Members Present:

Rose Battalio, Judy Blackstone, Janice Bogstad, Jacqueline Bonneville, Don Bredle, Jennifer Brockpahler, Michael Carney, Maria DaCosta, Patrick Day, Margaret Devine, Gary Don, Michael Dorsher, Jeff Erger, Leslie Foster, Mitchell Freymiller, Alan Gallaher, Andrea Gapko, Susan Harrison, Ann Hoffman, Robert Hollon, Larry Honl, Robert Hooper, Debra Jansen, Fred Kolb, Brian Levin-Stankevich, Bruce Lo, Barbara Lozar, Steven Majstorovic, Karl Markgraf, Susan Mc Intyre, Sean McAleer, Sue Moore, Mike Morrison, Jill Prushiek, Donna Raleigh, Scott Robertson, Richard Ryberg, Earl Shoemaker, Sheila Smith, Jan Stirm, Lois Taft, Charles Vue, Scott Whitfield, Michael Wick, Deborah Wright

Members Absent:


Guests:

Donald Christian, Jan Morse, Teresa O’Halloran, Andrew Phillips

The regular meeting of University Senate was called to order by Chair Harrison at 3:05 p.m. on Tuesday, April 10, 2007 in the Council Fire Room of Davies Center.

I. Minutes of March 27, 2007 University Senate meeting approved as distributed

II. Chancellor’s Remarks – Chancellor Levin-Stankevich

• Provost search now concluded
  • Grateful to all members of search committee, particularly Jim Oberly and Karen Havholm as co-chairs
  • Worked extremely hard for long period of time
  • Would not have been a good decision without their valued input, especially at end of process
  • Had four great candidates; delighted Steve Tallant has taken position
  • Dr. Tallant has tremendous amount of institutional knowledge, which I don’t have
  • Will sit down tomorrow to address priorities in his new life
• Off next week to Japan with Dean Rhoades to continue relationships with people there before she retires
• Also to build new relationships advantageous to students, faculty and staff
• Today held sixth of eight sessions on strategic planning
  • Trying to identify steeples and how to reinforce and take full advantage of those strengths, building on good decisions made at this institution over many years
  • Need to do that in changing environment
  • To hold sessions with department chairs and directors facilitated by UW-Madison personnel to spend time usefully
  • If want to be part of process and have ideas to contribute, can attend any of these sessions
    • Or email ideas and check out website for notes and ideas brought up in past sessions
• On May 5, 2007 will host breakfast and morning retreat
  • To identify most important ideas from sessions and begin to outline work groups to prepare white papers offering comparative perspectives on issues identified
• What other people are doing, where we are in competitive perspective, how to build on that, what it will take, and what implications are
• Canons of distinctiveness that have come forward include
  • Undergraduate/faculty collaborative research
  • International perspective provided on this campus
  • Student engagement, including service-learning, internships, and other forms
  • And student leadership
  • Also strengths in specific academic programs and disciplines
• Can draw heavily from Higher Learning Commission accreditation groups in terms of environmental scan of where we are, where rest of state is, where peers are
• Must redefine our aspirational peers which may be different for disciplines and for residential environment
  • Pull best from all those institutions; do gap analysis to see if we can get there and what decisions it would take
• Then the fun starts as get to budget process; all areas welcome rebudgeting process because are sure they are underfunded and funding for area will be increased
  • Need basic principles and values that come out of these discussions in order to make budget decisions on where to focus our energies and resources to make UW-Eau Claire more distinctive than in past

III. Chair’s Report – Chair Harrison
• Resolution supporting Growth Agenda approved at last meeting sent to President Reilly

IV. Faculty Representative’s Report – Senator Wick
• Met in Madison on March 30, 2007
• Discussed
  • Collegial coverage and sick leave document that will be discussed today
    • Received mixed reactions
    • Concern over supervisor correction of submitted leave reports
    • Considerable concern over phrase that includes reporting leave as condition of employment in contracts
  • Discussion on collective bargaining – largely trying to figure out details
  • Discussion on Wisconsin Technical College transfer program and what role faculty governance has or has not played there and what role it should play
  • Got update on faculty recruitment and retention fund distribution policies which have been drafted by system; got information to try to guide revision
• Next meeting on May 4, 2007 is joint meeting with Academic Staff Representatives and system folks

V. Academic Staff Representative’s Report – Senator Blackstone
• Written report distributed
• Would be glad to forward to anyone interested the revised and updated criminal background check template that has come out from system
• Will be talking about Fringe Benefit Advisory Committee recommendations later today
  • Need to send letter to UW System from governance group giving feedback

VI. Announcements
• Next senate meeting on April 24, 2007

VII. Unfinished Business
A. Second Reading – Motion from Faculty Personnel Committee
  • Topic originally before us on February 27, 2007 for first reading; after considerable debate, motion referred back to Faculty Personnel Committee for reconsideration
  • Revised motion quite similar to initial motion with following substantive changes
    • Omit restriction of time at rank to teaching time
    • Reduction of time at UW-Eau Claire from three years to two – so in third year here, can apply
● Rationale for second sentence where promotion in rank also recognizes future potential
  ● Was thought this may be in conflict with those seeing promotion as primarily backward looking; committee view was that promotion is primarily backward looking, but that does not exclude some future expectations of performance

Without objection, revised motion accepted as substitute for main motion previously under consideration.

Continued Debate on Motion
● No longer any restriction on whether five years FTE at rank was teaching or administrative
● Exceptions clause would allow for departments to consider someone doing very, very well earlier than five years
● Problem with idea of exceptions is have to make argument why this is necessary – don’t see it alleviating problem of retention of great faculty in departments
  ● Five year rule at assistant professor might be a little high – why not say three years if that is what really means
● Guidelines extremely helpful from perspective of people coming in, department personnel committees, and deans
  ● Exceptions to guidelines should require that people be exceptional; if lower rule, some departments would promote everyone
● Preamble uses terms like meritorious performance, future potential, and assuming greater responsibility which sound like performance criteria not minimums as section is titled
  ● Bring this up because putting additional requirements in this document results in more work across campus as department evaluation plans (DEP) must be changed to bring promotion language in line with this
  ● Don’t know if inserting new criteria is worth extra labor
● Section would not constrain hiring faculty without terminal degrees – pertains only to promotion to ranks
● Not sure of purpose of another two years at UW-Eau Claire at every rank, especially at associate professor level
  ● Could require two years up front before being considered for any promotion
● Part of it is promoting people and rewarding them for things they have done here; included in ranks because is criterion for promotion to that rank
● Important to demonstrate in UW-Eau Claire environment you can function at high level at given rank
● Good reason to leave two-year requirement off at assistant professor level is for those hired without terminal degree at instructor level with condition they would be promoted when they earn their terminal degree
● Also need requirement at professor level for those coming in at associate level
● This is for eligibility – promotion takes place based on recommendations of appropriate committee
  ● Think this is shrinking pool of eligible people at different levels
  ● Some people when hired do not get complete credit for other experience; five years at associate level will reduce pool of eligible people for promotion
● Sentence at end leaves plenty of flexibility for exceptional cases

MOTION by Senator Whitfield to postpone vote for two weeks seconded.

Debate on Postponement
● Have not had full discussion of revised motion with department; important for each department to consider
● Favor postponement since in process of revising DEP; would have to change language if motion passes
● Favor delay – no time constraint on revision

Motion PASSED. Vote on motion postponed to next meeting. Ask that suggested amendments be circulated prior to meeting if possible.

B. Second Reading – Motion from Faculty Personnel Committee
  Affirmative Action Complaints and Grievances

Continued Debate on Motion
● None

Vote on Motion 43-FP-03: Motion PASSED by vote of faculty senators without dissention.
C. Second Reading – Motion from Academic Staff Personnel Committee
Affirmative Action Complaints and Grievances

Continued Debate on Motion
- Is difference between faculty and academic staff versions, with faculty deleting last paragraph containing specific contact information, because two groups chose to treat differently as is their prerogative

Vote on Motion 43-AS-01: Motion PASSED by vote of academic staff senators without dissention.

VIII. Reports of Committees
- Academic Policies Committee – Senator Hollon
- Today supported request for entitlement to plan major in materials science and request for entitlement to plan bachelor’s degree and major in liberal studies – will be coming to full senate next meeting
- Physical Plant Planning Committee – Senator Kolb
- At last meeting, passed motion to come before senate regarding Putnam Park Parking Lot conversion to green space
- Compensation Committee – Vice Chair Gapko
- No additional meetings scheduled
- Only two topics left on agenda previously set for this year include
  - How instructional academic staff salaries being used in part to fund post-tenure review salary adjustments for faculty
  - Overload payment per credit
- Question is whether enough interest by senators to have those topics come to this body – ask people concerned about either topic to let me know
- Problem with $12,000 maximum overload per calendar year is would require legislative action to change
  - If have good way of approaching that, let committee know
- Executive Committee – Chair Harrison
- Motion related to change in term of faculty representative approved and will be before you today
- Nominating Committee – Senator Don
- At moment have only one nominee for vice chair – current Vice Chair Andrea Gapko
- Since chair-elect is University Faculty member, vice chair would be University Academic Staff
- No additional nominations from floor

IX. Special Reports
- None

X. Miscellaneous Business
A. First Reading – Motion from Executive Committee
Report on Faculty Representative Term – Vice Chair Gapko
- Noticed one office listed on report form is different from rest as far as when changeover takes place
- Motion would change faculty representative’s start date to earlier time

Motion 43-SE-03
MOVED and seconded by Executive Committee (12 for, 0 against) that the following change to the Bylaws of University Senate, Faculty Representative to UW System, Chapter 3, page 24 of the Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook be approved.

19. The Faculty Representative to the University of Wisconsin System shall be elected by the faculty members and from the tenured faculty members of the University Senate at the first fall-semester meeting of the University Senate of even-numbered years. The term of office shall be for two years beginning with the start end of the academic year in odd-numbered years.

Debate
- Support this motion – makes perfect sense
MOTION by Senator Wick that we suspend the rules to vote on this today seconded and PASSED by two-thirds vote.

Continued Debate on Motion
• None

Vote on Motion 43-SE-03: Motion PASSED without dissention.

B. Discussion of Leave Reporting Recommendations
• Letter from President Reilly dated March 16, 2007 noted he would appreciate comments and any additional suggestions for improvement on proposed administrative and policy changes to address Legislative Audit Bureau findings and recommendations in regard to leave reporting by May 16, 2007
  • Some, if not all, policy changes necessitate regent action
  • Two personnel committees have asked that this information be discussed at full senate
• Introduction to Recommendations by Fringe Benefits Advisory Committee – UW-Eau Claire Representative on Committee Senator Kolb
  • Spoke to you earlier and distributed handout on this subject; committee has held meetings and subcommittee meetings since then
  • Process still in flux – committee headed in direction of more significant change; faculty representatives and others influenced to move more slowly
  • Currently we have nice benefit, especially for those able to stay long enough to collect it
    • Probably a benefit that would not be created today
    • As strategy, when benefit is on the line, self-reporting is not a good system
  • Do have system of self-reporting; was looked at and found reporting was not at level it could be
    • To preserve benefit, administration wants to signal we will be sharp on reporting
    • Means in some cases being a little more careful, in other cases educating people, and in very few cases (five to seven people on each campus) doing things to make those people who refuse or have never turned in a leave report to act
  • Some schools have tried hour-by-hour basis rather than half-day units; can work
  • Evaluation of continued use of collegial coverage is tricky part
  • Committee uniformly felt there is no need for sick leave during sabbatical as there is no basis for report
  • Alternative model for defined work schedule will take time to put together
    • Keep in mind that with right work schedule, no one would ever need sick leave and there would be no reason to give it to us
• Deadline date for Policy Areas for Further Evaluation is October
• Floor open for comments to be sent to system
  • Why two forms when one used to work? Compliance issues, or convenience?
    • See it as waste of paper and trees
    • May feel people will misreport leave if looking at balances
    • Employees deserve to know how many hours of sick leave they have; as send in single report, should have not have give up attached records
  • Will there be leniency for people who don’t always get form in by the 10th of the month?
    • Getting form in requires several signatures – faculty could be penalized for supervisor, dean, or chair not getting forms to right office by right date
  • Might be people concerned about others knowing they are taking vacation instead of sick leave – might not want anyone to know their medical issues
    • Could report split of vacation and sick time used at end of year
    • Faculty do not have vacation; academic staff do get vacation
  • Are times that faculty are not here, not sick, and not necessarily working from home or at a conference – no way to record that
    • Don’t have problem with that because know faculty usually work 60 hours per week
    • Difficult to establish work hours for faculty who work most hours they are not asleep
  • If adopt an electronic form, could provide instructions via link
    • Not aware of people having problems filling out form
  • Would be great if generic blank form online could be filled out
• Do not presently have to report conference attendance
• Employee education parts are common business practices – reasonable to go ahead and do
• Would like more clarity on what is sick leave or vacation
  • Example would be funeral leave – don’t have that and is inconsistent reporting
• Those guidelines are available in UPG and in handbook
  • Basic rule is to define 40-hour work week and once you define it, if gone during that period of time, have to claim it either as sick leave or vacation if you have it
• Suggest that be clarified and made more public as lot of inconsistencies in how that is done
• Realize doing this to try to keep benefit, but offends me as professional working weekends and evenings
  • Defined work week totally ignores that
• Pilot project could sample faculty and chronicle what they do in a week and how many hours they work – most people spend 60 to 70 hours working
  • Effort underway earlier this year by Leader-Telegram reporter to shadow faculty member did not come to fruition
• Is need for defining when collegial coverage can be used and when it can’t
• When gone, collegial coverage only covers class period and office hours, otherwise must take sick leave
• Issue is not whether this is insult to our professional commitment, but how to preserve it in a political time
  • Concern is that may lose sick leave as benefit if we do not figure out some way to explain to people when we are using it and when we aren’t
• If not under contract over Winterim, is one supposed to be in office?
• Faculty have 39-week contract which covers from about August 20th to May 20th – technically under contract during Winterim
• Way things are headed, if I am given a choice between some kind of informal time clock or giving up sick leave, I will give up sick leave
• Many of us are concerned about sick leave benefits as we come close to retirement, please don’t take my accumulated sick leave because you are unhappy
• Issue really isn’t about sick leave, but about having some level of control and monitoring of what faculty do by a particular branch of legislature
• If have to account for every hour of every day, will still work 55 hours
  • Will feel slimed about filling out reports that really are not accurate
  • Will also feel vulnerable about other issues somebody might go after us as well
• Legislators have schedules very similar to ours – they don’t sit in an office either
• A few weeks ago, elected officials sick leave was taken away
• Is there any sense there could be backlash from faculty?
  • Do fair amount of work when not under contract, some of that expected
  • Is there potential faculty will then not be available when not under contract?
• Agree part of this is political, but don’t forget financial part
  • At end of career, will have upwards of $100,000 to spend on health insurance; is to our benefit to hold onto that
    • Part of issue is culture that we don’t work for our money, but part is it will cost a lot
  • Because of lower salaries, when all is said and done, it is a wash
• If they cut our benefits, don’t believe for a minute salary will go up
• Believe this is more financial than political
  • Other universities around country do not have sick time – recognize that it is not relevant for faculty
  • Seems reasonable to me that if we want the benefit, we need to figure out some system where we can provide data needed
• Right now for sick leave if you are gone less than two hours, you report nothing
  • For over two hours, you report a half day
  • Under new policy, for every single hour you are gone, you must report sick leave
  • Would take small benefit away – this is one place might want to use forceful language to stop change
• Don’t think system being unnecessarily cumbersome is good reason to switch to hour-to-hour reporting
• Hour-by-hour reporting based on defined work week, but could be some flexibility for such things as evening workshops; not really something someone will come in and catch you on
• Perhaps it would be much more advantageous for us to document all work hours rather than fixed, defined 40-hour week
Keeping track on hour-by-hour basis likely to lead to people being inaccurate as can’t remember about such-and-such day

Some of discussion about work week is really what we are looking for in evaluating alternative models for defined work schedules as relates to sick leave in Part III of handout
  ● Is serious thought to begin looking at that issue
  ● Might have opposite effect
    ● If people start chronicling hours they work, might get resentful and stop working as many hours; students would be who suffers
  ● It is not a matter of accounting for your time hour-for-hour, but accounting for leave you are taking on hour-for-hour basis – it is a matter of reporting that leave
  ● Administrative Officer Morse has talked to system about issues – no clear answer on whether you will get hours back if don’t get report in by the 10th
    ● Also are issues about being at conference or if supervisor doesn’t get report in
  ● In field-intensive and other flexible programs, issue is who can sign report when employee not present and not available
    ● For six or seven people per campus, this is elephant gun for a mouse
    ● Each individual campus should deal with problem of non-compliance as need be
    ● Background on this is how people in payroll office can get repetitive individuals who will not turn reports in to comply – alternatives would be wonderful, but it is labor intensive process to get reports in
    ● Could make a distinction between repetitive offenders and occasional late person
    ● Part II.2.a., c., and d. would be less onerous and punitive to people who occasionally have problems
      ● b. and e. should not be enacted no matter what
    ● If we don’t meet powers-that-be somewhere in the middle, they will be dictating terms
      ● As distasteful as some of these points may be, think there has to be a spirit of compromise
      ● Should take preemptive approach to choose some of the language
    ● Could do away with a lot Item II.2. if changed d. to permit supervisors to submit and correct leave reports that appear to be inaccurate or missing
      ● If faculty member not complying, supervisor can complete and submit report
    ● As supervisor, would prefer to let those people suffer consequences and not have me do their job for them
    ● Two kinds of things going on here
      ● One is being subjected to injustice about having to claim sick time and to define that
      ● Second piece is how we are going to comply with paperwork requirements
      ● Might be well served by showing lots of compliance with filling out forms in order to maintain flexibility about choosing which things actually have to go on them
    ● Learned more rules about how to make out sick leave reports today than ever knew before
      ● Is great need for dissemination of information so people know what to do
  ● Personnel committee chairs and chair of senate can work on summary for letter to system

Without objection, meeting adjourned at 4:48 p.m.

Submitted by,

Wanda Schulner
Secretary to the University Senate