UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-EAU CLAIRE
UNIVERSITY SENATE MEETING
VOL. 39, NO. 8
January 28, 2003

Members Present:


Members Absent:

Ned Beach, Dick Boyum, Joel Duncan, Meg Dwyer, Bruce Dybvik, Jeannie Harms, Sean Hartnett, Jeremy Hein, Phil Huelsbeck, Mary Iribarren, Fred Kolb, Tim Lane, Vicki Reed, Todd Stephens, Thomas Wagener, Rebecca Wurzer

Guests:

Margaret Cassidy, Mark Clark, Bernard Duyfhuizen, Kathleen Sahlhoff, Andrew Soll, Elaine Wendt, Ted Wendt

The regular meeting of University Senate was called to order by Chair Harrison at 3:01 p.m. Tuesday, January 28, 2003 in the Tamarack Room of Davies Center

1. Without objection, minutes of December 10, 2002 meeting of University Senate approved as distributed

2. Chair and Faculty Representative Report – Chair Harrison
   • Note Item #1 under Special Executive Committee meeting
     • After last Senate meeting, Senate Chair started receiving emails and personal visits concerning passage of 2004-2005 Academic Calendar
       • Concern expressed over lack of customary second reading and so few instructional days
       • After consultation with Shared Governance Discussion Group, called special meeting so committee could hold second hearing on calendar
       • Could make decision on behalf of full Senate as would be the case if Chancellor eventually rejected first Senate action
     • Executive Committee, after hearing those wanting to speak, by vote of 11 for and 2 against, passed Draft #1 (following) of 2004-2005 Academic Calendar as a compromise during extreme calendar conditions

Fall Semester 2004:

Aug 23 – First Day of Faculty Contractual Period
Aug 30-Sept 1 – Advising and Registration
Sept 2 – Classes Begin
Sept 6 – Labor Day Holiday
Sept 7 – Classes Resume
Nov 24 – Thanksgiving Recess begins 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

- Chancellor has signed off on above calendar and submitted to System
- Chancellor also signed off on
  - Handbook placement of details of University General Education Committee
  - Name changes to English major and minors
  - Creation of CRMJ prefix
  - Creation of Actuarial Science minor in Mathematics
- Please note two items listed on Chair’s Report to be changed in next edition of handbook
- At last Executive Committee meeting, question of how to respond to Representative Kreibich posed during open forum
  - Consensus to draft letter (attached to name tag) for support by full Senate to be sent to Rep. Kreibich

MOTION by Senator Stecher that the letter be sent to Representative Kreibich on behalf of the full Senate seconded and PASSED without dissention.

3. Chancellor’s Remarks – Chancellor Mash
- State fiscal situation
  - On January 30, 2003, governor will give State of the State address; not until February 18, 2003 will he make his budget recommendations public
  - Last Thursday governor called for special session of legislature and proposed reductions for between now and June 30th to deal this year’s deficit
    - Affects UW-System to tune of about $7 million; our campus share is $335,000
    - Additional reductions beyond what already taken this year
    - Referred to as a lapse because not a base budget cut; have to return some money
  - Able to handle this lapse through central university reserve
    - Anticipating lapse led University Senate Budget Committee to set aside larger reserve
    - As a result, units and departments won’t be asked to send money back to handle
  - Memo from President Lyall yesterday laid out lapse and cautioned campuses to do following
    - Limit travel, advertising, and publications
    - Be careful and selective about replacing staff
      - Rep. Kreibich wrote letter to new Secretary of Department of Administration pointing out positions being searched for and wondering why System would fill these during fiscal crisis
      - Letter occasioned conversations on part of System to Department of Administration clarifying that are managing our positions and anticipating a reduction
  - All in all, news is pretty good this year; wish I could be as positive about next two years
    - Now in second year of 2001-2003 biennium
      - In first year, campus took $500,000 reduction
      - In current year, before this lapse, we took another $1.6 million reduction
      - Puts reduction for this biennium at $2.15 million
    - Fortunate Chippewa Valley Initiative, funded in prior legislative session, not spent
      - Cut back by half what doing with that initiative; brought about $1 million to bear on this reduction
      - Why current biennium has not seemed too painful here
    - Budget repair bill that caused $2.1 million reduction this biennium was about a $50 million reduction to UW-System (about 5%)
    - Just finished 95/5 exercise whereby must indicate how will reduce budget by 5% if asked
Next year likely to be reality, not just exercise
Next biennium campus reduction would be about $2.3 million but will be no Chippewa Valley Initiative money to use
Pain likely to be about three times what felt this particular biennium
Also could be worse than 5%
May have read that at Eau Claire 5%, or $2.3 million, would equate to roughly 45 or 50 positions left vacant
Use personnel figures because 85 to 87% of campus operating budget is in personnel
Hiring or renewal of positions will be affected; all contingent on timing and when begin to know what reduction likely to be
Won’t necessarily make reductions exclusively from positions
Unknown in all of this is tuition
Raised tuition for current year by 8.4%
Raising tuition 8.4% for next year would roughly offset a 5% reduction
Must keep in mind that governor and legislators keep saying no new taxes
May get to point where do too much damage if try to handle with no new taxes
Legislators also cautioning governor on user fees
Need to watch very carefully because tuition could be considered user fee
Will continue doing everything we can; campus has done very well so far
Made some good calculations and anticipated reductions; has been tight and a little tough, but okay
President Lyall and Regents meeting regularly with Governor Doyle and his staff
More accommodating at those meetings than Governor McCallum and his staff
Willing to share information up front and assist with planning
Meetings with legislators also ongoing, if not always successful
While doing formal things that need to be done, constituents need to be talking to their elected representatives as well
Political game seems the same even with change in leadership
2003-2005 biennium is going to be difficult and painful
Way we talk about it and extent to which we share process in understandable terms will minimize impact on morale
Will continue talking and communicating
Looking for your suggestions or observations
Response to questions from floor
Increase in tuition of 8.4% offsetting 5% reduction looking at operating budget only, not pay plan increase
Most of pay plan increase in last biennium supported by tuition
Like to talk about this issue in regard to Wisconsin’s future and impact on region
Say as for us, we can manage it; but too bad for Chippewa Valley and Wisconsin
Have reduced size of freshmen class for next year as result of budget reductions already in place
Access is significant issue for parents and others; public cares as much about that issue as anything
Last year for first time, UW-Colleges turned away students so access issue resonating with parents
That sort of message not so much self-serving in terms of what university needs and wants, but what people want and Wisconsin needs
Recent poll clearly indicated where public stands on value of UW-System
Don’t want to see UW-System take disproportionate cuts as it did in budget repair bill

4. Academic Staff Representative Report – Senator Wilcox
- Next meeting will be February 20, 2003

5. Unfinished Business

A. Faculty Personnel Committee – Second Reading – Functional Equivalent of DPCs
Continued Debate on Previous Motion
MOTION by Senator Wick to substitute the motion attached to the name tags for the pending motion seconded

Debate
- Wording change does not change content or intent of motion

Vote on Substitution for Motion 39-FP-01: Motion PASSED without dissent by University Faculty Senators

Vote on Motion 39-FP-01: Motion PASSED without dissent by University Faculty Senators

TEXT OF MOTION AS SUBSTITUTED
Page 5.9 (Departmental Personnel Committees) of Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook

**Organization**

In order to formally organize and make recommendations, a Department Personnel Committee must have three or more members. 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 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 or Unit Director shall operate as the functional equivalent of the Department Personnel Committee and must formally consult with those faculty eligible for membership on the committee. Consultation with the eligible members must be reported to the next administrative level. The Chair or Director shall provide written notification to those eligible members of the recommendation being forwarded, and those members must be provided an opportunity 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 or Director. In this situation, the functional equivalent shall operate as the Department Personnel Committee and the recommendation shall be submitted directly to the next administrative level.
2. call for the Department Personnel Committee to assist the Chair or Director with a specific task. In this situation, the Chair or Director 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 or Director. In this situation, the functional equivalent shall be responsible for the specific action.
4. call for the Chair or Director to perform an evaluation independent from the evaluation performed by Department Personnel Committee. In this situation, the functional equivalent shall perform the single evaluation.
In those cases where the Department Chair or Unit Director 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. This 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 or Unit Director shall operate as the functional equivalent of the promotion subcommittee and must formally consult with those faculty eligible for membership on the subcommittee. Consultation with the eligible members must be reported to the next administrative level. The Chair or Director shall provide written notification to those eligible members of the recommendation being forwarded, and those members must be provided an opportunity 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 next administrative level.

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

B. Academic Policies Committee – Second Reading – Final Exam Policy Revision

Continued debate on previous motion

**Amendment 39-AP-10-a3**

MOVED by Senator Syverson and seconded to insert phrase *(e.g. hospitalization or military obligation)* at the end of the first sentence

Debate

- Amendment suggested by Interim Associate Dean Wilma Clark
  - Since last Senate meeting, has worked through series of sticky cases involving conflicting perspectives of faculty, students, and parents
  - See two policies as workable and enforceable, either
1) Completely liberalize policy to allow any individual exam time change to be decided by student and instructor; or
2) If deans’ offices to be involved, amend current motion to clearly indicate kind of exception that will be granted
   • Need firm examples to clarify to students and parents why request denied
   • Judgment still required; would approve change in exam time for athlete invited to post-season national championship scheduled by group entirely outside control of our university if instructor and department chair approved
   • Same language came up in Academic Policies Committee
   • After discussion, decided not defining anything was best approach
   • If say is for hospitalization and military obligation and yet indicate you will also excuse someone for an athletic event outside ability to schedule, not being entirely upfront and honest about intentions of policy
   • Motivation for putting examples in is to give parents something concrete in addition to vague “beyond student’s control”
   • Giving one good concrete example often finishes conversation because can give something of such magnitude that they realize a faulty alarm clock doesn’t measure up to standard
   • Post-season athletic events brought issue forward in first place; understand concern of including with examples, but concerned that might get lost
   • If written down, does not sound as much like making it up as go along; always better in deans’ offices if can point to something in writing
   • Simple word hospitalization opens a can of worms (whose hospitalization; bad injury, but not hospitalized, etc.)
   • Seems athletic competition and military service would be clearer
   • Support lack of “death in family” as example because definition of family might be different based on culture
   • Leaving “hospitalization” unspecified gives deans wiggle room for making decisions
   • Speak in favor of amendment because provides couple hard, fast examples parents and students can look at, but preserves deans ability to make decision based upon information in particular case
   • Just examples, not all-inclusive list, other part of policy says what won’t be allowed; support amendment
   • Motion does address another issue that brought this forward – possibility of legally giving an exam early during course of finals week

**Vote on Amendment 39-AP-10-a3:** Amendment PASSED by vote of University Faculty Senators

Continued debate on main motion
• Not mentioning incompletes does not alert students that if take exams after finals week, will result in incomplete which will need to be cleared up by 11th week of next semester
  • May make a difference to some students
• Committee believed incomplete language redundant because covered elsewhere
• Don’t see why all formality needs to be there; like idea of letting it be an agreement between faculty member and student
  • Read in background information that was opposed by faculty, but don’t know who they are
• Lot of faculty very much opposed to liberalization because feel it would be free-for-all with many students looking to change their exams
  • Heard of entire department that voted against liberalization; also defeated a couple years ago when brought before Senate
  • Faculty like to have deans’ offices as bad guys
• See no reason final exam schedules need to be signed off at level of dean
  • Chair has responsibility for providing some interference for faculty and also provide checks and balances
  • Looking at budget situation of making 5% or larger cut, yet have people assigned on campus to sign off on top of others’ signatures
    • Faculty could simplify administrative structure and take responsibility for it
  • Not important enough issue for deans to sign off; deans should be doing other things
• Many faculty have spoken in favor of being able to point finger at deans’ offices
  • Could have situation of having to give final exam over and over and over again
  • This officially stops much of that in tracks
If in hands of faculty and department chairs, still good possibility that upset parents would go to deans’ offices anyway; will still be in position to try to make decisions

Syllabi could include short list of extraordinary circumstances to stop volume of requests for moving finals
  • Agree having at level of dean may be work that doesn’t need to be done
  • Untenured faculty, especially in service courses, might be concerned about being seen as unbending and unaccommodating during last few weeks or days before end of semester at time handing out student evaluations
    • Risk integrity of faculty evaluations
  • This takes pressure off individual faculty members; part of job of deans
  • One of key elements hearing is consistency; probably more consistent with control in deans’ offices
    • Causes a mess when some students can change exams and others can’t under similar circumstances
    • Also concerned about protecting tenure-track faculty from pressures
  • Also need to protect instructional academic staff
  • Faculty member could still be protected if decision stopped at level of department chair
    • Is policy in place within which decisions have to be made; would still be able to point to that university-wide policy
    • When go to deans’ level, will not have additional information that wasn’t there for faculty and chairs’ decisions – seems like extra step that is not needed

Request for division of the assembly denied because appropriate only at time of vote

To get sense of whether discussion serving any purpose non-binding straw vote taken – 22 for, 10 against

Continued debate
  • By having dean at end of chain, much greater degree of consistency over decisions without putting faculty members at odds with one another based upon valid reasons for either approving or not approving changes in final exam times
  • Same inconsistencies could still happen across colleges
  • Students always have right to appeal anything instructor says, so could appeal denial by instructor; this process would stop because need instructor’s approval
  • No punishment in place for faculty who just don’t follow these rules

Amendment 39-AP-10-a4
  MOVED by Senator Hooper and seconded to strike the department chair from list of signatures required

Discussion
  • If want consistency and want deans doing this kind of work, send it directly from instructor to dean and leave the chairs out of process
  • Not comfortable voting on this amendment without consultation with department
  • Don’t get consistency argument; if faculty says no, then no consistency check, the answer is no
    • Only talking about consistency when answer is yes; will the dean overturn a yes from the instructor and the chair
    • Leave everybody in, it seems to be working now

Vote on Amendment 39-AP-10-a4: Amendment DEFEATED by vote of 5 for, 22 against by University Faculty Senators

Vote on 39-AP-10: Motion PASSED by vote of 24 for, 8 against by University Faculty Senators

TEXT OF MOTION AS AMENDED
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 (e.g.
hospitalization or military obligation). 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. A student with three or more examinations scheduled for one day may request the change of an individual examination time. 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.

6. Reports of Committees
   ♦ Executive Committee – Chair Harrison
     ● Annual review of frozen files that determine Senate proportions indicate faculty and academic staff numbers varied less than 5% from 1997 figures upon which structure of Senate based
     ● No change in representative proportions required at this time
     ● Noted two academic staff positions will be added to Senate when Academic and Career Services separates into individual units as of July 1st
     ● Vice Chancellor Soll reported UW-Eau Claire pay plan received final System approval because meets recently adopted Board of Regents guidelines
     ● Next meeting February 4, 2003
   ♦ Faculty Personnel Committee – Senator Wick
     ● Continue work on post-tenure/indefinite appointment salary adjustment policies
     ● Will be looking at clarifying language on periodic review, on complaint and grievances policies, and on search and screen policies
   ♦ Academic Staff Personnel Committee – Senator Wilcox
     ● Next meeting February 13, 2003
   ♦ Academic Policies Committee – Senator Lozar
     ● Next meeting February 4, 2003
     ● Discussing General Education Committee proposal on philosophy and criteria for general education courses

FOR THE RECORD
The vote in APC on the motion to approve the minor in International Business included the elimination of the emphasis in International Business as requested by the College of Business. The motion passed at the University Senate meeting of October 8, 2002, however, did not specifically state this emphasis was to be eliminated

Without objection, let the record show that the emphasis in International Business was eliminated at the time the minor in International Business was created

♦ Budget Committee
  ● Provost Satz met with committee to talk about budget planning process in effect on campus
    ● Working hard with leadership counsel to come up with guidelines; committee looking at those
  ● Next meeting March 4, 2003
♦ Compensation Committee – No Report
♦ Nominating Committee – Senator Taylor
  ● All Senate Committees full; Nominating Committee has not met
Technology Committee – Senator Lang
  Next meeting February 4, 2003 to continue discussion of intellectual property issue

7. Special Reports – None

8. Miscellaneous Business - None

9. Announcements
  On February 3rd at 5:00 p.m. on Wisconsin Public Radio, Representatives Rob Kreibich and Larry Balow, both assemblymen who are on Assembly Committee on Colleges and Universities, discussing Wisconsin Higher Education with either Chancellor Mash or Provost Satz; call-in program format

Meeting adjourned at 4:29 p.m. without objection

Wanda Schulner
Secretary to the University Senate