Members Present:


Members Absent:

Robin Baker, Paul Butrymowicz, Margaret Dwyer, Larry Honl, Thomas Kemp, Sean McAleer, Tarique Niazi, Bobby Pitts, Donna Raleigh, Carter Smith, Lorraine Smith, Laurie St. Aubin-Whelihan, Daniel Stevenson, Troy Terhark, Rebecca Wurzer

Guests:

Kris Anderson, Margaret Cassidy, Donald Christian, Kate Demerse, Bernard Duyfhuizen, Jan Morse, Donald Mowry, Katherine Rhoades, Mike Rindo, Andrew Soll, Chad Wade, numerous students

The regular meeting of University Senate was called to order by Chair Harrison at 3:05 p.m. on Tuesday, April 12, 2005 in the Council Fire Room of Davies Center.

I. Without objection, minutes of March 29, 2005 meeting of University Senate approved as distributed

II. Chancellor’s Remarks – Interim Chancellor Vicki Lord Larson
   • At Board of Regents meeting this past week
     • Recognized Jean Wilcox as UW-Eau Claire Academic Staff Representative at dinner at Brittingham House
     • Over 100 poster sessions of undergraduate student/faculty research displayed in capitol
       • UW-Eau Claire had nine or ten posters there
       • Quality of presentations more like graduate level students than what expect of undergraduates
     • In Education Committee, Chris Lind, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Research and Sponsored Programs, did excellent job explaining Center of Excellence at UW-Eau Claire for student/faculty collaborative research
       • Presentation extremely well accepted by Board of Regents
       • Number of other universities also captured by level at which faculty/undergraduate student collaborative research done here at UW-Eau Claire
     • Accepted Wisconsin Technical College System Report and Hospital Authority Board Report
   • President Reilly
     • Recognized two academic staff award recipients – one was our Carole Halberg
     • Honored UW-Stevens Point Division III basketball team
     • Commented governor’s budget important start, but doesn’t invest enough in university – particularly in terms of pay plan and reduction of positions, but also in flexibility
     • Need to think longer term than this biennium and communicate more effectively about higher education as important player in quality of life in Wisconsin
Continued concern about creeping degree requirements in allied health accreditation standards

Received Sexual Assault and Harassment Report for entire system
  - Regents felt statistics being reported quite low, probably not accurate

Received 2004 Minority and Disadvantaged Student Report – concerned over possibility of budget cuts in very successful pre-college programs

Reviewed Plan 2008 for updates

Business and Finance Committee
  - Numerous meetings before Joint Finance Committee – particularly with President Reilly and Executive Senior Vice President Mash
  - Joint Finance Committee asked
    - How system would react to tuition caps?
      - You probably know what response was here
    - How plan to handle utility shortfalls?
      - Has not been part of budget discussion; would be of great concern
    - If sufficient dollars in compensation reserve for five-plus-five faculty pay plan?
      - Is money there, but not sufficient for five-plus-five plan
    - Also interested in how university feels about budget
      - Stressed problem is also lack of flexibility to implement budgets

Update on WiSys – non-profit technology transfer organization designed by system to promote research and development by moving university discoveries to industry through intellectual property protection and marketing
  - Have come up with number of discoveries on this campus that now have intellectual property rights protection

Budget forums scheduled and announced in *University Bulletin*
  - Open forum last evening gave everyone common baseline budget data – discussion limited as time ran out
  - Eager to hear what you have to say about budget cuts – provide ideas via email, phone or talk to us
  - Will be receiving document entitled Priorities and Messages
    - Lists five or six priorities system would like all of us to keep in mind as budget cycle continues
    - Six or seven bullet points on messages hoping to disseminate to target audiences – trying to be clear, concise and consistent in message transmitting to legislators and others

Responses to questions from floor
  - Two hundred positions governor talked about cutting targeted to administration, but administration defined in broader sense by Legislative Audit Bureau (LAB) Report on UW Administration
    - By chance heard chancellors talking about all positions coming from UW-System, but had anticipated they would be spread throughout system with each campus taking ‘fair share’
      - Our ‘fair share’ typically approximately 5% - or 9.47 FTE
    - More important than number of positions is dollar amount we need to come up with – system has allocated dollar target for reduction, not FTE or position reduction
    - UWEC to cut $744,000; assumption is if every campus makes cuts to cover fair share of dollars, FTE reductions associated will add up to 200 positions or more
  - Governor referred to administrative reductions as opposed to reductions in direct instruction; have green light to do what we need to as long as generally follow LAB concept of administration and don’t reduce direction instruction
  - Report not due to Department of Administration until May 1, 2006

III. Chair’s Report – Chair Harrison
  - Students from Senator Dorsher’s Public Affairs Reporting class in attendance; may be requesting interviews
  - Recent developments in Chancellor Search and Screen Committee elections
    - No policy in handbook for selection of nominees to forward to system; Executive Committee defaulted to method used seven years ago when university-wide election held
    - Deans and faculty have expressed concern about university-wide elections for faculty from a particular college

Without objection, elections will be held in each college for nominees from that college; ballots to be electronic
Membership of special regent committee included in chair’s report; to charge Chancellor Search and Screen Committee on May 17, 2005

Some institutional reports under item #6 very interesting

IV. Academic Staff Representative’s Report – Senator Wilcox
University Academic Staff meeting on Monday, April 18, 2005 at 10:00 a.m. in Davies Theatre

V. Unfinished Business
A. Second Reading – Motion from Faculty Personnel Committee
Chair Administrative Review

Amendment 41-FP-06-a1
Moved by Senator Hollon and seconded that the motion be amended in the last sentence of the second paragraph to reinstate the language that has been striken to read: Copies of the written evaluation will be given to the Chair, the faculty and academic staff members of the department, and filed in the dean’s office and in the personnel file of the Chair.

Debate
- Speak for amendment – department chairs serve unique position responsible both to university administration and their own faculty
  - To remove faculty access to department chair’s evaluation means only half of group they are responsible to has access
- Against amendment – would share chair’s personnel records with whole department; not what happens with other administrators
  - Hard enough to get people to serve in chair role without making less desirable
- Handbook refers to chairs as administrators; percent of position that is chair is administrative, percent fulfilling faculty duties is not
- Against amendment – believe all administrators serve both people above and below them; chairs not unique
  - Do not want to build in inconsistency
- Against amendment – committee felt would not be in best interest to share personnel records of chairs for administrative portion of their positions
- Speak for amendment – helpful for faculty to know how chair being evaluated
- Against amendment – once dean reappoints chair, faculty know how chair is doing; making document public doesn’t serve any purpose
- Range of performance that might lead to dismissal versus full support is huge; all you know is something was decided
  - Don’t know how individual perspectives created, data dean used or interpretation of that data, or criteria used
- Against amendment – what chair does is rarely a mystery; department pretty much knows what is going on
  - Chair is someone department elects; if decide don’t like chair anymore, can elect somebody else
  - Suggestion that secret thing going on between dean and chair, and rest of department just gets orders not reality
    - If chair was enviable position, might be different
- Less worried about conspiracy than advocating transparency of process

Vote on Amendment 41-FP-06-a1: Amendment DEFEATED by vote of 13 for, 19 against by faculty senators.

Continued Debate on Original Motion – None

Vote on Motion 41-FP-06: Motion on PASSED by faculty senators without dissention.

B. Second Reading – Motion from Senator Wick
Clarification on Voting in Personnel Actions
Amendment 41-US-02-a1
Moved by Senator Muller and seconded that the following be inserted right ahead of the motion that we are considering: Individual department evaluation plans may define a positive vote. In the absence of a definition in the department evaluation plan, the following definition will be applied.

Debate
- Several department evaluation plans have language that defines a positive vote; in some cases more restrictive than language here
  - In certain cases, abstentions counted as essentially negative votes to ensure affirmative support for a positive recommendation
- Committee used language recommended by system legal to define a positive recommendation
  - Worried about departments adopting language inconsistent with system legal; could cause a mess
  - Important enough issue that need to make sure to send clear, concise message out to people; should not be left up to possible interpretation and/or misinterpretation of individual departments
- Worry about departments that might define positive endorsement in counter-intuitive ways
  - Absurd that abstention due to conflict of interest would be counted as negative vote

Vote on Amendment 41-US-02-a1: Amendment DEFEATED by faculty senators.

Vote on Motion 41-US-02: Motion PASSED without dissention by faculty senators.

C. Second Reading – Motion from Compensation Committee
Post-Tenure Review Salary Adjustments

Continued Debate
- Favor post-tenure review (P-TR) salary adjustments
  - Concern is for instructional academic staff (IAS) promoted to senior lecturer with no ability to be rewarded no matter how good service has been, or how important contributions have been; money that would otherwise go to IAS merit used for P-TR salary adjustments
  - Would like to see Compensation Committee address issue of separating out money that comes from IAS before propose next salary plan
- Can be done, but same holds true for vast majority of assistant and associate professors – only way they will participate in program is to move through academic ranks
  - Choice also available to academic staff; that is, attain qualifications and apply for tenure-track position
  - Money used to fund this not money that would have been used for merit, rather is money coming from chancellor's discretionary 10% now targeted to compression
  - Have argued in past that IAS may want to be considered under academic staff portion of pay plan – difficult position because straddle two domains
  - Could look into possibility; doubt committee would reserve funds that would have gone to IAS when not doing that for assistant or associate professors
- Would be under purview of committee to establish parallel plan to address IAS compression, don’t believe that would happen because don’t deal with same issues of recruitment and retention as with faculty

Amendment 41-CP-02-a1
Moved by Senator Majstorovic and seconded that the motion be amended to add that the post-tenure review salary adjustments will be awarded at each tier of the award according to faculty proportionality in each of the Colleges at UW-Eau Claire.

Debate
- Already established proportionality principle in terms of senate balance and other areas
  - Also see amendment as way to avoid possible gaming of system by different colleges and possible dissention later
  - Would be just as comfortable if IAS became part of proportional principle
- Couple of weeks ago, amendment defeated for suggesting element of rigor in terms of scholarship and teaching, so think proportionality is sound way to go
Against amendment – goes against basic philosophy behind these awards; that is, you reward people doing the best work regardless of where they come from
  - Should be left up to individual merit
Against amendment – College of Business opted not to participate in this program, not currently taking any of this money; this amendment would force them to take a percentage
Not known if percentage of full professors proportionate in each college or not
Seems proportionality principle used in other areas, should establish it as a practice and not pick and choose where we use it
Against amendment – vote at last meeting wasn’t speaking against scholarship, just wasn’t focusing on scholarship, but all dimensions
  - Concern is what happens if not enough professors qualify from given college in given year – do you have to give proportion out anyway? Does that money get transferred to other colleges?
Two weeks ago didn’t hear anybody say they were against academic rigor; just leery of going into departments and determining how they should define excellence and how they should value people
  - Favor excellence; oppose this amendment

**Vote on Amendment 41-CP-02-a1:** Amendment DEFEATED.

Continued Debate on Main Motion
- Originally when started talking about this concept, were trying to work something out for both faculty and academic staff because principle the same – the hit-the-wall principle
  - Issues were so different that finally gave up working together
  - Academic staff letting faculty figure out how they are going to do this and then deal with issue themselves

**Vote on Motion 41-CP-02:** Motion PASSED without dissention.

D. First Reading of Revised Motion – Motion from Ad Hoc Service-Learning Committee
Service-Learning Guideline Revisions
- At November 23, 2004 senate meeting, during second reading of proposed revision to service-learning guidelines relating to religious instruction, religious proselytization, conducting religious services and projects requiring specific religious belief or affiliation, motion referred to special ad hoc committee
  - According to Robert’s Rules of Order, committee free to consider and recommend for adoption any amendment to motion without regard to whether or not assembly considered same or similar amendments
  - When committee reports, matter stands before assembly as if introduced for first time – why under unfinished business, but first reading
  - Since relates to curriculum, all University Faculty Senators will vote

**Service-Learning Guidelines Revision Report** – Vice Chair Gapko
- Ad Hoc Service-Learning Committee named by then-Chancellor Mash charged to explore new language for proposal – given much latitude in determining scope and extent of proposed changes
- Committee chose to pursue broader perspective; formulated mission statement to clearly define service-learning, created goals and objectives flowing from mission statement and finally came up with guidelines of vital interest to all parties involved
  - Urge you to look at detailed minutes of ad hoc committees over last several months
    - In all cases, came to consensus and voted unanimously
  - Rather than enumerate pros and cons, many of which were discussed here last November, voted to present following statement to you:
    - Let the minutes show that this recommendation does not necessarily represent our individual beliefs, however, the committee operated in the spirit of mutual respect, compromise, and consensus; and that this reflects the spirit of a university or academic community such as our own.
- Director of Service-Learning appreciative of committee for long and hard work and sense of mutual compromise and respect
  - In report, Chad Wade left off list of committee members
Created list of recommendations that affirm value of service-learning, clarify the mission, set goals and objectives with measurable outcomes, and establish clear guidelines for fulfilling service-learning requirement

- Define service-learning as part of curriculum subject to same academic standards as other graduation requirements
- Also define service-learning as public activities for public service that promote the common good; establish limited restrictions on specific religious, political, and for-profit activities, while allowing students to participate in broad range of activities and projects with faith-based, political and for-profit organizations
- Added guideline for nondiscrimination as important element for service-learning
- Guidelines do not infringe on free speech or freedom of choice
  - Students may engage in any kind of service in any kind of organization they choose
  - Such activities may not necessarily meet curricular criteria established to fulfill service-learning requirement

- Responses to questions for clarification
  - Proselyting really is a word – checked by committee
  - Nondiscrimination clause does not preclude criminal background checks as required under federal law for programs in which students work with dependent individuals
  - Under caregiver law, if offense is relevant to duties for which consideration being given, can discriminate based on criminal background check
  - Cannot discriminate against someone based on criminal background unless you can find relevancy
  - Phrase “consistent with accepted interpretation of affirmative action policies of the University of Wisconsin – Eau Claire” included in paragraph to make these guidelines parallel current university guidelines
  - Political activity clause excludes projects directly involved in partisan advocacy, member recruitment, lobbying, or electioneering
  - Are lots of political activities that would be acceptable for service-learning
  - Political party could advertise for these other activities, but could not pick and choose who want to work with based upon political affiliation
  - Does not make sense if looking for someone to work for a political party to not be able to request students affiliated with that party
  - Based on these guidelines, education would be acceptable service-learning if it fell outside religious and political activities
  - Committee talked about words of and about in regard to educating and decided not to use those terms in guidelines although might appear later in frequently asked questions (FAQ)
  - Questions concerning teaching of religion or political activity versus teaching about religion or political activity probably best covered in FAQs or by Office of Service-Learning
  - Put statements in both sections encouraging students to contact that office in developing their proposals
  - Was difficult for committee to look at issue of devotional content or discipleship concepts and translate those into service and see how that contributed to benefit of community at-large
  - Wanted to apply criteria where both service component and education component were clear
  - Devotional religious content or political persuasion benefiting particular churches or particular political parties tended to fail that test
  - Find guidelines unclear as to whether not granting service-learning credit or academic credit for these types of activities
    - Think it could be misunderstood
    - Hope committee clarifies this is for credit toward service-learning requirement
  - Are some courses that do satisfy service-learning requirement
  - Guidelines indicate service must benefit others – definition of others deferred to different section or FAQs
    - In service-learning literature, defined as groups underserved by our market economy
    - Most nonprofit missions include service to create greater or better community
    - On campus, have accepted as exceptions intensive services to other students that are academically oriented
    - Issue could be environment, could be need in community such as unwanted animals; it’s public service that is in the common good
Many students unsure why service-learning credit showed up on degree audit, yet goals and objectives include extensive required activities

- Concerned that over 50% of students getting this credit from classes when they do not seem to go through those activities

- When service-learning requirement first instituted, came with no resources other than faculty time and mentoring and couple of committees to implement
  - Resulted in many courses being grandfathered in
  - Watchdogs for granting that service-learning credit are various curriculum committees, not Office of Service-Learning, although director willing to consult with committees on that issue

- NSE survey of freshmen and seniors indicates about 90% of students report doing service-learning – missing percentage could be ones that don’t realize they have completed service-learning within coursework

- Committee pared down guidelines to something quickly readable – did not want this to come across as ban on either religious or political activity
  - Encourage students to worship or stump for candidates, but those hours would not count toward credit for service-learning requirement
  - Committee used word others to make mission statement clear and concise and not have to define community
  - Idea was to make it broad in beginning and narrow it down through objectives and FAQs

- Wrote guidelines with understanding this was for non-coursework service-learning credit
  - These are steps, guidelines and objectives for non-academic credit option of fulfilling requirement

- Committee discussed what courses might be offering service-learning credit, how arranged and reviewed; didn’t feel it was purpose of committee to review or approve such courses
  - Encouraged those in charge of those courses to review them carefully, ask same questions, and hold to same standards regarding service

- If we are going to accept this, think it should be across the board, not for just 50% of students not fulfilling service-learning requirement through coursework

- POINT OF INFORMATION – on any issue, University Academic Staff may request separate vote to be reported to chancellor as well
  - This is curricular issue, but many academic staff work directly with students on service-learning projects

- Doesn’t sound feasible that any political party would risk infiltration by someone not in the party working on a database or similar activity
  - Seems pretty clear these guidelines end service-learning credit for political activity

- Know a liberal women’s rights student who worked for one of most conservative Republican legislators in state and wrote issue papers on topics that ideologically opposed; she said it was one of best learning experiences of her life – not a service-learning activity, but did happen

- Seems if talking about wanting students for projects in Catholic Church, very likely a Catholic student would be attracted to that project
  - Was committee’s hope that organization would not insist that students look or think in specific manner
  - Same would probably hold true for political parties

- Question is whether they are rejecting students based on political or religious affiliation

- Seems creating kind of quasi-establishment clause for political speech when politics and religion treated differently in constitution
  - Some people trying to equate free speech with establishment clause when they are not the same
  - May be problem down the line

- Not attempting to deny individuals right to worship or stump for political candidates
  - Merely saying that as public institution of higher education, we have right and responsibility to decide how and where to give credit for activities appropriate for service-learning

Revised Motion 41-AP-01
Moved and seconded by the Ad Hoc Service-Learning Committee (9 for, 0 against) that the mission statement, goals and objectives, and revised project guidelines for service-learning be accepted as proposed.

Debate

- Thank committee for hard work on proposal
• Agree with willing recipients language
• Think non-endorsement statement very appropriate
• For-profit activities section makes sense as well
• Speak in opposition to religious activities and political activities sections
  • Do not understand how some sorts of education meet service-learning definition and other types of education do not meet that definition

VI. Reports of Committees

◆ Executive Committee – Chair Harrison
  • At last meeting, much of discussion related to concept of administrators being elected as faculty or academic staff to committees – discussion will continue at a later meeting
  • Next meeting April 19, 2005
◆ Faculty Personnel Committee – Senator Wick
  • Next meeting April 21, 2005 to update progress on current subgroup workings
◆ Academic Staff Personnel Committee – Senator Wilcox
  • Next meeting April 14, 2005
  • Provost Satz to talk about role of governance and Academic Staff Personnel Committee in budget cuts
◆ Academic Policies Committee – Senator Syverson
  • Working through program reviews
    • Today covered Department of Psychology review
    • Physics and Astronomy, Mathematics and Chemistry reviews scheduled next
  • Next meeting April 19, 2005
  • Proposal for new prefix for music education probably to be on agenda in two weeks
◆ Physical Plant Planning Committee – Senator Bredle
  • Next meeting April 18, 2005 for update from Vice Chancellor Soll on budget issues
◆ Budget Committee – Senator Alex Smith
  • Met April 4, 2005; no future meeting currently scheduled
◆ Compensation Committee – Senator Wick
  • Next meeting April 14, 2005 to plan upcoming agenda items
◆ Nominating Committee – Senator Whitfield
  • On behalf of committee, put forth one nominee for Senate Vice Chair – Andrea Gapko
  • No additional nominations from floor

MOTION from Senator Wilcox to close nominations, suspend the rules, and allow one nominee to stand as election results for Senate Vice Chair seconded and PASSED without dissention.

Elected as Vice Chair of University Senate: Andrea Gapko

◆ Technology Committee – Senator Bollinger
  • At last meeting, heard report on electronic and information technology group
    • Developing accessibility policies and standards to provide equal access to electronic and information technology for students with disabilities
    • Promising new site for professional web pages
    • Updated on administrative system migration project
  • Next meeting May 5, 2005

VII. Special Reports – Update on UW-Eau Claire Budget Cuts

• Budget reports distributed – also available on Blugold Insider
• Last evening at open forum, stage was set for budget cuts now facing
  • Much information given on budget cuts, regent guidelines, UW-Eau Claire budget figures, and talking points
  • Future meetings on budget will focus on sharing suggestions – urge all faculty and staff to come
  • Bring ideas of how to be more efficient, ways to increase revenue stream, ways to be more resourceful, and how we might reorganize responsibilities to free up positions
VIII. Miscellaneous Business
Without objection, first reading of Women’s Studies Major Motion to be considered first; remainder of Miscellaneous Business postponed until next meeting.

First Reading – Motion from Academic Policies Committee
Authorization to Implement New Major in Women’s Studies Report – Senator Syverson
- Last year University Senate passed recommendation to seek entitlement to plan Women’s Studies major; now approved by UW-System and planning process begun
  - Seeking official permission to offer a Women’s Studies major on this campus
  - Again, needs system and regent approval
- Women’s Studies major here would better serve western Wisconsin – current programs available only in Madison, Milwaukee, Whitewater, and Twin Cities
- New major would not require additional FTE although would require that 0.5 floating FTE provided by College of Arts and Sciences over last several years be stabilized with permanent reallocation to Women’s Studies
  - Currently have 0.5 FTE for coordinator, 0.5 FTE for classified staff program assistant, and approximately 0.5 FTE for instructional academic staff appointment
  - Anticipate stabilized 0.5 FTE could be combined with 0.5 FTE from another department to create a tenure-track position, with person in that position teaching in both Women’s Studies and home department
- Courses to offer Women’s Studies major already on books, many cross-listed – is only one that would have to be reconstituted
- Stabilizing 0.5 FTE in College of Arts and Sciences might reduce flexibility to offer other courses
- Responses to questions on content
  - Under proposal, FTE permanently allocated to program would be 1.5 instructional, 0.5 classified
    - Combining floating 0.5 FTE with 0.5 FTE from another department may have financial implications beyond this program
    - If switching from instructional academic staff FTE to faculty FTE, may make difference in number of credits that would be taught

Motion 41-AP-05
Moved by the Academic Policies Committee (7 for, 1 against) that the authorization to implement a new major program in Women’s Studies be approved.

Debate – None

Without objection, vote on motion postponed to next meeting.

X. Announcements
- Next meeting April 26, 2005 in Tamarack Room of Davies Center

Meeting adjourned at 5:04 p.m.

Wanda Schulner
Secretary to the University Senate