The regular meeting of University Senate was called to order by Chair Harrison at 3:02 p.m. March 11, 2003 in the Tamarack Room of Davies Center

1. Without objection, minutes of February 25, 2003 meeting of University Senate were approved as corrected
   - On page 5, B., second bullet: spelling of accessible corrected

2. Chair and Faculty Representative’s Report – Chair Harrison
   - Introduction of new senator from Computing and Networking Services – Dan Drumm

3. Academic Staff Representative’s Report – Senator Wilcox
   - Next meeting March 20, 2003 in Madison

4. Unfinished Business

   A. Executive Committee – Second Reading – Handbook Revisions for Section UWEC 8
      Continued Debate on Previous Motion – None

   **Vote on Motion 39-SE-05:** Motion PASSED without dissention

Without objection, by request discussion of resolution on war with Iraq postponed until after first reading and discussion of item under Miscellaneous Business

5. Miscellaneous Business

   A. Academic Policies Committee – First Reading
      Report on Criteria for General Education Courses – Senator Syverson
      - Last year, University General Education Committee charged with developing criteria for General Education at UW-Eau Claire
Once criteria in place, University GE Committee to assume control over general education program
- Responsible for reviewing new courses for inclusion in GE and
- Reviewing courses as they go through update procedures to assure appropriate for GE
- GE Committee to develop questionnaire to be used by people proposing new courses or coming through course update procedure

- Currently addressing philosophy and criteria, which require University Senate approval
- Things discussed by Academic Policies Committee listed on written report
- Responses to questions on report
  - Last bullet under Prerequisites, Availability, and Evaluation means that you cannot rely solely on examinations that are machine scored
  - Entire prerequisite issue was sticking point along way
  - Co-requisites would be considered prerequisites
  - If require more than two prerequisites, then would be specialized course; but, also issue of fluency
    - GE Committee stated requiring fluency in mathematics would not preclude course like Physics 231 from eligibility for GE because some students come in ready to take calculus
    - In foreign languages, some GE literature courses require fluency in that language
      - Again, some students can come in with that fluency without taking four courses
      - Would be treated same way as mathematical fluency
- Implementation considered immediate so University General Education Committee can begin working under these criteria
- Since people now preparing GE proposals working under current guidelines, will still use old criteria for rest of this semester

Motion 39-AP-13
Moved and seconded by Academic Policies Committee (9-0) that the University Senate approve the policy statement on General Education and criteria for courses included in the General Education program as shown below:

Policy Statement on General Education
Experience and learning have always communicated the interdependencies and interrelationships that exist between persons and things – and today, because of the increasingly powerful technologies of information gathering, communication, and transportation, it is even more vital for students to see that specialized knowledge alone is not sufficient to meet the challenges of reasonable and responsible living in a complex world. Specialties enable persons to be successful as professionals. General Education must enable them to be successful as human beings.

The General Education program is provided to help each student attain the basic competencies, breadth of knowledge, and critical judgment that characterize a mature and responsible individual in the modern world. More specifically, the program is designed to: (1) stimulate and direct learning throughout life; (2) provide exposure to typical modes of inquiry within the disciplines; (3) promote active learning and a critical response to what is read, heard, and seen; and (4) broaden individual perspectives and emphasize relationships with other fields of study, other cultures, or other times.

The General Education program seeks to develop further the abilities and skills of students by fostering: (1) extensive communication and analysis; (2) an elevated social conscience and commitment to a life of involvement and public service; and (3) opportunities to study and to develop a system of values.

Criteria for courses included in the General Education program

Prerequisites, Availability, and Evaluation
Each GE course must:
- Be available to non-majors. Courses for which pre-assignments are only offered to majors or whose populations are only majors in the discipline will not be considered GE. [Note: to receive a favorable Update review, the course’s enrollment history must demonstrate course availability to non-majors.]
- Have no more than two courses as prerequisites for registration. More courses or credits in prerequisites imply a specialization in a discipline or content area.
- Employ a variety of means to assess and evaluate learning (i.e., no course may rely solely on types of examination that could be machine-scored).
Course Content
Each GE course must contribute to:
- Broadening individual perspectives (e.g., issues related to gender, cultural diversity and individual differences).
- Providing a basic foundation of the field to allow critical analysis of what is read, heard, and/or seen and solve problems.
- Providing exposure to typical modes of inquiry within the discipline(s) and examining relationships with other fields of study.
- Enhancing the ability to write, read, speak, and/or listen.

Amendment 39-AP-13-a1
MOVED by Senator Stecher and seconded that the first sentence of the second bullet point read
- Have no more than two courses as prerequisites for registration, excluding prerequisites that establish language or mathematical proficiency.

Debate
- Amendment clears up some specific cases
  - Physics 231 and 232, a basic one-year introduction to physics that requires calculus, could be interpreted as having too many prerequisites under way criteria currently written
    - Is another introductory physics sequence (Physics 211 and 212) that does not use calculus
      - But, Physics 231 and 232 is superior course in almost every way to students with mathematical preparation
      - Many students come here ready to take Physics 231 and 232
      - Too bad to have some students take a lesser course just because of this GE requirement
  - Similar situation exists for some foreign language courses
  - Friendly amendment to insert word foreign before word language accepted
  - Last fall, 49 GE courses had two or more prerequisites
  - 39 were foreign language courses; other ten scattered among English, Math, Biology, Physics, and Art
  - Was opinion of University GE Committee that these fell into area of proficiency; was not committee’s intent that those courses that rely on either language or mathematical proficiency at a certain level would fail to be GE
    - Recognize some students come to university at 200 level in a foreign language or 114 level in math
    - At the same time, need to recognize if student is not at 114 level in math and must start with 110, most of Category I credits will be used up before worrying about two prerequisites for a GE course
    - Was feeling of committee that didn’t need to specify foreign language or mathematical proficiency; are reasonable people, will view each course on its merit

Vote on Amendment 39-AP-13-a1: Amendment PASSED without dissention by University Faculty Senators

TEXT OF AMENDMENT AS PASSED
- Have no more than two courses as prerequisites for registration, excluding prerequisites that establish foreign language or mathematical proficiency.

Without objection, discussion of main motion to continue at next University Senate meeting

(4. Unfinished Business continued)
- Provost responded to question asked prior to his arrival about program review task force
  - Only update is that task force has been examining models used at other universities
  - Have asked for some additional time; original deadline was middle of this month

B. Executive Committee – Second Reading – Resolution Against War in Iraq
Continued Debate on Amendment to Original Motion:
Be it resolved that the University Senate, composed of faculty and academic staff, at the University of Wisconsin – Eau Claire urges President Bush not to start a war, unilaterally and preemptively, with Iraq and to pursue a diplomatic resolution built upon international support unless it is formally declared in accordance with the provisions of the United States Constitution.

- Wondering how amendment has any teeth given that Congress already handed power over to President Bush
- According to Provost Satz, maker of amendment, it was an attempt to reconcile differences of opinion heard at last meeting
  - Amendment indicates belief in something
    - In first part – don’t go to war, resolve using diplomacy
    - In second part – there is a way to think about going to war when one must do it; that is with open discussion, open debate, everyone on record, then take action
- Resolution too narrow in focus when only goes to president; ought to be sent to all representatives and senators from Wisconsin as they may have some say in this sooner or later
- Against amendment – president already given authority to go to war against Iraq; doing so unilaterally and preemptively without seeking international support
  - Original motion/resolution more powerful in its simplicity and more clear
- Against amendment – received many emails; gist was that amendment muddied the waters regarding what they wished to say, which was they are against the war
- Favor amendment – it speaks in favor of the constitution
- Liked comment on process, but if we send out amended resolution, people will be uncertain of message
  - Maybe need a second amendment on process used as opposed to statement about war
- Could pass two resolutions
  - One to the president saying don’t do this
  - Another to Congress saying grab your prerogative and don’t let him do this
  - In central place would be one to the president; should not be slowed down or confused by other need to get process back
- My colleagues only supported amendment where there was some thought on process; original was a true anti-war declaration they were less comfortable with
- Approximately three-quarters of my constituents favored original motion; about ten percent opposed both

Vote on Amendment 39-SE-06-a1: Amendment DEFEATED by vote of 15 for, 37 against

Continued Debate on Main Motion

Amendment 36-SE-06-a2

Moved by Senator Wick and seconded that the following resolution be substituted for the current resolution:

Be it resolved that the undersigned members of the University Senate acting as individuals and not acting on behalf of the entire faculty and academic staff of the University, urge President Bush not to start a war, unilaterally and preemptively, with Iraq and to pursue a diplomatic resolution built upon international support.

Debate
- My department was uncomfortable with resolution for couple of reasons
  - Some disagreed with content
  - Others didn’t think University Senate ought to be making the resolution
  - They asked that I draft this language, which was sent out to every senator
- Against amendment – issue is that we make a unified response and speak as a body
  - Have had plenty of time to poll our constituency
  - If we speak via a petition, we are speaking as individuals
Against substitute motion – would need to go back to constituents who asked me to represent an opinion; my signing a petition is not doing that

Against substitute – for same reason
  - Carefully polled my department; know how they responded
  - This would dilute that power

Not sure what it feels like to be over there in Iraq, but my sister-in-law does; urge you to support substitute motion

Amendment 39-SE-06-a2-a1
Moved by Senator Beach and seconded that the petition be worded

Be it resolved that the undersigned members of the faculty and staff of the University of Wisconsin – Eau Claire urge President Bush not to start a war, unilaterally and preemptively, with Iraq and to pursue a diplomatic resolution built upon international support

Debate
- If going to be speaking as individuals, why only members of University Senate
  - Should also try to publish petition in Leader-Telegram

Vote on Amendment 39-SE-06-a2-a1: Amendment PASSED by vote of 28 for, 14 against

Continued Debate on Amended Amendment:
- Speak against amendment – if we adopt substitute motion, we are coping out
  - Have moral obligation to speak out if we truly believe going to war unilaterally and preemptively is wrong
  - To remove this, after all this discussion, is wrong
- Against amendment – might be more appropriate if list of names would be for those who support war
- Offered amendment as attempt to act in good faith for my constituents
  - They indicated they do not want to see this go forward speaking for them; they don’t believe this body has the right to speak for them on this issue
- Substitute motion dilutes what resolution was trying to do
  - Uncomfortable with idea that those against going to war put name to a petition, but those either in favor or not wanting to make voices heard assume kind of anonymous support
  - Aware of potential contradiction that we vote in Senate all the time and not all of us agree, yet we live by decisions; this is a different kind of situation
    - Would rather have a motion that tells what the vote was, so it allows for people who disagree with it
- If amendment passed, Senate would stop right here and petition would go out to faculty and staff to sign
- Recommend voting against this amendment so can consider original motion; then this one can be considered by everyone individually
- Agree – can have both Senate resolution and also petition

MOTION by Senator La Salle to move the question seconded and PASSED by two-thirds majority

Vote on Amendment 39-SE-06-a2: Amendment DEFEATED

Back to Main Motion:

MOTION by Senator Pitts to move the question seconded and PASSED by vote of 43 for, 7 against

Vote on Motion 39-SE-06: Motion PASSED by vote of 41 for, 11 against

POINT OF INFORMATION: Vote not normally indicated on Senate actions
- Take exception to sending out vote count
  - Voted against resolution not because opposed to it, just don’t think it should come from University Senate
- Agree – my unit unanimously preferred not to have this addressed
● Sending Vote Count with Resolution DEFEATED by voice vote

MOTION by Senator Pitts to send resolution to Wisconsin Senators and Representatives seconded and PASSED

6. Reports of Committees
   ♦ Executive Committee – Chair Harrison
     • Next meeting April 1, 2003
     • Looking at possible change to how Senate officers elected

   Question of Chair’s Ruling on previous motion and request for a hand count ruled OUT OF ORDER because not done immediately following vote

   ♦ Faculty Personnel Committee – Senator Wick
     • Next meeting March 14, 2003
     • Getting updates from subcommittees

   ♦ Academic Staff Personnel Committee – Senator Wilcox
     • Next meeting March 27, 2003

   ♦ Academic Policies Committee – Senator Syverson
     • Next meeting March 25, 2003
     • Discussing College of Business residency requirement and potential item from Provost concerning registration

   ♦ Physical Plant Planning Committee – Senator Stuettgen
     • Next meeting March 28, 2003

   ♦ Budget Committee – Senator Carpenter
     • Last meeting had a presentation by Provost Satz
       • Important for people to know five percent exercise is no longer an exercise; now decisions are being made by administration on kinds of numbers and proposals that will be put forth
     • Next meeting near beginning of April

   ♦ Compensation Committee – Vice Chair Gapko
     • Next meeting March 28, 2003
     • Taking up report from Analysis Subcommittee on last two year’s pay plans and other subcommittee reports

   ♦ Nominating Committee
     • All Senate Committees full; Nominating Committee has not met

   ♦ Technology Committee
     • Next meeting April 1, 2003
     • Hearing from web accessibility committee about draft policy
     • Will also begin discussion of administrative policy on distance education
     • Close to bringing to Senate
       • Flow chart for communication of committees on campus with regard to technology
       • List of questions and answers for faculty developing online courses

7. Special Reports - None

8. Announcements - None

Meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m. without objection

Wanda Schulner
Secretary to the University Senate