Members Present:


Members Absent:

Paul Butrymowicz, Terry Classen, Michael Dorsher, Dan Drumm, Margaret Dwyer, Bruce Dybvik, Betty Hanson, Jeremy Hein, Robert Hollon, Larry Honl, Debra King, Tim Lane, Gene Leisz, Donald Mash, Rick Mickelson, Jane Pederson, Richard Ryberg, Karen Welch, Rebecca Wurzer

Guests:

Margaret Cassidy, Mark Clark, Wilma Clark, Frank Cuda, Tom Dock, Bernard Duyfhuizen, Steve Horner, Jessie Keene, Jan Morse, Katherine Rhoades, Kathy Sahlhoff, Andrew Soll, Steve Tallant, Matt Waters

The regular meeting of University Senate was called to order by Chair Harrison at 3:07 p.m. on Tuesday, October 28, 2003 in the Tamarack Room of Davies Center.

I. Without objection, minutes of October 14, 2003 meeting of University Senate approved as corrected
   ● Correction to spelling of Alan Gallaher

II. Chair and Faculty Representative’s Report – Chair Harrison
   ● Chancellor today representing UW-System at Kellogg Foundation sponsored forum in Racine
   ● Forum title – Implementing the National Action Agenda for Civic Engagement in Higher Education
   ● Part of national series of forums focused on restoring the public in public higher education
   ● Introduction of Carter Smith, new senator from department of foreign languages
   ● Current listing of senate committee members attached to name tags
   ● Note Joey Bohl was elected to Academic Staff Personnel Committee at last senate meeting
   ● Chair’s report contains comments from Executive Committee open forum and from legislative report
   ● Next faculty rep’s meeting will be October 31, 2003 in Madison
   ● Next Board of Regents meeting will be November 6 and 7, 2003 in Madison

III. Academic Staff Representative’s Report – Senator Wilcox
   ● Held teleconference on October 16, 2003
   ● Many topics of discussion now settled, such as pay plan
   ● Held long discussion on Joint Finance Committee and concealed weapons bill
   ● Bears watching as amendment exempts university buildings but not university lands
   ● Katharine Lyall asked faculty and staff to share “flesh and blood” examples of effect of budget cuts when opportunity to talk to legislators arises
   ● Legislators getting facts and figures, but not stories
   ● All but two campuses have passed academic staff rep’s issue statement approved at our last senate meeting
   ● Has not yet come up at those two campuses
   ● Will be discussing how to use it at next academic staff rep’s meeting
IV. Unfinished Business - None

V. Reports of Committees

♦ Executive Committee – Chair Harrison
  • At last meeting
    • 2005-2006 academic calendar discussed
    • Proposed calendar coming to full senate for approval as soon as administrators and students consulted
    • Reviewed comments heard at last senate meeting concerning senate officers
    • Consensus reached that anyone desiring to change current procedures for electing senate chair and/or faculty rep should bring forth formal motion to be distributed prior to next Executive Committee meeting
    • All senators notified of this action via email
  • Next meeting November 4, 2003
    • Committee to discuss requests that statistical results of required summary statement included on administrator evaluations be made public

♦ Faculty Personnel Committee – Senator Wick
  • Next meeting November 4, 2003 for
    • Discussion of motion concerning language on periodic reviews in handbook
    • Discussion of motion concerning distribution of DPC minutes
    • Distribution and discussion of materials on complaint and grievance policies and on quality investment salary adjustments

♦ Academic Staff Personnel Committee – Senator Wilcox
  • Next meeting November 13, 2003 to
    • Put together motion on election of Academic Staff Representative
    • Continue to look at additional handbook changes

♦ Academic Policies Committee – Senator Syverson
  • Discussion of proposed revisions to department review process and procedures on campus to continue at meeting November 4, 2003

♦ Physical Plant Planning Committee – Senator Bredle
  • Next meeting October 31, 2003
    • At last meeting discussed long-range building plan with Vice Chancellor Soll; also discussed riverbank stabilization project to start in spring

♦ Budget Committee – Chair Harrison
  • Set planning reserve at 1½% of budget – same as last year
    • Already built into this year’s budgets; won’t have additional negative impact on any area

♦ Compensation Committee – Vice Chair Gapko
  • Will meet again in November – no date set
  • Salary increases for faculty and academic staff now set for 0% this year and 1% for next year; health insurance premiums based on three-tiered system
    • Will be reviewing pay plan at November meeting; to bring something forward for 2004-2005 pay plan
    • Was part of Board of Regents pay package that if recommendation forwarded was less than 2%, increases would be across-the-board

♦ Nominating Committee – No Report

♦ Technology Committee – Senator Goulet
  • At last meeting heard report from Interim Assistant Vice Chancellor for Information Technology Lowe summarizing planning process over last three years regarding administrative systems
  • At next meeting – November 12, 2003 – will continue playing role in that process

VI. Special Reports – Master Plan for Future Development of Campus Facilities – Vice Chancellor Soll

♦ Introduced Steve Horner, Director of Facilities Planning; instrumental in putting plan together
  • Will respond to questions here; can also email or contact Vice Chancellor Soll or Steve Horner after presentation or after review of materials

♦ Power Point Presentation (handout distributed)
  • Campus involved in facilities planning exercise for last three years at direction of system administration
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- Six-year physical plant plan required with biennial plan every two years as part of budget process
- Also required to submit long-range six-year plan
- System makes clear what data expected as review proposals from campuses
- This plan serves as basis for 2005-2007 biennial request and includes detailed six-year plan with indications for subsequent six years
- To be submitted March 1, 2004; not a static plan, evolves as needs changes
- Overall goals, taken from system guidebook, are to promote stewardship of university physical plant resources and to provide basis for ongoing physical plant maintenance and development
  - Trying to lay out overall concept so that as things happen they can be done within that context – to avoid instances of undoing or redoing changes previously made
  - Hoping for grand scheme that guides smaller scale projects today, which don’t necessarily require legislative or regent authorization, so we build toward a master plan
  - Objectives range from support of general mission of university at global level to more specific things addressing safety, security, and accessibility
  - Will review general concept and direction with campus during October and November to make sure on right track, then use time from Thanksgiving until March 1st to flesh out details
- Has been participatory process starting three years ago
  - Held series of meetings to find specific needs of departments and units
  - Constantly working with system administration space planning people and Division of State Facilities people
    - Addressing questions up front as build plan, rather than making changes after submitted
    - Hope to be compelling enough in justification so some projects in plan will be included in regents’ priority list that goes forward
- No significant capital construction of academic space on this campus for 20 or 30 years
  - Chancellor’s Hall not academic space, nor did it receive funding from state
  - Focusing on justification and supporting data to move academic needs higher in queue to get state support for much needed academic projects
  - Eventually to be sent forth by regents to State Building Commission with large projects moving on to legislature for enumeration and appropriation
- Took all information gathered through process and condensed to 19 general space issues (see handout)
- Were basis for proposal for 2003-2005 biennium
- Past winter, held another round of meetings and came up with refined list of space issues
- Goes from generalized things, such as classrooms, research space and teaching labs, to more specific
  - Once issues identified, researched and gathered data
    - Most basic piece of research information was space tabulation
      - Looked at each department, unit, and office, room by room, to build case for how much additional and what type of square footage necessary
    - Classroom demand analysis looked at scheduling of classes hour by hour and day by day in regard to section size, utilization and capacity
      - Quality analysis assessed how well current classroom space serving instructional process taking technology and different pedagogical methods into consideration
    - Most classroom designed 30 or 35 years ago; have updated through renovation and modernization projects, but structural and spatial limitations remain
      - Space planning standards for classrooms increased from 15-16 square feet 30 years ago to 25 square feet per student station today
      - Generated total square footage of additional classroom space necessary and configuration of those rooms in terms of seating capacity, ceiling height and aspect ratio, and built those into overall plan
    - Other analytical issues also worked on during process
      - Looked at program and departmental adjacencies very carefully to foster collaboration and programmatic work
      - Looked at opportunities within campus boundaries for construction – great limiting factor
- Plan does not address land holdings – not proposing any change in campus boundaries
- Finally last summer, working with system planners, went through tracing-paper exercise to arrive at number of alternatives
  - Took large campus map with footprints of buildings and added blocks representing mass needed to add square footage called for in plan
• Came up with four alternatives – rapidly rejected three of the four
• System folks ultimately endorsed direction we were heading
• Although have identified alternatives, presenting that one plan as proposal to modify based on reaction and comments
• Can talk about other approaches if questions or concerns surface
• Steve Horner will then turn into document to be presented to system on March 1st
• Then start long, laborious process of securing funding and implementing plan
• Packet contains master plan and origin/destination chart
• Looking at on website has advantage of being in color; also includes classroom demand analysis
• Master plan includes existing structures and additional space under consideration
• Origin/destination chart shows by department or unit where they are today with how much space and where they might move and how much space is planned for them
  • Includes addition to Phillips Hall of state-of-the-art classrooms
    • Allows inadequate academic space in that building to be used for research and offices
    • Allows move of math department to Phillips Hall
    • Allows arts and sciences departments in Schneider Hall to move into space in Hibbard Hall vacated by math department
    • Allows College of Business to use vacated space in Schneider Hall to fill space needs
  • So one project addresses four, five, or six different space issues
  • New buildings and additions to chart show only mass needed, not shape, design, or placement
  • Also proposing additions to Haas Fine Arts Building for
    • Art & design department studio space and room for expanding graphic arts program
    • Dance program and rehearsal space for music and theatre arts department
      • Also theatre to replace Kjer, which will be lost to redevelopment of Garfield Avenue and Park Street corner, with appropriate dressing rooms, scene shop, and costume shop
    • Spreads burden in terms of traffic, parking, and public access
  • Addition to McPhee to address needs of kinesiology and athletics and recreation program
  • Only new building proposed is academic building between Zorn Arena and Schneider Hall
    • Allows, with other additions around campus, removal of Brewer Hall, Kjer Theatre and Campus School
    • Smaller new building, proposed by Hibbard parking lot to replace children’s center, not supported by state funding
  • Concept of L-shaped configuration of Davies Center just an idea; not reviewed by any committees
    • Involves building an addition, demolishing about two-thirds of present building, then building a second addition to meet needs identified for Davies Center
    • If nothing happens to Davies, does not affect other parts of plan
    • Allows for architectural focal point at front of Davies Center, right in line with Roosevelt Street, and consolidation of campus mall
  • Addition to Zorn for appropriate facilities such as locker rooms, restrooms, tickets offices, concession stands, lobbies, etc.
    • To keep shell of Zorn for actual performance space
    • Creates another focal point at that entrance to campus
• Response to general questions from floor; specific questions to be addressed outside meeting
  • General academic category includes classrooms and general class laboratories; if something is discipline specific, it would be indicated under that department
    • Probably will end up with slightly fewer classrooms, but capacity and size would be larger
    • Classroom demand analysis showed large number of classrooms sized for 30 students, or fewer once new state planning standards applied
    • Have more rooms than we need in that size range
    • Will develop larger classrooms to accommodate demand and devote smaller rooms to research or office space
  • Phillips House (at corner of McKinley and Park) belongs to Foundation and is not within campus boundaries – not addressed by this plan
  • For last several years, has been shortage of classrooms at middle and upper capacities and abundance at lower ranges; space plan not driving change in pedagogy, but responding to need
    • Not enough classrooms of proper capacity to meet current demand; larger capacity also more flexible
    • May be additional increase in class size related to budget constraints and fewer positions – not necessarily where we want to go
Website includes issues, map, chart and classroom demand analysis, but not contextualizing language
- Why trying to reach as many people as possible
- Clearly not all-or-nothing plan
- Tried to create plan so could do any part of it, based on political whims, if necessary
- Priorities flexible depending on what hear from system administration, State Building Commission or Division of State Facilities
- Plan now fully addresses everything we have heard from various department and units
- Becomes a matter of how compelling the case is at state level and what might be politically supported
- Other issue is sequencing – some things have to happen in certain order for plan to unfold
- Would appreciate comments and suggestions before Thanksgiving – will be more presentations, including open forums to be announced

Special Report on Wisconsin Women in Higher Education Leadership Conference – Chair Harrison
- Attended with eight other UW-Eau Claire women
  - Evening speaker was Lieutenant Governor Barbara Lawton
    - Mentioned concern over silence at capitol of faculty talking about budget cuts and declining state support
    - Very concerned about movement toward privatization coming from within legislature and even some campus administrators
    - Gave faculty permission to speak up
  - Might be worthwhile to initiate meeting with Representative Kreibich to explain some of our concerns
    - Could invite and see what response we get; will discuss possibility with campus legislative liaison

VII. Miscellaneous Business

A. Academic Staff Personnel Committee – First Reading

Report on Full-Time Teaching Load for Instructional Academic Staff – Senator Wilcox
- Committee asked to change handbook language that doesn’t reflect current practice or policy
  - Apparently years ago created section on instructional academic staff teaching load by simply transplanting faculty section
  - Committee wrote language to reflect reality
- Response to questions of clarification
  - Assumed twelve credit load was error because language all related to faculty and their load
    - Faculty load is 15 credits if don’t factor in advising, scholarly activity and service
  - At one time, instructional academic staff had teaching loads of 12 credits for full-time salary, which is partial salary when compared to faculty members

Motion 40-AS-02

Moved and seconded by the Academic Staff Personnel Committee (7 for, 0 against) that the academic staff of the University Senate update the language of the Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook, Chapter 5, p. 38, “Full-time Teaching Load – Instructional Academic Staff (IAS)” as follows:

Full-time Teaching Load – Instructional Academic Staff (IAS)

A full-time semester teaching load is generally twelve fifteen credits, or the equivalent. IAS responsibilities are more limited than those of a probationary faculty and are generally limited to teaching duties. However, those assigned responsibilities in addition to teaching such as advising will have a reduced teaching load. Such arrangements will occur only after careful consideration of the individual staff member’s responsibilities and after consultation with the IAS member, the department chair, the college dean and the Provost or designee. Such assignments will be stipulated in a letter of appointment.

A full-time summer session load is eight credits. An alternative load measurement for a semester is based upon the number of student credit hours required to meet targets for student credit hour production within the various departments. A instructional academic staff teacher who is are assigned an overload are generally compensated through an overload payment; however, instructional academic staff may will be compensated by a reduction in load a following semester. However, such overloads are approved only in very rare instances.
Teaching loads of Department Chairs are approximately nine hours in departments which have five to fifteen members, and six hours in departments which have more than fifteen hours.

Faculty assigned to other appropriate professional activities, such as curricular development, student advising, pursuit of external grant support, research projects (generally involving students), coaching, directed or independent study with individual or small groups of students, other scholarly/creative activities or administrative duties, will have their teaching load reduced. Such arrangements will occur only after careful consideration of the individual faculty member’s professional goals and consultation between the faculty member, the Department Chair, and the College Dean. Position descriptions or memoranda of agreement will typically serve as documentation that variances have been approved by the College Dean.

The nonteaching elements of faculty workload for a semester typically include advising; serving on department, school, college, and/or University committees; providing public service; and conducting scholarly or creative activities. These elements are detailed in the annual performance review materials submitted by each faculty member and should also be reported, in summary form, in the departmental annual report as prepared by the Department Chair and forwarded to the College Dean and Provost and Vice Chancellor.

Faculty workload is initially determined by the Department Chair in consultation with the individual faculty member. A recommendation is submitted to the College Dean who reviews the workloads of all faculty in the College. The Provost and Vice Chancellor is ultimately accountable for the determination of faculty IAS workload. (US 5/94 10/03)

MOTION by Senator Mac Briar to suspend the rules to allow continued debate and vote on the motion today seconded and PASSED by a vote of 30 for, 15 against.

Continued Debate
- Against motion because need more consideration and to look at history
  - Concerned that instructional academic staff in double jeopardy because same full-time load, but paid 80% of faculty salaries
  - Would not like to see motion pass without further information
- Would like time to talk back and talk to colleagues
- Whole issue here is just to bring language up to reality – changing current practice would take another motion
- Editorial error happened years ago – academic staff teaching load for at least last decade has been 15 credits
  - Are large sections of academic staff side of handbook that were simply dropped in from faculty side without even changing word faculty
  - Handbook committee working to find and correct those sections
- May release academic staff for additional duties, such as advising or service, but currently negotiated from that 15-credit base; what phrase or the equivalent means
- Also hired emeriti faculty member from English department to help with language editing of handbook
- Would prefer we vote against this and revisit policy so don’t change handbook language to practice some of us disagree with
- Survey of campuses around state showed every campus had 15-credit load unless there were advising responsibilities

Vote on Motion 40-AS-02: Motion PASSED by academic staff members of University Senate by vote of 11 for, 5 against

B. Academic Policies Committee – First Reading
Report on Foreign Language/Foreign Culture Requirement Revisions – Senator Syverson
- Currently students must demonstrate competency at 102-level in a foreign language, or complete a full semester of study abroad, or take nine credits of foreign culture courses to satisfy graduation requirement
- Associate deans group brought motion forward so students participating in internship abroad programs, immersing them in foreign culture, could satisfy the foreign language/foreign culture requirement
  - Also bringing forward separate motion with criteria to get credit for internships
- Motion also would allow a mix of foreign language course(s) with six credits of foreign culture courses to satisfy requirement
- Initial concerns of department of foreign languages addressed by modification of motion brought forward
• Responses to questions for clarification of report
  • Current competency defined as C or above in foreign language 102 [section (a)]
    • If get C- or below, have not shown competency
    • Then section (d) applies and would have to take six credits in foreign culture courses as well
  • Internship abroad is not same as study abroad
  • Getting an F or a U means not completing course – not getting credit for it
    • Committee discussed wording specifically – changed passing to completing because means getting credit for
  • Writing this for students, so should just say you got credit; could at end of (a) say for those not achieving a C, look at (d) below
  • APC looked at various language, but had problems with saying you need to get a C- or below as an option at a university with motto of excellence
  • BM [in section (a)] is Bachelor of Music
    • This motion does not change requirements for BA or BM students, or those in with international business minor
    • Spanish is not an option for music students because in music world use more of classical languages
    • Suggest write out Bachelor of Music
  • Aspects in current first paragraph were placed in paragraph describing foreign culture courses – not deleted
  • Internships do not necessarily language competence
    • Those internships where speaking another language, living with a family, and doing everything in that language, may not need to be 14-16 weeks long to satisfy requirement
    • If in England and work in English, might need to be longer program to meet criteria
    • That is separate motion – flexibility designed into criteria
  • Previously dropped English competency exam, not requirement, so reference to non-native speakers of English completing that requirement does not need to change

Motion 40-AP-02
Moved and seconded by the Academic Policies Committee (9 for, 0 against) that the following changes be made to the catalogue language for the Foreign Language/Foreign Culture requirement (page 36 of 2003-2004 Catalogue)

FOREIGN LANGUAGE/FOREIGN CULTURE REQUIREMENT

All students seeking the baccalaureate degree must satisfy the foreign language/foreign culture requirement. The goal of this requirement is to develop an understanding of the cultural, social, religious, intellectual, and philosophical aspects of foreign countries or regions. The requirement can be met in one of three four ways:

(a) demonstrating competency at the 102 level in a foreign language by achieving a score on the foreign language placement test that qualifies the student to enter the 201 level course in a foreign language or completing a 102 level foreign language course (or AIS 112 or Cdis 303) with a grade of C (not C-) or higher, or mark of S.

NOTE: B.A. students in the College of Arts and Sciences, and all students minoring in Global Studies, must choose complete option (a). Bachelor of Music students must complete this option in French, German, or Italian. The International Business minor requires foreign language competence at the 201 level.

(b) successfully completing either a full semester of study abroad or approved internship abroad; or incrementally through a combination of short term study abroad and courses designated as fulfilling the foreign culture requirement. The incremental value of a short term study abroad program is available in the Center for International Education, Schofield 111.

(c) completing a minimum of nine credits designated as fulfilling the foreign culture courses requirement. Courses which fulfill the foreign culture requirement are on the following list.

(d) completing a 101- or 102-level foreign language course (or a course from AIS 111, 112; Cdis 301, 302, 303); AND completing at least six credits in foreign culture courses.
Students who are not native speakers of English may satisfy this requirement by completing the English competency requirement for the baccalaureate degree and demonstrating competency in their native language.

(To precede listing of Foreign Culture Courses [found on page 37 of the 2003-04 Catalogue]):

FOREIGN CULTURE COURSES (FC)

The following courses have been approved to meet the University Foreign Languages as Foreign Culture (FC) requirement. These courses are broadly based and enhance understanding of contemporary life in foreign countries or regions. They develop an understanding of the intellectual, religious, social, linguistic, historical, political, and/or philosophical aspects of foreign countries or regions.

Amendment 40-AP-02-a1

Moved by Senator Freymiller and seconded that under item (d) the word completing be struck and in its place put earning credit in a 101- or 102-level foreign language course and also after the AND strike the word completing and insert the word earning

Debate

- Makes what is expected clearer – students may not interpret completing as we do
  - May think completed, just got an F; need to spell it out so no confusion
- Agree – wouldn’t have known what completing meant, am sure none of my students would
  - Also don’t think language differentiates enough from section (a); could just say passing with less than a C as opposed to earning credit in
- Originally wanted to say C- or lower, but that way flagging option of getting poor grades
  - Has been option in foreign culture courses all along; think advisers and students will find this option without announcing poor academic performance is okay
- Favor change – students could earn an A in 101 and take six credits of foreign culture without completing 102
- Speak against because think completing is clearer – currently use that language in foreign culture courses
  - Will think if they paid for credits and their son or daughter attended, then completed course
- Since completing not defined in catalogue, think clarification would be good
- Speak for amendment, think language about earning credit makes more sense
- Too late to make friendly amendment, but should change other sections to similar language so consistent

Vote on Amendment 40-AP-02-a1: Amendment PASSED by University Faculty members of University Senate

Without objection, rest of discussion and vote postponed until the next meeting.

C. Academic Policies Committee – First Reading

Report on Foreign Culture Criteria for Internships Abroad – Senator Syverson

- Directly related to previous motion – if previous motion passes, then need criteria to evaluate whether an internship abroad experience would meet foreign culture requirement
- Motion proposes departments look to see if internships, in their opinion, appropriate for meeting foreign culture requirement
  - Course then would go to respective school or college curriculum committee to see if reasonable
  - If committee agrees, course would be listed in catalogue with own course number, title, and note that it would fulfill foreign language/foreign culture requirement
- Similar to what used for evaluating study abroad experiences; designed to give flexibility to evaluate different experiences with different immersion levels
Motion 40-AP-03
Moved and seconded by Academic Policies Committee (10 for, 0 against) that the following criteria be used to evaluate internship abroad courses for fulfillment of the Foreign Language/Foreign Culture requirement

Criteria

Individual departments and school/college curriculum committees must use the following criteria when approving internships abroad for meeting the Foreign Language/Foreign Culture requirement.

1. The internship must:
   - Require the student to be fully engaged in the local culture (see item 3 below) of the foreign country where the internship is being completed.
   - Be approved as a formal university-sponsored internship, with a pre-arranged site supervisor reporting to a UWEC faculty internship supervisor.
   - Be approved and offered formally in a credit-bearing course (i.e., departmental course prefix, specified number of degree credits, and course grade will appear on student’s official transcript).

2. The extent to which the internship meets the foreign culture requirement will not be based on credits earned (i.e., theoretically, a student may fulfill an entire semester’s internship of fifteen weeks abroad and earn only one degree credit) but rather on time spent in the foreign country engaged in the internship activities and fully engaged in the local culture.

3. Department and college/school curriculum committees will need to evaluate whether an internship abroad course meets the “fully engaged in the local culture” criterion.
   - To meet the foreign language/foreign culture requirement, an internship abroad must engage the student in the local culture for a semester (14 to 16 weeks). The student must be engaged in interacting directly with persons of the local culture while carrying out responsibilities of the internship during this period.
   - The internship abroad option can not be used for partial fulfillment of the foreign language/foreign culture requirement.
   - An internship shorter than 14 weeks may be approved for meeting the full foreign language/foreign culture requirement if additional features of the experience add depth to the student’s engagement in the foreign culture: e.g., the internship is carried out in a non-English speaking country; the student uses a language other than English to carry out the internship and/or to communicate with persons in the community; the student’s living arrangement is with persons from the local culture (i.e., a family or roommates from the local culture). The department offering the internship course, and the appropriate college/school curriculum committee, will judge whether the mix of experiences in the internship justifies using the course to meet the full foreign language/foreign culture requirement.

4. In this context the word “internship” is used as a broad term covering a variety of kinds of workplace and professional experience. Field courses of various kinds may meet the criteria for fulfilling the foreign culture requirement even though a term other than “internship” may be used in the course title. For example, the Department of Curriculum and Instruction distinguishes between “Internship” and “Student Teaching” in their professional experience courses. However, they could propose, for example, a CI 4XX International Internship Teaching course and/or a CI 4XX International Student Teaching course, and for each of these courses they could propose that it “meets the foreign culture requirement.”

5. The Center for International Education (CIE) office emphasizes that any student participating in a University-sponsored experience abroad (whether study abroad, field course, internship abroad) must be covered by a specific insurance policy, which is available through the CIE. Enrollment in this specific policy, and with the specified carrier (CISI), is mandated by UW-System. The coverage provides for
repatriation of mortal remains, emergency medical evacuation, and related risks, and is intended not only to
provide for the welfare of student participants, but also to limit the University's liability. Information is
available in the CIE office.

Debate
• Thinking was that department and school/college curriculum committees would evaluate every course
• Motion proposes internships be approved with a formal course number to limit kinds of experiences that
come forth
• Course is what approved by curriculum committees; course might contain a number of different internships
that would be up to department to decide

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

D. Academic Policies Committee – First Reading
Report on New Minor in Ancient Studies – Senator Syverson
• Minor brought forth by host of departments listed
  • Puts ancient studies minor on books; until now students had to design own minor
  • Basic focus of minor would be ancient Mediterranean civilizations
  • Department of foreign languages has agreed to serve as home for minor
  • Does not require any new faculty or courses – all courses currently on books
  • Allows students to see this right in catalogue, which may lead to more students selecting this option
  • Committee felt studying this sort of classic subject very appropriate for university with strong liberal arts
  tradition

Motion 40-AP-04
Moved and seconded by Academic Policies Committee (10 for, 0 against) that the proposed Ancient Studies
minor be approved (see motion form)

Debate
• Detailed sheet of various requirements and rationale for minor distributed with agenda

MOTION by Senator Mac Briar that the rules be suspended to vote on this today seconded and DEFEATED

Amendment 40-AP-04-a1
Moved by Senator Akiba and seconded that the name of the minor be changed from Ancient Studies minor
to Ancient Mediterranean Studies minor

Debate
• This minor doesn’t concern any civilizations other than ancient Mediterranean ones
• Had to come through college; may need to be careful how we change it here
• Name was not questioned in curriculum committee nor at college level or Academic Policies Committee
• Titled ancient studies because although current focus is ancient Mediterranean area, hope at some point to
incorporate ancient civilizations outside that area if such courses became available
• Could be reflected by language change to indicate now really means Mediterranean, but might later include
other cultures

Without objection, amendment postponed for further discussion and voting at next meeting.

E. Faculty Personnel Committee – First Reading
Report on Faculty Committee Membership – Senator Wick
• Handbook committee asked Faculty Personnel Committee to look at what to do on committees when someone
can’t serve because of official leave – in particular Faculty Complaint and Grievance Committee
  • Faculty Personnel Committee introducing language that would allow people unable to participate because
  of an official leave to be replaced at discretion of chair of committee
• Will bring full motion to floor with understanding that division of question will occur at time of voting
First recommendation concerning Section G affects University Faculty portion of constitution and will be voted on by University Faculty Senators only and sent forward to full University Faculty for ratification.

Second recommendation concerning Section F affects University Senate portion of constitution and will be voted upon by full University Senate before going forward to University Faculty and University Academic Staff for ratification.

Third recommendation concerning UWS 4 affects personnel rules of faculty and will be voted on by faculty senators only before being forwarded to regents for approval.

Motion 40-FP-01

Moved and seconded by Faculty Personnel Committee (6 for, 0 against) that the following changes be made to the Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook:

Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook Twentieth Edition, September 2002, Chapter 3, p. 6

Section G University Faculty Committees:

Election is by mailbox ballot following nominations from the floor at the spring University Faculty meeting. In the event an elected member of a committee is unable to fulfill the duties of the committee due to an official leave (sabbatical, medical leave, etc.), the Committee Chair may request a temporary replacement of that member following the established procedures for filling vacancies on committees as outlined in the Bylaws of the University Faculty.

…

3. Faculty Termination Review Committee
   a. Membership: The committee includes twenty four fifteen tenured members of the faculty, elected at large by the faculty, to serve three-year terms with eight five elected each year.
   b. Functions: The function of the Faculty Termination Review Committee is to implement the hearing procedures outlined in the Local Implementation Procedures for UWS 3.08 (non-renewal), UWS 4.03 (dismissal), and UWS 5.11.

4. Faculty Complaint and Grievance Committee
   a. Membership: The committee includes six fifteen tenured faculty members elected by the faculty for three-year terms (two five elected each year).
   b. Functions: The function of the Complaint and Grievance Committee is to implement the hearing procedures outlined in Local Implementation Procedures for UWS 6 (complaints and grievances).


Section F Committees:

The University Senate shall create and maintain standing and ad hoc committees to assist in its deliberations. Such committees are responsible to the University Senate and their recommendations on matters of policy become effective only after receiving approval from the University Senate. Chairs of University Senate Committees must be senators. In the event an elected member of a committee is unable to fulfill the duties of the committee due to an official leave (sabbatical, medical leave, etc.), the Committee Chair may request a temporary replacement of that member following the established procedures for filling vacancies on committees as outlined in the Bylaws of the University Senate. The following committees are the standing committees of the University Senate:


UWS 4 PROCEDURES FOR DISMISSAL

UWEC 4.03 Standing Faculty Committee

The faculty committee to operate as a hearing agent under UWS 4 shall be a committee of five faculty selected from the standing Faculty Termination Review Committee as follows: The Chair of the Faculty Termination Review Committee shall call a meeting of the full committee and conduct the meeting at which the five-member Hearing Committee is selected. Those members of the Faculty Termination Review Committee who are not qualified to serve on the Hearing Committee as provided by UWS 4.06(b), or because of an official leave, shall first be disqualified and proceed to conduct its business. (US 4/2/94 11/03)
UWEC 4.05 Adequate Due Process

If replacements are needed because of further disqualifications under UWS 4.06(d) or because of official leaves, they shall be selected by lot the remaining members of the Hearing Committee from those qualified members of the Termination Review Committee not originally selected by lot to serve on the Hearing Committee. If further replacements are needed, they shall be selected by lot from eligible members of the Faculty Complaint and Grievance Committee. In those rare cases where further replacements are still needed, they shall be selected by the University Senate Executive Committee from eligible members of the faculty at large.
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UWEC 6.01 and 6.02 Faculty Complaint and Grievance Committee

The local standing committee to act as a hearing agent for UWS 6.01 and 6.02 shall be the Faculty Complaint and Grievance Committee which shall consist of six fifteen tenured faculty members elected by the faculty. Each member shall be elected for a three-year term with two five terms expiring each year. The committee shall meet and elect a chair at the beginning of each academic year. (In the initial formation of the committee, all six fifteen members shall be elected and terms of one, two, and three years determined by lot by the elections committee.)

Any member of the Complaint and Grievance Committee shall be disqualified from serving on the committee during the consideration of a particular complaint or grievance in which the member is involved in the substance of the complaint or grievance. This would include, but is not limited to, cases in which a member makes the complaint or grievance or is the object of a complaint or grievance. Any question of disqualification shall be resolved by a majority vote of the committee members voting.

Five members from those remaining shall be selected by lot to consider the particular complaint or grievance in question. If more than one ten members of the Complaint and Grievance Committee is are disqualified from or, because of an official leave, are unable to participate in the consideration of a particular complaint or grievance, the committee shall be increased to five members for consideration of the particular complaint or grievance in question. The additional members shall be selected by lot by the remaining members of the committee. The additional members shall be elected from eligible members of the Faculty Termination Review Committee. In those rare cases where further members are still needed, they shall be selected by the University Senate Executive Committee from eligible members of the faculty at large.

Without objection, motion to be debated and voted on at the next meeting.

VIII. Announcements – None

Meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m. without objection

Wanda Schulner
Secretary to the University Senate