respective schools or colleges. One student, with at least junior standing, will be appointed by the Student Senate President in accordance with customary procedures.

**Debate**
- Doesn’t force people already serving on school or college curriculum committees to also be on super-committee
  - People may shy away from workload
  - From same places, in same proportion, with same representation, just not from curriculum committees
- Language proposed would not prevent interested parties serving on curricular committees from doing dual service, just doesn’t require it
- Would run for new committee in same manner now run for other curriculum committees
- Against amendment – adding students leaves even number of members on important committee
- Good idea to have odd number for cases where vote split

**Vote on Amendment 38-AP-15-a2:** Amendment PASSED by vote of University Faculty Senators

**Amendment 38-AP-15-a3**
Moved by Senator Bushnell and seconded that committee consist of six faculty from the College of Arts & Sciences, one from Business, and one each from the Schools in the College of Professional Studies, and one student, with the rest the same

**Debate**
- Specifically changes membership for College of Business from two to one
- Based on numbers run by Institutional Planner Kay Magadance
  - Faculty
    - 250 in College of Arts & Sciences – approximately 2/3 of faculty
    - 32 in College of Business
    - 74 in College of Professional Studies
  - Courses
    - 2,176 in Arts & Sciences – approximately ⅓ of courses
• 823 outside Arts & Sciences
• Perhaps committee representation should be based on reality at university
• Degree-seeking status of students enrolled in courses also important
• In terms of majors, ratio is something like 5.5 students in arts and sciences majors to 4.5 students in other majors
• Others got slightly different numbers
• 5.5 out of 10 students in either College of Professional Studies or Business majors; 4.5 Arts & Sciences students
• May be saying Business most efficient at offering curriculum
  • Small percentage of faculty, yet 22% of students
• Need to represent students fairly based on proportion of students in respective schools
• Against amendment; in favor of original layout of committee
• Seems since committee for purpose of discussing GE credits, ought to be talking about portion of GE credits taught by each school
  • Only going to be allowing two courses from new Category V; representation should parallel that
• Something like 400 courses in arts and sciences that are GE right now; if guess 100 courses from other colleges (which might be high), that argues for more favorable split towards Arts & Sciences
• Amendment with College of Business getting same representation as students an insult
• Need to look at faculty full-time equivalent positions
• Students from professional colleges generally required to take 60 credits in their college; other 60 credits to degree from College of Arts & Sciences generating faculty positions there
• To be fair, committee makeup should be something like
  • Four from College of Business
  • Four from College of Arts & Sciences
  • Four from College of Professional Studies
  • One student
• Makes committee of 13 so would have tie-breaker
• Could also look at exit information (how many students graduated from university in last five years)
  • 47.6% of graduates from College of Arts & Sciences
  • 24.9% of graduates from College of Business
  • 27.5% of graduates from College of Professional Studies
• On a committee of 11, that would give Arts & Sciences 5, Business 3, and Professional Studies 3
• Best way would be to take percentage of general education credits generated by each college
  • Those figures very hard to get
  • General education credits generated in fall 2001 were 81,564
    • College of Business generated 19.1%
    • College of Professional Studies generated 33.3%
    • College of Arts & Sciences generated the rest - 47.6%
• Many of these arts and sciences students taking general education classes for their majors
• Don’t understand relevance of all these numbers to make-up of committee with sole task of deciding which courses actually meet general education mission of university
• Correct move would be to add one person from each of outside schools and colleges to Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee
• Easiest solution until such time as this has been weighed and evaluated
• Against amendment – never heard so much proportional discussion on committees
• Committee ought to be made-up of people who understand GE criteria and content of courses that will be considered
• Numbers smack of turf battles and hate to see it set up that way in either direction
• College of Business has sufficient diversity within to warrant two representatives to adequately explain content of those courses that may be proposed
• Oppose amendment
• Was a general studies committee 25 years ago including members from College of Business – would be interested in why that committee politically died
• Hearsay from historians that was problem in quality of what was offered resulting in major revisions of program
• Unfortunate being reduced to numbers; usually most important questions cannot be answered by numbers
• One thing liberal arts education teaches is what are significant questions and what kind of answers different methodologies provide
• Original motion and numbers in it get to heart of getting people around table for discussion
• Reason College of Business requires 60 credits in arts and sciences is because university about obtaining liberal arts education and mostly those courses are going to be in College of Arts & Sciences
• That arts and sciences is kind of adjunct to professional schools and colleges not right
• Professional schools and colleges cannot offer many GE courses because don’t have facilities
• Huge majority of general education courses are going to remain in arts and sciences
• Sense that many of us don’t accept presupposition that proportions are way to allocate this committee

Motion by Senator Hooper to move the previous question seconded and PASSED by two-thirds vote of University Faculty Senators

Vote on Amendment 38-AP-15-a3: Amendment DEFEATED by vote of University Faculty Senators

Debate on Main Motion Continued:
• Opposed to having students voting on curricular issues although apparently tradition here
  • Faculty in charge of curriculum because have additional background allowing view of broader issues

Motion by Senator Hooper to move the previous question seconded and PASSED by two-thirds vote of University Faculty Senators

For clarification of customary procedures
• In a college, Student Senate President recommends student to Dean and Dean appoints
• If university-wide committee, Student Senate President recommends to Provost and Provost appoints
• In case of Academic Policies Committee, no administration involved
• Important point is that emanates from Student Senate President – official term is appointed and customary procedures is where appointment by dean, provost, or whomever comes in

Vote on Motion 38-AP-15: Motion PASSED by vote of University Faculty Senators

TEXT OF MOTION AS AMENDED
  A University Wide Committee is to be established to develop criteria for General Education courses and to approve courses for inclusion in the General Education Program. The criteria will be forwarded to the University Senate Academic Policies Committee and the University Senate for approval. The Committee will consist of six faculty representatives from the College of Arts & Sciences, two faculty representatives from the College of Business, and one faculty representative from each of the Schools of the College of Professional Studies. These representatives will be chosen by existing shared governance processes established through the bylaws of the respective schools or colleges. One student, with at least junior standing, will be appointed by the Student Senate President in accordance with customary procedures.

Academic Policies Committee – Second Reading – Motion #4 of General Education Requirement Revisions
  Department, School and College Requirements

Motion 38-AP-16
  Moved and seconded by Academic Policies Committee (10-0) that the Senate recommend that all Departments, Schools, and Colleges review and revise their General Education requirements so that they adhere to the recommendations concerning simplifying the three existing GE categories (II-IV) and reducing the number of upper division credits. Very little, if any, benefit will be gained from the proposed changes if Departments, Schools, and Colleges require “additional” and/or more specific General Education requirements.
Debate

- Do need to do this, but disagree where it says little if any benefit will be gained
  - Do students a favor by streamlining their curriculum and getting them to graduate sooner with
    recommendations such as taking Math 245 for statistics which also meets GE requirement
  - Not sure doing students a favor by eliminating that kind of department-specific recommendation
- Motion referring not so much to what program telling students, but to programs with very specific general
  education requirements
  - If students change majors to another major with specific general education requirements, can be loss of
    many credits in process

**Vote on Motion 38-AP-16:** Motion PASSED by vote of University Faculty Senators

Academic Policies Committee – Second Reading – Motion #5 of General Education Requirement Revisions
Evaluate Impact of GE Changes

**Motion 38-AP-17**
Moved and seconded by Academic Policies Committee (10-0) that all Departments, Schools, and Colleges
evaluate the impact on course availability for their students of any General Education changes resulting
from Recommendations 1 and 2 and changes made at the Department, School, and College level. We
recommend that this evaluation be included as part of the annual report.

Debate

- This motion specific to course availability; motion to establish specific timeframe to review all revisions to
  general education would be in order after completing this motion
  - Made tremendous changes in GE requirements without oversight to see if changes actually meeting goals
  - Need clarification of intent of Senate – is intent to throw out entire general education program in existence and
    put committee in place to create new criteria for general education
  - Senator Lozar noted intent always has been to make modifications as specified by motions
  - Clear understanding in committee that all policies and procedures in place, that have not been changed by
    specific motion, remain in place until new committee comes up with others that have been approved by
    APC and University Senate
  - Do need to add implementation date
  - General understanding to allow cycle of review of GE courses to manage transition to new system
  - Courses already in GE when changes made, still part of GE program
  - Once new criteria set up, GE courses up for review will be evaluated using newly established criteria

**Vote on Motion 38-AP-17:** Motion PASSED by vote of University Faculty Senators

**Motion 38-US-21**
Moved by Senator Pitts and seconded that five years from the implementation date that all of these five
general education motions be reviewed by University Senate

Debate

- Need to set implementation date to specify time framework
- Friendly amendment that Academic Policies Committee do review to include self-study by committee and
  report to University Senate accepted

**Vote on Motion 38-US-21:** Motion PASSED by vote of University Faculty Senators

**TEXT OF MOTION AS AMENDED**
Five years from the implementation date of the general education revisions, the Academic Policies Committee,
with assistance from the University-Wide General Education Committee, will review the impact of the revisions
and report to the University Senate.
Implementation Date
- Understood to be 2003-2004 catalogue with assumption that committee in place in fall 2002
- Work of committee would have to be done in fall semester to meet catalogue copy deadline
- Input from associate deans on whether minimum of two subcategories could be made retroactive important so don’t overlook something in process
  - Can do very quickly
  - Will bring back results of consultation to discuss

Academic Policies Committee – Second Reading – Sport Pedagogy Emphasis

**Motion 38-AP-18**
Moved and seconded by Academic Policies Committee (10-0) that the University Senate approve the proposed emphasis in Sport Pedagogy within the Kinesiology Comprehensive major

Debate
- Emphasis designed for students interested in teaching but not qualifying for our school of education
  - Will give kinesiology background to take to another university to pick up education courses
  - Has approval of School of Education
- Little nervous about opening backdoor and introducing means for students not meeting minimum qualifications to complete an education program and be placed out in schools
- Not really case of students not meeting minimum standards; case of program in education not being large enough to handle number of qualified students we have
  - Tell them as freshmen that think they are good enough, but minimum qualifications often a moving target
  - This gives avenue to say to juniors not admitted to small number of PE teacher preparation positions in School of Education, we respect you and have taken you on as a student, we want you to finish here
  - Can do everything except teaching certificate courses
  - Alternative is to send them to River Falls or Winona State as juniors and lose good students
- For motion – education graduates currently in high demand
  - Often individuals in masters programs for school counseling don’t have credits in education, but helps if have background and training allowing them to do adjunct activities in schools
  - Might go on for master of arts in teaching
- Possible for students to graduate with bachelors degree and come back for teaching certificate here
  - Some decided to become teachers after the fact
  - Others coming in backdoor

Vote on Motion 38-AP-18: Motion PASSED without dissention by vote of University Faculty Senators

Academic Policies Committee – Second Reading – HMNG Prefix

**Motion 38-AP-19**
Moved and seconded by Academic Policies Committee (9-0) that the University Senate approve the establishment of a new prefix: HMNG (Hmong)

Vote on Motion 38-AP-19: Motion PASSED without dissention by vote of University Faculty Senators

2. Announcements
- Encourage faculty and academic staff colleagues to submit spring election ballots if they have not done so
  - Certain number of ballots must be returned to consider vote on referenda valid
- Consultants from KPMG working with UW-Eau Claire on plan to modernize administrative systems (like Blugold system)
  - Week of May 6th, Senate Technology Committee will organize open sessions for faculty and staff to meet with consultants and discuss technology needs and concerns
  - Important to be prepared to talk about types of functionality to retain from current system and what hope to gain
Email invitations to these sessions will be sent as soon as dates, times and rooms confirmed.

3. Miscellaneous Business

**Motion 38-US-22**

Moved by Senator Pitts and seconded that the following resolution be approved by the Senate.

Whereas the Statutes of the State of Wisconsin (Chapter 36, Section 13, Sub-Section 5) state that; "Any person having tenure may be dismissed only for just cause and only after due notice and hearing";

And whereas the Administrative Code of the University of Wisconsin System (Chapter 4, Section 1, Sub-Section 2) states that "A faculty member is entitled to enjoy and exercise all the rights and privileges of a United States citizen and the rights and privileges of academic freedom as they are generally understood in the academic community. This policy shall be observed in determining whether or not just cause for dismissal exists. The burden of proof of the existence of just cause for a dismissal is on the administration."

And whereas the Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System has adopted the Safransky decision (Safransky v. The Personnel Board, 62 Wis. 2d 464 [1974]) as the standard of "just cause"; a standard which permits the dismissal of an employee if "some deficiency has been demonstrated which can reasonably be said to have a tendency to impair his [sic] performance of the duties of his [sic] position or the efficiency of the group with which he [sic] works."

And whereas it has become the stated policy of the Board of Regents to apply this inappropriate standard; and whereas this standard is inapplicable in the specific situation of faculty members at a University of Wisconsin institution, with the distinctive rights and imperatives of academic freedom and shared governance and all that such entail;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the University Senate of the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire, strenuously objects to the Board of Regents' adoption of the Safransky decision as the standard of "just cause"; and calls upon the Board of Regents to restore due process protections of tenure thereby returning to the principle of "just cause" as it is traditionally understood in the context of institutions of higher learning; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED the University Senate of the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire requests the Board of Regents comply fully with procedural and substantive provisions of the UWS Administrative Code and State Statutes when making decisions; and that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Regents of the University of Wisconsin System and the President of the University of Wisconsin System.

**Debate**

- Safransky Decision being used as basis for dismissing tenured faculty
  - Safransky made mistake of mentioning sexual preference in 1970s – fired for that reason
    - In this case, just cause satisfied by deficiency which can reasonably be said to have tendency to impair performance
  - UW-Eau Claire only campus not responding to issue; haven’t even talked about it
  - Ought to stand in opposition to vague standard of just cause entitled to in Chapter 36
  - Has nothing to do with decision made in Superior
- Laws for academic freedom allow people to express opinions
- Safransky creates fear resulting in groups not fully embracing debate
- Number of tenured faculty declining in system; academic staff numbers increasing
- We have history and tradition and keep talking about shared governance – to keep shared governance alive and vital, important to support this resolution

Motion by Senator Boyum that rules be suspended to allow item to be voted on today seconded and PASSED without dissention
Continued Debate

- Several motions of this nature coming before Faculty Personnel Committee didn’t make distinction between individual cases where definition had been applied and the definition itself
  - This motion makes that distinction
  - Favor motion

Motion by Senator Wick to move the previous question seconded and PASSED without dissention

Vote on Motion 38-US-22: Motion PASSED without dissention

Motion by Senator Lozar to suspend the rules and let the minutes show that the University Senate expresses its great appreciation to Chair Harrison for her highly skilled, patient, and good humored leadership of University Senate seconded and PASSED by acclamation

Meeting adjourned at 4:26 p.m. without objection

Wanda Schulner
Secretary to the University Senate