The regular meeting of University Senate was called to order by Chair Harrison at 3:02 p.m. on Tuesday, September 23, 2003 in the Tamarack Room of Davies Center

I. Without objection, minutes of September 9, 2003 meeting of University Senate approved as distributed

II. Chancellor’s Remarks – Chancellor Mash

- At Friday morning meeting with area legislators, sponsored by Chamber of Commerce, comments all directed at budget and growing Wisconsin out of economic downturn
  - Eight or nine legislators present – all Republicans
  - They were looking forward to going back into session and coming up with own ideas about growing Wisconsin; several made positive comments about important role of university
  - Governor announced his plan two weeks ago
  - Although legislators said governor’s plan was incomplete, they were also charitable and complimentary about some things he put forward that they felt they could build on
  - Significant change in tone since complete change in leadership of Republicans and Democrats in Madison
  - May get some bipartisan attention on challenges of state – would seem to be good for university system
- Following that session, sent letters to legislators
  - Commended them and provided with information on card just distributed to senators
  - Purpose of card is to head off additional budget reductions when deal with structural deficit by June of 2005 by pointing out disproportionality of cuts to UW-System in past
  - Other message is able to keep quality (such as US News & World Report ranking) by managing very carefully, but also by reducing capacity in public higher education system of state
    - Now even University of Wisconsin Colleges turning students away; not good for future of Wisconsin
    - Coming out of economic downturn can’t happen without more college degrees and more high-end jobs
    - Have to get back to investing in and growing capacity of UW-System
When introducing governor at meeting in Menomonie, had opportunity to talk about reduced capacity of UW-System and why Grow Wisconsin Plan can’t work without much healthier UW-System

Received well; governor made comments about UW-System before going on to his own remarks

Need to continue to make point as best we can – that’s what cards are for

By chancellors meeting Friday, Compensation Advisory Committee representatives will have given Katharine Lyall feedback on pay plan/health insurance issue

Response to question from floor

More cards available from Chancellor’s Office or News Bureau; will be distributed to all faculty and staff on campus shortly

III. Chair and Faculty Representative’s Report – Chair Harrison

Welcome Senator Hollon, new senator from Department of Curriculum and Instruction

Next faculty rep’s meeting is teleconference on Friday, October 3, 2003

Next Board of Regents meeting in Oshkosh on October 9th and 10th

Any member of Faculty Personnel Committee, Academic Staff Personnel Committee or Executive Committee not having copy of Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook, let Senate Office know

IV. Academic Staff Representative’s Report – Senator Wilcox

Met last Thursday

Louise Root-Robbins told us of UW-System Sloan Project for Academic Career Advancement

UW-System received $500,000 to look at effect of changing demographics (more women, more minorities) on academic community and how to deal with changes

Looking at workplace issues such as equity, flexibility and career options

George Brooks continued to talk about idea of increased contributions for health insurance premiums to partially fund pay plan

Reps realized idea not dead in water yet and grilled Brooks about plan

Reps drafted issue statement regarding academic staff and budget cutbacks

Now being looked at by Academic Staff Personnel Committee here

When talking about budget of UW-System, given message to say enough is enough, legislators need to get message this is painful; interesting that does not trickle down to individuals employed by System as got message it is not good for UW-System for us to talk about our pain, meaning 0% raises

V. Unfinished Business - None

VI. Elections to Fill University-Wide Vacancies on Academic Staff Personnel Committee

Person elected to hold office until next regular election

Additional nominee since nominees were published, so will take additional nominations from floor today with election being held at next Senate meeting

Report of University Academic Staff Nominating Committee – Chair Leisz

Nominations for Academic Staff Personnel Committee

Joey Bohl from Admissions

Jacqueline Bonneville from Advising, Testing, and Orientation

Norm Card from TLTDC

No additional nominations from floor

VII. Reports of Committees

Executive Committee – Chair Harrison

At last meeting, set following topics for Open Discussion held here next week at 3:00 p.m.

Further updates on health insurance premiums and pay plan

Overview of proposed changes in English competency and Foreign Language/Foreign Culture requirements

Revisions to Academic Program Review Process

Topics of Attendees Choice

Next meeting October 7, 2003 to discuss

Membership requirements for various Senate Committees
Potential guidelines for constructing academic calendar in less than ideal years

Faculty Personnel Committee – Senator Wick
- Meet Tuesday, September 30, 2003 for updates from subcommittees

Academic Staff Personnel Committee – Senator Wilcox
- First meeting September 25, 2003 to
  - Elect chair
  - Look at issue statement from academic staff representatives
  - Consider changes in election of Academic Staff Representative and other handbook changes

Academic Policies Committee – Senator Syverson
- Meet again September 30, 2003
- Talking about
  - Proposed revision of foreign language/foreign culture requirement
  - Proposed change to department program review policies – encourage early input on issue

Physical Plant Planning Committee – No Report

Budget Committee – Senator Dwyer
- Organizational meeting set for October 1, 2003

Compensation Committee – Vice Chair Gapko
- Reached consensus at last meeting that if were to receive 2% pay increase, would temporarily suspend merit/market model and go with across-the-board percentage increase
- Also agreed if George Brooks proposal to pay higher amount for health benefits for pay increases approved
  - Would recommend increase in January be flat dollar amount
  - Second increase in July be percentage increase
- Committee discussed, but did not reach consensus, on whether to support pay plan already approved for nonrepresented classified staff (0% first year, 1% second year) or George Brooks’ proposal

Nominating Committee – No Report

Technology Committee – Senator Dwyer
- Next meeting October 2, 2003 to elect chair and set agenda for semester

VIII. Special Reports – Health Insurance Update – Vice Chancellor Soll
- UW-System proposal brought to Compensation Advisory Committee to gather reaction from faculty and academic staff
  - By October 10th, Regents to make decision on pay plan recommendations to be sent forward – need reactions and comments down to System by tomorrow afternoon
- Faculty/Academic Staff Pay Plan and Health Insurance for 2003-05 Biennium Power Point Presentation – handout distributed (see attached for details)
  - Faculty/Academic Staff Pay Plan
  - Health Insurance Programs and Premium Contribution Structure
    - Major Changes in Health Insurance Programs 2003-05 Biennium
      - New Standard Plan
      - Pharmacy Benefit Manager Program
      - Premium Contribution Structure
        - 105% Model
        - 80% Model
        - 3-Tier Model
      - Alternative 3-Tier Model – UWS Alternative Compensation Plan
        - Advantages
        - Disadvantages
    - Next Steps in Pay Plan Process
  - Details not included in handout
  - Three categories of state employees that JCOER deals with – two directly, one indirectly
    - Represented classified employees pay plan determined by collective bargaining
      - Bargaining process also used to determine health insurance contributions
    - For faculty/academic staff, regents send proposal to Office of Employee Relations in Department of Administration, then to JCOER
    - Nonrepresented classified employees, not part of bargaining process, pay plan set by JCOER
      - Usually first to be set; establishes baseline for unions and university
Come January, may be three different contribution structures; level of complexity not dealt with before
System-wide about 77% of employees use plans that fall in Tier 1; at UW-Eau Claire, nearly two-thirds of employees participate in plans in Tier 2
Alternative Compensation Plan
  - For Group Insurance Board proposal, multiplier from single to family is 2.5; for alternative plan, multiplier is four
  - Plan would require use of one-time source of money in second year of biennium to make it work
  - Unclear where money will come from in future – serious disadvantage
  - No way to predict timeframe for pay plan process
  - Will be more opportunities to hear about insurance plans

Responses to Questions and Comments from Floor
  - At this point, have not heard any discussion of separating faculty from academic staff
  - UW-System Alternate Plan 2% increase would be to base, but be implemented in January of 2004
  - Non-formulary drugs did not apply to maximum this year
  - Tiers determined based on efficiency of plans, not on cost alone
    - Population served taken into consideration
    - Tier 1 most efficient
    - Have not seen actual documentation; part of reasoning was to encourage plans to increase efficiency
    - State-wide only four HMOs in Tier 2; two in Eau Claire County
  - System has been told by DOA Office of Employee Relations, if employee contribution not at least equal to three tier plan, proposal will not be approved
  - Tier 3 plan contributions considerably less than current because standard plan no longer the same; now total premium significantly lower
  - All HMOs cost more than under old 105% plan
    - Consistent with getting all employees to contribute something
  - Rate structure for alternate plan similar to that in other states and necessary to generate enough dollars to cover pay plan
  - Seems unless salary around $70,000, will pay more because 2% raise would not compensate for added insurance cost
    - If in Tier 1, would be money ahead
    - Have to take into consideration impact of higher salaries over years; can’t just look at premiums
  - Should point out to System how this looks in relation to item just discussed about work/life issues
  - System factored into equation that many may change to Tier 1 plans; did not factor in people moving from family to single plan
  - Don’t see avoiding getting 0% raises as good thing
    - Trying to make point that we are not being treated well; we got 0%, that is reality should let world know
    - Trying to pretend we didn’t get 0% so System can say they are taking care of us, does not change reality
  - One of George Brooks’ points is never trade salary for benefits
    - Salary increase advantageous in long run
    - Also other political considerations
  - Experience of 0% pay plan about a decade ago illustrated results of year of not advancing at all; why System more anxious now to avoid that
  - Employee contributions should have no impact on total premium for various plans – not giving more money to HMOs or Blue Cross
    - Hopefully plans will seek placement in Tier 1 by becoming more competitive
    - Alternative pay plan only applies to unclassified staff in UW-System, not all state employees, so limited potential to affect total premiums
  - One of risks of plan is state might just take extra contributions
  - Plan also puts more pressure on bargaining unions because this state group willing to pay bigger amount
  - Retirees pay full premium, not just employee share, so does not impact them
  - Contribution increases not only money being used to fund pay plan
    - About $22 million, from paying current premiums instead of two months in advance, also in plan
    - George Brooks believes at end of biennium, state would pick up this amount
    - In that case, would come out ahead
  - If support UW-System recommendation and live in Eau Claire, Dunn, or Chippewa County, will be funding larger share of system-wide pay raises because probably in Tier 2 plan
System response would be, with uniform benefits, move to Tier 1 program; is personal decision of how
important current plan is relative to lower cost plans
Can’t predict how many employees would switch to Tier 1 plan; System did factor in some movement
Will continue to be enough providers to handle people that switch because HMOs don’t have own clinics
and physicians; so change plans, but not necessarily providers
Even though health insurance is prepaid, when you leave state employment, you pay full premium
Contribution structure in effect for two years even if health insurance premiums rise in second year
Also now 2% closer to medium salary, so less likely to get pay raise next biennium
Base salary increase this year to come from compensation reserve; continuation of 2% increase would
come from health insurance contributions and premium holiday
If salaries increased 2%, probably won’t be lowered later; UW-System would simply have to find way to
fund meaning reduced support and decreased new hires
Choices not decreased, costs just changed
Increases in premiums down road may erode pay increases, although premium probably will go up in all
plans
Old 105% model gone either way
Will get paid next week
People who pay single premium come out even better
Faculty can influence plan – why System floated idea
Contact Compensation Advisory Committee with input by noon tomorrow
Are other ideas still being considered for feasibility
Would like to see assumptions laid out – major assumptions of alternate plan problematic

IX. Miscellaneous Business

Chair Harrison outlined options for getting to essential business of English Competency Exam considering open
forum scheduled for next week (exam scheduled for October 11, 2003; next Senate meeting on October 14, 2003)

- Give exam as scheduled and move forward with motion before next scheduled exam
- Meet next Tuesday, prior to open forum, to handle motion

MOTION by Senator Gapko to continue this meeting next Tuesday at 3:00 p.m. in Tamarack Room for the
English Competency Exam motion and shorten the forum seconded

Discussion

- Favor eliminating exam, but can’t remember treating an issue this way in terms of scheduling; concerned
standards being dropped
- On urgent issues in past have suspended rules to vote at first reading; first reading of this motion was scheduled
for today
  - Would have that option today if not for long health insurance/pay plan presentation
- Could also continue now; typically many senators need to leave at 5:00 p.m.
- Tried to propose in spring, but agendas full at that time
  - Wanted to save students from having to take exam that now feel is indefensible
  - Students already know elimination being proposed; dilemma whether to sign up now or wait and see
  - Affects ability to apply to School of Education
- Proposal to do first reading of issue right now and meet again next week for second reading accepted as
friendly amendment

MOTION passed without dissention

Academic Policies Committee – First Reading
Report on Removal of English Competency Exam from Graduation Requirements – Senator Syverson

- Department of English brought issue forth because believe exam outdated based on way most students now
write
- For English Competency Exam, students sit down and write on paper; typically in English 110, use
computer technology with rough draft and edits in iterative process
- Propose English Competency Exam be dropped and a grade of C or better in English 110 satisfy university
writing competency
Now most people have to take English 110 (or Honors 101, or English 112) and take this competency exam; if they pass English 110 or equivalent, but fail competency exam, then have not met writing competency requirement at UW-Eau Claire

**Motion 40-AP-01**

Moved and seconded by the Academic Policies Committee (9-0) that UW-Eau Claire no longer require an English competency exam for graduation. Instead, a grade of C or better will be required in English 110 or 112, Honors 101, or a transfer equivalent to fulfill the University graduation requirement for writing competency. Students who have earned credit in English 110 by means of the Advanced Placement or International Baccalaureate examinations or have tested out of English 110 at UW-Eau Claire will have met the University requirement for writing competency.

We recommend the following procedure for making these changes:

**Beginning in fall 2003**

- To eliminate the backlog, exempt from the exam all current students who, by the end of spring 2004, have earned a C or better in English 110 or 112, Honors 101, or a transfer equivalent. (Students who have not earned a C in one of those courses will need to pass the CLEP, a computer-based essay exam.)

**Beginning in fall 2004**

- Remove the English competency exam from University graduation requirements and
- Require a grade of C or better in English 110 or 112, Honors 101, or a transfer equivalent to fulfill the University graduation requirement for writing competency.

Debate

- Editorial change from word *exam* to *examination* in first line accepted without objection

Second reading and vote on this motion to take place on September 30, 2003

Meeting adjourned at 5:12 p.m. without objection

Wanda Schulner
Secretary to the University Senate