UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-EAU CLAIRE  
UNIVERSITY SENATE MEETING  
VOL. 41, NO. 2  

September 28, 2004

Members Present:


Members Absent:

Paul Butrymowicz, Jesse Dixon, Bruce Dybvik, Gene Leisz, Tarique Niazi, Jill Prushiek, Donna Raleigh, Todd Stephens, Paula Stuettgen, Steve Tallant, Rebecca Wurzer

Guests:

Robert Bolles, Cheryl Budnaitis, Margaret Cassidy, Donald Christian, Patricia Christopherson, Bernard Duyfhuizen, Debbie Gough, Jack Hoggatt, Robert Knight, Lucretia Mattson, Janice Morse, Andrew Phillips, Andrew Soll, Kathy Tank, Elaine Wendt, Marty Wood

The regular meeting of University Senate was called to order at 3:00 p.m. on Tuesday, September 28, 2004 in the Tamarack Room of Davies Center.

I. Without objection, minutes of September 14, 2004 meeting of University Senate approved as distributed

II. Chancellor’s Remarks – Chancellor Mash

- Approaching official fall enrollment count date
  - UW-Eau Claire enrollment target – 9429 FTE (full-time equivalents)
  - Enrollment head count at this point is 10,540; will be practically right on button in terms of FTE
  - Has not changed much for several years
  - Graduate enrollment at about 500 head count – about 220 FTE
  - Nice increase in freshman class this year
    - Downsized last year’s freshman class to get ahead of budget reduction
    - This year’s class closer to normal – 2033
- Busy week on campus
- Homecoming this weekend with typical related student activities
- Couple of new things this year
  - Parade route – not trying to discourage good time, but concerned about things that developed last year as parade traveled down Water Street
    - Packed into Water Street where people have been drinking from early morning
    - So this year will go down First Avenue
  - Data from annual study out this morning trying to record students’ habits related to alcohol and other drugs
    - Media has picked up on numbers and they sound pretty high
Not by design that coming out at this time, although do have heightened awareness

- Carson Park looks absolutely terrific
- State-of-the-art facility now with new turf installed
- Marching band, under direction of Senator Dickerson, gave impressive program last weekend
  - To repeat at Homecoming game
  - In addition, will do half-time performance at Packer game this weekend
- Also annual meeting of University Foundation Board as try to bring activities together on Homecoming weekend
  - Expect extension of capital campaign timeline to end of 2007 and raised goal of $50 million
  - Now at $38 million, having exceeded original goal comfortably by over a year
  - Certainly think new goal is doable as lot of potential to bring additional alumni and friends into campaign in significant ways
  - Each year additional academic departments choose to hold alumni gatherings at Homecoming time
    - Typically small numbers, but graduates appreciate chance to visit with faculty and find out what is going on in departments
    - Complements newsletters all departments now doing for graduates
- Legislative Audit Bureau for a year has been working on report titled University of Wisconsin System Staffing – An Evaluation looking at UW-System administrative costs
  - Bit unusual considering national reporting system governing public higher education ranked UW-System as one of leanest systems of public higher education in country measured by administrative overhead
  - After system just took a $250 million cut this biennium, $50 million in budget repair bill, and another $100 million in early 1990s, a couple legislators felt it necessary to see what system was hiding
  - Report counted things differently than national numbers and guidelines
    - Still trying to figure out what numbers mean
    - Appears departmental secretaries counted as administrators, as well as faculty who teach, but also run a center
    - Causes questions of credibility
  - Audit also looked at whole budget, not just state-funded portion
    - UW-System has $4 billion operating budget if include federal grants, residence halls, student fees and the like
    - GPR funds support less than $1 billion of that operating budget
  - Bothered by whole thing because people look at figures and reason system is not struggling, that maybe there is more to be had from university systems – simply not true and not good news
    - Hope to get this clarified; have been few editorials that do understand
  - Will be public hearing October 6, 2004 before Legislative Audit Committee
    - Have some third parties who will testify and attempt to clarify some of this
    - Dream would be to have influential third party ask how dare they make it more difficult for this system to function and get the kind of support required to do what Wisconsin needs – this is not open season on UW-System
    - Think there needs to be some genuine righteous indignation
    - Managing morale and communication is big part of what we need to do as we continue working together
    - We will continue to sort this out – when we have additional information, we will bring it to you
- Flurry of activity this noon – students actively engaged in voter registration
  - Statewide over 100,000 young people, students primarily, now registered for upcoming election
  - Largely through new voter project funded by PEW Foundation
  - Will be interesting to see how it all plays out in November
- Response to question from floor
  - Update on riverbank project from Vice Chancellor Soll
    - Construction moving along smoothly and progress being made
    - Expect full stabilization effort to be in place before winter season
    - Contractor to return in spring to do landscaping
III. Chair’s Report – Chair Harrison
- Introduction of new senator – Sallie Kernan from Education Access Programs
- Calendar on back of chair’s report shows corrected dates for senate/executive committee meetings in March
- Next meeting of faculty reps is teleconference on October 1, 2004
- Next Board of Regents meeting on October 7 and 8, 2004 in Superior

IV. Academic Staff Representative’s Report – Senator Wilcox
- Academic staff reps met in Madison last Thursday for first meeting of year
- Report attached to name tags makes reference to briefing paper
  - Paper contains lots of information about academic staff
    - For instance, only 48% of academic staff in system are paid by GPR dollars
    - Put paper together so when meet with legislators or others who don’t know what academic staff are, will have something to put in their hands
- Al Crist gave us same report George Brooks gave to regents: Faculty, Staff and Academic Leaders’ Salary Review
  - Website of very interesting power point included
  - Information on salaries; all behind our peers
  - Information on retirements; 25% of academic staff and 33% of faculty retirement eligible
  - Of people leaving system, only 15% leaving because of retirement
- Would also like to point out concern
  - Freda Harris talked to us about submitted 2005-2007 budget
    - Includes request to provide 3% per year increase in unclassified pay plan to bring faculty, academic staff, and graduate assistants up to average salary of peer institutions
      - Would be above and beyond any pay plan
    - Department of Administration asked budget office to submit cost if increase just offered to faculty
    - Freda Harris assured me system would fight for academic staff because we were further behind than faculty
    - Still red flag for academic staff

V. Unfinished Business
Post-Tenure Review Senate Action Modifications Report from Executive Committee – Vice Chair Gapko
- Executive Committee discussed modification to action passed last year because of concern on part of chancellor
  - Accepted modification then returns to floor of senate for approval
  - Only thing back for discussion is acceptance of modification
  - Modification just removes reference to chairs’ assigned administrative duties
  - Response to questions for clarification – Senator Wick, chair of Faculty Personnel Committee
    - Idea of original phrasing was to have post-tenure review of chair as faculty member
      - Confusion came with implication that review should look at administrative responsibilities as well
      - Chairs do have service role as faculty member; up to department to decide how much to weigh administrative responsibilities as service
      - Now including only those things set for all faculty – teaching, scholarship, service, and advising – left out any reference to administrative duties
        - So not required to look at administrative duties, but not prohibiting their inclusion in Department Evaluation Plan (DEP)
    - Chair is reviewed as far as administrative duties by dean with input from faculty of department; we wanted to have chair reviewed as faculty member as well

Motion 41-SE-01
Moved and seconded by Executive Committee (8-0) that the modification to the post-tenure review senate action be approved as follows:

Post-Tenure Review of the Department Chair
The post-tenure review of the Department Chair shall adhere to the normal policies and procedures that govern all post-tenure reviews except that the most senior member of the post-tenure review subcommittee shall fulfill those responsibilities normally associated with the Department Chair. As with all post-tenure reviews, the
evaluation of the Department Chair shall be conducted relative to the faculty performance criteria outlined in Department Evaluation Plan of the Chair’s department. In particular, the Department Chair is to be evaluated against criteria for teaching, scholarship, service and advising and not just their assigned administrative duties. In those cases where there are no eligible faculty to serve on the post-tenure review subcommittee for the Department Chair, the Dean in consultation with the Department Chair, shall select three tenured faculty at or above the rank of the Department Chair and from disciplines similar to that of the Department Chair to serve as the post-tenure review committee. This committee shall be explicitly instructed to limit their review to the policies outlined in the Department Evaluation Plan of the Chair’s department. The Dean shall appoint one member of the post-tenure review committee to assume the responsibilities normally delegated to the Department Chair in the post-tenure review process.

Previous action voted on by University Faculty; only University Faculty will vote on modifications
- Because modification is result of consultation on previously passed motion, considered old business; vote may take place today

Debate
- Concerns me that there may be no recourse for average faculty members
- Line seemed to allow DPC recourse; without it DPC has no recourse regarding assigned administrative duties
- Line stricken so DPC not charged with performing administrative review
- Faculty are included by other policies in handbook in administrative review of chair, but dean runs review
- Language doesn’t cover that; added that in explanation
- Removed phrase so department not required to look at administrative duties in post-tenure review
- Disagree – seems it simply removes our opportunity to have some dialogue about that
- Is entire section about responsibilities of reviewing chair
- DPC should be involved in reviewing department chair as a faculty member
- Original language implied they must also look at administrative duties, which is not how most faculty members are evaluated
- If want post-tenure review to be strictly faculty review, then needed to strike that requirement
- Department may choose to put consideration of some chair duties as part of their service in DEP; not required to do so
- Other language does require faculty input into administrative review of chair by the dean
- Don’t understand why faculty members don’t have opportunity through DPC to make comment on administrative duties here
- Speak on behalf of motion
- This is post-tenure review – should be evaluated on things which go into original tenure decision
- Tenure decisions, in most cases, do not include administrative responsibilities – they revolve around teaching, scholarship, service, and advising
- I am evaluated on my service; chairs’ administrative duties are one of those service items
- But chairs get release time for their service

Vote on 41-SE-01: Motion PASSED by vote of University Faculty Senators.

V. Reports of Committees

Late meeting notices now cost $15 to print – please try to get notice in on time to go in pink sheet

- Executive Committee – Chair Harrison
  - Heard concerns about federal financial aid allocations – interesting details in chair’s report
  - Discussed changes in membership to University General Education Committee – motion before senate today
  - Overall size of senate and various senate committees briefly reviewed
    - Further discussion of possible changes in structure delayed until official count of faculty and academic staff obtained in October
  - Went into closed session to consult on appointments to University Planning Committee
Next meeting October 5, 2004

Faculty Personnel Committee – Senator Wick
- First official meeting October 5, 2004 for introduction of committee members and discussion of pending items of business

Academic Staff Personnel Committee – Senator Wilcox
- Meeting October 15, 2004
- Closed meeting to discuss search committee for director of Educational Access Programs to be arranged

Academic Policies Committee – Senator Syverson

FOR THE RECORD
- Approved closure of study-abroad program in Alnwick, England
- Approved model for offering faculty-led summer study-abroad programs
  - Along lines of special topics model – five to six week programs
  - Faculty member could propose going to some site abroad and teaching at least a three credit course and having contact person there teaching possibly three credits as well
  - Goal is to make study-abroad possible for people in sciences, for example, where have course sequencing issues
Without objection, placed in record.

Have begun talking about changes to Undergraduate Academic Program Changes chart in Chapter 7 of Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook – to continue next meeting
- Next meeting October 5, 2004
- Next item coming up is proposal from service-learning area to add following to current practice:

  Please note: Religious instruction, religious proselytization, conducting religious services, or projects requiring a specific religious belief or affiliation are not acceptable as service-learning experiences, since they are generally viewed as constituting a violation of the Establishment Clause of the U.S. Constitution.

- Received packet from College of Business; will be starting college review
- Physical Plant Planning Committee – Senator Bredle – No Report
- Budget Committee – Senator Smith – No Report
- Compensation Committee – Senator Wick
  - Will meet October 4, 2004 to introduce committee members and discuss of pending business for year
  - Response to question from floor
    - Post-tenure review salary adjustment issue on pending business list
- Nominating Committee – Senator Whitfield – No Report
- Technology Committee – Senator Dwyer
  - Still trying to find possible meeting time
  - Only one topic on agenda; can send any items you have which relate to technology to dwyerm@uwec.edu

VI. Special Reports

Special Report on General Education Goals and Business of Committee – Robert Knight, Chair, University General Education Committee (UGEC)
- Why is a question I hear a lot these days
  - Why GE goals?
  - Why now?
  - Why not suggest some goals and we will tell you what we think?
  - Why should I care?
- Personally prefer question what if
  - What if, in words of American Association of Colleges and Universities Report entitled Greater Expectations, GE goals enabled UW-EC to create students that were empowered to the mastery of intellectual and practical skills, informed by knowledge about the natural and social worlds and about forms of inquiry basic to those studies and responsible for their personal actions and for civic values?
  - What if we have GE goals that would enable graduating students to articulate a connection between their GE courses and their major?
• What if GE goals provided a guide for course content that stimulated intellectual curiosity and critical thinking?
• What if GE courses with titles such as Music and Politics, Economics of Ecology, and Rationality and Social Choice were offered at UW-EC?
• What if all GE courses at UW-EC were interdisciplinary and included a senior capstone that required application of the knowledge and skills learned on campus to help solve a problem in the community?
• UGEC’s call for GE goals for the GE program challenges members of the UW-EC community to ask not what for, but what if …
• Deadline for GE goals submissions changed to December 1st because of reorganization of colleges
• Finally, asked to comment on UGEC membership
• Part of UGEC’s function is to educate members of faculty to appreciate methods and merits of curricular processes and curriculum throughout university
• The more faculty exposed to that, the more departmental and college boundaries will disappear – another good what if

VIII. Miscellaneous Business
A. Executive Committee – First Reading
Two-Year Nominating Committee Terms – Vice Chair Gapko
• At all University Faculty meeting last April, request made to change Nominating Committee so at least one person had two-year term
• So committee would not be totally new each year and have some consistency from one year to the next
• Response to question for clarification
• Proposed that all members have two-year staggered terms transitioning as recommended

Motion 41-SE-02
Moved and seconded by Executive Committee (10-0) that the term of membership on nominating committees be increased to two years

Three different votes need to be taken
• University Faculty will vote on change affecting University Faculty Nominating Committee
• University Academic Staff will vote on change affecting University Academic Staff Nominating Committee
• Full University Senate will vote on change affecting University Senate Nominating Committee

Debate
• Don’t know whether for or against
  • Just voted on Senate Nominating Committee after arm twisted hard to run – not sure would have accepted if it had been two-year term
  • It’s an awful job to call all those people and try to convince them to run for various offices
  • Found it amusing that con was would give too much power to these people
    • They can have the power, it is a lot of work
• Recently elected as well, would not have accepted if it had been for two years
• Not sure why this is necessary – need a little more explanation of why better
• Having been on university-wide nominating committee three years ago, don’t consider it to be a problem
  • Having no experience at all, was able to find other people who had done it to get some idea of what to do
  • Extra year might be helpful, but don’t believe inexperience hurt that much
  • You just have to ring up a whole bunch of people – don’t think there is much learning curve on that
• May be benefit to changing every year – new group of people have different contacts

Without objection, motion postponed to next meeting for a vote.

B. Executive Committee – First Reading
University General Education Committee Membership – Vice Chair Gapko
• Please note vote on motion should be changed to carried by voice vote
• Chair failed to call for show of hands for vote – heard two people say no, which would leave 13 ayes, but that is not for sure
• Executive Committee discussed UGEC membership at length at last meeting
• Reorganization of three schools into two colleges prompted UGEC membership updating
• Went through variety of proposals
• Proposal being made addresses original issue of reorganization, keeps Arts and Sciences majority while including all colleges, and reduces size of committee in response to workload issues

Motion 41-SE-03
Moved and seconded by Executive Committee (voice vote) that changes be made to the membership of the University General Education Committee so the committee includes five faculty representatives from the College of Arts and Sciences (A&S), one faculty representative from the College of Business (COB), one faculty representative from the College of Education and Human Sciences (EHS), one faculty from the College of Nursing and Health Sciences (NHS), and one student.

As a curricular matter, University Faculty will vote on this motion.

Debate
• Would like to hear from NHS about willingness to have just one member on committee
• Was discussed among faculty of that college – main concern is that spirit of GE category V lives and that GE courses can come from different colleges
• Don’t have problem with having one representative as long as part of that process
• Committee has been working really well with six members from A&S coming from across college with fair diversity of opinions
• Have not been territorial turf battles
• Neither A&S, nor professional representatives, have voted as group
• Not sure five/three split is necessary to maintain A&S view of general education
• Somewhat surprised COB, originally given two seats, now reduced to one simply because other programs reduced to one
• Would like to see two seats remain for EHS
  • Education has one group of concerns; Social Work, Kinesiology and Communication Disorders have another
  • So suggestion on first page of A&S with six, COB with two, EHS with two, NHS with one, and one student seems ideal
• Colleagues in political science want to ensure that general education continues to be productive for baccalaureate degree
  • Want to avoid creeping process whereby A&S becomes producer of credits or service departments when really are disciplines
  • Since teach 90% of these courses and constitute almost 70% of university, five/four split seems equitable
• A&S right now is 50%, not majority, of twelve member committee
• Usually don’t include student because don’t know which college student coming from
• In listening to previous discussion regarding nominating committees, seems we have lot of difficulty finding folks – seems leaner is meaner here
• When this came up before Senate Executive Committee, first proposal was six faculty representatives from A&S, and two from each of the other colleges, plus one student
• Raised alarm when A&S became minority of membership
• Took concerns to the A&S chairs who expressed two concerns, not just for UGEC, but for faculty governance on campus
  • One is workload issue – faculty constantly complaining that amount of expected university service, department activities, teaching, and scholarship getting bigger and bigger
  • Chairs would like to see many committees reduced to minimum working size that allows everyone a voice and allows for good discussion, but reduces workload on faculty
  • Willing to look at any number of scenarios, but would like to see a smaller committee
Other thing is that A&S has roughly 70% of faculty at university – not asking for representation that is proportional

Thought it appropriate, because A&S so involved in general education program for so long, that A&S maintain something that looks like majority

Not matter of defending turf, or keeping professional schools from interacting, or to threaten status of GE category V because people from A&S largely vote independently, not as block

Chairs felt 5/1/1/1 split addressed most concerns

Gave A&S good representation on committee, but allowed for real reduction of workload

As original member of UGEC, can say committee members have always worked well together

Are as efficient as possible

Always kept foremost that everything we do is for benefit of students to help them mature and gain best education possible – never seems to be any block working one way or another

UGEC needs to have good representation from all areas of university – present makeup of twelve people achieves that

Advantage of this committee is educational process of faculty who serve on it – learning what is important to other colleges and departments as well as understanding interrelationships

Another objective of committee is to minimize turf wars that seem inevitable

If truly concerned about workload of faculty, need to evaluate size and components of every university and college committee, not just single out one committee

Sensitive to workload issues – if you take large amount of work and divide it among nine instead of twelve people, won’t it be harder to attract people to that committee

Might seem UGEC unanimous in support of original revision to 6/2/2/2/1 membership

As member have not made up mind yet – tendency is not to support proposal originally circulated

No role model to refer to

Could not find any consistency of membership on university general education committees on other campuses

Other UW-Eau Claire committees, both University Faculty and senate, not proportional

One important thing is tradition of approaching general education from liberal arts perspective

If approach GE from liberal education point of view, UGEC should be made up predominantly of people from liberal arts college

Same argument that UGEC working so well together so should support original proposal was made three years ago to APC by A&S Curriculum Committee

Response was that is current committee – don’t know what will happen down the road

Seems spirit of original motion that came out of APC and was approved by senate working well

Do need to change because schools have disappeared

Giving two seats to each college does not guarantee more diversity of backgrounds – could be elected from same department

Want people from all colleges at table; want good intelligent people sitting on committee capable of working with all members and taking voting seriously

Nine people are not going to have to work any harder than thirteen because all still have to read every proposal

Might streamline things having a smaller committee – is an attractive option

Without objection, motion postponed for a vote at next meeting.

IX. Announcements

• Next meeting October 12, 2004

Meeting adjourned at 4:13 p.m.

Wanda Schulner
Secretary to the University Senate