Members Present:

Don Bredle, Jack Bushnell, Paul Butrymowicz, Linda Carpenter, Michael Dorsher, Dan Drumm, Margaret Dwyer, Robert Erffmeyer, Leslie Foster, Mitchell Freymiller, Warren Gallagher, Alan Gallaher, Andrea Gapko, Marc Goulet, Betty Hanson, Susan Harrison, Sean Hartnett, Jeremy Hein, Ann Hoffman, Robert Hollon, Larry Honl, Robert Hooper, Richard Kark, Fred Kolb, Tim Lane, Kate Lang, Gene Leisz, Barbara Lozar, Barbara Mac Briar, Steven Majstorovic, Donald Mash, Susan Mc Intyre, John Melrose, Jane Pederson, Bobby Pitts, Connie Russell, Richard Ryberg, Ronald Satz, Kathie Schneider, Roger Selin, Nick Smiar, Alex Smith, Carter Smith, Lorraine Smith, Linda Spaeth, Todd Stephens, Paula Stuettgen, Kent Syverson, Lois Taft, Dale Taylor, Roger Trusty, Karen Welch, Sharon Westphal, Scott Whitfield, Michael Wick, Jean Wilcox, Steve Zantow

Members Absent:

Ken Akiba, Joey Bohl, Marcia Bollinger, Terry Classen, Jesse Dixon, Bruce Dybvik, Tim Ho, Rose Jadack, Debra King, Rebecca Matter, Rick Mickelson, Andrew Phillips, Vicki Reed, Peter Rejto, Rebecca Wurzer

Guests:

Margaret Cassidy, Mark Clark, Wilma Clark, Bernard Duyfhuizen, Erik Hendrickson, Eugene Hood, Dale Johnson, Jan Morse, Katherine Rhoades, Teresa Sanislo, Marilyn Skrivseth, Johannes Strohschank, Andrew Soll, Steven Tallant, Marty Wood

The regular meeting of University Senate was called to order by Chair Harrison at 3:02 p.m. on Tuesday, February 24, 2004 in the Tamarack Room of Davies Center.

I. Without objection, minutes of February 10, 2004 meeting of University Senate approved as distributed

II. Chancellor’s Remarks – Chancellor Mash

- February is Black History month
- Attendance at sponsored events this year higher than usual – lots of interest
- Forum/Artists Series attempts to coordinate events with special initiatives
- Three students ran for Eau Claire City Council; two advancing to general election
- Students excited about possibility because number of issues impact them
- Suggests work begun over last several years at orientation of incoming freshman about engaging in their work, both in and out of classroom, to maximize time here effective
- Just approved creation of Center for Material Science
- Noteworthy in that four departments – Physics and Astronomy, Chemistry, Biology, and Geology – participating collaboratively for center
- Holds real promise in focusing program activity
- Open house on April 22, 2004
- Example of things continuing to happen because thinking about future even though challenged
- Leader-Telegram last night carried big headline “Homecoming Parade Route Changed”
  - Picked up because The Spectator ran essentially same story
  - University Activities Commission did propose that change; at this point is recommendation, not approved
  - Difficult timing as university in conversations with neighborhood and community groups about variety of issues
- Want to keep communication positive, helpful, and timely
- In this particular case, doesn’t look like we are doing that; lots of community relations damage control now needs to be done
- Would want to talk to those living on First Avenue and tavern owners on Water Street before such change took place
- In process of working through

III. Chair and Faculty Representative’s Report – Chair Harrison
- Welcome provost back
- Faculty and academic staff will be receiving call for nominations for vacancies on university committees
  - Opportunity to nominate yourself or someone else
- Next meeting of faculty reps will be teleconference February 27, 2004
- Forwarded names of James Oberly (History) and CeCelia Zorn (Nursing Systems) to regents for System President Search and Screen Committee
- Next Board of Regents meeting March 4 and 5, 2004 in Madison

IV. Academic Staff Representative’s Report – Senator Wilcox
- Academic staff reps met February 19, 2004 in Madison
- Heard many times during meeting on many issues – wait and see
  - Written report distributed on those issues
- Will be having Academic Staff Leadership Conference at Stout this summer
  - Keynote speaker will be Secretary of Education Rod Paige or his deputy Secretary of Education in charge of post-secondary education, Sally Stroup
- Academic staff representatives drafting mission statement revolving around ideas of communication and advocacy
- Forwarded names of Andrea Gapko and Jean Wilcox for consideration for Search and Screen Committee for President of University System

V. Unfinished Business

Academic Policies Committee – Second Reading
Revisions to Department/Program Review Process

Chair Harrison noted that according to parliamentary procedure, an amendment is debated and voted on before moving to other unrelated amendments
- Without objection, will call for reports on all proposed amendments prior to accepting any amendment on floor so can hear and clarify all, prior to voting on any one amendment
  - Would allow consultation with constituents on all ideas at once if necessary

Reports on Proposed Amendments
- If looks like Senate will pass motion, will propose there be departmental input into makeup of program review subcommittee – PRS (amendment language distributed)
- Shared proposal and documentation with department; feedback was that something needed to be done
  - Instead of having entire council appointed, have it partially appointed and partially elected
  - Input in makeup of subcommittee from faculty at-large and perhaps from faculty of department
- Leaning towards making council an elected body with distribution similar to what done before
- Think we should consider remanding back to Academic Policies Committee
- If send back, need to also send list of specific objections to proposal
  - Could send copy of minutes with discussion

Debate (and start of official speakers list)
- Against main motion – view along lines of states rights vs. federal government
  - Any time departments give away power to administration not a good thing; extremely important that departments have say as to who goes on subcommittee
• Opens possibility of stacking subcommittee one way or another without current restrictions requiring 
  related and unrelated disciplines being represented
• Appointment of PRS not done by provost; done by Academic Program Review Council - APCR
  • Provost only appoints APCR from lists from APC and deans with consultation with Executive Committee
• Current process says whenever possible the three to five member internal review committee will include an 
  individual from a related academic and unrelated academic discipline
• See this more in terms of appointing a slate of judges that aren’t confirmed
  • Concentration of power over five outcomes, three of which are real bad, one not very good, and one good
  • Seems could create zero-sum mentality among departments in competition for university resources
• Would not have problem with amendment to have council elected
  • See format and procedure as far superior to what we have now with significant positive impact
• Believe ought to trot this right back to Academic Policies Committee
  • Probably not something we want to hastily amend
    • Refer back to APC and get broader spectrum of voices to address concerns about makeup of APCR, 
      whether elected or appointed, and whether departments should have voice in matter
• APC already spent considerable time hashing and rehashing proposal; how about referring to ad hoc committee 
  appointed by provost?
  • Start over, run it back through APC, and back to Senate
  • Hate to see us give it back to same committee that gave it to us because having a hard time dealing with it
• Think it went wrong in charge given to ad hoc committee; when go outside governance, don’t get grass roots 
  support
• Task force created was chair of APC, another member of APC, a department chair, an associate dean, an 
  administrator, and an academic staff person; wasn’t governance committee, but worked with groups related to 
  governance structure
• Leaning toward sending it back to committee
  • Would also like to talk about outcome statements new proposal asks for
  • Heard discussion about this being less qualitative and more summative in nature
  • Not sure will be enough in minutes to reflect the will of this body
• Concerned by lack of departmental input into makeup of subcommittee
  • Would be ready to vote for today if two members were agreed upon by department and the council
  • Not sure it is valuable to send back to committee
• Wondering whether we really need another committee doing things at this university
  • Wonder why majority of those on APC voted to give up responsibility in review process
  • Would like clearer sense of onerous part of process
• APC extremely busy committee; program review very important and at times gets short shrift when conflicts 
  with other items that need to be done
  • Also see lack of continuity because minor component of what APC does
  • Would derive benefit by having someone sit on PRSs in consecutive years to evaluate programs more 
    clearly
  • Another weakness in currently procedures is internal review committee becomes expert on program or 
    department; APC never sees that committee, just sees their written report
  • This year plan to invite someone from internal review committee to be at APC to gain that experience
• Don’t believe this process onerous for APC; is interesting to learn about university by this valuable experience
  • Spread more widely now than would be under new plan and council
  • One advantage would be possibly greater consistency and perhaps better quality depending upon training
  • Think process has worked pretty well; see no evidence to contrary
• In lengthy APC discussion, rationale that we were overworked and need to unload work to another committee 
  never discussed openly
  • Intent was to improve process primarily in terms of continuity over period of years
  • Also felt this was due in part to fact that resources dwindling and hard decisions must be made
    • Got sense that in general reviews were positive with requests for more resources and that process may 
      not serve well for making difficult decisions down the road
Could have body with continuity and training and time to look not only at program quality, but data related to resources

Does that mean just being more systematic about rearranging deck chairs on the Titanic?

Or that we will be more systematic about taking academic departments and reperceiving them as service departments?

Is future so grim that we have to create a better structure for being able to send certain departments to the guillotine?

That was part of my perception, not something that was clearly stated

This is also a faculty governance issue – favor status quo

Should leave system that seems to have worked fine with committee open to any faculty member

This is a step away from faculty governance

Concerned that with so much internal continuity (PVC appoints the APRC, which appoints the PRS from within the APRC) a perception of a model of the way things should be will be developed

Innovative programs that do things effectively, but a bit differently, may not fall within that model

May become one of those chairs sliding toward edge

Current draft does include consultative process in appointment of original members

New committee would report recommendations to Academic Policies Committee

Same model used in GE committee established few years ago

Currently have five to seven departments reviewed in any given year

If provost followed recommendations, resource allocation available to entire university would be gone

Looking for basis to make some of those decisions by fine tuning information that comes in

GE committee elected, not appointed

Also concerned that department not assured of having even one person on subcommittee in a like discipline

Concern seems to be that taking-care-of-each-other mentality not allowing honest assessment

How is this committee going to be more honest knowing their departments will be reviewed in future?

Adding resources may not be helpful comment to administrator, but that doesn’t mean it is not something that department needs

How is this committee going to be more honest knowing their departments will be reviewed in future?

Motion can be amended, referred back to committee, or voted up or down; if defeated, anyone can work on it and bring it back to Senate or to APC

If look outside at how university assessed (by Princeton Review or US News and World Report), academic reputation stands out

If we were even 25th or 30th in faculty resources, we would jump ahead

Perceiving us as doing really good job with resources we have

Don’t see connection between this and funding

Person who makes decision about funding must make that decision – is administrative decision

If give money to committee to decide, might empower them, but is disconnect

Already have several layers of review – internal, external, APC

This would add one more - APRC

Would be nice if we were consulted and informed, but don’t see where we are prepared to make those decisions

Vote on Motion 40-AP-09: Motion DEFEATED by vote of University Faculty Senators.

VI. Reports of Committees

Executive Committee – Chair Harrison

At last meeting, reviewed number of faculty and academic staff at UW-Eau Claire as related to make-up of Senate

Details of that discussion included in Chair’s Report by request

Next meeting March 2, 2004

Response to questions from floor

Departments that drop below four members no longer eligible for Senate representation

Includes faculty and academic staff with faculty status appointed 50% or more in department

At-large members represent those departments
Approximately five senators are department chairs

Faculty Personnel Committee – Senator Wick
- Next meeting March 2, 2004 with agenda items
  - Motion for post-tenure review
  - Motion for distribution of DPC minutes
  - Motion on dismissals/complaints and grievances policies
  - Discussion of selection of chairs criteria in handbook
  - Handbook revision policy
- Response to questions from floor
  - Looking into question of where DPC minutes should be distributed
    - Have answer from system legal and others - formulating letter to respond to person raising question
  - Two separate issues on post-tenure review
    - One is post-tenure review process coming before Faculty Personnel Committee covering only tenured faculty; first step is to get review process accepted
    - Other is salary adjustment for people who have hit the wall; second step will be to look at if want to reward or penalize people based on that process, which is Compensation Committee function

Academic Staff Personnel Committee – Senator Wilcox
- Next meeting February 26, 2004; will discuss
  - Handbook language changes
  - Academic staff awards recommendation

Academic Policies Committee – Senator Syverson
- Continue to talk about Assessment Report brought forth from Assessment Committee
  - Evaluating benchmarks; talking about data that is being used to evaluate outcomes and goals of baccalaureate degree
  - Discussions to continue next week
- Other things coming up shortly in APC
  - New prefix for Latin American Studies
  - Attendance/medical excuse policy suggested by Health Services
- Next meeting March 2, 2004
- Response to question from floor
  - Assessment Committee to use APC input to revise Assessment Report to be distributed to university community; will not result in Senate motion

Physical Plant Planning Committee – Senator Stuettgen
- Hope to meet March 5, 2004 to hear presentations from city traffic engineer and on air quality studies

Budget Committee – No Report

Compensation Committee – Vice Chair Gapko
- Next meeting March 2, 2004
- Primary discussion item will be post-tenure salary adjustments

Nominating Committee – No Report

Technology Committee – Senator Goulet
- Meeting next week to get update on university discussions regarding conversion of administrative systems

VII. Special Reports – Dr. Teresa Sanislo
- Flyers and calendar distributed highlighting events planned during Women’s History Month
- Information also on website accessible from History and Women’s Studies Program websites

VIII. Miscellaneous Business

A. Academic Policies Committee – First Reading
Report on Computer Engineering Emphasis – Senator Syverson
- Brought forward from Computer Science Department
  - Chippewa Valley technology firms initiated discussions about need for emphasis
Remodeling has begun on new classrooms required to support Emphasis draws heavily on courses from Math and Physics and Astronomy Departments
- Those departments supportive of emphasis; courses already on books
- If emphasis highly subscribed, may need additional sections of Physics 350 and 360 to service
- Do not have engineering school, so would be computer science degree
- Has cleared necessary curriculum committees; favorably received by Academic Policies Committee
- Way to build additional connections between university and local businesses in area; also preparing students for elsewhere
- Response to question on content of report
  - Template for course completion only one of several possibilities
  - Just showing possible to complete major and general university requirements in four years
  - Other versions have GE credits spread more liberally throughout

Motion 40-AP-10
Moved and seconded by Academic Policies Committee (9 for, 0 against) that the proposed Major: Computer Science, Liberal Arts (code 170-040) be approved as indicated in the motion.

Debate
- This would be computer science degree, not computer engineering degree
  - Is hardware-oriented emphasis within computer science degree appropriate for local industry and industry nationwide
- Is room in curriculum (internship listed in last semester or research project) to spend time getting grounding in engineering at places like Stout, or Madison, or elsewhere
  - As done in past, will accommodate students based on background, such as allowing prerequisite structures to be avoided
- Would assume similar to physics where some projects will be in house because faculty have projects for students to work on here, but encourage outside internships which enhance program
- Faculty in Computer Science Department has expertise to teach courses
  - Also have local experts interested in being adjunct faculty
- Received renewable grant for $80,000 to buy hardware to be used by students to experiment
  - No additional resources requested
  - Also using older machines no longer appropriate for use by masses for hands-on experience
- See this as very good, viable program
  - Experience in remote sensing and GIS program indicates curricular and staffing aspects eventually may become problem
    - When went to hire someone for remote sensing/GIS program, were $25,000 away from target price
    - No general access labs on campus with machines with sufficient memory to use for these classes
  - Can have curricular ideas sometimes undercut by financial concerns, particularly in technical areas that require technical resources down the line
- Emphasis requires no additional resources beyond what already have
  - Should this emphasis grow into major program, then would have to address faculty and laboratory needs
    - Anticipating five to eight people in program per year – that level and slightly above can be supported with existing staff and equipment
- Department did commendable job of bringing folks on campus to address questions of likely needs and curriculum itself
- Not against motion – see no indication of student demand
  - Why take computer engineering here rather than going to computer engineering school to meet demand?
- Will not be producing computer engineers – what local and national companies need is hybrid
  - Line between software and hardware more blurry every year
  - Lot of design verification work (right on that line) done in Chippewa Valley
Now produce very solid performers in software design and implementation; those placed in local companies say they would have benefited greatly from experience such as this emphasis provides
Now companies are retooling people that come in, so our graduates not as able to compete with someone coming in with this background
About eight students now interested and waiting to transfer over to this program
Emphasis is comprehensive major not designed as certificate program
Would probably not be popular with people who have already obtained computer science degree

MOTION by Senator Mac Briar that the rules be suspended to allow a vote on this today seconded and PASSED by two-thirds vote.

Continued Debate – None

Vote on Motion 40-AP-10: Motion PASSED by vote of University Faculty Senators without dissention.

B. Academic Policies Committee – First Reading
Report on CE Prefix – Senator Syverson

- Brought forth by Computer Science Department
  - Would like to have new prefix to show people who might be interested in computer engineering emphasis just approved which courses have computer engineering subject matter
  - Would represent different use of prefix than typical at UW-Eau Claire, i.e., to enhance profile of emphasis within a major
  - Registrar expressed some hesitation about using prefixes in such way
  - May be other programs that may want to create new prefix for same reason
  - Also some discussion in APC whether CE was best possible prefix; most members did not think that would be major problem
  - What just passed not contingent on passing new prefix – are separate issues
  - Would just be run under computer science prefix
  - CE prefix would enhance profile of computer engineering emphasis; make it clearer to students and potential employers which courses had computer engineering subject matter
  - Response to question of content
    - Title of CE313 currently under revision; remaining course titles would stay same

Motion 40-AP-11
Moved and seconded by Academic Policies Committee (8 for, 1 against) that a new prefix for Computer Engineering (CE) be approved.

Debate
- If transcript already says computer engineering emphasis, why necessary to have this prefix?
- Department proposing because in past students interested in more hardware-oriented program have looked at our liberal arts based institution and come away with impression there will be no hardware component to courses
  - Better represents to prospective students and parents that is engineering aspect to computer science degree here
- Wonder at precedent being set; to what extent do we want to turn labeling system around for nonsubstantive reasons?
  - Would argue students are literate enough to figure out there is an engineering emphasis
  - Want to hear more about whether this might be direction we should move as institution
- Not a minor issue as to whether focusing on artificial intelligence vs. object-oriented design – computer engineering is a major and a program at other institutions
  - At those institutions (and on transcripts of students going there), there are CE prefixes on computer engineering courses
  - If employers see everything with CS prefix, and others have CE prefix as well, our students are at disadvantage, not because they didn’t get content, but simply because of labeling
Can use as filter when get lots of applications for open positions

 CE prefix would more appropriately represent what students experience here

 Would think more important that name of course on transcript be descriptive than that the prefix CE be there

 Concerned that emphases being developed on campus because new majors and minors will not get Board of Regents approval

 So creating new prefixes to match emphasis moving closer to giving blessing to new degree which isn’t really a degree

 Perhaps too big of change for payoff here with maximum of eight people per year interested in program

 Maybe also need system for allocating labels; CE could have other uses

 Favor motion – when preparing students to work at interface between science and engineering, some people employing these students are going to be engineers

 Engineers particularly persnickety about how people are trained

 Prefix gives program enhanced visibility to companies without costing much

 Gives students best foot forward to go out and compete at national level

 Against this because opens Pandora’s box – think this is dangerous precedent

 Shouldn’t need to worry about somebody going through resumes and finding courses with CE prefix when computer engineering emphasis right on transcript

 Diploma does not state emphasis, but emphasis does show up on transcript

 Local recruiters told us they want this on transcripts; need to adapt to real world

 Telling us these should be computer engineering courses, CE prefix confirms that

 Should handle each case as it comes forward, not reject because not the way we have done things

 Might backfire if student from another institution has whole list of CE courses while our students have mostly CS courses plus five CE courses

 Not attempting to graduate students to compete with entire CE major, nor do companies want those individuals

 They want our people, but they want our people with this background

 Not applying for same jobs as computer engineers; applying for computer science jobs where need hybrid knowledge of hardware and software

 Having hard time believing these highly paid people can’t read title of course, just the prefix

 English has five emphases, but only one prefix, yet students graduate and become technical writers

 Was at that meeting where personnel people were talking about what they are looking for – heard same thing – that they want to see CE before course

 Title of course does need to be there, but a CS452 Advanced Computer Architecture has different type of content than CE452 Advanced Computer Architecture

 Have taught course from computer science perspective; not what we are doing here

 Pandora’s box has been opened

 Have taught in departments with multiple prefixes – though think each was associated with degree

 Do have Foreign Literature in Translation (FLTR) Classical Mythology and others with no minor, no emphasis, no degree

 Favor motion – if can do anything to help students, should do that; this not costing any money

 If Pandora’s box opened, APC can handle it

 Representatives on business advisory board from North Carolina, Colorado, and California indicate employers in broader world also want this

 Believe CE courses will be listed with CS courses in catalogue

 Without objection, vote on this postponed until next meeting.

 C. Academic Policies Committee

 Report on Renaming ART Majors; Eliminating KINS/MUSI Majors – Senator Syverson

 Motion came forward from School of Education to bring education majors in line with new DPI initial certifications becoming effective August 31, 2004

 Not in best interest to have teaching emphases on books which no longer coincide with certifiable education emphases
• In Kinesiology and Music, will still have teaching emphases that fit changed certifications

**Motion 40-AP-12**
Moved and seconded by Academic Policies Committee (8 for, 0 against) that the proposed changes in the teaching curriculum at UW-Eau Claire be approved to reflect changes in the Department of Public Instruction legislative mandates per state statute:

1. Rename Major: Art, Comprehensive Teaching (020-004) to Art and Design Education (020-004)

2. Rename Major: Art, Middle Childhood/Early Adolescence (020-204) to Art and Design Education, Middle Childhood/Early Adolescence (020-204)

3. Eliminate Major: Kinesiology, Middle Childhood/Early Adolescence Physical Education Teaching Emphasis (991-259)

4. Eliminate Major: Music – Choral and General Music Teaching, Middle Childhood/Early Adolescence Emphasis (060-055)

MOTION by Senator Lozar that the rules be suspended to allow vote on this today seconded and PASSED by two-thirds vote.

Debate

- Previously had emphases for teaching grades 1 through 9; new DPI regulations license grades 1 through 12
  - Majors for teaching grades 1 through 12 already exist in music and kinesiology
  - Eliminating redundancy which cannot be certified anyway

**Vote on Motion 40-AP-12:** Motion PASSED by vote of University Faculty Senators without dissention.

Without objection, next two items will be held until next meeting.

IX. Announcements – None

Meeting adjourned at 4:56 p.m.

Wanda Schulner
Secretary to the University Senate