Members Present:

Ken Akiba, Joey Bohl, Marcia Bollinger, Don Bredle, Jack Bushnell, Jesse Dixon, Dan Drumm, Margaret Dwyer, Leslie Foster, Mitchell Freymiller, Warren Gallagher, Alan Gallaher, Andrea Gapko, Marc Goulet, Betty Hanson, Susan Harrison, Sean Hartnett, Tim Ho, Ann Hoffman, Larry Honl, Robert Hooper, Rose Jadack, Richard Kark, Tim Lane, Kate Lang, Gene Leisz, Barbara Lozar, Barbara Mac Briar, Steven Majstorovic, Donald Mash, Rebecca Matter, Susan Mc Intyre, John Melrose, Rick Mickelson, Jane Pederson, Andrew Phillips, Bobby Pitts, Peter Rejto, Richard Ryberg, Kathie Schneider, Roger Selin, Nick Smiar, Alex Smith, Carter Smith, Lorraine Smith, Linda Spaeth, Paula Stuetgen, Kent Syverson, Lois Taft, Dale Taylor, Karen Welch, Sharon Westphal, Scott Whitfield, Michael Wick, Jean Wilcox, Steve Zantow

Members Absent:

Paul Butrymowicz, Linda Carpenter, Terry Classen, Michael Dorsher, Bruce Dybvik, Robert Erffmeyer, Jeremy Hein, Robert Hollon, Debra King, Fred Kolb, Vicki Reed, Connie Russell, Ronald Satz, Todd Stephens, Roger Thusty, Rebecca Wurzer

Guests:

Robert Bolles, Margaret Cassidy, Wilma Clark, Thomas Dock, Bernard Duyfhuizen, Erik Hendrickson, Eugene Hood, Dale Johnson, Paula Kleintjes, Thomas Miller, Jan Morse, Kathleen Sahlhoff, Johannes Strohschank, Andrew Soll, Steven Tallant, Elaine Wendt

The regular meeting of University Senate was called to order by Chair Harrison at 3:04 p.m. on Tuesday, February 10, 2004 in the Tamarack Room of Davies Center.

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

II. Chancellor’s Remarks – Chancellor Mash

- Additional information about Provost Satz
  - Expecting to be back on campus part-time beginning Thursday for visit from System Academic Affairs people
  - Being treated for non-Hodgkin’s Lymphoma
    - Has had three rounds of chemotherapy; will continue treatments
    - Keeping in touch with immediate staff via email; reviewing items that have been taken home to him
    - Looking forward to his return contingent on how he is feeling
      - Remains concerned about his immune system; hoping folks with colds or other illnesses will contact him via telephone or email
      - Also wants to avoid handshaking/hugging
  - Everyone on campus invited to lunch on Friday
  - Foundation appreciation luncheon also kicks off this year’s campus portion of Fulfilling the Promise of Excellence Campaign
  - Tom and Debra King, campus campaign chairs, making brief remarks around noon
  - Disappointed in Governor Doyle’s state-of-the-state address
    - Governor continues to talk about education as a priority and then talks only about K-12 education
    - Not as though haven’t given feedback on noteworthy omission of higher education funding
  - On positive note, possibility of a budget repair bill this biennium less and less likely
In middle of biennium with deepest budget reductions ever following biennium with deep budget reductions
Like to think have weathered worst of situation well
Have to believe 2005-2007 will be better as economy starting to improve
Significant tuition increases (16-17% per year) this biennium will continue in place generating higher tuition revenues; with reasonable state support, should be able to do things we put on hold
Working hard at system level to ensure financial aid becomes priority to protect people priced out of market because of tuition increases

Compensation Issues
Possibility 1% pay plan anticipating for next year could turn out to be a bit better
- Unions continuing to negotiate and parity discussions occurring
- Good news if happens; not trying to raise expectations
At last meeting in December, Senate took action to enhance Compensation Committee’s Pay Plan proposal
- Have not signed and cannot approve that action; is topic for discussion at this meeting
President Lyall announced her retirement; System will undergo transition at some point
- *Leader-Telegram* article suggested, much to my surprise, that perhaps I should be her successor
- Flattered to be mentioned in that context; is not my intention to apply for position
- Board of Regents must run comprehensive national search to attract strongest leader possible whatever the cost
- Richard deGrood, long-time faculty member in Philosophy and Religious Studies, passed away from relatively short bout with cancer
- Visitation and mass this evening at Ecumenical Religious Center

III. Chair and Faculty Representative’s Report – Chair Harrison
- Letters said to be forthcoming (not yet received) from system notifying us to go ahead with performance reviews but not to include in salary letters the dollar amount of any increase in anticipation of possible change
- Special introduction of Kathie Schneider’s new dog, Garlyn

IV. Academic Staff Representative’s Report – Senator Wilcox
- Next academic staff reps meeting in Madison on February 19, 2004
- Concept of parity does exist – was imbedded in Board of Regents recommendations
- George Brooks indicated at last meeting that UW-System will watch union negotiations and then bring up issue of parity
  - He feels not unlikely that may get more than 1%; did not feel it would exceed 2%
- UW-System undergoing administrative audit
- Some concerned because auditors not indicating whether defining administrators broadly or narrowly
- Watching because could have impact, particularly on administrative and professional academic staff, if defined broadly
- Academic Staff Representatives Issue Statement voted on in University Senate last semester in regard to academic staff employment practices forwarded to President Lyall
  - All suggestions from this Senate put into final issue statement
  - President Lyall committed to issues; communicating with institutions
- Received request from system to nominate one or two academic staff members from each campus for consideration for appointment to Search and Screen Committee for System President
  - Asked that person be available through July and have some experience that would give knowledge of UW-System
  - Anyone interested, let me know
  - Will be taking up at Academic Staff Personnel Committee meeting Thursday
- Response to question from floor
  - Thinking about forwarded my name; would be interesting experience

Chair Harrison noted similar request received by faculty
- Faculty nominated should be tenured, preferably full professor
V. Unfinished Business

Report on Modified 2004-2005 Pay Plan – Vice Chair Gapko

- Issue considered by Executive Committee at request of chancellor for consultation on recommendation
- Original recommendation of Compensation Committee proposed promotion increments for faculty and academic staff, and stipends for department chairs
  - Those figures increased in Senate action
- Committee discussed process by which original plan amended, what original and amended plans would cost, modifications acceptable to the chancellor, and next steps of process
- Response to questions on content from floor
  - Was no compromise; modification presented would go back to original numbers coming forth from Compensation Committee
  - Not remanded to Compensation Committee because handbook policy provides that any items approved by Senate but not approved by the chancellor go back to Executive Committee for consultation

Motion 40-SE-03

Moved and seconded by University Senate Executive Committee (11 for, 2 against) that the agreed upon modifications, during consultation with the Chancellor, of returning to the original figures for the 2004-2005 Pay Plan as presented by the Compensation Committee be approved.

Debate

- Comments by Chancellor Mash
  - What attempting to do with regard to compensation and where we find ourselves now play into decision
    - Very clear that salaries of our people are priority we are working on
  - All three items contained in Compensation Committee’s recommendations desirable; should be done
    - Should continue to increase promotion increments for both faculty and academic staff and how compensate chairs for important work
  - Way additional dollars added to Compensation Committee’s recommended pay plan clearly communicated importance of issue to this body and also the frustration about compensation coming at time when struggling with difficult budget decisions
  - Can’t sign Senate action because of timing, pace of increases, and process
  - Compensation Committee does incredible job of trying to understand and reflect values of university
    - To extent possible, administration works with committee, provides encouragement, guidance, and commitments for funding
  - As important as faculty and academic staff salaries are; not only challenge we face
    - Now 85%-plus of operating budget is personnel
    - Approving committee’s recommendation would dig deeper into base budget that has been reduced several years in a row
    - Perfectly prepared to approve that and figure out way to do that even against smaller base
    - Additional bump of Senate action makes even harder
  - Not playing spectator role in pay plan issues just waiting for Madison to act
    - Striving since I arrived to improve compensation; making some progress in worst of times
    - Immediately started doing best job possible with entering salaries at hire – focused on one time we could make significant difference in salaries
      - When do that, does exacerbate compression, a serious issue and challenge
    - So also moved quickly to increase promotion increments (for both faculty and academic staff) up to top of comprehensives
      - Considerable progress made
      - Attempt to improve salaries and address aspect of compression issue
    - Left chancellor discretionary pay-plan dollars in pay plan to also address compression issue to extent possible
    - Brought idea of post-tenure review with salary increment attached to Compensation Committee
      - Fully expect to figure out way in 2005-2007 to fund another increment beyond promotion to professor
For first time in 1999-2000, chairs received stipend of $2,000 per year
  * Would like to increase when opportunity arises as difficult to entice faculty to take position of chair
  * Need to make job more desirable – developing stipends, providing release time and extending contracts over summer
  * Have been making progress, although difficult to have desired impact when consider pay plans we have gotten in last couple of years; will continue as possible against shrinking base budget
  * Issue of salary savings – idea that replacing faculty/academic staff retiring at big salaries (remember we have a compression issue here) with faculty/academic staff at lower salaries results in big savings
  * Is mystique that somewhere is big pot with salary savings on it and it’s got a lot in it
  * Fact is every time go to base budget for something, can call that spending salary savings
  * Funded first six months of health insurance for new hires – typically $150,000 to $180,000 a year
  * Compensation Committee recommendations for promotion increments and chair stipends estimated to cost $200,000 a year
  * In some areas, such as College of Business, have inversion as opposed to savings
  * Senate action increasing increments not something I can approve now although understand why it was done
  * Not the time to change pace of enhancements we have begun to put in place

Discussion
  * Not even all members of Compensation Committee voted against amendment on Senate floor
  * Don’t believe further increasing numbers was naïve, came with due consideration
  * Ought to remand back to Compensation Committee for compromise; not that much money
    * Compression worst amongst those with longest tenure – same faculty compare least favorably to peers
    * One way to directly affect salaries of those with longest tenure is to increase promotion increment
  * If we really wanted just to save money, where were we a few years ago when some $60 million went to Madison faculty, or when executive salaries were raised?
  * Have opportunity to engage in shared governance – using principles of compromise, patience, understanding the other point of view, trust, and response to questions
  * Sends strong message to faculty and academic staff at UW-Eau Claire that someone is interested
  * To cover original recommendation itself is stretch given shrinking budgets
    * Have made progress compared to peers in UW-System in ranking of upper two faculty levels
      * Getting dollars to salary line desirable, but have things in place here that make this a very special place that other campuses cannot match
      * If want to do by reducing programs or size of programs, that is another conversation
      * How we choose to spend dollars has impact not only on salary but what is happening day-to-day on campus
  * In College of Arts and Sciences, promotions each year come to roughly $90,000 at current rates
    * Must move that amount from flexible base to individual salary lines
    * Although people deserve an increase, does reduce flexibility when comes to course availability – added expense of amendment to original committee motion equivalent to four or five class sections not able to offer next year
      * Usually sections taught by part-time academic staff to address particularly critical need
  * Are either committed funds or uncommitted funds – no other hidden pool
    * In College of Business unrestricted pool used for four different purposes
      1) Funding promotions, which do not come out of salary increases
      2) Hiring part-time faculty to offer sections not covered by full-time faculty
      3) Faculty overloads
      4) Compression – salary inversion results in dipping into pool to hire new faculty
    * At some point unrestricted pool runs out of money; no other source because rest is assigned to areas
      * Since legislators sending more money our way not likely, alternatives are
        * Take faculty position offline to increase unassigned money and figure out how to cover classes
        * Permanent academic organizational restructuring to allow reallocation of base dollars and free some up
  * College of Professional Studies similar to College of Business – in many areas replacing faculty at salaries equal to, if not higher than, that of person who retired or resigned
    * This would just further decrease flexibility in how base budget used
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- Also using base budget for overloads to backfill for wellness and other courses
- Such things as emergency hires due to illness also eat into base budget
- Trying over last few years to enhance faculty development initiatives to recruit and retain faculty
- Favor motion to go back to original recommendation not because we ought never go to base to help fund salaries, this just isn’t year to do so more dramatically than already doing
  - Increment in promotion amounts not where money most desperately needed – people past promotion keep losing ground to those getting larger promotion dollars
  - Working on post-tenure review salary award process for over two years
    - Taking so long because no money to fund
    - $20,000 would almost cover proposed post-tenure review salary increment
  - Increased promotion increments don’t make big enough impact where needed most
- Feel guilty after listening to all this – hard to believe could impact all those identified problems with $20,000
- See as faculty governance and priority issues
  - University, or academy, product is education as delivered by faculty
  - If running a university, should start with faculty salaries and compensation issues, not end there
  - What did any of us do to deserve our 0% last year? What happened to our insurance contributions?
    - Someone not watching out for our interests
  - Last semester our faculty stepped forward and said promotion salaries are a priority
  - Chancellor has done superb work, but we should be doing anything we can for faculty
  - Mentioned to local legislator that anyone near academics is getting underpaid, especially if compare to salaries at Strong Capital Management, Inc. that manages funds to send students to our university
- Rationale used by Compensation Committee for not increasing promotional increments this year
  - Few years ago thought about principles for increasing; settled on
    - Academic staff should get minimum of 5% as set by system
    - Faculty wanted flat dollar amount
    - Academic staff stayed with percentage
  - For instructor to assistant professor used 5% based on mean salary in rank; for associate to assistant professor used 7.5%; for associate to full professor used 10.0%; increased academic staff from 5% to 7.5%
  - If run those numbers for 2004-2005, increments already in place were slightly above those generated
    - Instructor to assistant professor would be $2,010; now set at $2,100
    - Assistant professor to associate professor at 7.5% would be $3,375; now set at $3,400
    - Associate professor to professor at 10% would be $5,171; again a little less then current $5,250
  - Were consistent by not increasing promotion increments this year
- When issue introduced at Executive Committee last week, was my understanding that chancellor had not made up mind whether to sign Senate action; ensuing discussion was in context of information gathering
  - No context for discussion about less costly alternatives such as rescinding extra $400 for department chairs or splitting the difference
  - Seems by moving to recommend return to original Compensation Committee motion, Executive Committee vetoed and bypassed any chance of negotiating
  - Reject argument that way amendment rose last December sufficient reason to rescind it; not ruled out of order as recommendations coming out of committees can be amended
  - Still plan to vote against motion; original action only incurs extra $20,000 in expense
  - Do better understand salary savings now though

**Vote on Motion 40-SE-03:** Motion PASSED by vote of 29 for, 23 against.

**TEXT OF PORTION OF PAY PLAN CHANGED BY MOTION 40-SE-03**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promotion To</th>
<th>Salary Adjustment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>$5,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>$3,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>$2,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Salary adjustments for promotion of academic staff will be provided from base funds at 7.5% of the incumbent’s salary rounded to the next $10.
Each Department Chair shall receive a **$2000** academic year stipend.

VI. Reports of Committees

- **Executive Committee – Chair Harrison**
  - At last meeting
    - Consulted with Associate Vice Chancellor Barrett about reorganization of Student Development and Diversity and consulted with Chancellor Mash about pay plan just discussed
    - Brief discussion held about adding language in handbook outlining responsibility for revisions to various chapters in handbook – chair will notify relevant committees of suggested language changes
    - Consensus that when bylaw changes now under consideration concerning election of Academic Staff Representative and Faculty Representative come before Senate, bylaws should be voted on solely by respective groups
  - Next meeting February 17, 2004

- **Faculty Personnel Committee – Senator Wick**
  - Next meeting February 17, 2004; will discuss
    - Distribution of DPC minutes
    - Language concerning dismissals and complaints and grievances
    - Language concerning post-tenure review

- **Academic Staff Personnel Committee – Senator Wilcox**
  - Next meeting February 12, 2004; will discuss
    - Motion for election of academic staff representative
    - Academic staff awards recommendation – potentially another award for academic staff
    - UW-System president’s search and screen committee
    - Other handbook-related changes

- **Academic Policies Committee – Senator Syverson**
  - Working on assessment issues – Assessment Committee brought report to us
  - Talking about benchmarks used to evaluate educational experience we offer students
  - Discussions to continue next week
  - Passed some name changes and deletions of education majors no longer supported by current Department of Public Instruction standards – will be coming forward at next Senate meeting
  - Other things coming up shortly in APC
    - Attendance/medical excuse policy suggested by Health Services
  - New prefix for Latin American Studies
  - Next meeting February 17, 2004

- **Physical Plant Planning Committee – No Report**

- **Budget Committee – Senator Dwyer**
  - Will meet late in February to work on 2004-2005 budget

- **Compensation Committee – Vice Chair Gapko**
  - No meeting set

- **Nominating Committee – No Report**

- **Technology Committee – No Report**

VII. Special Reports - None

VIII. Miscellaneous Business

A. **Academic Policies Committee – First Reading**

**Report on Department/Program Review Revisions – Senator Syverson**

- Report of ad hoc committee appointed by provost last spring came forward to APC last fall
- Committee spent lot of time considering – fairly contentious issue
  - Written report summarizes how what is being proposed is different from what we have now
  - Could not use pro and con method because people looked at same issue and drew different conclusions
What passed by 7-2 vote (wasn’t unanimous vote, but strong majority vote in favor) was creation of new 11 member committee, called Academic Program Review Council (APRC), to conduct department/program reviews

Currently provost selects internal review teams with input from department/program to be reviewed and recommendation of APC

- Internal review team studies documents put forward by department/program being reviewed and writes report
- External reviewer appointed, again with input from department/program to be reviewed, by provost in consultation with chair of APC also writes a report
- Once all information collected, written reports forwarded to APC
- APC writes another report with recommendations to the provost

Change is new APRC would no longer be elected body – would be appointed by provost in consultation with APC, deans and Senate Executive Committee

- APRC would select who sits on internal review committee (Program Review Subcommittee – PRS); all members of PRS would be current members of APRC
  - No longer would be pulling in people from all over university
- APRC members serve three-year terms
  - Would become more proficient in reviewing programs
  - Would be more consistency in process
- External reviewer also selected by APRC, but would be input from department/program to be reviewed
- No departmental/program input as far as which APRC members would sit on PRS
- All reports by PRS, external reviewer and self-study document then forwarded to APRC
- APRC writes another report with recommendations to be forwarded to provost

Additional difference is report would address issue of resources

- Provost asked for this in original charge to ad hoc committee
- Many reports now coming forward indicate with additional resources, everything would be fine
- Also added to self-study document what department/program could do if more resources were available – where university could get best bang for buck

Committee members expressed following concerns

- Potential shared governance issues – reports would go to appointed body instead of elected body
- Internal review committees selected with no department/program input
  - Some members felt this was an advantage to eliminate cronyism or stacking committee
  - Others felt disadvantage because of limited pool to draw people for subcommittees

Response to questions on content of report

- Committee talked about possibility of appointed committee becoming tool of an administrator; lot harder to stack body when elections involved
  - Committee did feel with appointed committee easier to make sure all areas represented at table; more complicated to do so with election of members
  - Past recommendations of APC to provost have been taken very seriously and not overturned for no reason
  - Amendment in APC to elect committee voted down by large margin
- Provost appoints committee from pre-selected slate coming in part from APC and Executive Committee

Motion 40-AP-08

Moved and seconded by Academic Policies Committee (7 for, 2 against) that a new committee be created to conduct academic department/program reviews and that the department/program review guidelines be modified as shown in the main motion.

Debate

- Start debate on motion at first reading so hear about pros and cons to take back to colleagues for discussion
- Talked about this for months – thinking that went into proposal was solid – process might be improved by creating cadre of trained faculty with expertise
  - Voted against motion in committee because election important in faculty governance
Also felt role of departments in review process was missing – should be opportunity for departments to suggest people to serve on internal review committee

Adamanly opposed to way committee structured
- Doesn’t fit in with shared governance; bad precedent to set
- Role of administrator is to make tough decisions
- No such thing as expert when real job is other than reviewing departments
- Will vote against; don’t agree with arguments of why shouldn’t be people included that are not on APRC
- Would be improvement to allow departments to share in governance process and suggest pool of people able to give informed reasons in discipline-specific evaluation
- APRC may be limited in expertise
- Even though all intelligent people who could come in and give good review, doesn’t necessarily mean review will be strongest possible
- At least one person from outside APRC could come in and sit on PRS to help process along
- One weakness of current procedure is APC only sees internal review committee report; expertise gathered interviewing people and talking to students not transferred to APC
  - One strength of proposal is people in internal review committee take active role in writing report going up to provost
- Never feel something should be passed because colleagues spent a lot of time and meetings on it; do appreciate their effort
- Concern raised when read purpose of department/program reviews in proposal
- Understood purpose of past reviews was to identify strengths and weaknesses of program or department
  - Allows members to do their best rectifying problems and capitalizing on strengths
  - Overall tenor was enhancing excellence of programs and thus the university
  - This seems to be major shift to using department/program reviews as way of finding places to save dollars – more punitive aspects of program review
- Seventeen department chairs aligned against proposal – are 32 departments across university
- Some concerns voiced by chairs in signed statement already heard here
- Also felt something ominous about timing of proposal
  - Gap between funding available and academic needs always existed – now widening
  - Addressing needs of university by cutting programs saving at wrong end
  - Need to instead educate public and state legislature and not fix something that isn’t broke
- Have not seen proof that certain reports were too flattering or self-serving for some departments
- As with applicants’ letters of recommendation, if you get to pick who writes your recommendation, it’s bound to be good
- Heard original purpose of ad hoc committee was to make program review more meaningful so not every program gets a positive review
- Programs maybe should feel concerned if cannot choose two of three people on review
- Not sure this is taking care of cronyism because certainly possible in any appointment process, even if pool brought forward
- Memory of review process, as past member of APC, was not that it was an onerous activity
  - Took up few meetings in spring; each of us had to look at certain departments and write up our own reports
  - Was interesting to find out what is going on in departments other than your own
  - Why the need to free up APC and create another committee?
  - Certainly could still be elected, like GE Committee and Senate Committees
- In general, reports going forward from APC positive; reviewing excellent university with excellent programs
  - Have had negative reports come out of APC including one last year noting serious problems and recommending either something needed to change or program should be cut
  - APC definitely not always rubber stamp
- As chair of department up for review next year, think process works as it is now
• If participate in couple reviews, learn something about departments close to yours and departments unlike yours
• If eleven people are elected/appointed to take care of this for us, they will learn how to do it really well, but it limits how much connection we have and how much learning we do from each other
• When make recommendations to APC of people I want to review my department, try to find people who are critical thinkers and will give honest review in areas we should improve
  • Looking for constructive criticism on how to be a better department

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

First readings of remaining items under miscellaneous business will be held at next meeting.

IX. Announcements – None

Meeting adjourned at 4:57 p.m.

Wanda Schulner
Secretary to the University Senate