Members Present:


Members Absent:


Guests:

Don Christian, Scott Hartsel, Katherine Rhoades, Kathy Sahlhoff, Andrew Soll, Chris Wagner

The regular meeting of University Senate was called to order by Acting Chair Gapko at 3:02 p.m. on Tuesday, April 11, 2006 in the Tamarack Room of Davies Center.

I. Minutes of March 28, 2006 University Senate meeting approved as distributed

II. Chancellor’s Remarks – Chancellor Larson

- Report on Board of Regents meeting last week on Green Bay campus – details available online
- Commend UW-Green Bay on extraordinarily good job in presenting university, its highlights, and its growth agenda
  - Chancellor Shepard’s presentations and Board of Regents agenda at UW-Green Bay some of finest I have ever seen
  - Growth agenda involves expanding opportunities in Northeast Wisconsin by increasing number of students supported by state dollars by approximately 50%, from 5400 to 7500 students
    - Claim most of those students will come from geographical region
      - Other institutions, however, wondering about impact on their recruitment
    - Requesting $8.2 million over course of next three biennia
  - Three reasons
    - Grow diversity in student body – draw from increased number of people of color along urban corridor
    - Demonstrated economic transition from manufacturing to knowledge-based economy
    - Increased demand for access to UW-Green Bay because urban corridor growing rapidly
  - Masterful presentation of information and also demonstration of support from northeast quadrant of state
    - Had room full of community people, business leaders, president of Northeast Technical College, and many state representatives
  - Growth agenda very well received by regents; something for Northwest Wisconsin to be thinking about
  - Highlighted Phuture Phoenix program – seeking to grow notion of having college aspirations among fifth grade students – building the pipeline
    - Proud of program that doesn’t use tax dollars
  - Master plan for UW-Green Bay for sustainability of green space also well presented by students
  - Theme at Green Bay is connecting learning to life using interdisciplinary approach
• UW-System report on sexual assault and harassment indicated increased number of students reporting
  - Perceived as good news rather than bad with rationale that campuses providing more services and opportunities so students feel comfortable reporting; regents supportive of that
• Education Committee reported on program array
  - Good news is statistics don’t support strong feeling on part of regents that program development out of control with more program development when fewer resources
    - According to President Reilly, has been net reduction of six programs over ten-year period
  - Went through revised entitlement to plan – information forthcoming from provosts on process for new programs or eliminating old ones
    - Major change is only one reading at BOR meetings; down from two
    - One reading does increase efficiencies, but need everything properly in line
    - No longer chance to revise presentation and be guaranteed place on next agenda
• White paper on food services from Business, Finance and Audit Committee indirectly affects all campuses
  - Looked at whether to consolidate food services across entire UW-System with one procurement
  - Will be no formal proposal for consolidation at this time; all will continue to contract individually for food services on respective campuses
• Response to questions from floor
  - Did not see Green Bay’s growth agenda having any connection to movement regarding program array – just coincidental that also talked about program array in system at this particular meeting
  - Did not get any indication that growth agenda was about consolidation of programs, or that they want any of our programs or want to give away some of their programs

III. Chair’s Report – Acting Chair Gapko
• No Report

IV. Faculty Representative’s Report – Senator Wick
• Commend Green Bay for outstanding job with BOR meeting – walked away with following impressions
  - UW-Green Bay is dynamic institution embracing change; is another institution that may well come up and pass us as one of premiere institutions in Wisconsin
  - Report on sexual assault incidence on each campus in system presented definition for sexual assault that was eye-opening – included much more than I thought
    - Would be eye-opening to number of our students as well
    - Good news is relatively low percentage of students affected by sexual assault; bad news is devastating effect on anyone assaulted
      - Still problem to solve
  - According to anonymous survey, are many repeat offenders of behavior that, while they don’t know it, would constitute sexual assault
    - If catch these people and get them help or in jail, could significantly reduce number of sexual assaults that occur
  - Education, of men in particular, on definition and reporting of incidents could bring more people into idea that this is socially unacceptable behavior
  - UW-Green Bay proposed nice package; growth initiative was quite popular
    - Something we need to keep in back of our minds as look at where we are going and what our identity will be

V. Academic Staff Representative’s Report – Senator Blackstone
• Next meeting in Madison on April 20, 2006 – will report after that
• Will be holding Academic Staff Leadership Conference on our campus July 13 and 14, 2006; all invited to work with our committee

VI. Announcements
• None

VII. Unfinished Business
• None

VIII. Reports of Committees
◆ Executive Committee – Chair Gapko
Next meeting April 18, 2006 to set agenda for April 25, 2006 senate meeting

Faculty Personnel Committee – Senator McAleer
- Met April 3, 2006
  - Discussed and approved motion for next senate agenda regarding promotion criteria in department evaluation plans
- Next meeting April 27, 2006
  - To discuss and start crafting report on status of advising as stand-alone category for evaluation

Academic Staff Personnel Committee – Senator Blackstone
- No report

Academic Policies Committee – Senator McIntyre
- On April 4, 2006 completed Philosophy and Religious Studies Department Review
- On April 11, 2006 completed Kinesiology Department Review with final approval of report to occur at next meeting on April 18, 2006
- April 18, 2006 will begin review of Biology Department
- April 25, 2006 will review Public Health Professions Department
- May 2, 2006 will review Special Education Department

Physical Plant Planning Committee – Senator Russell
- Met April 10, 2006
  - Kimberly O’Kelly, interim coordinator for parking and transportation services, gave report
    - Bus ridership increased this year
    - Still vacant parking spaces on campus, often in Fine Arts and Water Street lots across river
    - Held brief discussion of how to encourage students to use those lots more
    - Reviewed how residence hall lots assigned and used
    - In April of 2000, senate action extended hours that permits required in McPhee and Murray lots from 3:00 p.m. to 4:30 p.m.
      - Committee reviewed that action, as required in original motion
      - Since no complaints or problems noted, voted to continue extension of hours in lots
    - Reviewed handbook language describing purpose and membership of committee
- Next meeting April 24, 2006

Budget Committee – Senator Gallaher
- Met April 10, 2006
  - Passed draft of revised functions of committee to be presented to senate at next meeting
- Next meeting on May 1, 2006
  - Vice Chancellor Soll and staff will present report on budget

Compensation Committee – Senator Wick
- Met April 10, 2006 and approved motion to be brought up under miscellaneous business today
- Will be meeting first week of May to continue deliberations on 2007-2008 Salary Plan

Nominating Committee – Senator Lo
- Present three names for senate chair-elect
  - Senator Michael Dorsher from Communication and Journalism
  - Senator Mitchell Freymiller from Biology
  - Senator Marty Wood from English
- No further nominations from floor
- Nominations will be received until next Tuesday; election to be held at next meeting on April 25, 2006

Technology Committee – Senator Duckworth-Lawton
- Committee voted to recommend single standard for clickers at meeting last Friday
  - Motion to come to senate at April 25, 2006 meeting
  - Will also have demonstration at that meeting of all three systems looking at on campus
- In regard to administrative system migration
  - New course searching and advising have been enhanced and moved to Blugold under My Blugold system (Blugold Insider will eventually become My Blugold)
  - LTS will move administrative functions; don’t have definite target date
- Contract in works to allow for five bars for cell phone use in every building; will be no more dead spots at least on lower campus
- People in Hibbard received email last week about removal of Mac lab on first floor of building
Those with concerns should contact Rick Richmond
Plan is to replace Macs with PCs
LTS also thinking about ways to accommodate growing use of videos
Have made number of recommendations including faculty coordinating deadlines

IX. Special Reports
• None

X. Miscellaneous Business
A. First Reading – Motion from Executive Committee
Report on APC Membership – Senator Wick
• Recommending provost and vice chancellor be removed as voting member from Academic Policies Committee
• Issue brought up by provost uncomfortable with dual role as voting member on committee that makes recommendations to himself
• Provost and vice chancellor will remain ex officio non-voting member

Motion 42-SE-03
Moved and seconded by University Senate Executive Committee (14 for, 0 against) that the membership of the Academic Policies Committee, Chapter 3, page 14, of the Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook be changed as follows:

4. The Academic Policies Committee
   a. Membership: The committee includes the Provost and Vice Chancellor, nine University Faculty senators elected for three-year terms by the University Faculty members of the Senate, and one ex officio and non-voting University Faculty representative from Library Services elected by and from members of Library Services professional staff. There shall be at least one member from each of the colleges. The Provost and Vice Chancellor or designated representative shall serve as an ex officio non-voting member of the committee.

Debate
• Since membership of this committee is part of Constitution of Faculty and Academic Staff, all senators may vote
• To be ratified in spring election, would need to be voted on at this meeting

MOTION by Senator Ducksworth-Lawton to suspend the rules to vote on the motion at this meeting seconded and PASSED by two-thirds vote.

Continued Debate
• Library Services language changed to emphasize election is by and from faculty and academic staff members of Library Services not all professional staff
• Since provost votes on senate, would still be voting on motions that would be coming up to office
• One problem at a time

Vote on Motion 42-SE-03: Motion PASSED without dissention.

B. First Reading – Motion from Faculty Personnel and Academic Staff Personnel Committees
Report on Review of Interim Administrators – Senator McAleer
• Both committees asked by Chair Harrison to look into issue of evaluation of interim administrators – not mentioned in handbook
• New policy not overly strict, sets guidelines and checks and balances for instances when interim in place for more than two years

Motion 42-FP-02
Moved and seconded by the Faculty Personnel Committee (8 for, 0 against) and the Academic Staff Personnel Committee (7 for, 0 against) that the following changes to the Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook, Chapter 5, page 82, The Procedure for Faculty and Academic Staff Review of Academic Administrators: Chancellor, Provost and Vice Chancellor, Assistant or Associate Vice Chancellor, Deans, Associate Deans and Assistant Deans, be approved:

Each administrator is reviewed within three years of the initial appointment and every five years thereafter.
It is expected that interim appointments will normally not last more than two years. The supervisor to whom the administrator is responsible shall formally consult with the Senate Executive Committee if a successful search has not been completed within two years of the position being filled with an interim administrator, and shall formally consult with Senate Executive Committee at least annually until a successful search is completed. When an interim administrator serves for more than two years, the administrator will be reviewed according to the above schedule.

The review is to be conducted by a committee of University Faculty and University Academic Staff, etc.

Debate

- Since this motion affects both faculty and academic staff, all senators may vote

Without objection, vote on motion postponed until next meeting.

C. First Reading – Motion from Academic Staff Personnel Committee

Report on Review of Interim Administrators – Vice and Assistant Chancellors and Directors – Senator Blackstone

- Companion piece to motion just presented – addresses interim administrators in areas academic staff report to
- Positives and negatives similar to last motion

Motion 42-AS-02

Moved and seconded by the Academic Staff Personnel Committee (7 for, 0 against) that the following changes to the Faculty and Academic Staff handbook, Chapter 5, pages 83 and 84 be approved:

PROCEDURES FOR REVIEWING VICE/ASSISTANT CHANCELLORS (page 83)

Vice/Assistant Chancellors are to be reviewed within three years of the initial appointment and every five years thereafter.

It is expected that interim appointments will normally not last more than two years. If a successful search has not been completed within two years of a position being filled with an interim administrator, the supervisor shall formally consult with Senate Executive Committee annually until a successful search is completed. When an interim administrator serves for more than two years, the administrator will be reviewed according to the above schedule.

The review is to be initiated by the Chancellor, etc.

PROCEDURES FOR REVIEWING UNIT DIRECTORS (page 84)

Unit Directors are to be reviewed within three years of the initial appointment and every five years thereafter.

It is expected that interim appointments will normally not last more than two years. If a successful search has not been completed within two years of a position being filled with an interim administrator, the supervisor shall formally consult with Senate Executive Committee annually until a successful search is completed. When an interim administrator serves for more than two years, the administrator will be reviewed according to the above schedule.

The review is to be initiated by the Provost/Vice, Vice or Associate Vice Chancellor, etc.

Debate

- Since this motion affects both faculty and academic staff, all senators may vote
- When implement rules, means use discretion for special circumstances, such as current provost who was interim for six months, then out for six months, then back to interim provost again
  - Would leave decision up to supervisor and Executive Committee
- Pages 82 to 84 of Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook cover faculty and academic staff review of these various administrators so was decision of chair that all senators vote on motions

Without objection, vote on motion postponed until next meeting.

D. First Reading – Motion from Compensation Committee


- Possibility 3.02% pay increase told will be in effect for 2006-2007 may be increased due to contract negotiations with represented groups
  - Not sure what increase might be or when it would happen
In preparation for possibility, Compensation Committee extended plan
- Put back in tables much like previous years when didn’t know what pay plan increase was going to be
- If do get adjustment, tables direct how much money available in each of various categories for distribution

Response to question about report
- Still governed by 1/3, 1/3, 1/3 Rule
  - One-third of plan must be distributed on solid performance, one-third on merit/market; other third can float
  - Under our plan, included compression concept in merit/market portion, which we have set to minimum
  - So if get additional funds, have to increase that to keep up to one-third level

Motion 42-CP-02
Moved and seconded by Compensation Committee (6 for, 0 against) that the following changes to the 2006-2007 Comprehensive Salary Plan be approved:

5. Salary Adjustments from the Pay Plan
Salary adjustments shall be based on criteria for periodic performance review as identified in the appropriate sections of the University of Wisconsin – Eau Claire Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook.

The following tables indicate the approximate funds available under each UW-Eau Claire category for a 3.02% Pay Plan increase assuming specific pay plan percentage increases. Unused Equity funds shall be distributed as Longevity for administrative and professional academic staff and as Compression for faculty and instructional academic staff. If the Pay Plan increase is two percent or less, no merit is available, and the full increase is distributed to Solid Performance. Should the actual Pay Plan increase fall between rows of these tables (e.g., 2.50%), the approximate funds available under each UW – Eau Claire category shall be determined by interpolation. For Administrative and Professional Academic Staff, from 2.01% to 3.49%, only one merit is available; from 3.50% to 4.99%, one or two merits are available; and at 5.00% or above, one, two, or three merits are available. Each merit/market award shall be in the amount of $400. All merit adjustments approved under the anticipated 3.02% pay plan shall be awarded before additional merit adjustments are awarded.

### Administrative and Professional Academic Staff Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent Increase</th>
<th>Merit/Market</th>
<th>Solid Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Longevity/Equity</td>
<td>Merit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Administrative and Professional Academic Staff Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent Increase</th>
<th>Merit/Market</th>
<th>Solid Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Longevity/Equity</td>
<td>One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Faculty and Instructional Academic Staff Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent Increase</th>
<th>Merit/Market</th>
<th>Solid Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compression/Equity</td>
<td>Merit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Debate

- Motion to amend something previously adopted requires two-thirds vote because body not notified in advance of this meeting
- Motion pertains to faculty and academic staff salary plan, so all senators vote
- Provost’s Office privy to where compression and equity money goes
  - Could also be figured out using salaries published annually
- Oppose whole idea of telling us we get a 3% pay raise, then taking our money to enhance salaries of colleagues
  - Have nothing against my colleagues, we all are underpaid
  - Is regents’ responsibility to award for compression, equity and merit; when announce we get a 3% pay plan and it turns out to be 2%, that is propaganda
- System Advisory Committee on Compensation meeting April 27, 2006; Chair Gapko and Senator Wick to attend
- Need to interpolate to get data for values other than those specifically in tables
- On Administrative and Professional Academic Staff Funds table, 0.82% for merit (at the 3.5% increase level) represents pool of money available to fund merit increases
  - Individuals receive one or two merits at $400, and $800 respectively, not 0.82%
  - Same is true for 1.17% funding one, two, or three merits at 5% increase level
- When looked at 3.02%, thought better to fund more $400 merit awards than to fund some at $800
- Will now take ranked list for single merit increase and fund another merit for people high on that ranked list with leftover money after everyone on list awarded single merit increase of $400
  - As always will use merged ranking from various divisions and units with administrative team drawing line

MOTION by Senator Wick to suspend the rules to vote on the motion at this meeting seconded and PASSED by two-thirds vote.

Continued Debate

- If don’t pass motion today, salary plan would offer administration no guidance on how to use possible pay increase above 3.02%
  - What presented here philosophically in line with what we have done in past

**Vote on Motion 42-CP-02:** Motion PASSED without dissention.

Without objection, meeting adjourned at 3:55 p.m.

Submitted by,

Wanda Schulner
Secretary to the University Senate