The regular meeting of University Senate was called to order by Chair Harrison at 3:05 p.m. Tuesday, December 10, 2002 in the Tamarack Room of Davies Center

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

2. Chancellor’s Remarks – Chancellor Mash
   - Proud of recognition received by CeCelia Zorn, selected as Wisconsin’s Professor of the Year, at Board of Regents meeting last week
     - Two of System President Katharine Lyall’s good news items included Eau Claire
       - Dr. Zorn and fact that Eau Claire campus won award four times since begun in 1993
         - Reinforces notion of strong teaching and great learning environment
         - This campus consistently listed in top twenty nationally for size of study-abroad program
     - Also heard presentation at meeting on Citizens for Higher Education
       - New organization in state sending out letter co-signed by two former governors talking about active support for public higher education in Wisconsin and need for stronger advocacy on behalf of UW-System
         - Solicitation for membership costing $100 per year
         - Going to be small staff organizing way to advocate for UW-System among citizenry
         - Same sort of organization at work in number of other states
   - No more currently known about state’s budget challenges; will not know much definitive for long time
     - Governor presents budget in February and then to legislature
     - May be early summer before know impact; currently contingency planning
     - Work going on at System level to position university to head off major reductions and maintain reasonable support
     - As mentioned in op/ed piece in Eau Claire Leader-Telegram, another serious reduction would limit access to university resulting in a smaller campus with far-reaching implications
Also said tuition needs to be part of solution
Clearly new leadership in legislature – taking fresh look at state government and how it operates
Looking at how state manages resources and comes to budget reductions
Met with chancellors of Stout and River Falls and west-central Wisconsin legislators to emphasize important role of UW-System in state
Trying to educate legislators on implications of recent budget reduction and concerns about coming legislative session
Will continue working at this; communicating with area legislators extremely important
Looking for suggestions and ideas about how to position more of our people on campus to effectively communicate among neighbors as well as legislators – administration prepared to provide any necessary information for such sessions
Governor-elect Doyle to be on campus Monday to hear suggestions on budget
Another large commencement December 21, 2002
Mickey Crothers, Excellence in Teaching Award recipient from Psychology Department, to be commencement speaker
To present five or six alumni achievement awards
Want to be sure you know administration and others appreciate strong focus on work being done here and great things continuing to happen in and out of the classroom despite continual unsettling news of budget
Response to question from floor
Not only other chancellors, but those outside of higher education as well, concerned about suggestions that state tap into retirement fund as part of solution to budget; UW-System has been in touch with governor’s office on that matter
Not clear at this point whether idea has much credence
Such talk an indication of difficult budget challenge

3. Chair and Faculty Representative Report – Chair Harrison
Chair’s report includes review of last Board of Regents meeting
Note correction on item #3 under Board of Regents
Performing arts major is affected by three-month moratorium on all new academic planning not theatre program as stated
Next meeting of Faculty Representatives on January 31, 2003
Chancellor signed motions
Establishing minors in International Business and Teaching English as a Foreign Language
Changing language for Faculty Status Eligibility
Changing Bylaws for filling vacancies for terms of different lengths
Talks have resumed and tentative agreement appears to have been made with some unions regarding classified pay plans – some hope that things will happen after last couple years with no new contract

4. Academic Staff Representative Report – Senator Wilcox
Next meeting will be teleconference on December 19, 2002

5. Unfinished Business
A. Academic Policies Committee – Second Reading – CRMJ Prefix in GE III G (Interdisciplinary Social Sciences) Continued Debate on Previously Amended Motion
Concern about trying to force CRMJ courses into just one GE category addressed by College of Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee in motion passed by 7 to 0 vote on December 5, 2002
Suggests courses with Criminal Justice prefix proposed for general education credit be allowed to count in categories below as appropriate based on GE Committee decision
GE-C (interdisciplinary studies – communications);
GEII-F (interdisciplinary studies – natural sciences);
GEIII-G (interdisciplinary studies – social sciences);
GEIV-E (interdisciplinary studies – humanities); or
GEV
Amendment 39-AP-06-a2

MOVED by Senator Smith and seconded to include the criminal justice prefix courses that meet the general education criteria in GEI-C (Interdisciplinary Studies – Communication), GEII-F (Interdisciplinary Studies – Natural Sciences), GEIII-G (Interdisciplinary Studies – Social Sciences), GEIV-E (International Studies – Humanities), or GEV

Discussion

- Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee heard examples of courses that in future, if proposed, might fit into any one of those categories, such as
  - Crime in the Mass Media in GEI
  - A Forensic Science course in GEII
  - Philosophy of Punishment in GEIV
- Against amendment – original wording indicates courses which cross GE categories and courses offered by Colleges of Professional Studies and Business, except courses with IDIS prefix, will be listed under General Education V category
  - If a course has content that belongs in GEII as well as GEIII, that crosses categories and should be designated GEV; that is why category created
  - Also possibility of courses within a GE category that are interdisciplinary in nature
  - Courses just mentioned would exist within a particular category
  - If are criminal justice courses, are already interdisciplinary
  - Then belong in GEIII-G; if they might also fit in those other categories, would cross categories and belong in GEV
  - Could have course developed with criminal justice nature within particular category
  - Was understanding when Category V passed that courses which cross boundaries be put in that category
  - Topic has not been discussed by University General Education Committee; that committee believes recommendations for particular categories rests with curriculum committees of individual schools/colleges
  - University GE Committee has presented Category V for catalogue copy as courses coming from professional schools or courses that include more than one GE area as previously indicated

Vote on Amendment 39-AP-06-a2: In opinion of chair, amendment DEFEATED by University Faculty Senators

Vote on Motion 39-AP-06: Motion PASSED without dissention by University Faculty Senators

TEXT OF AMENDED MOTION

That any course with the CRMJ prefix that meets General Education criteria will be included in General Education Category III-G (Interdisciplinary Studies – Social Sciences) or Category V

B. Academic Policies Committee – Second Reading – University General Education Committee membership and function details

Vote on Motion 39-AP-07: Motion PASSED without dissention by University Faculty Senators

TEXT OF MOTION

1) The University General Education Committee be established as a University Faculty Committee;
2) Staggered three-year terms for current members begin August 2003 with the first faculty members being replaced in 2004; and
3) The following language be inserted in Chapter 3 of the Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook, The Constitution of the University Faculty and the University Academic Staff, Article One: University Faculty, Section G – University Faculty Committees:

6. University General Education Committee
   a. Membership: The committee includes six faculty representatives from the College of Arts and Sciences, two faculty representatives from the College of Business, and one faculty representative from each of the three 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. Faculty serve staggered
three-year terms with approximately one-third of the representatives from each College being elected each year.

b. Function: The University General Education Committee is responsible for recommending criteria for General Education courses. The criteria will be forwarded to the University Senate Academic Policies Committee and the University Senate for approval. The Committee approves courses for inclusion in the General Education Program, periodically reviewing existing general education courses for reapproval.

6. Reports of Committees
   ◆ Executive Committee – Chair Harrison
     ● Next meeting January 21, 2003
   ◆ Faculty Personnel Committee – Senator Wick
     ● No additional meetings scheduled
     ● Subgroups working on issues raised by Handbook Review Committee
       ○ Periodic review of faculty
       ○ Complaint and grievance policies
       ○ University-wide and departmental search and screen policies
   ◆ Academic Staff Personnel Committee – Senator Wilcox
     ● Meeting December 12, 2002
       ○ To continue work and elect Academic Staff Representative for July 2003 to July 2005
       ○ Contemplate going into closed session to consider appointments for Search and Screen Committee for Director of Teaching and Learning Technology Development Center
   ◆ Academic Policies Committee – Senator Syverson
     ● Will not meet until next year
     ● Things coming up include
       ○ College of Arts & Sciences initiatives, one to approve name change of Department of Art
       ○ University General Education Committee recommendations
   ◆ Budget Committee
     ● Discussing budget planning process; to continue at next meeting on January 21, 2003
   ◆ Compensation Committee – Senator Gapko
     ● Meet next at end in January
     ● 2003-2005 general compensation plan and guidelines have been approved by Board of Regents
       ○ UW – Eau Claire pay plan, previously approved by this body, will be sent to System again for approval
   ◆ Physical Plant Planning Committee – Senator Stuettgen
     ● Committee heard report from Gary Bartlett on parking and transportation services
       ○ No parking rate increase planned for 2003-2004
       ○ Bus service numbers indicate more people riding buses – 33,086 students and faculty rode student transit system during October
       ○ Also heard report from Interim Athletic Director Tim Peterman regarding ongoing discussion on condition of Carson Park field
     ● Next meeting January 31, 2003
   ◆ Nominating Committee – Senator Taylor
     ● Since all Senate Committees full; Nominating Committee has not met
   ◆ Technology Committee – Senator Lang
     ● Began discussion of intellectual property issue; will continue next semester

7. Special Reports – None

8. Miscellaneous Business
   A. Executive Committee – First Reading
      2004-2005 Academic Calendar Report – Vice Chair Gapko
      ● Administrative Officer Jan Morse brought some calendar options to Executive Committee for consideration
        ○ Committee reached consensus to revise spring semester of Draft 2 to match Draft 1
        ○ Only difference between two drafts, included as blue sheets in meeting packet, is when fall classes begin
          ○ Draft 1 has classes beginning before Labor Day on September 2, 2004
• Draft 2 has classes beginning after Labor Day on September 7th
• Draft 1 has 41 MWF classes and 28 TTh classes; Draft 2 has 40 MWF classes and 27 TTh classes in fall
• In spring semester, on both drafts, there are 43 MWF classes and 29 TTh classes
• After much discussion, Executive Committee decided by split vote to recommend Draft 2, but to bring both drafts forward to full Senate for input
• Response to questions for clarification on content of report
  • No fall break – difficult to add to this particular calendar with short time period between Labor Day and Christmas
  • Lose many days of teaching early in September; hard for sciences to work around that kind of schedule
  • Winterim meets guideline requiring minimum of 14 days of classes

Motion 39-SE-03
Moved and seconded by Executive Committee (8-4) that the proposed University of Wisconsin – Eau Claire calendar for 2004-2005 with Winterim be approved as follows

Fall Semester 2004:
  Aug 23 – First Day of Faculty Contractual Period
  Aug 30-Sept 3 – Advising and Registration
  Sept 6 – Labor Day Holiday
  Sept 7 – Classes Begin
  Nov 24 – Thanksgiving Recess begins at 5 p.m.
  Nov 29 – Classes Resume
  Dec 13-17 – Final Examinations Week
  Dec 18 – Commencement

Winterim 2005:
  Jan 3 – Classes Begin
  Jan 17 – Martin Luther King Holiday
  Jan 21 – Last Day of Classes

Spring Semester 2005:
  Jan 24-25 – Advising and Registration
  Jan 26 – Classes Begin
  Mar 21-28 – Spring Break
  Mar 29 – Classes Resume
  May 16-20 – Final Examinations Week
  May 21 – Commencement
  May 22 – Last Day of Faculty Contractual Period

3-Week Summer Session 2005:
  May 23 – Classes Begin
  May 30 – Memorial Day Holiday
  June 10 – Final Day of Classes

8-Week Summer Session 2005:
  June 13 – Classes Begin
  July 4 – Independence Day Holiday
  Aug 5 – Final Day of Classes
  Aug 6 – Commencement

Debate
• Jan Morse confirmed calendar must be to System in mid-January; requires vote on issue today
• Seems fall break successful, especially for first-year students; think should be considered
• Break excluded because of unevenness of semesters – so few class days in fall semester compared to spring; imbalance was major concern
• Speak against proposal in favor of alternate draft
  • Since on campus, have never seen as few as 40 MWF classes in a semester; has been as high as 46
Classes start on Tuesday; if have labs on Tuesdays, difficult to have first class be a lab

Is possible to propose third draft; can also amend Draft 2 if desired

Draft 2 is whole week less compared to what we have now; lose too many classes

Student Senate Academic Affairs Commission, at meeting last week, reached consensus to approve Draft 2 for following reasons

- No need for students to come to classes two days, then travel back home, then return for next week of classes
- If start classes on Thursday, would also be Thursday labs with same situation as previously brought up for starting on Tuesday
- Allows students to move in over weekend without need for parents to take off work
- Allows more days for registration of international and other students

Troubled and disappointed that when talk about calendars like this, first thing to go is time for education; at an institution of higher education, should be most important issue

To start after Labor Day would in many science classes with labs eliminate whole week because would not have met with students prior to first scheduled lab

Draft 2 has basically 13-week fall semester; would have to deal with 14 weeks of coursework in 13 weeks

Administrative Officer Morse also talked to students from Student Life and Diversity Commission; primarily agreed with start after Labor Day

- Rationale much like related here in addition to child care and employment concerns

Draft 1 gives students an extra week of classes free

Calendar different than any previous calendar in way Winterim ends; will be two day break before second semester begins – on both drafts

MOTION by Senator Syverson that rules be suspended to allow item to be voted on today seconded and PASSED

Amendment 36-SE-03-a1
Moved by Senator Ho and seconded to add the 13th and 14th of December to the fall semester as teaching days and start finals on December 15th

Debate on Amendment

- Finals would be split, December 15th, 16th, 17th, 20th and 21st; commencement would be in middle of finals
- Have had this pattern before; not well received by parents to come to commencement when students haven’t actually passed their exams
- Thing that seems to upset students most is when commencement in middle of finals; really object to that
- Could hold commencement after finals during the next week
- Would seem to be issue for parents and commuters; believe only graduations in System not on Saturday, are on Sunday
- Support amendment only because desperately need more class days
  - Encourage administrators to work with legislature to have constraint of starting after September 2nd removed
  - Not enough days to do good job of teaching
- Is state statute that classes do not start until after September 1st
  - Administration has been trying to change for years; will take very loud voice to do so
- To split finals into two different weeks would be very tough, especially with commencement issues
  - Again would be moving during week

Vote on Amendment 39-SE-03-a1: Amendment DEFEATED

Vote on Motion 39-SE-03: Motion PASSED by vote of 32 for, 17 against

B. Faculty Personnel Committee – First Reading
Report on Functional Equivalents of DPCs and Promotion Subcommittees – Senator Wick

- Asked by number of sources to clarify language regarding operation of ‘functional equivalents’ when DPCs or promotion subcommittees cannot be formed due to lack of sufficient membership
- Tried to come up with formalization of current practice in most departments
Tried to develop language to clarify what functional equivalent means and role it would play in overall process of personnel recommendations
Since this published, have had feedback, so would ask that we not suspend rules to vote on this today

Motion 39-FP-01
MOVED and seconded by the Faculty Personnel Committee (6-0) that the following changes be made to the University Handbook, Chapter 5.

Page 5.9 (Departmental Personnel Committees)

Organization
In order to formally organize and make recommendations, a Department Personnel Committee must have three or more members. If a Department Personnel Committee cannot be formed because of insufficient numbers of eligible members, then the Department Chair in consultation with those faculty eligible for membership on the committee shall initiate those recommendations which the committee would normally have submitted to the Chair. Consultation with the eligible members shall include notification of the decisions reached and shall provide the opportunity for the eligible members to attach written comments to be included with the recommendations forwarded through the administrative channels.

Each eligible faculty member has a responsibility to serve on the Department Personnel Committee, and there is no provision for resignation from this committee. An individual may must decline to participate in certain decisions of this committee when there is a danger of conflict of interest. If However, the failure of an individual faculty member to participate in this committee's actions reduces the number of participating members to fewer than three, then for the purpose of those actions, the functional equivalent (see below) shall replace the committee. does not negate the procedures of the Department Personnel Committee nor does it necessitate the less formal consultation (authorized when no Department Personnel Committee can be constituted). In fact, the use of the consultation procedure is inappropriate in such instances. (US 3/89)

Functional Equivalent
If the Department Personnel Committee cannot be formed because of insufficient numbers of eligible members, then the Department Chair in consultation with those faculty eligible for membership on the committee shall operate as the functional equivalent of the Department Personnel Committee. Consultation with the eligible members must include notification of the decisions reached and must provide the opportunity for the eligible members to attach written comments to be included with the recommendations forwarded through the administrative channels.

The functional equivalent shall be treated as the Department Personnel Committee in all respects and must adhere to the normal policies and procedures (including meeting announcement procedures) that govern the operation of the Department Personnel Committee except in those cases where the normal policies and procedures:

1. call for a recommendation to be submitted from the Department Personnel Committee to the Chair. In this situation, the functional equivalent shall operate as the Department Personnel Committee and the recommendation shall be submitted directly to the Dean.
2. call for the Department Personnel Committee to assist the Chair with a specific task. In this situation, the Chair shall perform the specific task with assistance from the other members of the functional equivalent.
3. call for the Department Personnel Committee to take a specific action with input from the Chair. In this situation, the functional equivalent shall be responsible for the specific action.
4. call for the Chair to perform an evaluation independent from the evaluation performed by promotion subcommittee. In this situation, the functional equivalent shall perform the single evaluation.

In those cases where the Department Chair is the sole member of the functional equivalent, the normal meeting announcement procedures do not apply.

Page 5.24 (Promotion Subcommittees)
**Organization**

There normally will be three such subcommittees in each department, to be known as (department name) Professorship Subcommittee, (department name) Associate Professorship Subcommittee, and (department name) Assistant Professorship Subcommittee. In order to formally organize and make recommendations, a promotion subcommittee must have three or more members. If any of the promotion subcommittees cannot be formed because of insufficient numbers of eligible members, then the Department Chair in consultation with those faculty eligible for membership on the subcommittee shall initiate those recommendations which the subcommittee would normally have submitted to the Chair. Consultation with the eligible members shall include notification of the decisions reached and shall provide the opportunity for the eligible members to attach written comments to be included with the recommendations forwarded through the administrative channels.

Each eligible faculty member has a responsibility to serve on the appropriate promotion subcommittee. Moreover, there is no provision for resignation from this committee. An individual may must decline to participate in certain decisions of this committee when there is a danger of conflict of interest. If However, the failure of an individual faculty member to participate in this committee's actions reduces the number of participating members to fewer than three, then for the purpose of those actions, the functional equivalent (see below) shall replace the committee. does not negate the procedures of the promotion subcommittee, nor does it necessitate the less formal consultation (authorized when no promotion subcommittee can be constituted). In fact, the use of the consultation procedure is inappropriate in such instances. (US 3/89)

**Functional Equivalent**

If any of the promotion subcommittees cannot be formed because of insufficient numbers of eligible members, then the Department Chair in consultation with those faculty eligible for membership on the subcommittee shall operate as the functional equivalent of the promotion subcommittee. Consultation with the eligible members must include notification of the decisions reached and must provide the opportunity for the eligible members to attach written comments to be included with the recommendations forwarded through the administrative channels.

The functional equivalent shall be treated as the promotion subcommittee in all respects and must adhere to the normal policies and procedures (including meeting announcement procedures) that govern the operation of the promotion subcommittee except that recommendations for promotion shall be initiated by the functional equivalent and shall be submitted directly to the Dean.

The normal policies and procedures call for a recommendation to be submitted from the promotion subcommittee to the Chair. In this situation, the functional equivalent shall operate as the promotion subcommittee and the recommendation shall be submitted directly to the Dean.

In those cases where the Department Chair is the sole member of the functional equivalent, the normal meeting announcement procedures do not apply.

**Debate**

- Issues raised concern role of department chair and clarification of consulting process
- Also are faculty on campus that do not have recommendations submitted directly to deans
- As stated, if you do not have three members for DPC, then DPC does not exist and functional equivalent takes over
  - If have at least three members, then DPC does exist even if someone withdraws themselves from a particular action; so need clarification that functional equivalent takes over in these cases also
- Suggest specific language changes be forwarded to committee to come back in package form for next meeting
- Chair does not lose level of approval on those personnel actions; chair still forwards recommendation, but done with consultation
- Important to clarify this motion essentially formalizing what we already do
  - Major change is in second paragraph where previously if someone withdrew from deliberation for conflict of interest and that withdrawal dropped number on committee from three to two, the two left acted as the DPC; Faculty Personnel Committee preferred functional equivalent model be used in all cases where fewer than three people participating
Rest is clarification of current policy and practice

Confusing to create impression chairs are going to meet as committee with other eligible members when they are really not; when say going to be functional equivalent of personnel committee, suggests following set procedures that personnel committee would follow

That would be change from somewhat informal consultation currently done

Committee believes when that kind of consultation occurs, ought not to be behind-the-scenes consultation that no one knows about; is in fact evidentiary meeting and should be open

Believe this to be original intent as best could understand

Seems changing nature of whole enterprise because now have personnel committee acting independently of chair; proposal now brings those two things together and tries to formalize it in a manner that substantially changes the relationship

Current policy indicates when DPC can’t be formed, chair makes recommendation in consultation with eligible members of committee that can’t be formed, not changing that

Committee concerned about degree of informality in situation that does not occur when formal DPC existed; could be problematic if aren’t minutes and records as to evidentiary knowledge brought to meeting

Thought should fix that

Language in Chapter 5 of Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook recognizing and operationalizing distinctive role of department chair seems to conflict with changes

Language on membership of DPC explicitly excludes department chair

Language saying in all personnel matters, department chair is responsible for conducting his/her own review

Would like to have all this language considered

Second paragraph is not talking about abstentions, but when someone formally withdraws, not participating in meetings and not voting

Current policy provides opportunity for faculty who are eligible to submit minority reports; probably not current practice

Strictly a consultation with minutes and then chair would write up his/her report

Current policy is when can’t form DPC, department chair makes evaluation and recommendation in consultation with faculty members who could have served on committee had it been formed

Proposal calls for opportunity for people who would have had a chance to vote to be informed as to what department chair will recommend, to provide input, and to attach a report that they agree or disagree

There is single person making evaluation - the department chair

However, being forced to hear opinions of those who would have been eligible for committee if one could be formed

Puts lot of power into one person’s hands

Committee believes checks and balances in place up administrative channels outweigh possible side effect of having one person make recommendation

Current policy precludes practice of using individuals from related disciplines or from off campus when DPC cannot be formed

Not allowed under current policy; not changing that

Existing language is actually clearer; creation of concept of functional equivalent of DPC confusing

Especially where says functional equivalent shall be treated as DPC in all respects and must adhere to those policies and procedures

There is no vote, it is not forwarded to chair; that’s really ambiguous

Seems informing people of and enforcing current language would be clearer

Agree with previous speaker

Reason why language has been changed is remainder of Chapter 5 refers to what governs operation of DPC

Confusing as to whether applies when no DPC, for instance, language about appeals refers to what to do with DPC, but there is no DPC, so that language doesn’t apply in some instances

Certainly not intent of document; tried to add some formality to clarify

With changes, if talking about something that governs operation of DPCs and you don’t have one, then you are dealing with functional equivalent and policy applies

Seems way to fix that is to add phrase DPC or source of original recommendation

Committee looked at that – found so many places in language that would become convoluted with that phrase; thought better to separate out and put in beginning
Adding phrase certainly would be an option

Without objection, continued debate and vote on motion will take place at next meeting

C. Academic Policies Committee – First Reading

Report on Final Exam Policy Revisions – Senator Syverson

- Motion originally brought forth by Dr. Wilma Clark from Associate Deans Group
  - Later withdrew her support, deciding status quo better
  - Members of APC felt still some merit in what presented so continued to work on document
- Considerable agreement that current final exam policy too inflexible
  - May be some cases where faculty members think appropriate to give final exam early, but forbidden under current policy
  - Also some students have three exams on last day of finals; in that case under current regulations, student would have to take final on commencement or take incomplete; felt it may be more appropriate to take that final early
  - Students participating in NCAA sanctioned post-season tournaments now required to take incomplete
  - Allows faculty members flexibility to give early exam above board instead of under cover
  - Some faculty believe instructor alone should control when final exam given; others wanted check of assistant/associate dean so they become the fall guy
  - Decided list of extraordinary circumstances may be beneficial, but because could not make it exhaustive, felt perhaps better to leave out

Pros of recommendation

- Allows more flexibility and at least consideration of early final exams
- Removes some wording about incompletes because that policy detailed elsewhere
- Allows faculty to come out of cover of darkness and offer early finals legally

Cons

- May lead to increase in requests for rescheduling of final exams
- Some faculty may feel more pressure to reschedule exams although this policy does reserve their right to say no; also reserves right of deans office to say no

Response to questions on content of report

- Recommendation does not use word early, but does not limit it to later
  - Cannot, however, reschedule for before finals week
  - Does not change requirement that classes meet during regularly scheduled final exam time
- Does not allow for students with exams on Monday, or those leaving before beginning of finals week, to take exams earlier
- In APC were concerned about students with three exams on Friday having same flexibility as students with three exams on Monday

Motion 39-AP-10

Moved and seconded by Academic Policies Committee (7-1) that the final examination policy as stated below be substituted for the “Change of Schedule by Student Request” section under “Final Examinations” on page 7.10 of the 20th edition of the Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook

Change of Schedule by Student Request

No student will be permitted to reschedule a final examination unless there are in the event a course is concluded with a final examination, no student will be permitted to take it before the regularly scheduled examination time for the course involved; and no student will be permitted to postpone a final examination unless for illness, death in the family, or other extraordinary circumstances over which the student has no control. Make-up examinations must be arranged by the student with the instructor and must be completed by the 11th week of the following semester except under extraordinary circumstances approved by the Dean of the College in which the student is enrolled. The exact date is published in the Schedule Bulletin [Class Schedule] each semester.” (FS 7/70)

Administrative policy permits students to request the change of an individual examination time for any of the following reasons: three or more examinations scheduled for one day; conflict with a military obligation; conflict with an employment commitment, if such commitment existed prior to the publication of the examination schedule. Verification of the circumstances must be furnished by the student. Approval must be obtained through whatever procedure has been established by the College which offers the course involved. Changes are not allowed for
reasons such as an already purchased plane ticket, leaving campus early, a family vacation, or conflict with employment, unless such work commitment existed prior to the publication of the examination schedule.

A request for a change in the time of an individual final examination must be approved by the instructor, the department chair and the assistant/associate dean of the school or college in which the course is offered. Make-up examinations must be scheduled during finals week or later and must be arranged by the student with the instructor.

Amendment 39-AP-10-a1
Moved by Senator Syverson and seconded that the following wording be inserted into first paragraph after the second sentence: A student with three or more examinations scheduled for one day may request the change of an individual examination time.

Debate on Amendment
- Because no list of dire circumstances for which exam time may be changed, concerned that three exams in one day rationale might be lost
- Current language does include this

Vote on Amendment 39-AP-10-a1: Amendment PASSED without dissention by University Faculty Senators

Debate on Main Motion as Amended
- Would like to hear rationale for originally not allowing finals to be changed to earlier
- Understand it was attempting to preclude requests for students to get out of here early because they wanted to extend break by a few days
- Also concern about exam being out early for courses with multiple sections
- Still concern for NCAA athletes going on national championship trip; language that pertains to that hasn’t changed
- Remains circumstances over which student has no control – in past, have been occasions where professors have determined an NCAA championship was within the students control, i.e., they could either go to that or they could take finals
- Would like to see after no control a reference to authorized absences in Handbook which speaks to illness and serious injury as well as university sanctioned events, like NCAA athletic events

Amendment 39-AP-10-a2
Moved by Senator Bredle and seconded to insert (see Authorized Absences in the Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook) after first sentence

Debate
- Believe taking out phrase that no exam can be given early will solve problem; generally faculty have been very cooperative about NCAA events
- Phrase about authorized absences would open floodgates for requests from students because are many activities on campus that are authorized; afraid would invite people to think permissible to change final exams all around
- Only happens for athletes in spring; will happen again this spring because finals start May 12th
- National golf championship and national softball tournament held that week
  - Fortunately we have qualified one out of the eight national teams in each event
- Every year, athletic director has students in office anguished because faculty member reads in handbook “only in cases of three exams, conflict with military or employment, or extraordinary circumstances out of their control”
- Taking list out might be helpful as will being more permissive about solving conflicts
  - Current motion does; Athletics can live with either authorized absences phrase or not
- Point about NCAA tournaments is that calendar is made by people outside university; calendars for many authorized activities lie within control of people here
- Against amendment; APC tried to come up with list and it kept getting longer and longer
- Determined best to have no list; doesn’t preclude any student from making a request, but allows instructor, chair and dean to make final judgment
Vote on Amendment 39-AP-10-a2: Amendment DEFEATED by University Faculty Senators

Continued Discussion on the Main Motion as Previously Amended

- Suggest don’t suspend rules and vote today
  - Encourage every senator to talk to entire constituency about issue so body can hear those opinions before vote

Without objection, continued debate and vote on this motion postponed to next Senate meeting

9. Announcements – None

Meeting adjourned at 4:43 p.m. without objection

Wanda Schulner
Secretary to the University Senate