The regular meeting of University Senate was called to order by Acting Chair Gapko at 3:03 p.m. on Tuesday, January 31, 2006 in the Tamarack Room of Davies Center.

- Senate Chair Harrison filling temporary position as acting dean of student development so vice chair will be serving as acting chair until her return
- Senator Wick has agreed to convene Compensation Committee
- Welcome Linda Carpenter, replacing Larry Solberg as senator from Communication Sciences and Disorders

I. Minutes of December 13, 2005 University Senate meeting approved as distributed

II. Chancellor’s Remarks – Chancellor Larson
- Thank those who participated in chancellor candidate forums
  - Understand forums were well attended, which speaks well for university faculty and staff
- Tomorrow will hold reception to kick-off Black History Month
- Representative Ron Kind to be on campus Monday, February 6, 2006
  - To discuss current federal legislation, which would cut $13 billion in federal financial aid for students
  - Huge factor in retention and recruitment of students
- Issues you may want to follow
  - Wisconsin Covenant brought up by governor; to be talked about more by President Reilly
    - Seeing what state can do to aid intellectually capable and highly motivated individuals to fulfill dream of college education; starts back in eighth grade
  - Collective bargaining bill now in committee in state legislature; don’t know whether will come to floor or not
  - Continue to be discussions about TABOR (Taxpayers Bill of Rights); know consequences from state of Colorado, don’t know all ramifications
- Board of Regents meeting February 9 and 10, 2006; Wisconsin Covenant to be more fully discussed
  - Provost Tallant and Vice Chancellor Soll will attend; chancellor will be speaking at conference in Colorado

III. Chair’s Report – Acting Chair Gapko
- Following actions approved by chancellor since last meeting
  - Comprehensive Major: Biology, Liberal Arts with Emphases
  - Academic Calendar Guidelines
Comprehensive Major: Music, Music History, Liberal Arts
Selection of Administrators
Emphasis in Earth and Space Science Teaching and Minor in Geology Teaching
Topical Minor for College of Education and Human Sciences
Minor in Social Studies
Broadfield Teaching and Discrete Subject Certification

Minor:
- Spanish for Health Professions, Liberal Arts
- Japanese, Liberal Arts

Motions for constitutional changes need to be to Senate Office in February; other handbook changes due in March

IV. Faculty Representative’s Report – Senator Wick
- Faculty representatives group to meet February 3, 2006
  - Agenda includes items about UW-System personnel policies that expedite review process in response to problems occurring over summer
  - Will also present and talk about collective bargaining bill
  - Salary compression resolution being drafted to bring to each campus for feedback; to support doing something about salary compression
- Will be attending Board of Regent meeting on February 9 and 10, 2006; items on agenda include
  - Discussion of UW growth agenda, a future vision
  - First reading on master in science in agroecology from UW-Madison
  - Authorization to recruit for provost and vice chancellor position at UW-River Falls
  - Will report on that meeting next time

V. Academic Staff Representative’s Report – Senator Blackstone
- Last teleconference held on January 19, 2006; items system wanted governance input on included for you in written report
- Urge you to go to UW-System website two days before February 9, 2006 Board of Regents meeting to see draft of new disciplinary process available for review
  - Draft comes from committee put together by board
  - What was being called faculty and academic staff discipline now focusing on faculty positions
  - If have ideas about draft, send feedback to chancellor
- Resident assistant working group report also out on web; looking for feedback on issue
- Also want feedback on how governance groups feel about collective bargaining
  - Testimony of System Vice President for Human Resources Crist available on website
  - If you have feedback, contact academic staff representative

VI. Announcements
- NET sponsoring follow-up discussion to Declining by Degrees on February 10, 2006
  - Chancellor sponsored viewing earlier this month; video available for check out at help desk
- To show video February One: The Story of the Greensboro Four on February 7, 2006 and hold associated discussions; please send classes in disciplines where civil rights topics appropriate
- Internship Mania to take place February 8, 2006

VII. Unfinished Business
- None

VIII. Reports of Committees
- Executive Committee – Acting Chair Gapko
  - Next meeting February 7, 2006
    - Committee to continue discussing academic program action chart and administrators voting on committees
- Faculty Personnel Committee – Senator McAleer
  - Next meeting February 9, 2006 to continue working on personnel issues
  - Also asked by Provost Tallant to look at question of whether advising should remain as stand-alone category for evaluation or whether it should be subsumed in teaching
- Academic Staff Personnel Committee – Senator Blackstone
No report

- Academic Policies Committee – Senator McIntyre
  - Next meeting February 14, 2006
- Physical Plant Planning Committee – Senator Russell
  - No additions to report from last semester; will be special report from committee later in this meeting
- Budget Committee – Senator Gallaher
  - No report
- Compensation Committee – Senator Wick
  - No report
- Nominating Committee – Senator Lo
  - No report
- Technology Committee – Senator Duckworth-Lawton
  - No report

IX. Miscellaneous Business

First Reading – Motion from Compensation Committee


- Compensation Committee went through considerable deliberation to come up with modifications to academic staff side of pay plan
  - Implications for changes not completely investigated, so chose to forward plan largely the same as last year
- Few changes that took place
  - Known percentage increase of 3.02% included in table
  - Will be room for equity adjustment in this plan so should be aware of that process
  - Post-Tenure Review Salary Adjustment language passed by senate last year included as mandated
  - Limit of one $400 merit available for administrative and professional academic staff (APAS)
  - Current UWEC salary minima maintained except where increased because UW-System minima increased above ours
  - Chair stipend language removed from salary plan since not funded by pay plan; will be brought forward as separate policy
  - Maintained current promotion salary increase levels using standard formulas as in past – those numbers still seemed appropriate
- Pro of proposed plan mainly that it is familiar; others include
  - Single merit award for APAS helps make up for miniscule increases over last few years by not giving too much reward to few individuals, instead spreading it a bit more still based on merit
  - Maintains promotion amounts, but doesn’t increase them
  - Includes funds for equity requests
  - Allows input in merit rating system from immediate supervisors both on faculty and APAS sides
- Disadvantages include that it remains complex; concerns have been voiced over that
  - Language that allows subsequent levels of administration to query and challenge ratings and merit presentations seen by some as disadvantage
  - Plan still does not address vast market shortfall compared to peer institutions

Motion 42-CP-01

Moved and seconded by Compensation Committee (5 for, 0 against) that the Comprehensive Salary Plan 2006-2007 be approved and sent to the chancellor.

Debate

- Senator Wick indicated because of timing, do need to go forward with implementation
  - Chairs probably already in communication with administration on this
  - May be appropriate, only if people comfortable with it, to suspend rules to vote today to allow process to move forward
- With past plans, moved away from providing higher level administrators ability to overturn lower decisions; why has that been changed?
- Two aspects of that
  - On faculty side, model distributes rating authority to immediate supervisors, typically department chairs
    - In past, no mechanism built in to allow someone from outside department to oversee process
• Added it in so chair can be asked to defend ratings to make sure everyone treated fairly in case of anomaly
• Not meant to be micromanagement tool; no one on committee comfortable with that concept
• On APAS side, recommendations forwarded up from units in ranked list
• Then based on funds available, able to honor ranking, but draw line
• That process used for checks and balance up ladder on that side

• Have had situations where everybody in department given exact same rating; probably not within spirit of merit-based system
• Should be within process to allow dean to ask about situation – did everyone perform meritoriously exactly equal or is something else going on here?
• Wanted to make sure there was openness to communication channel to allow for that dialogue

• Chair stipend policy now moving through shared governance structure
• Being proposed as policy in and of itself because pay plan dollars not dedicated to that
• Will eventually work up to this body

• Has been four or five years since promotion stipends increased, other than $50 in couple of categories last year
• Implemented policy has maintained those numbers over time; expect in next year or two formula used will result in recommended pay increase in promotion numbers

• One beauty of current systems is chairs do not need to provide documentation of all people for whom ratings are forwarded
• Idea that might have to be providing documentation to immediate supervisor almost same as getting that documentation ready
• See this creeping in direction I don’t like, especially with different deans

• Committee did talk about this; clearly stated intent was to challenge cases where is extreme discrepancy between ratings and merit-based system
• Happy to let this run a year or two and look at again if there is any abuse; could put language in that it is to be used only in extreme cases and should be rarely exercised
• Don’t think departments making decisions which cannot be challenged keeps integrity of system
• May be alternative models to provide checks and balances, but this is model committee looked at and thought was worth trying

• Paragraph preceding paragraph containing objecting supervisor language talks about resolution when faculty member objects to his or her rating so dispute moves up to next level to be resolved
• In case discussing here, no one needs to be objecting to individual ratings; faculty members not privy to overall set of ratings, so no one else observing overall ratings distribution in departments

• Intent of policy is not to override situations where department decided everyone gets mutual increase as all equal; must remember institution governed by UW-System policy requiring one-third of pay plan money be distributed based on merit/market comparisons so have to operate within that premise
• If decide after review that everyone performed meritoriously, not the same, but equally meritoriously in different activities, department may submit all twos or threes
  • In past was no mechanism for dean to even inquire, which would seem to be perfectly appropriate in such an instance
• If merit reviews performed, then decision would stand; if no reviews done because no money that year, would not be in spirit of system policy and would not stand

• Language under section on Performance Salary Adjustments for Staff under Alternative Salary Plans not new and intended to disallow modification of alternative pay plans because old system required you to follow one of three very restrictive models
• Modification of those plans not always in compliance with handbook or system policies so intent was to grandfather in current alternative pay plans with any desired modifications to come through channels

MOTION by Senator Wick to suspend the rules so that a vote can be taken on the motion today seconded.

• If we don’t consult with constituents on issue, don’t think we represent them well
• Immediacy concern results from system instructions to have all entries in Red Book by April 1, 2006
• If work backward from that date for approvals and process this has to flow through allowing time for challenging individual ratings, will see we need to get process started
Worksheets have gone out to chairs and directors clearly indicating pay plan not yet approved; the longer it takes to get plan through chancellor and system, more work chairs and directors are doing without knowing it is consistent with pay plan. May result in less thoughtful process as people are rushed to meeting deadlines imposed by system.

Need to get started to make sure when all done that whole total adds up. Before can submit final budget to system, have to make sure it will balance with funds available. Sooner process started, better chance everyone in every department will be happy with what they end up with.

Question how much impact voting in two weeks would have on ratings and decisions on merit of people in departments. Whether I am meritorious or just some regular guy is weighty issue, but numbers here are nickels and dimes, so more symbolic than anything else.

POINT OF ORDER: Motion to suspend rules is not debatable.

Vote on Motion to Suspend Rules: Motion DEFEATED.

Continued Discussion – None. Debate to continue in two weeks.

X. Special Reports
Putnam Park Proposal – Sean Hartnett, Physical Plant Planning Committee

Dr. Hartnett, due to class conflict, may take few minutes to arrive; did provide handout for meeting.

Senator Russell indicated proposal comes out of Physical Plant Planning Committee discussion.

Committee discussed possibility of changing parking lot at bottom of hill into more aesthetic entrance to Putnam Park. Also possibility of converting it into outdoor classroom. Handout shows some of possibilities, which have been discussed with some faculty in sciences and other disciplines that might be able to use such an outdoor facility.

Floor opened for comments.

Where student, handicap, and GF faculty parking spaces to be displaced to is one of issues to be worked out.

Vice Chancellor Soll indicated study by engineering firm now being done for university to look at alternatives for redeveloping Garfield Avenue:

- Have some indication that Division of State Facilities prepared to recommend funding for this.
- One of challenges given to engineering firm was to recommend alternative ways to relocate parking.
- Hoping to share those recommendations early this semester.
- Physical Plant Planning Committee agreed to have Dr. Hartnett bring presentation to senate; not coming with endorsement by committee.
  - Most committee members would like to see how entire plan comes together, would also like to hear comments from you.

Wondering about safety and security of residents currently parking there; other spaces may not provide safe walking distance for most residence halls.

Another consideration is how fire pit reserved, maintained, and monitored.

Seems may be better alternate location for outdoor classroom.

One reason this particular location advantageous is as entrance to Putnam Park and also where Little Niagara Creek joins Chippewa River.

Engineering firm working on whole concept of parking and residents including safety of students.

Don’t know whether designation as state natural area includes parking lot; lot is part of Putnam Park, but there are other university facilities built on what is officially Putnam Park.

Point is whether we can make improvement to overall campus from instructional, safety and aesthetic perspectives.

Have been told in past could not run military simulations in that area because of fragile nature of biodiversity; seems this would impact that as well.

Is also lighting issue in area given number of level three sex offenders in this area.

Drawing is concept Dr. Hartnett put together, not a design.

Would still need to answer some of these concerns.

If space envisioned as open to public, would also need parking facilities to allow for that use.

As far as funding is concerned, know state is amenable to redeveloping Garfield Avenue.
Also know program revenues (sale of parking permits or parking citation fines) will have to pay for parking lot redevelopment because state funds cannot be used for that

- For amenities, like park benches, etc., there is no identified funding source; assume Dr. Hartnett concluded foundation funds must be involved
- If conceptualizing this as outdoor learning space, would encourage consultation with learning space design people in Learning and Technology Services
  - Even though not conventional learning space, some issues with learning theory ought to be dealt with
  - Believe Dr. Hartnett’s concept was that park and state natural area would be classroom with park entrance to be more like staging area, not where instruction would actually take place
  - Unfortunate Dr. Hartnett not here because he could answer questions; believe this is just conceptualization of idea to restore back entrance to park with short term parking for public and senior citizens to have better access
  - Committee just agreed best to discuss this along with other planning for Garfield Avenue

- Novel to tear down parking lot to put up paradise
  - Seems to me biggest hurdle is procedural

- Concept has been presented to Putnam Park Commission, which embraced concept but not details
- Design for restoration of trail in park complete; to be bid this spring with work to be completed over summer

- I use area as classroom to speak to classes before going out and down trail – is indeed jewel of campus
  - Don’t know that this proposal would help me use Putnam Park any more effectively as classroom
  - Seems to be aesthetic issue and seems might be other, better uses for money
  - Opposed to fire pit right by dorms and Chippewa River; also if you put shelter in can attract some things you don’t want in your classroom either
  - At least with parking lot, know what goes on there, would be careful about doing other things there

Without objection, meeting adjourned at 4:02 p.m.

Submitted by,

Wanda Schulner
Secretary to the University Senate