October 12, 2004

Members Present:

Judy Blackstone, Joey Bohl, Marcia Bollinger, Don Bredle, Charlene Burns, Jack Bushnell, Paul Butrymowicz, Randy Dickerson, Michael Dorsher, Dan Drumm, Selika Ducksworth-Lawton, Margaret Dwyer, Robert Erffmeyer, Jeff Erger, Gloria Fennell, Leslie Foster, Mitchell Freymiller, Alan Gallaher, Andrea Gapko, Susan Harrison, Ann Hoffman, Robert Hooper, Rose Jadack, Jennifer Johns-Artisensi, Harry Jol, Sallie Kernan, Fred Kolb, Kate Lang, Bruce Lo, David Lonzarich, Barbara Lozar, Steven Majstorovic, Karl Markgraf, Donald Mash, Rebecca Matter, Susan Mc Intyre, Sue Moore, Cheryl Muller, Bobby Pitts, Jill Prushiek, Scott Robertson, Connie Russell, Kristen Sandager, Nola Schmitt, Earl Shoemaker, Alex Smith, Carter Smith, Linda Spaeth, Laurie St. Aubin-Whelihan, Todd Stephens, Daniel Stevenson, Kent Syverson, Lois Taft, Steve Tallant, Karen Welch, Sharon Westphal, Michael Wick, Jean Wilcox, Steve Zantow

Members Absent:


Guests:

Cheryl Budnaitis, Donald Christian, Patricia Christopherson, Tom Dock, Gina Duwe, Jack Hoggatt, Andrew Phillips, Ronald Satz, Andrew Soll, Charles Tomkovick

The regular meeting of University Senate was called to order by Chair Harrison at 3:03 p.m. on Tuesday, October 12, 2004 in the Tamarack Room of Davies Center.

I. Without objection, minutes of September 28, 2004 meeting of University Senate approved as distributed

Introduction of two guests visiting UW-Eau Claire as part of larger delegation from Jinan University in China

II. Chancellor’s Remarks – Chancellor Mash

• Welcome Jinan University
  • Very distinguished university has chosen us as higher education partner
  • Pleased with growing and developing relationship
• Faculty and staff pay plan for 2005-2007
  • Regents approved budget request at August meeting as obliged to do
  • For first time this year, regents made strategic move of proposing 3% increase each year of biennium (as catch-up for faculty and academic staff) early for governor and other state leaders to see
    • Typically pay plan does not come out publicly until much later
  • At Board of Regents meeting in Superior last week, Business and Finance Committee devoted a session to hearing testimony about challenges of recruiting and retaining faculty and staff in competitive marketplace
    • Session complementary to regents’ attempt to create some attention to this issue
  • On Monday, October 18th, one of two regent listening sessions will occur at UW-Eau Claire
    • Regents want to hear views from general public on
      • Competitive pay plan
      • Affordability and access
      • UW-System role in economic climate of Wisconsin
Open meeting for anyone with an interest to attend and speak
Will continue conversation in Oshkosh on October 25th
Point is that pay plan is key piece as one of budget priorities going into next biennium

Also at Board of Regents meeting continued discussion of Legislative Audit Bureau findings
Depending upon newspaper, can read anything from UW-System administratively top heavy to numbers don’t make sense and everything in between
Is matter of counting things differently than public higher education systems have been asked to for years by federal government
Challenge for UW-System is to get beyond this and try to clarify differences in data
Not easy when lots of numbers out publicly
Can get mixed opinions – some of which are not very helpful as attempting to reclaim state funding
At some point can get into details for those with an interest
UW-System embraced all four recommendations in findings and will submit data that way
Detailed system report with comments to go back to Legislative Audit Bureau in February

Caution everyone during this political season to be aware that sensitivities are heightened
Received anonymous call last week complaining about students being influenced in classes with particular political viewpoints
Also received email from system saying someone called system about same sort of thing happening on campuses
Believe faculty understand difference between spirited discussions conducted in classes and striking a position clearly advocating for one candidate or another
Guideline on system policy to be included in upcoming bulletin as reminder
Wisconsin Women in Higher Education annual meeting to be held on campus Thursday and Friday
Twenty to 25 UW-Eau Claire women to participate
Next week, Kimberly Barrett leading delegation from our campus to state-wide discussion on closing achievement gap between our students generally and our multicultural students
Part of retention effort connected to Plan 2008
Encouraged by continued growth in academic departmental activities directed at alumni during homecoming
Additional departments have formed alumni advisory committees of graduates working in their field
Return with feedback from world of work as it relates to curriculum and what we are teaching
Also other gatherings in departments to connect to alumni
Those activities important to campus long-term – commend those taking that initiative

III. Chair’s Report – Chair Harrison
Much of discussion of last faculty rep’s meeting summarized in chair’s report
Many resolutions discussed across various campuses, concerning defense of marriage proposal and domestic partners information, available on link provided on senate website
Check out websites listed at bottom of chair’s report to learn more about Board of Regents meeting
Especially recommend reading day one summary as relates to faculty retention and recruitment issue
Next meeting of faculty reps is October 29, 2004 in Madison
Next Board of Regents meeting on November 4 and 5, 2004 in Madison

IV. Academic Staff Representative’s Report – Senator Wilcox
Academic Staff Representatives Council will meet on Thursday, October 21st
Invite any interested academic staff members to join me in teleconference
No agenda yet; know we will be discussing Department of Administration request for data if eliminate academic staff from proposed catch-up pay increases

V. Unfinished Business
A. Two-Year Nominating Committee Terms
Since changes affect three parts of constitution, owned by different bodies, three votes will 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 - None

**Vote on 41-SE-02:** Change to term of membership on University Faculty Nominating Committee PASSED by University Faculty Senators with vote of 20 for, 12 against
Change to term of membership on University Academic Staff Nominating Committee PASSED by University Academic Staff Senators with vote of 10 for, 9 against
Change to term of membership on University Senate Nominating Committee PASSED by vote of 33 for, 18 against

**TEXT OF MOTION**

*Changes to Chapter 3, page 6, Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook, Twentieth Edition:*

1. **University Faculty Nominating Committee**
   a. Membership: The committee includes five University Faculty members who serve staggered two-year one-year terms. Members are not eligible for consecutive terms.

*Changes to Chapter 3, page 8, Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook, Twentieth Edition:*

1. **University Academic Staff Nominating Committee**
   a. Membership: The committee includes three University Academic Staff members who serve staggered two-year one-year terms. Members are not eligible for consecutive terms.

*Changes to Chapter 3, page 15, Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook, Twentieth Edition:*

8. **The University Senate Nominating Committee**
   a. Membership: The committee includes six senators elected at the first fall semester meeting of the University Senate: three University Faculty, two University Academic Staff, and one additional senator. Members serve staggered two-year one-year terms. Members are not eligible for consecutive terms.

**B. University General Education Committee Membership**
- University Faculty will vote on motion; debate open to all

Proposed language from Motion 41-SE-03

**Article One: University Faculty, Section G**

6. **University General Education Committee**
   a. Membership: The committee includes six five faculty representatives from the College of Arts and Sciences, two one faculty representatives from the College of Business, one faculty representative from the College of Education and Human Sciences, and one faculty representative from each of the three Schools of the College of Nursing and Health Sciences Professional Studies. These representatives will be chosen by existing shared governance processes established through the bylaws of the respective schools or colleges. One student, with at least junior standing, will be appointed by the Student Senate President in accordance with customary procedures. Faculty serve staggered three-year terms with approximately one-third of the representatives from each College being elected each year.

**Amendment 41-SE-03-a1**

Moved by Senator Gallaher and seconded that the University General Education Committee consist of six members from the College of Arts and Sciences, two members from the College of Business, two members from the College of Education and Human Sciences, two members from the College of Nursing and Health Sciences, and one student representative from the College of Arts and Sciences.

Debate
- General education important to all students and all majors on campus
  - College of Arts and Sciences (A&S) clearly needs major voice as nearly all curriculum in general education continues to be in A&S
  - At same time, UGEC has worked well because of diversity
    - Even within A&S, six members represent diverse sampling of attitudes from within college
  - As far as workload issue, if you want faculty governance, you have to spend time on committees
  - No problem getting people to run for election to this committee, so apparently people consider it important
• Amendment provides for good representation from A&S and reasonable representation from three professional colleges
• Student coming from A&S means it maintains seven to six majority
• Would be interested to know how numbers relate to university proportions – number of students, number of faculty, number of courses, or number of GE courses offered
• More than half of graduates of university on an annual basis come from professional schools
• So in terms of representation, this is reasonable
• Original committee composed of six members from A&S, two from College of Business (COB), and one from each professional school, plus one student member – senate came up with that
• At this point, talking about how to equitably adjust committee membership given new college structure
• Seems having two voices from each professional college is reasonable
• Amendment good idea – was on UGEC for first two years
• Has steep learning curve with lots of subtle issues
  • What is general education?
  • What is GE-V?
  • How is that different from IDIS?
• Lot of consequences to being on that committee
  • Merit of having two people from non-A&S colleges is that it allows those units to implement a rotation scheme, much like we talked about for nominating committees
• Over last two weeks, talked to people from College of Nursing and Health Sciences (NHS), as well as those from COB and College of Education and Human Sciences (EHS)
• Is concern about voice
• NHS has people from different disciplines; support having two voices represent college
• When talk to COB and EHS people, get same feeling of not limiting that voice – especially in season of our reorganization when still writing bylaws and getting sense of new colleges
• Seems like reasoning for this motion is to change balance of committee
  • Can understand why you want two voices and that it might be useful to have overlap
  • Why not change to representation of 10 A&S/2 COB/2 EHS/2 NHS?
• Political science department feels debate not really about UGEC membership, but about where A&S sits at university
  • Feel sense of quiet, but slow marginalization even though constitute a majority of faculty at university, not service departments
• Are mixed points of view from NHS; however, many of us don’t have a problem with say 7 A&S/2 COB/2 EHS/2 NHS
  • Would support that, just feel strongly that we need two voices from professional colleges
• Look at issue in large measure as faculty workload issue
  • Understand last year about six courses came through UGEC that weren’t part of A&S process
  • Concerns me that large committee required to review six courses
  • All other courses have already gone through, some would say grueling, A&S Curriculum Committee process
  • Effort is disproportionate – could offer additional three-credit course
  • Appreciate other colleges’ desire to have fair hearing for proposed GE courses, just don’t see the review needing large faculty committee
• Six GE-V courses proposed last year – all of which were approved by school or college curriculum committees, just like any proposal from A&S
  • If senate wishes to turn all of GE back to individual colleges, that would be fine
  • But UGEC not only reviews proposals in GE-V, also reviews new changes and new courses in all other categories; not a small workload
• Question came up in UGEC today concerning purpose of that committee
  • A&S Curriculum Committee was involved, until last three years, in overseeing GE program
    • Group reviewed GE courses proposals, updates, and removal of courses from general education
    • Did this in course of other business with 11 people, plus or minus one
    • Never felt overwhelmed; don’t need 13 people to do that
  • Now UGEC taking on new responsibility of reviewing entire program
Some people might be in favor of this, others may not be
Not sure this initially intended when voted in favor of general education committee
If it was, then larger size group would have better input, more ideas, and maybe better solutions
Are competing points
Ideal would be to have more views from colleges represented, but if general education committee is only here to review courses that are in general education program, then we do not need 13 people
Support 6/2/2/2 and 1 student from A&S
Can’t imagine going up to graduating students and saying to them that their majors don’t matter
When I think about context of representation, champion colleges and programs we have here
Management and Marketing Department graduates approximately 11% of students on campus; another 10 or 11% come from colleagues in COB
Relevant, then, that colleges, including EHS and NHS, have participation to support governance
Voted for original UGEC membership with six members from A&S and five distributed among the professional colleges
Thought reasonable because wanted to make sure professional schools had strong voice in direction general education going
General education critical to everyone at university; particularly critical to people in A&S because we offer most GE courses
Provide serious services role to every single major here at university
Natural to want to see some recognition of that very critical mission at institution
Was okay with membership of six to five; red flag went up when it became six to six
Devalues A&S role in general education
Think A&S chairs would accept anything providing A&S with representation recognizing critical role
Other issue is that many people across disciplines spending lots of time in service activities
That time comes directly out of teaching, or directly out of scholarship activities
Service and governance are very important, but not so important that should devote time from other activities to something that can be done pretty simply
A general education committee that is simply reviewing GE courses could be a smaller body, thus freeing up faculty to participate in more important activities on this campus
Could be more important governance activities, or may be scholarship and teaching
A&S chairs have strong desire to reduce workload
Amendment would have same composition as current committee from A&S
Student member, also voting, would now also be from A&S
At least theoretically A&S would have seven votes – six faculty and one student
Business would stay the same with two members
Previous three schools had one member; now split into two colleges; each would have two members
Just increasing to four members versus previous three

Vote on Amendment 41-SE-03-a1: Amendment DEFEATED by University Faculty Senators with a vote of 18 for, 20 against.

Amendment 41-SE-03-a2
Moved by Senator Gallaher and seconded that colleges may elect an alternate committee member for the GE Committee. In the event the regular committee member representing the college is unable to attend a meeting of the committee, the alternate may attend and vote at that meeting.

Debate
Robert’s Rules of Order does not allow for proxy voting
Therefore, a person could attend meetings and listen, but not vote
Handbook says we abide by Robert’s Rules unless specifically stated otherwise; so if proxy voting put in bylaws, it would be allowed
In many European parliamentary systems, proxy voting is part and parcel of system; real issue is one of power, not about GE committee
Don’t have this failsafe on any other committees; can’t imagine one issue so critical it would have to be resolved this way
• In professional colleges, many faculty required to be off campus for many hours to supervise clinicals; with only one representative, if that member not able to attend, college would not be represented
• ‘Those of us from A&S are never off campus’
• For three credits, I teach six hours a week – am not sympathetic
• Reason for amendment was quite simple
  • Colleges reduced to only one voting member should at least have equal right to get one voting member there if person elected can’t make it
• Are other committees with at least one member from various colleges, but often have other members elected at large as well
• Strikes me as reasonable request because one goal of general education committee is to hear voice of faculty from all colleges – proxy vote furthers that issue; will support this
• These are open meetings – if you want a voice, all you have to do is show up and ask to speak; still think it is about power
• Language says alternate will be elected, so would be done ahead of time
  • Also says may, so don’t have to elect alternate
  • Even A&S could elect an alternate, not just professional colleges
• Just curious who backs up the back up; is it really important that we have this turf battle – it’s embarrassing
• Not opposed to amendment because see why amendment put forward; really opposed to developing a general education committee at a senate meeting
  • UGEC is very important committee on campus; disconcerted that close vote took place basically along party lines
  • Would like to defuse that
• Are many different models that we could use for development of this committee
• Would recommend tabling motion to get deans from various colleges together to develop a model that everybody can buy into and feel better about
• Don’t want to see a model where either A&S or the professional colleges walk out saying we won, because that is not best thing for the university

MOTION by Senator Hooper that further discussion on the amendment/motion be postponed until the deans and some faculty get together and recommend the make-up of the University General Education Committee seconded.

Discussion
• Deans Christian and Dock support that approach; don’t like way current discussion heading
  • Could address issue in different way to find solution where there is consensus
• Supposed to be collegial community – wonder if vote had gone the other way, would people have been willing to compromise and have deans meet
• What deans come up with would be brought back to senate for final determination
• Fear no debate – that is our job here
  • Every week someone walks out of this hall that voted for something that didn’t pass, or against something that did
  • We absolutely have authority and mindset to understand this and do it
    • Way too simple to need to consult the deans
• Could not go with new committee makeup until language officially in constitution, so postponing decision not a problem for committee
• Favor proposal – have been on senate as long as anyone
  • Agree that good debates are part of it, but there is tone here I have never heard before
  • Better catch it and get it under control
• Concern from beginning has been timing – support postponing to allow new colleges to get bylaws written and get themselves established as colleges before decisions like this made
• Support proposal – will still have senate discussion after recommendation
  • Speaking for colleagues in professional departments, we would also have supported postponement if vote had gone the other way

Motion PASSED.
V. Reports of Committees

♦ Executive Committee – Chair Harrison
  ● Agreed changes, made by APC to Undergraduate Academic Program Changes Chart, primarily for clarification could be entered FOR THE RECORD rather than coming before senate as a motion
  ● Discussed role of senate in developing resolutions concerning domestic partner benefits and defense of marriage proposal
    ● Decided to distribute summary handout in senate packet and provide links to sample resolutions created on other campuses and leave it up to individuals or committees to bring forth any action
    ● Committee did note that in order to send a resolution forward before November regents meeting, interested people would need to be organized quickly for resolution to be distributed for next senate meeting
  ● Next meeting October 19, 2004

♦ Faculty Personnel Committee – Senator Wick
  ● Next meeting on October 19, 2004
  ● Agenda to include considering a motion on department chair review language and updates from 13 subcommittees

♦ Academic Staff Personnel Committee – Senator Wilcox
  ● Meeting on October 15, 2004
  ● To discuss handbook language issues and composition of some academic staff committees

♦ Academic Policies Committee – Senator Syverson

FOR THE RECORD
  ● Blue chart, contained in senate packet, which is in UW-Eau Claire Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook approved
    ● Sent to Jan Morse
    ● Hope will get in updated version of handbook

Without objection, placed in record.

♦ Today began discussing new issue brought forth from Center of Service-Learning; requirement would prohibit religious instruction, religious proselytization, conducting religious services, or projects requiring a specific religious belief or affiliation as acceptable service-learning experiences
  ● Next meeting on October 19, 2004; be watching pink sheet
  ● May be covering this issue for a while

♦ Physical Plant Planning Committee – Senator Bredle
  ● Next meeting on October 25, 2004
  ● Agenda will be topics to discuss this year
  ● Email any items you would like Physical Plant Planning Committee to address to Senator Bredle

♦ Budget Committee – Senator Smith
  ● Next meeting on October 18, 2004 to discuss planning reserve

♦ Compensation Committee – Senator Wick
  ● Split into subgroups working on various issues
  ● No meeting planned at this time

♦ Nominating Committee – No Report

♦ Technology Committee – Senator Dwyer
  ● Next meeting on October 22, 2004
  ● To get update on administrative system conversion and on various college technology committees and coordination of those committees

VI. Special Reports – None

VIII. Special Orders
A. Academic staff election to fill vacancy on Academic Staff Complaint, Grievance, and Review Committee

Report of University Academic Staff Nominating Committee – Senator Russell, Chair
• Nominees
  • Jacqueline Bonneville – Advising, Testing, and Orientation
  • Norman Card – Teaching and Learning Technology Development Center
• No additional nominations from floor

**Elected to the Academic Staff Complaint, Grievance and Review Committee: Jacqueline Bonneville**

B. Academic staff election to fill vacancy on Academic Staff Professional Development Committee

**Report of University Academic Staff Nominating Committee – Senator Russell, Chair**

• Nominees
  • Heidi Fisher – Development/Alumni Relations
  • Angela Sterling-Orth – Communication Disorders
  • Ingrid Ulstad – Accounting and Finance
  • Kelly Jo Wright – Communication Disorders
• No additional nominations from floor

**Elected to the Academic Staff Professional Development Committee: Kelly Jo Wright**

IX. Miscellaneous Business - None

X. Announcements
  • Reminder that Minnesota and Wisconsin teachers conventions next two weeks on Thursday and Friday
    • Will have about 400 visitors each day; please direct any wandering souls appropriately
  • Next meeting October 26, 2004

Meeting adjourned at 4:09 p.m.

Wanda Schulner
Secretary to the University Senate