The regular meeting of University Senate was called to order by Chair Wood at 3:05 p.m. on Tuesday, November 13, 2007 in the Tamarack Room of Davies Center.

I. Minutes of October 23, 2007 University Senate meeting approved as distributed

II. Chancellor’s Remarks – Chancellor Levin-Stankevich

- Spoke to you since state budget passed and sent out lot of information; assuming you have all seen that
- Strategic planning work group reports due today; reports, comments, and charrette comments go to University Planning Committee (UPC)
  - Will put in form more like traditional strategic plan with directions and goals for future available in January for another round of campus comments
  - Will then go back to UPC for rewriting so have strategic plan in February
- Work group three held number of focus groups with various segments of community – health care, business leadership, non-profits, educators
  - Got interesting, consistent feedback on perceptions of university, interactions with university, and directions we might pursue
  - Most of it supportive of our ongoing discussion
- Next step as strategic plan is being written and priorities decided is getting budget process to follow
- Worked with Chair Wood to put together strategic budgeting process task force to look at different models between now and March
  - Fred Kolb has agreed to chair task force; in process of jointly appointing members
    - Will also be three faculty, two academic staff, one classified staff and one student member on task force; will get membership out to everyone when process complete
    - Support staff to be Stephanie Jamelske and Dave Gessner
- Announced at opening breakfast that signed American College and University Presidents Climate Commitment
First step is establishing institutional structure; have been watching earlier signatories reports and looking at structures they created
- Not something to assign to a few people; what to make it part of how we work and how we think
- Number of elements
  - Physical steps (having to do with physical plant, heating, cooling, HVAC systems, recycling) to reduce greenhouse-gas emissions
  - Educational element to include sustainability as part of student education and learning community
  - Also academic component, number of faculty and staff banded together over time to work on environmental issues across disciplines
- Created small advisory group of faculty, academic staff, and a student; largely from sciences
- To do gas-emission study of campus (our carbon footprint) which must be done by year from now
- Are number of models for how to do that; would like to see students and faculty involved as part of undergraduate research projects or part of classes
- In meantime, will commit to one or two other steps such as access to Eau Claire Transit for faculty, staff and students
  - Receiving ideas on constant basis so will seek advice from advisory group on how to order that
  - Lots of room for initiative; need to know about actions taken, not to control them, but to document some reduction in greenhouse-gas emissions as move toward longer-term plan
- Davies Center construction also figures in; as does academic building that hope will be in construction mode in next biennium
- Formal two-month report due in December
  - Fund announced to assist universities signatory to this agreement reduce carbon emissions
    - Funds in form of loans and/or grants
    - Will have to look at that to take advantage of those resources
- Always have students and faculty doing great things
- Athletics had tremendous run over last few weeks
  - Soccer went to NCAA regionals
  - Volleyball came in fourth but went to regionals because of strength of Wisconsin Athletic Conference
  - Womens’ cross country headed to sectionals after competing in regionals
  - Football team just invited to regionals based on strength of schedule and wins this year
- Tribute to coaching staff and leadership they provide; run a clean program
  - To win in that environment with that philosophy is real tribute to them
- Playing the Badgers allowed good opportunity to meet with alumni and talk about other good things doing at university

III. Unfinished Business
- None

IV. New Business
A. First Reading – Motion from Faculty Personnel Committee

Report on DPC Functional Equivalent – Senator McAleer
- Motion gives departments an opportunity for DPCs to specify alternatives to functional equivalent; primarily affects small departments, but for promotions may affect some larger departments
- In paragraph (3), should read post-tenure review subcommittee not promotion subcommittee

Motion 43-FP-01
MOVED and seconded by Faculty Personnel Committee (5 for, 0 against) that the following changes to the Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook, Chapter 5, pages 10, 26, and 29 be made:

1. FASH 5.10

Functional Equivalent

If the Department Personnel Committee cannot be formed because of insufficient numbers of eligible members, then, unless the Department Evaluation Plan specifies other procedures for designating the functional equivalent of a Department Personnel Committee in such situations, the Department Chair
or Unit Director shall operate as the functional equivalent of the Department Personnel Committee and must formally consult with those faculty eligible for membership on the committee.

(2)  

\textit{FASH 5.26}  

\textbf{Promotion Subcommittees}

\textbf{Functional Equivalent}

If any of the promotion subcommittees cannot be formed because of insufficient numbers of eligible members, then, \textit{unless the Department Evaluation Plan specifies other procedures for designating the functional equivalent of a Promotion Subcommittee in such situations}, the Department Chair or Unit Director shall operate as the functional equivalent of the promotion subcommittee and must formally consult with those faculty eligible for membership on the subcommittee. Consultation with the eligible members must be reported to the next administrative level. The Chair or Director shall provide written notification to those eligible members of the recommendation being forwarded, and those members must be provided an opportunity to attach written comments to be included with the recommendations forwarded through the administrative channels.

(3)  

\textit{FASH 5.29}  

\textbf{Post-tenure Review Subcommittees}

\textbf{FUNCTIONAL EQUIVALENT}

If any of the post-tenure review subcommittees cannot be formed because of insufficient numbers of eligible members, then, \textit{unless the Department Evaluation Plan specifies other procedures for designating the functional equivalent of a Post-tenure Review Subcommittee in such situations}, the Department Chair in conjunction with the faculty eligible for membership on the appropriate post-tenure review subcommittee shall operate as the functional equivalent of the post-tenure review subcommittee.

\textbf{Debate}

- Accepted as edited with \textit{post-tenure review} replacing \textit{promotion} in paragraph (3)
- Examples of what department has done as alternative
  - Foundations of Education about five years ago came up with process because had no one tenured except chair
    - Person up for tenure or promotion submits to chair a list of three to five faculty members holding appropriate rank willing to review materials of candidate
    - Chair, in consultation with faculty member, chooses three faculty members to form committee to review candidate’s materials and forward recommendation to chair
    - Chair independently makes recommendation as well
    - Committee does not have same statutory standing as DPC within a department; just additional group of people to look at materials
  - Another example would be if only two eligible members for given committee or subcommittee, DEP could state functional equivalent would be chair plus those two members in formal consultation
- Sympathetic to this; own department has that kind of issue – would support
- Would be limit to number of models that could be used in sense that every DEP needs to be approved at administrative level; no limit in this provision
- Seemed better not to set limits at handbook level

\textbf{MOTION} by Senator Stirm \textbf{that we suspend the rules to vote on this today} seconded and \textbf{PASSED} by two-thirds vote.

\textbf{Continued Debate on Motion}

- None

\textbf{Vote on Motion 43-FP-01:} Motion \textbf{PASSED} by University Faculty senators.

\textbf{B.  First Reading – Motion from Executive Committee}

\textbf{Report on Resolution to Support UW-River Falls Health Insurance Petition – Vice Chair Gapko}

- Brought by Chair Wood from faculty representative colleague; River Falls interested in support for petition from all campuses
Executive Committee discussed and felt it appropriate to support
Recommendation was to endorse petition and also come up with stronger resolution in future
Health insurance available at approximately same rate for UWEC faculty who live in Minnesota and work here
  Most, however, have had to switch to standard plan with reduction in coverage; more costly with higher
  deductibles and limited providers
  UW-River Falls just leading edge of this
State does not seem to be working to advantage of campuses located away from major metropolitan areas
  Allows companies to chop state into different areas of coverage and offer drastically different packages in
  both price and quality of coverage depending upon area of state
One major consideration was dropping of Preferred One network of physicians and facilities for all plans; limits
  access to many physicians that people already seeing
Could also have been that Preferred One did not bid because of losing money; can’t be forced to pick up
contract
Intent is to ask Employee Trust Funds to figure out better way to approach this
Problem is lack of system that covers River Falls, Pierce and St. Croix Counties; need to contract with company
in Minnesota to provide those services – also affects Stout and Superior

Motion 43-SE-01
MOVED and seconded by Executive Committee (12 for, 0 against) that the University Senate endorse the
Petition for an Equitable, Reasonable, and Affordable Quality Health Care Plan for all Faculty and Staff
at the University of Wisconsin – River Falls below:

 Whereas, most UWRF faculty and staff did not learn details of major changes in the 2008 Health Care Plans
 until Wednesday, October 17, 2007; and

 Whereas, prior to the meeting, many received incomplete and inconsistent information; and

 Whereas, the ETF appears to have committed to health plans without knowing the complete list of their network
 providers; and

 Whereas, UWRF faculty and staff have received pay packages which have lagged behind the Consumer Price
 Index for 10 of the last 10 years by on average 1% per year plus compounding; and

 Whereas, UWRF is having more and more difficulty attracting and keeping quality faculty and staff; and

 Whereas, the Tier 1 Health Care Plan does not meet the needs of this campus: the provider network includes few
 if any Minnesota-based providers, despite the fact that many UWRF faculty and staff live in Minnesota and most
 specialists who practice within a reasonable distance of River Falls are in Minnesota; and

 Whereas, the Tier 2 Health Care Plan is no better than Tier 1 in terms of access to clinics, hospitals and
 specialist networks, offers extremely limited access to Minnesota-based providers and will cost 2.5 times as
 much as the Tier 1 plan; and

 Whereas, the Tier 3 Health Care Plan will cost UWRF employees residing in Wisconsin approximately
 $4,296.00 per year in annual premiums along with (assuming out of network providers) a $4000.00 annual co-
 insurance (based on UAC) for the family plan, $2,000 prescription drug maximum, and offers no vision or
 dental coverage; and

 Whereas, our geographic location places us in the federally demarcated Greater Twin
 Cities Metropolitan Region, which has a higher cost of living than many other areas served by UW System
 institutions; and

 Whereas, the University needs a fair and good quality health care plan with an affordable price that would
 enable UWRF employees access to the excellent network of healthcare providers in the Twin Cities area (25 to
 35 miles from UWRF); therefore,
Be it resolved that the Faculty and Staff with the endorsement of the Faculty Senate are requesting the following actions:

1. the usual and customary timelines should be suspended and a new AFFORDABLE, QUALITY Tier 1 and an AFFORDABLE, QUALITY Tier 2 plan that includes Minnesota providers be made available for calendar year 2008.
2. a representative from western Wisconsin be named to the ETF board

MOTION by Senator Morrison that we suspend the rules to vote on this today seconded and PASSED by two-thirds vote.

V. University Senate Chair’s/Faculty Representative’s Report – Chair Wood

- Aaron Wingad, Student Senate Liaison to University Senate, introduced
- Sick leave accrual policy to be discussed at joint faculty and academic staff representatives meeting on November 15, 2007
  - Not radically different than how weighed in on this campus
  - Colleague coverage offset provision to be eliminated even though our willingness to get rid of provision not supported by other campuses
  - Accrual of sick leave to continue during sabbaticals
  - Recommend existing cap on maximum number of sick leave days that can be accrued in any one year (which has been waived for several years) be observed if individual campuses want to enforce as consequence of not filing sick leave reports accurately

- Discussion
  - Don’t know who on each campus has responsibility of deciding to cap sick leave – would seem to be personnel matter
  - System intends to provide fact sheets about how this works
  - Cap is 6.4 days for 9-month contract; 8.5 days for full-year contract
  - No other campus mentioned flex time – probably since can already, under existing provisions, file a 40-hour work week and change that at will; already sort of have flex time
  - Would be long time and system must work better before vote to propose caps
  - If don’t file a workweek schedule, standard workweek assumed
  - Policy requires filing form by 10th of each month – currently this institution doesn’t have policy to cap benefits so have not specified when that would come into play
  - Chair Wood to find out whose job it is to determine that type of policy

- Later in this meeting, Interim Associate Vice Chancellor Phillips to give update on Higher Learning Commission self-study; we want to find ways to get governance more actively and centrally involved in that report

VI. Academic Staff Representative’s Report – Senator Brockpahler

- None

VII. Reportable Items from Committees

- Executive Committee – Chair Wood

FOR THE RECORD ITEM

Academic Calendar 2009-2010

- As body, senate no longer considers all options for academic calendars; calendar for 2009-2010 on web
- Pam Scheible now liaison – taking this duty from Jan Morse
Without objection, Academic Calendar 2009-2010 entered into senate record.

- Also at Executive Committee, objection made to advertisements in UWEC directory perceived as being demeaning to women at least and offensive to many people
  - Executive Committee unhappy to see ads for Chubbys Gentlemen’s Club
  - First amendment issues and awareness that is policy governing what advertisements go in publication left Executive Committee not wanting to put forward a resolution
  - Director of LTS, along with chair, baffled as to why this is under LTS authority; is policy in place and Craig Mey will talk to anyone with questions

- Discussion
  - Get two directories; do we need both?
  - Don’t see need for printed directory – seem obsolete; students don’t even pick them up
  - Points were discussed in Executive Committee as well
  - Ad revenue pays for printing of document – way to provide campus-wide telephone directory produced at no cost to campus
  - Don’t see as senate decision to keep directory; could pass resolution that don’t see need
  - Current limitations to online searching make printed directory useful in cases where name is common, or no longer registered student
  - If improve online system, could get rid of printed directory
  - Use printed directories often to find graduates; old directories usually give home address so can contact parents for things like job opportunities
  - Students also sell university directories – get good training selling ad space
  - Perhaps LTS could explore whether could do archival-type system
  - Information available on bridge system, but are reducing access
  - Family should be on My Blugold
  - Reasonable for LTS to discuss electronic resources and way to combine them
  - Senator Richmond to take concerns back to LTS
  - Students not included in first fall directory

VIII. Special Reports

Report on Higher Learning Commission Self-Study – Interim Associate Vice Chancellor Phillips

- About two weeks ago, self-study steering committee and study group chairs met with chancellor, executive staff, and planning committee to talk about first draft of first chapter of self-study report
- Process intended to be campus-wide discussion so thought best to bring draft to senate in two weeks
- Will send to senators via email attachment; includes eight challenges cited by Higher Learning Commission in 1999 and our response to those challenges
- Would like to hold discussion with senators about responses
  - May ring true, may have ways to better state, or information to strengthen arguments, or may not think chapter addresses challenges
  - Propose small groups to look at couple challenges per table with members of steering committee listening to discussion
- Over two-year period hope to review HLC document in pieces to get feedback
  - Invite you to share document with others; the more feedback we have, the better off we will be
  - Have lots of people to edit; would like you to look at big questions

IX. Miscellaneous Business

- None

X. Announcements

- None

Without objection, meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Submitted by,
Wanda Schulner
Secretary to the University Senate