Members Present:

Robin Baker, Judy Blackstone, Joey Bohl, Marcia Bollinger, Don Bredle, Jack Bushnell, Gary Don, 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 Hollon, Robert Hooper, Rose Jadack, Harry Jol, Thomas Kemp, Sallie Kernan, Kate Lang, Vicki Lord Larson, Bruce Lo, Barbara Lozar, Steven Majstorovic, Karl Markgraf, Rebecca Matter, Sean McAleer, Susan McIntyre, Sue Moore, Cheryl Muller, Bobby Pitts, Jill Prushiek, Donna Raleigh, Scott Robertson, Connie Russell, Kristen Sandager, Earl Shoemaker, Alex Smith, Carter Smith, Larry Solberg, Linda Spaeth, Laurie St. Aubin-Whelihan, Todd Stephens, Daniel Stevenson, Paula Stuettgen, Kent Syverson, Lois Taft, Steve Tallant, Sharon Westphal, Scott Whitfield, Michael Wick, Jean Wilcox, Steve Zantow

Members Absent:


Guests:

Kris Anderson, Brandon Buchanan, Donald Christian, Bernard Duyfhuizen, Norman Hubbard, Stephanie Jamelske, Dale Johnson, Jan Morse, Donald Mowry, Jonathan Radcliffe, Brian Reisinger, Katherine Rhoades, Mike Rindo, Kathy Sahlhoff, Andrew Soll, Chad Wade, Elaine Wendt

The regular meeting of University Senate was called to order by Chair Harrison at 3:04 p.m. on Tuesday, May 10, 2005 in the Tamarack Room of Davies Center.

I. Minutes of April 26, 2005 approved with one correction
   ● Page 4, Vote on Amendment 41-AP-01-a1: Amendment DEFEATED PASSED by vote of 20 for, 18 against by University Faculty Senators.
Minutes of April 18, 2005 University Academic Staff Meeting approved as distributed.
Minutes of April 18, 2005 University Faculty Meeting approved as distributed.

II. Chancellor’s Remarks – Interim Chancellor Vicki Lord Larson
   ● Information, opinions, and ideas from budget forums, emails and conversations with chancellor to be disseminated via University Bulletin
   ● Plan for budget reductions, along with list of ideas generated, to be put forth at May 17, 2005 meeting of University Senate Executive Committee
   ● Chancellor Search and Screen Committee, with Robert Hooper as chair, will meet on May 17, 2005
     ● President Reilly, of UW-System, to charge committee
   ● May Board of Regents meeting held at UW-Stout
   ● Stout’s outstanding programs showcased
   ● Susan Harrison recognized for eight years as UW-Eau Claire faculty representative – only missed three Board of Regents meetings
     ● Also recognized as one of ten people in nation to receive 2005 Outstanding Advising Award from National Academic Advising Association
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- Michael Wick is new Faculty Representative starting in fall
- Business and Finance Committee looking at tuition options – something to follow over time
- Board of Regents also looking at Midwest Higher Education Compact – agreement between six states to exchange students – worthy of tracking over time
- Some institutions taking budget cuts
  - UW-LaCrosse cuts on regent agenda – seeking to eliminate College of Education, Exercise Science, Health and Recreation – not programs, but entire college
    - Put on hold by Board of Regents to investigate further
- Interesting to follow avenues of how some universities dealing with budget cuts

III. Chair’s Report – Chair Harrison
- Welcome new Student Senate Liaison – Jonathan Radcliffe
- Senators with terms expiring
  - Joey Bohl – Admissions
  - Jacqueline Bonneville – Advising/New Student Initiatives
  - Jack Bushnell – English
  - Jesse Dixon – Multicultural Affairs
  - Larry Honl – Business Communication
  - Robert Hooper – Geology
  - Rosemary Jadack – Adult Health Nursing
  - Thomas Kemp – Economics
  - Sallie Kernan – Educational Access Programs
  - Kate Lang - History
  - Gene Leisz – Teaching and Learning Technology Development Center
  - Sean McAleer – Philosophy and Religious Studies
  - Cheryl Muller - Chemistry
  - Roger Selin – Accounting and Finance
  - Linda Spaeth – Educational Support Services
  - Paula Stuettgen – University Centers and Programs
  - Karen Welch – English
  - Scott Whitfield – Physics and Astronomy
  - Rebecca Wurzer – Children’s Center
- Will adhere to five-minute speaking terms and allow 30 minutes of debate per issue
- At end of 30 minutes, will either vote or postpone further debate until end of meeting
- Note clarifications at top of Chair’s Report
  - Term main motion used on name tags in reference to moving the previous question to stop debate refers to motion under discussion
  - On motion to reconsider, in absence of a recorded vote on original motion, as long as another senator can verify a person voted on prevailing side, that person can move to reconsider
    - Reconsideration can occur on day of original vote, or next day on which business occurs

IV. Academic Staff Representative’s Report – Senator Wilcox
- Next meeting Thursday, May 19, 2005

V. Unfinished Business

MOTION by Senator Freymiller to change order of unfinished business moving service-learning proposal to end seconded.

Debate
- Would like to deal with item A first
- Had feeling last time people were ready to vote on motion; will vote to keep first on agenda
- Will still be limit of 30 minutes per issue no matter where placed on agenda
• Change to senate agenda would be voted on by full body

MOTION to change order of senate agenda PASSED by vote of 28 for, 25 against.

B. Second Reading – Motion from Academic Staff Personnel Committee
   Review of Performance – Administrative and/or Professional Academic Staff

Continued Debate
• Part of academic staff personnel rules; only academic staff senators vote
• In response to question raised during last meeting, practice has been to include performance reviews in academic staff member’s personnel files

Vote on Motion 41-AS-03: Motion PASSED without dissention by vote of academic staff senators.

C. Second Reading – Motion from Academic Staff Personnel Committee
   Instructional Academic Staff Multiple-Year Contracts

Continued Debate
• In response to question raised during last meeting, 11 instructional academic staff employed this semester would be affected by motion

Vote on Motion 41-AS-04: Motion PASSED without dissention by academic staff senators.

D. Second Reading – Motion from Faculty Personnel Committee
   Dismissal for Cause

Amendment 41-FP-07-a1
   Moved by Senator Wick and seconded to reinsert original language in UWEC 4.03 inadvertently removed from final version of motion that maintains current policy:

   If replacements are needed because of further disqualifications under UWS 4.06(d) or because of official leaves, they shall be selected by lot from those qualified members of the Termination Review Committee not originally selected by lot to serve on the Hearing Committee. If further replacements are needed, they shall be selected by lot from eligible members of the Faculty Complaint and Grievance Committee. In those rare cases where further replacements are still needed, they shall be selected by the University Senate Executive Committee from eligible members of the faculty at large.

Vote on Amendment 41-FP-07-a1: Amendment PASSED without dissention by University Faculty Senators.

Continued Debate on Main Motion:
• Dismissal for cause defined in system policy; not repeated here

Vote on Motion 41-FP-07: Motion PASSED without dissention by University Faculty Senators.

A. Second Reading – Motion from Ad Hoc Service-Learning Committee
   Service-Learning Guideline Revisions

Continued Debate
• Current status of motion
  • Bulleted item on political activity deleted
  • In religious activity bulleted item, word credit replaced with phrase service-learning hours
  • In nondiscrimination item, phrase gender identity or expression included as per Board of Regent guidelines

MOTION by Senator Jol to substitute a motion that UW-Eau Claire eliminate service-learning as a requirement for graduation seconded.
Debate to accept Substitution

- Voting for right to substitute motion for one being debated
  - After one vote, if allow substitution, current motion would be dead
  - If then defeat substitute motion, back to policy currently on books
- Have followed whole debate on service-learning with interest
  - One issue of primary importance in deciding if this is appropriate has been missed
  - At university of reason and reasoned process, start from position of ignorance and proceed toward truth
    - Become more enlightened than in past
  - Not same as process of faith, which proceeds from understanding of truth and operates down from it
    - Not to dismiss faith, but not same reasoned scientific process
  - Is antithetical to reasoned scientific process I believe university stands for
  - So oppose religious proselytization as credited activity
  - Would ask colleagues to consider what university stands for, not in terms of mission statement, or what law says, but in terms of our purpose to engage in scientific endeavors
- Like previous senator’s comments – don’t know that we are in position to make decision in last meeting of spring semester to dump service-learning
  - Requires reasoned discussion
  - Although open to idea, speaking against motion
- Speak against motion – two of things we do as an institution are sift and winnow through information to seek truth and serve our region
  - Service-learning serves our region
- Service-learning forcing lot of work on faculty members already busy with lot of other issues
  - University is Center of Excellence for undergraduate research, yet has no 30-hour requirement for undergraduate research – no recognition on transcript for that in any way
  - Not a Center of Excellence for service-learning, yet maintain this requirement
  - Idea of service-learning is great; forced volunteerism is not
    - Research at UW-Madison showed volunteering devalued by forcing it for credit
  - Should not be transcript issue, but resume issue
    - If students want to do, can still have something that says excellence in service-learning
  - Can look at student dollars and FTE that support this and ask where else that could go on this campus
  - Not pushing students past comfort zone in much of service-learning as originally intended
    - Don’t have resources to do that for all students
  - Vast majority of hundreds of students polled do not agree with service-learning
  - Do lot of things on campus very well; need to push those
    - Increasing load on already busy faculty, staff and students not helping, but hindering education here
  - Can’t support service-learning; many colleagues would also appreciate ability to go in other directions
  - Seems service-learning based on corporate model; may be inappropriate at this university
- Research cited had nothing to do with service-learning; conducted at high school level involving forced volunteerism without learning component
  - What doing here entirely different
- Against motion; service-learning simply one component of liberal arts education
  - Great majority of students would argue against being forced to take a math course, or wellness course, or biology course – we don’t throw those out
  - Look at intrinsic value of various activities and decide how much we value them, then work to improve what we perceive to be wrong with programs
    - Aspects of service-learning may need to be addressed in great detail, throwing program out would be terrible step backwards
- Against motion – teach course with service-learning component
  - Feel close connection between what students learn and integrate from class experience and service hours
  - That many students choose to continue service contacts at end of class speaks to value of this opportunity
- Speak against motion – service-learning one of most effective tools in our study-abroad programs of immersing students in culture of world
  - In polls, over 400 students unanimously affirmed value of service-learning in terms of understanding cultural situations
• Oppose substitution as member of ad hoc service-learning committee
  • Committee worked hard to make issue curricular, not political or religious hot potato
  • Question timing of substitution capitalizing on fact that we are not in complete agreement on all issues
  • Need to work on guidelines rather than pull whole service-learning requirement

MOTION by Senator Ducksworth-Lawton to move the previous question seconded and PASSED by vote of 26 for, 4 against by University Faculty Senators.

Motion to substitute DEFEATED by vote of 5 for, 25 against by University Faculty Senators.

Continued Debate on Main Motion
• At end of last meeting, speaker from gallery presented pertinent opinion from system lawyer that students are not agents of state and lawsuits not a danger
  • Seems when debate started, one of premises was danger of lawsuits; apparently no longer under that premise

MOTION by Senator Ducksworth-Lawton to move the previous question seconded and PASSED by vote of 24 for, 7 against by University Faculty Senators.

Vote on Revised Motion 41-AP-01: Motion PASSED by vote of 24 for, 8 against by University Faculty Senators. University Faculty includes instructional academic staff with faculty status.

VI. Reports of Committees
  ♦ Executive Committee – Chair Harrison
    • Committee heard budget update at last meeting; additional meeting scheduled for May 17, 2005 to hear budget reduction plan
  ♦ Faculty Personnel Committee – Senator Wick
    • No report
  ♦ Academic Staff Personnel Committee – Senator Wilcox
    • Next meeting May 12, 2005
    • Contemplate going into closed session to consult regarding search and screen committee for director of University Centers
  ♦ Academic Policies Committee – Senator Syverson
    • Met today for last time of semester
      • Department of Chemistry review approved
      • Internal reviewer recommendations to be forwarded to provost
      • Heard Assessment Report from Scott Oates, chair of Assessment Committee
      • Approved new prefix in Music Education
      • New Geology comprehensive major, Teaching Earth and Space Science, and new minor, Teaching, approved
    • No more meetings planned this academic year
    • Assessment issue will come back next fall; motions will come forward on new prefix, major and minor
  ♦ Physical Plant Planning Committee – Senator Bredle
    • Will meet May 17, 2005; agenda items:
      • Putnam Park parking lot proposal of Sean Hartnett
      • Report from Vice Chancellor Soll on whether riverbank project will ever be completed and other items from state
  ♦ Budget Committee – Senator Alex Smith
    • No report
  ♦ Compensation Committee – Senator Wick
    • No report
  ♦ Nominating Committee – Senator Whitfield
    • No report
  ♦ Technology Committee – Senator Bollinger
• Met on May 5, 2005 for last time this year; heard update from Jim Lowe on technology-related activities on campus

VII. Special Reports
• Thanks due to ad hoc committee that went through job of rearticulating what service-learning ought to be
  • Even though we mucked around with proposal, it more or less stood as brought to us

VIII. Miscellaneous Business

First Reading – Motion from Faculty Personnel Committee

Absentee Voting in Personnel Actions Report – Senator Wick
• Faculty Personnel Committee asked to look at rules governing absentee voting in personnel matters
  • Because handbook, UW-System policy and Wisconsin state statues silent on matter, defer to Robert’s Rules of Order, which
    • Discourage use of absentee voting except in situations where geographic distribution makes voting in person impossible
    • Strongly encourage if choose to allow absentee voting, that it be explicitly addressed in rules
  • Many times well-informed members of DPC cannot be present when official vote taken
    • Thus, committee felt personnel matters on campus probably do fall under exception Robert’s Rules would allow
  • Recommend language to indicate right to vote limited to members of an organization who are present in person or via phone at time vote taken at legal meeting
• Responses to questions for clarification
  • Committee did consider voting via email – equated that to a proxy vote and didn’t want to create disconnect between vote and time of vote
  • From standpoint of Robert’s Rules of Order, key thing is for person voting to hear discussion and debate, which might influence vote
  • In discussion with system legal, real issue is that person voting have access to all materials and information to cast legitimate vote
  • Mandates some kind of contact at time of vote – used generic term phone as opposed to telephone so you could argue for use of various technologies
  • Would recommend live communication instead of phone – that would cover typing at a computer or internet meetings
  • Believe two-way live communication would be acceptable

Motion 41-FP-08
  Moved by University Senate Faculty Personnel Committee (5 for, 0 against) that the following changes to the Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook, Chapter 5, page 10, be approved:

Voting

All votes pertaining to a personnel action will be conducted by voice, by show of hands, by signed ballot, or by roll call. If any member of the voting body requests a roll call or signed ballot vote, then the vote must be conducted in that manner. In the case of signed ballot or roll call, the name and specific vote cast by each voting member must be recorded, preserved, and be available for public inspection.

In reporting the results of any personnel action requiring a vote, the vote count (votes for, votes against, votes abstaining) will be recorded on the appropriate official personnel form. That form will be provided to the individual under consideration in the personnel action at the same time that it is forwarded to the next appropriate administrative level (Chair, Dean, etc).

To be considered a positive recommendation (e.g., supportive of reappointment, tenure, or promotion), a simple majority of the voting members must vote for the action (more votes “for” than votes “against”). Any personnel action that does not have a simple majority of the voting members voting for the action (either a tie or more
votes “against” than votes “for”) is considered a negative recommendation (e.g., against reappointment, tenure, or promotion).

The right to vote is limited to members of an organization who are present in person or via phone at the time the vote is taken at a legal meeting.

Amendment 41-FP-08-a1
Moved by Senator Hollon and seconded to include the phrase discussion and immediately before the word vote.

Debate
- Committee did look at how to make sure absentee voter was informed; problem came in if discussion lasted more than one meeting
  - If one meeting missed, or if have to leave during meeting but come back for vote, do those cases mean vote no longer valid
  - Decided people in room not held to standard that forced them to be engaged in debate or to listen to commentary, didn’t feel could be inconsistent and force that on absentee voter
- If not there for argument, don’t believe you should have a vote – doesn’t allow for persuasion to different point of view
- Widely-accepted term synchronous discussion covers it – could be internet meeting, phone, video-conferencing; means at same time, different place
- Mover and seconder willing to accept synchronous prior to discussion in amendment
- Quorum is those present and voting, absentee person would be included as voting
- If department thinks it is enough discussion, that’s fine; don’t want to micromanage language, have to trust good judgment of departments
- Reason for insisting on discussion not to force participation, but to ensure people have opportunity to participate in discussion so someone can’t deliberately not be present to hear evidence and then just vote
  - Makes it clear that is part of responsibility
- Setting up double standard between what an absentee voter must do and what a voter in person must do; inconsistency is pervasive problem throughout handbook, trying to fix some of that
- Unfair for someone to go into a vote on something that is as important as a personnel issue and be so callous as to not even hear the discussion
- Not about what is fair, about what have right to do
- Amendment would require people actually at meeting to be there for synchronous discussion as well
- This is part of faculty personnel rules, vote is by faculty senators

Vote on Amendment 41-FP-08-a1: Amendment DEFEATED by vote of 14 for, 18 against by faculty senators.

Amendment 41-FP-08-a2
Moved by Senator Erger and seconded that the word phone be replaced with the phrase synchronous discussion.

Debate
- Intent of committee was to use roll call votes for absentee ballots
  - If signed ballot forced, ballot has to be turned in at time of vote, which would disallow absentee voter from voting
  - Suspect fax would be acceptable at time of vote

Vote on Amendment 41-FP-08-a2: Amendment PASSED by vote of faculty senators.

MOTION by Senator Gallaher that the rules be suspended to allow a vote on the motion today seconded and PASSED by two-thirds vote.
Continued Debate on Main Motion
- Proxy voting is using a substitute to cast vote; this does not allow for proxy voting

**Vote on Motion 41-FP-08:** Motion PASSED by vote of faculty senators.

IX. Announcements
- Next meeting will take place in the fall

Meeting adjourned at 4:16 p.m.

Submitted by,

Wanda Schulner
Secretary to the University Senate