Members Present:


Members Absent:

Ken Akiba, Paul Butrymowicz, Linda Carpenter, Terry Classen, Dan Drumm, Bruce Dybvik, Robert Erffmeyer, Marc Goulet, Betty Hanson, Jeremy Hein, Larry Honl, Rose Jadack, Debra King, Fred Kolb, Rick Mickelson, Bobby Pitts, Vicki Reed, Peter Rejto, Ronald Satz, Nick Smiar, Lorraine Smith, Rebecca Wurzer

Guests:

Margaret Cassidy, Mark Clark, Analisa DeGrave, Gina Duwe, Bernard Duyfhuizen, Kristen Hutchins, Dale Johnson, Robert Knight, Karline Koehler, Tara Marshall, Jan Morse, Eva Santos-Phillips, Johannes Strohschank, Andrew Soll, Kathy Tank

The regular meeting of University Senate was called to order by Chair Harrison at 3:05 p.m. on Tuesday, April 27, 2004 in the Tamarack Room of Davies Center.

I. Without objection, minutes of April 13, 2004 meeting of University Senate approved as distributed

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

- No written chair’s report
- Chancellor signed off on motion renaming Theatre Arts, Early Adolescence/Adolescence Teaching to Theatre Arts, Teaching
- At last Executive Committee meeting, request made that chair announce as motions introduced who will be voting – procedure will start today
- Next meeting of faculty reps is teleconference on April 30, 2004
- Next Board of Regents meeting on May 6 and 7, 2004 in Madison
- Senate surveys distributed in packet
  - Responses will guide format of senate next year and be shared with nominating committee as they prepare for fall elections
  - Please place in box or send to Senate Office

III. Academic Staff Representative’s Report – Senator Wilcox

- Last Academic Staff Representatives Council meeting on March 15, 2004
- Talked about parity plan, upcoming budget deliberations, TABOR, and system president search – nothing new
  - Did notice different tone when discussing parity plan – now not nearly as optimistic
    - Apparently still in Karen Timberlake’s Office; no indication of when will be sent to JCOER
May be waiting to see how negotiations with classified staff progress – not likely to go quickly when better off with contract in force that pays for health care premiums rather than negotiating raise that would not cover increased cost of health care premiums

Handout on mission statement and organizing principles of Academic Staff Representatives Council put together out of concern that new president might come to system without knowing what academic staff even are

Welcome suggestions or feedback

IV. Unfinished Business

A. Compensation Committee – Second Reading
Post-Tenure Review Salary Adjustment

• Since passage of motion changes language in 2005-2006 Comprehensive Salary Plan passed by full senate, all senators to vote on motion as well as amendment
• Left discussion in midst of amendment that in Tier IV, which goes above and beyond that expected for extra meritorious performance, be added between growth and in

Continued Debate on Amendment – None

Vote on Amendment 40-CP-04-a1: Amendment PASSED.

Continued Debate on Main Motion

• Bothers me
  • That motion to support higher increments for promotions approved last semester reversed because money coming from base would reduce money for attracting new faculty
  • Seems administration supporting current motion because money coming from comprehensive pay plan, which translates into merit money, compression money and equity money – money that would come back to campus on yearly basis
  • Next, cost of about $36,000 a year would be divided among just 14 people – a sizeable reward
  • 138 full professors on campus, one-fifth up for post-tenure review each year of five-year cycle, so 28 eligible
  • With 28 eligible, 14 get nothing, three get maximum amount ($4,500), four next amount ($3,000), and seven least amount ($1,500)
  • Also to be given out under old merit plan, meaning from chair, to dean, to provost, to chancellor
  • What chair recommends may or may not happen because across campus only three people get $4,500
  • All faculty and all academic staff will lose as money comes out of comprehensive pay plan

• Political Science Department discussed
  • Thought wonderful idea in theory, if truly merit based
  • Believed along the way some people would have greater influence, greater access, and process would be politicized
  • In practice may not be good idea in terms of collegiality and university culture

• Faculty portion of comprehensive pay plan includes instructional academic staff who are ineligible for salary adjustments
• Concerned about comparative analysis between different disciplines in winnowing down to 14
• Administration would do in same way did it for 15 years – is nothing new

• Forgetting this comes out of chancellor’s discretionary 10% of pay plan funds
  • In past, has been put into compression, longevity and equity, however, he can distribute as he sees fit
  • He would like to see it used for something along these lines

• In years with 2% raise or above, post-tenure review salary adjustments would be funded strictly out of pay plan dollars
  • In years we get 2% or below, it would be funded from a combination of pay plan and base dollars
  • In years with no pay increase, would be funded entirely from base funds
  • So is potential for infusing additional money into salary line, but only in meager years

• Similar discussions held in Geography and Anthropology Department – key question was where money coming from
  • Thought about paying this as stipend prorated over years to senior faculty using foundation money – much like start-up funds for younger faculty
  • Then not robbing Peter to pay Paul
Since only up for post-tenure review every five years, would always be in competition with same cohort for same bucket of money
If rejected in particular year, is no appeal process for next year; would, according to policy, wait for five years
Nothing in writing says half are automatically eliminated – it says over time that is what we expect
Not strictly 14 per year; in given year if have people who are extreme performers, might fund 20 awards
Same idea as merit increases, where over time about 50% receive solid performance and 50% receive merit increases

Vote on Motion 40-CP-02: Motion DEFEATED by vote 17 for, 25 against.

B. Academic Policies Committee – Second Reading
LAS Prefix
• Vote will be by University Faculty Senators, which includes Instructional Academic Staff with Faculty Status

Continued Debate – None

Vote on Motion 40-AP-14: Motion PASSED without dissention by vote of University Faculty Senators.

C. Academic Policies Committee – Second Reading
LAS GE Category
• Vote will again be by University Faculty Senators.

Continued Debate
• Courses offered would automatically go into III-G or IV-E; if course crosses categories, then would be in V by virtue of previous senate action

Vote on Motion 40-AP-15: Motion PASSED by vote of University Faculty Senators.

D. Academic Policies Committee – Second Reading
Medical Excuses Guidelines
• Since authorized absences affect many aspects in and out of classroom, full senate will vote

Continued Debate
• Effective date changed to fall 2004 when next handbook published
• No discussion of absences for mental health reasons in Academic Policies Committee because dealing with concerns of Student Health Services
  • Don’t believe there would be opposition to including something about mental health
• If formalizing what does and doesn’t happen, makes sense to include mental health in policy
  • Will take back to colleagues in Counseling Services in order to bring something forward next year

Vote on Motion 40-AP-16: Motion PASSED without dissention.

E. Academic Policies Committee – Second Reading
Wellness Requirement Exemption for Military Service
• As curricular issue, University Faculty Senators will vote

Continued Debate
• Amended at last meeting to add additional form accepted for proof of military training

Vote on Motion 40-AP-17: Motion PASSED by vote of University Faculty Senators.

V. Reports of Committees
• Executive Committee – Chair Harrison
  • At last meeting of Executive Committee, request made at University Faculty meeting that terms of nominating committee members be lengthened discussed – motion to come forward next year
  • Next meeting May 4, 2004
Committee will review this year, set goals for next year, and discuss senate role in eliminating programs
Subcommittee of University Faculty members of Executive Committee will convene to consult with chancellor on concerns about post-tenure review motion passed on March 30, 2004

Faculty Personnel Committee – No Report
Academic Staff Personnel Committee – Senator Wilcox
  Next meeting May 13, 2004, no agenda yet
Academic Policies Committee – Senator Lozar
  Met today and took two actions

FOR THE RECORD
Accepted Memorandum of Understanding between Nicolet College and UW-Eau Claire allowing Nicolet College students to take four beginning social work courses through distance education and then transfer into social work program here
Without objection, Memorandum of Understanding accepted into the record

Other recommendation coming to senate to change name of Department of Communication Disorders to Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders and to create prefix reflecting that change
Next meeting May 4, 2004
  Will start discussing proposal regarding music therapy
  Information packets, both for and against, available at Circulation Desk in Library and in Senate Office

Physical Plant Planning Committee – Senator Stuettgen
Response to question from floor
  First heard of increased cost of riverbank project at Putnam Park Commission meeting yesterday
  Riverbank stabilization frequently discussed by Physical Plant Planning Committee
  Project is underway, appears will be increase in cost due to restrictions on who can install geopiers
  Cannot leave river bank unprotected – plan not changed other than expenses higher
  Will report on status at next senate meeting

Budget Committee – No Report
Compensation Committee – No Report
Nominating Committee – No Report
Technology Committee – No Report

VI. Special Reports
Special Report on Activities and Plans of University General Education Committee – Chair Robert Knight
University General Education Committee (UGEC) in past two years established criteria for assessment, availability and content of General Education courses and began to review new course proposals and course updates
Now sending out to curriculum committees and APC a survey on GE categorization
  Plan to use survey results to help committee judge future course proposals
Able to attend American Association of Colleges and Universities convention in March
  Struck that currently no goals for General Education program here and by creativity of ideas and possibilities for General Education presented there
  Have since presented process and timeline for development of GE goals
  Issue call to faculty, academic staff, students and administration to submit goals for GE program
  Deadline for goals submission is October 15, 2004
  UGEC will review and assemble final list by December 7, 2004 for distribution and discussion by university community
  University-wide email with details for submission process to be distributed soon
  Please consider submitting goals for GE program
Response to questions from floor
  Hope to have opportunity during two week period prior to start of next academic year for discussion on developing those goals – working out details
  Feel valuable to allow everyone in community chance to be involved rather than committee making list of goals for reaction
Plan to take advantage of information already thought and written about in redefinition of baccalaureate degree

Great deal of placement in GE categories determined by senate action
- Have been couple instances of courses where lot of division in committee as to where they should be categorized
- Survey to get sense from committees to guide decisions in future

VII. Special Orders – Election of University Senate Chair
Comments by Candidates
- Chair Harrison – would appreciate opportunity to continue to serve
  - Also chance to work with new faculty representative in separating duties of chair and rep
- Senator Freymiller – will strive to do as good a job as Susan has done for last several years
  - Cannot replace her, but will attempt to achieve at her level
- Response to question of process
  - Both candidates are University Faculty (Senator Freymiller is academic staff with faculty status), so bylaws dictate vice chair would be elected from among University Academic Staff senators
  - To change process would require constitutional amendment
  - Academic staff rep and faculty rep were bylaws and could be changed by this body
  - Instructions on election of officers are in constitution and would have to be amended by full faculty and academic staff

Reelected as Senate Chair: Susan Harrison

VIII. Miscellaneous Business

A. Faculty Personnel Committee – First Reading
   Handbook Language Changes to Selection of Department Chair Section – Senator Wick

- Faculty Personnel Committee asked by Handbook Review Committee to clarify language relating to who can serve on Department Chair Search and Screen Committees
  - Confusion because in some places it refers to instructional and/or research academic staff with faculty status, in others to instructional staff, and in still others to instructional/research academic staff
- Charges faculty of department with responsibility of recommending candidates for department chair

Motion 40-FP-05
Moved and seconded by Faculty Personnel Committee (4-1) that changes to the Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook, Chapter 5, page 5.75 be approved.

TEXT OF CHANGES

4. Selection of Department Chair and Director of Libraries

All Department Chairs and the Director of Libraries are appointed by the Chancellor of the University. The Department Chair is directly responsible to the Dean of the College in which the department is situated and represents the department in the administration of the University (FS 1/80).

a. Procedure for Selecting Department Chairs and Director of Libraries

1) The instructional staff of a department shall be informed in writing by the Dean of their College that a Chair is to be selected and appointed.

2) The Dean shall meet with the instructional staff of the department to initiate the selection process by:
   a) Reviewing the nature and responsibilities of the office of Chair.
   b) Suggesting useful criteria.
   c) Informing the department of any constraints that might impinge on the selection process.
   d) Determining a target date for completion of the selection process.

3) The faculty of the department and instructional and/or research academic staff with faculty status or a committee selected by and from the faculty and instructional and/or research academic staff of the department shall formally organize as the Department Chair Search and Screen Committee with an elected chair and secretary. The committee shall:
   a) Determine whether preference is for selection:
      1. from within the department,
2. from without the department, or
3. from either within or without the department.

b) Formulate criteria to be used in selecting the Chair.

c) Arrange with the Dean to publicize the vacancy and to solicit applications.

d) Review and evaluate all applications.

e) Interview and evaluate candidates for the position.

f) Submit to the Dean of the College the name(s) of one or more individuals whom the committee recommends to be considered for the position of Department Chair. When more than one individual is recommended, the committee may, if it chooses, rank the individuals recommended.

g) Solicit suggestions and information from all instructional staff of the department throughout the entire process on matters relating to the selection of the Department Chair.

4) The Dean of the College shall evaluate the candidate(s) recommended by the Search and Screen Committee and submit his/her recommendation to the Provost and Vice Chancellor, along with a copy of the recommendation from the committee. The Provost and Vice Chancellor will in turn evaluate the candidate(s) and submit his/her recommendation to the Chancellor along with copies of the recommendation of the Dean and the committee.

5) If after administrative review none of the recommended candidates is appointed, the Chancellor shall notify the Dean of the College who shall reconvene the Department Chair Search and Screen Committee. The committee will then reconsider its earlier decisions and recommendations, and as necessary and appropriate, may solicit and evaluate additional candidates prior to submitting another recommendation as described in section a.3.

6) Upon the recommendation of the Department Chair Search and Screen Committee, the Dean of the College, and the Provost and Vice Chancellor, the Chancellor shall appoint a Department Chair. At the University of Wisconsin – Eau Claire, an appointment to the administrative post of Department Chair is a limited appointment under the terms of UWS 15. (US 10/91)

b. Procedures for Selecting Acting Department Chairs and Director of Libraries

In the event that an acting Department Chair is to be appointed by the Chancellor of the University prior to the selecting of a permanent Chair, the Dean of the College where the vacancy has occurred shall:

1) Announce to the instructional staff of the department that an acting Chair is to be appointed, describe the circumstances requiring the appointment, and indicate the anticipated length of the appointment.

2) Solicit advice from the instructional staff faculty concerning possible candidates to fill the vacancy.

3) Make recommendations to the Chancellor of the University.

5 The procedures for selection of the Director of Libraries is are the same as that for selection of Department Chair except that the Assistant Chancellor, to whom the directory reports, holds the responsibilities described for the Dean. The Assistant Chancellor will make his/her recommendation to the Chancellor along with the committee’s recommendation. (US 10/91)

6 While departments may choose to develop internal provisions for limiting the term of the chair, these provisions are informal and not binding on the Chancellor. (US 5/9/98)

7 “Faculty” means persons who hold the rank of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, or instructor in an academic department or its functional equivalent in an institution.

● As faculty personnel matter, faculty senators will vote, which does not include academic staff with faculty status

Debate

● Issue causing person to vote no in committee related to listing of committee policies not currently in practice
   ● Objection was still would be disagreement between new policy and current practice; felt more changes needed

Without objection, vote on motion postponed until next meeting.

B. Academic Staff Personnel Committee - First Reading

Report on Handbook Language Changes to Academic Staff Personnel Rules – Senator Wilcox

● Suggestions from ad hoc committee looking at Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook
   ● Most changes update language to current usage, reflect current practice, clarify, or provide consistency
• Page 32 of Chapter 5 updated to reflect UW-System language of Instructional Academic Staff and Administrative and Professional Academic Staff
• Added phrase primarily associated with institutions of higher education because it differentiates administrative and professional academic staff from classified staff
• Page 33 of Chapter 5 doesn’t change policy or procedure, but differentiates process of recruitment for administrative and professional academic staff in units, which don’t have chairs and deans, as opposed to rare instances where administrative and professional academic staff recruited by departments
• Page 34 of Chapter 5 changed to reflect current practice
• Page 40 of Chapter 5 – Review of Performance
  • On reflection, probably should have also gone to Faculty Personnel Committee because covers review of performance of instructional academic staff
  • Asking that review of instructional academic staff follow procedures at department level outlined in department evaluation plan
  • Assures instructional academic staff reviewed according to contract
  • Adds procedure for review of no-intent-to-rehire instructional academic staff
  • Have many instructional academic staff who are no-intent-to-rehire, but hired year after year
• Final change clarifies that evaluation process for administrative and professional academic staff must be completed by January 15
• Questions for clarification of report
  • January 15 date provides time for proper notice
  • Administrative and professional academic staff work year around so generally available at that time
  • Same date for departments, but can move up to complete before fall semester ends

Motion 40-AS-04
Moved and seconded by Academic Staff Personnel Committee (7-0) that the language in the Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook be changed as indicated.

TEXT OF MOTION
Chapter 5, page 32, 2nd paragraph headed UWEC 10.01(2) Composition of Academic Staff

UWEC 10.01(2) COMPOSITION OF ACADEMIC STAFF

Academic staff appointments shall include the following categories: (a) general administrative and professional academic staff, which includes employees involved in policy development or execution, or in directing, organizing, or supervising activities in the administration of UW-Eau Claire or a college, school, division, or department (or functional equivalent) or unit; thereof, (b) academic professional support staff which includes those academic staff persons assigned to duties extending and supporting the or involved in the support of students and/or research, teaching, or public service primarily associated with institutions of higher education functions of UW-Eau Claire not defined in (a) above; (c) and (b) instructional and/or research academic staff.

Chapter 5, page 33, 1st paragraph under UWEC 10.02(1) Recruitment of Administrative and/or Professional Academic Staff.

UWEC 10.02(1)(a) RECRUITMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND/OR PROFESSIONAL ACADEMIC STAFF IN UNITS

Recruitment to fill an administrative or professional academic staff position in a unit, whether it is newly created or becomes available through an established position being vacated, shall follow these procedures: the administrator (Director, Chair, Dean, Assistant/Associate/Vice Chancellor, or Provost/Vice Chancellor) shall seek the advice of the unit’s academic staff in defining the position and conducting the search. The administrator shall oversee the development of a position description detailing the duties and responsibilities of the position and the qualifications to be sought. All recruiting procedures shall be in accordance with the UW-Eau Claire’s Affirmative Action Plan.

Upon review by the Affirmative Action Officer and approval of the appropriate Dean or Vice/Assistant/Associate/Vice Chancellor and the Provost/Vice Chancellor, the position shall be publicized in accord with the principles of affirmative action and in an effort to secure as many qualified applicants as possible. All academic staff position vacancies in units shall be advertised on campus. Local and outside Internal and external candidates shall be given equal consideration. (US 4/00)
The Director or Chair shall obtain from the Affirmative Action Office the appropriate forms for recording the recruitment activity and the qualifications of the applicants reviewed.

After the closing date for applications, the administrator shall seek the advice of the screening committee unit’s academic staff in determining which candidate(s) to interview. The best-qualified candidate(s) shall be selected identified and, after review by the Affirmative Action Officer and approved by approval of the appropriate Dean or Assistant/Associate/ Vice Chancellor and the Provost/Vice Chancellor, the candidate(s) shall be invited to the campus for interviews. (US 11/88)

While on campus, the candidate(s) shall be interviewed as appropriate, by the director or Chair, members of the faculty or academic staff, the Dean or Vice Chancellor, and the Provost and Vice Chancellor.

If the candidate(s) is (are) not acceptable, another candidate from the approved list will be invited for interviews. If none of the remaining candidates is available or acceptable, the position shall be readvertised and a new closing date set.

When an acceptable candidate has been identified, the director or Chair administrator will prepare a recommendation for appointment. After review by the Affirmative Action Officer, and upon recommendation of the appropriate Dean or Assistant/Associate/ Vice Chancellor, the Provost/Vice Chancellor shall prepare an appointment letter for the Chancellor’s review.

If none of the candidates is acceptable, the administrator in consultation with the screening committee shall (1) revisit the pool for additional candidates, or (2) readvertise in the same and/or different locations using exactly the same position requirements and description, or (3) close the search, and if appropriate, determine what changes need to be made to either the position or the wording of the advertisement and request permission to begin a new search incorporating changes.

UWEC 10.02(1)(b) RECRUITMENT FOR ADMINISTRATIVE AND/OR PROFESSIONAL ACADEMIC STAFF POSITIONS IN DEPARTMENTS

Recruitment to fill an administrative or professional academic staff position in a department, whether it is newly created or becomes available through an established position being vacated, shall follow these procedures: the department chair shall develop a position description detailing the duties and responsibilities of the position and the qualifications to be sought, identify appropriate means of publicizing the vacancy, and determine procedures for screening the applicants. All recruiting procedures shall be in accordance with the UW-Eau Claire’s Affirmative Action Plan.

Upon review by the Affirmative Action Officer and approval of the appropriate Dean and the Provost/Vice Chancellor, the position shall be publicized in accord with the principles of affirmative action and in an effort to secure as many qualified applicants a possible.

After the closing date for applications, the department chair, in accordance with the screening procedure described on the Request to Recruit, shall determine which candidate(s) to interview. The best-qualified candidate(s) shall be identified and, after review by the Affirmative Action Officer and approval of the appropriate Dean and the Provost/Vice Chancellor, the candidate(s) shall be invited to the campus for interviews.

When an acceptable candidate has been identified, the department chair will prepare a recommendation for appointment. After review by the Affirmative Action Officer, and upon recommendation of the appropriate Dean, the Provost/Vice Chancellor shall prepare an appointment letter for the Chancellor’s review.

If none of the candidates is acceptable, the department chair shall (1) revisit the pool for additional candidates, or (2) readvertise in the same and/or different locations using exactly the same position requirements and description, or (3) close the search, and if appropriate, determine what changes need to be made to either the position or the wording of the advertisement and request permission to begin a new search incorporating changes.
Chapter 5, page 34, Letter of Appointment to Academic Staff

UWEC 10.02(2) LETTER OF APPOINTMENT TO ACADEMIC STAFF

The terms and conditions of appointment of an academic staff member shall be specified in a written letter of appointment signed by the Chancellor or an official of the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire authorized by him or her. The letter of appointment must contain: (a) designation of type of appointment as fixed term, probationary, or indefinite; (b) duration of the appointment, including starting and ending dates; (c) salary; (d) general position responsibilities; (e) definition of operational area; and (f) length of the probationary period, if appropriate, and recognition of credit for prior service as part of the probationary period, if appropriate (UW 4/00); and (g) reference to Accompanying the letter of appointment shall be an attachment detailing institutional and system regulations, rules, and procedures relating to academic staff appointments. If the appointment is subject to the approval of the Board of Regents, a statement to this effect must be included in the letter.

An amended letter of appointment shall be sent to an academic staff appointee whose position responsibility is to undergo significant change, and a copy of the amended letter shall be sent to the chair of the standing Academic Staff Personnel Committee at the same time.

A Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook will be provided after the initial contract is accepted. All academic staff shall be apprised of their governance rights by the unit director or department chair at the time of original hire. (US 4/00)

Chapter 5, page 40, UWEC 10.03(3) Review of Performance, Instructional Academic Staff

UWEC 10.03(3) Review of Performance

1. Fixed Term—Instructional and/or Research Academic Staff (IAS)
   a. Fixed Term
      1) Performance Review
         The performance review of instructional and/or research academic staff will follow procedures at the departmental level as outlined in the departmental evaluation plan and similar to those employed for probationary faculty for peer review (UWEC 3.05) including the evaluation consideration of student ratings evaluations. The Departmental Personnel Committee will conduct a review of performance and forward a report to the Department Chair. The performance evaluation by the Department Chair, including the Departmental Personnel Committee’s report, will be given to the instructional and/or research academic staff member in writing at the same time the report is forwarded to the appropriate Dean. The instructional and/or research academic staff member shall have the right to comment on the evaluation in writing within ten calendar days of receipt of the Department Chair’s evaluation. To make appropriate personnel decisions and to support the individual’s personnel record, the Department Chair’s performance evaluation and the academic staff member’s comments, if any, shall be filed in the instructional and/or research academic staff member’s personnel file.
         The Department Chair’s performance evaluation is to be forwarded to the Dean prior to January 15 in the instructional and/or research academic staff member’s first two years of service; prior to October 15 of the third through sixth years of service; and prior to February 15 for appointment to the seventh and subsequent years of service. (US 5/97)
   b. 2) Areas of Evaluation
      The performance review for instructional and/or research academic staff shall be a comprehensive evaluation based and shall include those functions related to teaching as well as professional growth and appropriate contributions to the department, university, the profession, and the public. An instructional and/or research academic staff member is to be evaluated only on his or her assigned contractual responsibilities, as specified in UWEC 10.03(4)
   b. Fixed Term - No Intent to Rehire
      1) Performance Review
         The performance review for instructional and/or research academic staff who are on no intent to rehire contracts will follow procedures at the departmental level as outlined in the department evaluation plan. The Instructional Academic Staff member will meet with the
Department Chair at the beginning of their contract period to discuss review criteria. The review should consist of, at a minimum, a written document of review.

2) Areas of Evaluation

The performance review for instructional and/or research academic staff with no intent to rehire contracts shall be an evaluation based only on contractual responsibilities.

Chapter 5, page 41, UWEC Review of Performance, – Administrative and/or Professional Academic Staff

*UWEC 10.03(3) Review of Performance*

2. Fixed Term— Administrative and/or Professional Academic Staff
   a. Performance Evaluation
      Within the first month of each contract period, the immediate supervisor shall call a meeting with the academic staff member to review and explain work assignments and performance expectations for the period. Performance expectations shall be determined in the context of the areas of evaluation specified below. Performance evaluation process shall be *completed* by January 15 in the first two years; by October 15 in the third through sixth years of service; and by February 15 for appointment to the seventh and subsequent years of service. (US 5/97)

3. Probationary Administrative and/or Professional Academic Staff
   a. Performance Evaluation
      Within the first month of each contract period, the immediate supervisor shall call a meeting with the academic staff member to review and explain work assignments and performance expectations for the period. Performance expectations shall be determined in the context of the areas of evaluation specified below. Performance evaluation process shall be *completed* by January 15 in the first year of service, by October 15 in the second year of service, and by February 15 thereafter. (US 5/97)

- As academic staff personnel matter, academic staff senators will vote on this motion
- Includes instructional academic staff with faculty status
- Faculty senators, since motion directly involves departments in some areas, may ask to have vote recorded as well

Debate

- In first paragraph under 10.01(2), language not clear as to how an academic staff member primarily conducting research would be classified
- Seem to be included in both (a) and (b)
- Key word in section (a) is support
  - Academic staff whose job is to support research and teaching and public services are administrative and professional academic staff
  - Those who do the research and teaching are instructional and/or research academic staff
- Review of performance section b. Fixed Term – No Intent to Rehire should maybe go to Faculty Personnel Committee because are two groups in that category
  - Those who really are no intent to rehire – there for one year
    - May not need to be reviewed
  - Those in department almost permanently, coming back year after year
    - Should be some review on periodic basis
- Committee felt individuals hired on this type of contract, even for one year, deserve some kind of recommendation or review to take along to next position
- Reviews to be done in accordance with evaluation procedures existing within programs – not by chair
  - Is significant amount of work; need to keep eye on workload issue
- In many cases, type of contract based on soft versus hard money
  - Have been instructed if have any intent to rehire person in future, need evaluation data available
- When says no-intent-to-renew people evaluated according to department evaluation plan, doesn’t necessarily mean what you have in there now for fixed-term people
  - Can go back and write something for this group of people
  - Can make it less than for fixed-term people; can turn it over to chair
• Would come out of faculty in department in way evaluation plan is written
• For person there for one year, student evaluations and summary by department chair may be sufficient; department could define this for no-intent-to-rehire people instead of full blown evaluation
• Faculty do not vote on this, because academic staff giving their rights over to faculty, even though spells out something faculty have to do
• Could also divide question to vote separately on this section
• Suggest should be looked at by Faculty Personnel Committee to see if other problems
• Would mean it would come back here in fall – wouldn’t go into new handbook
• Faculty Personnel Committee could just look at it between now and next meeting
• No section to cover recruitment by dean’s office for a budget position, for example, because not a unit nor a department
• Advice would be for dean to follow as though they were a unit as long as there is some procedure for it to be approved
• Could amend to leave out in units under UWEC 10.02(1)(a) so would include places like dean’s office
• Chair and dean struck out because not administrators in units; units typically report to a director and then up the line
• Should be okay to put dean back in
• Will wait until next time to make amendment putting dean back in; look at ramifications before second reading

Without objection, vote on motion postponed until next meeting.

IX. Chancellor’s Remarks – Chancellor Mash
• Have had conversations before about things we’ve been doing over several years to improve standing of average salaries by rank now out; doing closer analysis of how we compare
• Appears we are making progress, moving up in position within the comprehensives
• Higher promotion increases and better entering salaries playing into that
• At next meeting will share more information after further analysis
• Have announced provost beginning leave of absence effective today and extending at least through summer
• He will be devoting his time exclusively to his personal health
• We will be making changes to ensure we continue to move and to operate without his involvement
• Following appropriate consultation, including Senate Executive Committee, other groups and individuals, will announce plans to provide ongoing smooth operation
• During challenges like this, people seem to come forward and take more responsibility – work that Jan Morse, Steve Tallant, deans and chairs have been doing contributed to ability to continue to move forward
• Also fortunate campaign has done so well, not concluded, but having met goal makes me feel better about shifting time to where needed most
• Response to question from floor
• Email probably works best for contacting provost; conversations and phone calls not as well
  • He will be focused on treatments and considerable energy required for recovery

X. Announcements
• Several students here today working on assignment in public affairs reporting class
• Appreciate cooperation and patience when approached after meeting by them with note pad
• Next meeting on May 11, 2004 in Tamarack Room.

Meeting adjourned at 4:31 p.m.

Wanda Schulner
Secretary to the University Senate