Members Present:

Members Absent:
Robin Baker, Jennifer Brockpahler, Barbara Davis, Margaret Devine, Jeff Erger, Larry Honl, Jeffrey Janot, Fred Kolb, Brian Mahoney, Karl Markgraf, Sue Moore, Tariqe Niazi, Geoffrey Peterson, Mehdi Sheikholeslami, Laurie St. Aubin-Whelihan, Steve Tallant, Troy Terhark, Charles Vue, Rebecca Wurzer

Guests:
Donald Christian, Bernard Duyfhuizen, Chip Eckardt, Jennifer Lee, Gail Scukanec, Aaron Wingad

The regular meeting of University Senate was called to order by Chair Wood at 3:04 p.m. on Tuesday, April 8, 2008 in the Tamarack Room of Davies Center.

I. Minutes of March 11, 2008 University Senate meeting approved as distributed
Approved as distributed with minor editing

II. Chancellor’s Remarks – Chancellor Levin-Stankevich
Next Wednesday is the anniversary of the Virginia Tech tragedy
Over the course of the last year UWEC has been looking at emergency response issues
  • Have done a tabletop exercise that involved all the area emergency response agencies
  • Fire evacuation process should be taken more seriously as it is the same process used to evacuate in other emergency situations
  • Working on ways to create instant notification
    • As an incident is happening how can we notify people who might be in a dangerous area about that event
    • Testing of a text messaging notification process
    • First week of May UWEC will be testing notification technology
  • UWEC is looking at
    • Pushing a message out to every network computer that is active
      • A screen will come on and display an emergency message that might explain something or maybe very quickly can say where to go, such as an emergency page on the website
    • Emails
    • Voice over internet phones
    • Text messaging through 3rd party software
      • Would be a process to sign-up or opt out
      • Only 40% of students at Virginia Tech had given their cell phone number for emergency notification purposes
Cell phone information would only be used for an emergency situation notification
Use the speakers on top of Schofield Hall for people outside of the buildings
Looking at the use of the fire alarm system
Want to make sure the use of these would not overload the system
Looking at when the police get notified they can, out of their dispatch area, send out a message from a predetermined list/menu on where to direct people to get more information
- On Wednesday, UWEC will sound a carol 32 times at the anniversary of the Virginia Tech shootings
- Our thoughts and condolences are with UW-Stout as they just went through the tragedy of losing 3 students in an off-campus fire
- Pay Plan Structure
  - We may be asked to default to the agreed upon union contracts
  - Instead of the 2% this July and a 1% next April the Unions have agreed to 1% in July and 2% next June
  - We’re urging UW System to not make the assumption that just because the union agrees to it, that everyone should be on this schedule
  - Remember that the Governor was talking about additional increases above and beyond the pay plan for certain classes of Universities and University employees
  - Understands that there is a significant differential in our salaries and Wisconsin is not keeping pace as we continue to lose people in the system
  - Will be disappointed if the pay plan structure changes from what it is already
- Goldwater Scholarship
  - Competitive award for Mathematics, Natural Sciences, and Engineering across the country
  - Promotes student success
  - Katie Klotz and Eric Weber received the Goldwater Scholarship
    - $7500 per student
  - Lee Behling received an honorable mention
  - Allowed to submit no more than 4 names and of the 4 applications, UWEC came away with 2 wins and 1 honorable mention
- 2 Fulbright Scholars at UWEC
  - Jill Pinkney-Pastrana and Michael Dorsher
- Strategic Plan
  - University Planning Committee to have the final draft of the Strategic Plan in 2 weeks
  - Chancellor to present it
  - Most likely on May 6, 2008
- Budget Process Task Force will have a recommendation at the end of the semester

III. Unfinished Business
Second Reading – Motion 44-FP-02 from Faculty Personnel Committee
Appeal Procedures: Promotion

### Appeal Procedures: Promotion Subcommittee Decisions

A faculty member may request an administrative review of the decision of a departmental promotion subcommittee not to recommend promotion provided that the faculty member meets the minimum degree and experience requirements for consideration for promotion to the rank sought.

The administrative review shall be conducted by the next highest administrative level not involved in the contested decision. During the course of this review, it shall be the responsibility of the faculty member to show cause why the issue of his/her promotion should receive further consideration. After reviewing the statement of the faculty member, the qualifications of the faculty member, and the facts relating to the promotion subcommittee's review, the reviewer may direct the promotion subcommittee to reconvene and to reconsider the issue on its merits. After reconsideration the promotion subcommittee shall submit a report to the reviewer including a recommendation and the justification for the recommendation. After considering the subcommittee's report, the reviewer shall make a report and a recommendation to the next highest administrative level not involved in the appeal. (US 10/99)
**Appeal Procedures: Administrative Decisions**

A faculty member may request the Chancellor to review administrative decisions not to recommend promotion provided that the following conditions have been met:

1. The faculty member meets the minimum degree and experience requirements for promotion to the rank sought.
2. The faculty member has been recommended for promotion by the appropriate promotion subcommittee in each of two separate years, and a negative recommendation has been recorded each year by any subsequent level of administrative review. (US 12/91)

**Reconsideration and Appeal of Denials of Promotion**

Upon receiving written notice of a decision to deny promotion, a faculty member who meets the minimum degree and experience requirements for promotion to the rank sought may within 10 days formally request reconsideration of the negative decision. A reconsideration is not a hearing, or an appeal, and should be non-adversarial in nature. The reconsideration shall take place within 20 days of the faculty member's request, and the faculty member shall be given at least 10 days advance written notice of the time and place of the reconsideration. It is the faculty member's obligation to provide good reasons why the negative decision merits reconsideration. The reconsidering party shall give fair and full consideration to all relevant materials, and shall, within 5 days of the reconsideration, inform the faculty member in writing of the results of reconsideration.

If reconsideration rescinds the initial negative decision, the application for promotion shall be forwarded to the next higher administrative level, if any, though the faculty member may not request reconsideration of a subsequent negative decision of the current application for promotion.

If reconsideration affirms the initial negative decision, the faculty member may, within 10 days of receiving the result of the reconsideration, formally appeal the negative decision to the next highest administrative level not involved in the contested decision. The faculty member's appeal shall be heard within 20 days of its initiation. It is the faculty member's obligation to provide good reasons why the negative decision should be overturned. After reviewing the relevant facts, the reviewer shall, within 5 days of hearing the appeal, decide the appeal and shall promptly inform the faculty member in writing of his or her decision and the reasons for it.

If the party hearing the appeal reverses the negative decision, the application for promotion shall be forwarded to the next higher administrative level, if any, though the faculty member may not appeal a subsequent negative decision of the current application for promotion. If the party hearing the appeal reaffirms the negative decision, the faculty member may neither request reconsideration of this reaffirmation nor appeal it.

Continued Debate
- Resume suspended conversation: Motion to amend brought back to the Senate with clarifying language

Accordingly, last meeting’s MOTION by Senator McAleer to amend the motion in the second paragraph to add the wording “or appeal” unanimously defeated

MOTION by Senator McAleer to replace the original motion with the language as amended to replace FASH 5.28 seconded and PASSED without dissention

Debate
- New amendment strikes reference to reconsideration
- Everyone gets an appeal and you don’t have to wait two years
- This is a motion to replace the original motion
CURRENT LANGUAGE

**APPEAL PROCEDURES: PROMOTION SUBCOMMITTEE DECISIONS**
A faculty member may request an administrative review of the decision of a departmental promotion subcommittee not to recommend promotion provided that the faculty member meets the minimum degree and experience requirements for consideration for promotion to the rank sought.

The administrative review shall be conducted by the next highest administrative level not involved in the contested decision. During the course of this review, it shall be the responsibility of the faculty member to show cause why the issue of his/her promotion should receive further consideration. After reviewing the statement of the faculty member, the qualifications of the faculty member, and the facts relating to the promotion subcommittee's review, the reviewer may direct the promotion subcommittee to reconvene and to reconsider the issue on its merits. After reconsideration the promotion subcommittee shall submit a report to the reviewer including a recommendation and the justification for the recommendation. After considering the subcommittee's report, the reviewer shall make a report and a recommendation to the next highest administrative level not involved in the appeal. (US 10/99)

**APPEAL PROCEDURES: ADMINISTRATIVE DECISIONS**
A faculty member may request the Chancellor to review administrative decisions not to recommend promotion provided that the following conditions have been met:

1. The faculty member meets the minimum degree and experience requirements for promotion to the rank sought.
2. The faculty member has been recommended for promotion by the appropriate promotion subcommittee in each of two separate years, and a negative recommendation has been recorded each year by any subsequent level of administrative review. (US 12/91)

**PROPOSED LANGUAGE** (striking all language related to reconsideration)

**APPEALS OF DENIALS OF PROMOTION**
Upon receiving written notice of a decision to deny promotion, a faculty member who meets the minimum degree and experience requirements for promotion to the rank sought may within 10 days formally appeal the negative decision to the next highest administrative level not involved in the contested decision. The faculty member’s appeal shall be heard within 20 days of its initiation. It is the faculty member’s obligation to provide good reasons why the negative decision should be overturned. After reviewing the relevant facts, the reviewer shall, within 5 days of hearing the appeal, decide the appeal and shall promptly inform the faculty member in writing of his or her decision and the reasons for it. If the reviewer reaffirms the negative decision, the faculty member may not appeal it. If the reviewer reverses the negative decision, the application for promotion shall be forwarded to the next higher administrative level, if any, though the faculty member may not appeal any subsequent negative decision of the current application for promotion.

Continued debate
- We are now substituting for the original motion
- Use this in place of the motion from last week
- Committee could not reach a quorum as there were not enough committee members at the last meeting, most likely due to spring break
- Thought it was unfair that you had to be denied twice before you had the right to appeal
- Amended motion doesn’t overcomplicate with an extra step
- Provost now comfortable with language
- New language does not mention reconsideration
- Currently, an appeal can result in a directed reconsideration as follows:
Hanbok states that a person whose promotion subcommittee does not recommend for promotion can appeal and then the next higher level of administration can direct that the subcommittee make a reconsideration.

After that reconsideration then that administrative level makes its own recommendation.

The reconsideration step is in the existing FASH but not in this motion.

If the language in the last sentence stating “…faculty member may not appeal any subsequent negative decision of the current application for promotion” were removed that would allow someone to appeal at every level all the way up to the Chancellor, every time and could become a problem.

This motion came to be because there was a clause in the existing FASH stating that you had to wait until the second year of denial to file an appeal.

In other areas, the handbook (chapter 5 page 27) talks about communication through the levels and in the new language that communication process is missing.

It currently states” If a department promotion subcommittee’s recommendation for promotion is not supported at any successive level of review, the official responsible for the decision not to support the recommendation will, in a timely manner, provide the promotion subcommittee chair and lower levels of administration with a written explanation of the decision not to support the recommendation.”

Under the proposed language the chair could reverse the decision/recommendation and not provide any explanation for that.

Was not the intent of the committee to allow the decision levels to avoid reporting their reasons.

Makes sense.

Day is defined as a calendar day.

MOTION by Senator Hollon to move to amend the proposed language on line 7 to state “After reviewing the relevant facts, the reviewer shall, within 5 days of hearing the appeal, decide the appeal and shall promptly inform the faculty member and all previous levels of review in writing of his or her decision and the reasons for it.” seconded and passed without dissention.

**Vote on Motion 44-FP-02:** Motion PASSED as amended to replace FASH 5.28 by University Faculty Senators without dissent.

IV. New Business

- Amend your agenda to reflect that there will be no new business.

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

- Thank the Chancellor and administration for their support of the faculty concern over the pay plan and their strong encouragement to UW System and the Regents to stick to what we thought we had coming.
- It’s bad enough that the 4 ½% is now 3% and to hear that it is really 1% could be very discouraging.
- Appreciate that administration is in support of some dialog on this campus as to a more carefully planned approach to IAS hiring and under what conditions people will be asked to work and for how long.
  - Grows out of system-wide concern.
  - Variation from campus to campus and department to department.
  - Situation that could lend itself to abuse.
- Faculty representatives to explore ways of improving working relationships between faculty and academic staff from all categories system-wide.
  - Administration is in support of these discussions.
- Rest of the Chair’s Report will be given on-line.
- Visitors coming from System.
  - Lisa Kornetsky, Ron Singer and Bob Jokisch.
  - Will come to Senate on April 22, 2008.
  - Talking to faculty and academic staff on working conditions, contract, salaries or anything that is a matter of concern.
- Our liaisons with the Central System Administration and indirectly, with the Regents.
VI. Academic Staff Representative’s Report – Senator Brockpahler
- Circulated a report online

VII. Reportable items from Committees
- Executive Committee – Chair Wood
- Faculty Personnel Committee – Senator McAleer
- Academic Staff Personnel Committee – Senator Brockpahler
- Academic Policies Committee – Senator Hollon
- Compensation Committee – Vice Chair Gapko
- Nominating Committee – Senator Don
  - Report on Nominees for Senate Chair-Elect
    - Nominee: Marty Wood, English
    - No additional nominations from the floor
    - Andrea Gapko, Chair Pro Tem, declared nominations closed
    - Election to be held at the next meeting

VIII. Special Reports – Jennifer Lee, Director, Center for Alcohol Studies/Blugold Parent and Family Office
- UWEC has been presented with a unique opportunity to participate in a Positive Response Pilot Project
- Minnesota Department of Public Health is creating an assessment program for campus communities
- An assessment tool that will be used to create a consulting procedure to use with other universities around the nation
- UWEC is the only school in the nation that is participating
- UWEC will benefit from some free consulting
- First part is an assessment
  - Majority will be completed via an online survey
  - Community members will be given a paper survey
  - Faculty, staff, students, community members, taverns and restaurants in Eau Claire will be participating
  - Talking about attitudes, norms and cultures
  - Takes a comprehensive look at alcohol and alcohol use in our community
  - Designated to assess the culture of drinking on campuses
- Over the summer UWEC will provide our policies and procedures
- UWEC will be given a report at the end of the summer
- 23% of UWEC students have not used alcohol in the past 30 days
  - Up from 17% in 2004
- 61% of UWEC students drink 4 drinks or fewer each week
- UWEC male students estimate that others average 8.4 drinks per occasion and self report 6.2 drinks per occasion
- UWEC female students estimate others average 5.5 drinks per occasion and they self report 3.9 per occasion
- 6% of UWEC students “binge drink” 3 times per week
- Wisconsin spends $1.2 billion on problems associated with underage drinking and $1.1 billion on the higher education system
- Neighborhood/Bar Walk
  - Scheduled for April 18, 2008
  - Begins at 10:00 p.m.
  - Meet at the police station
City council members and police officers will be attendance
Traffic timings and street lighting have been looked at/changed because of this walk
Enhances our relationship with the community members that also participate in this walk

Discussion
California State University in Fresno
Faculty voluntarily pledge to do 3 things: A) Become familiar with the laws and campus policies about alcohol; B) Know about programs and services for students seeking help for alcohol problems, and post a sticker or magnet on office doors identifying their participation in the pledge; C) Promote “safe and responsible” attitudes toward alcohol in classroom or office discussions
Would like for the University Senate to endorse the formation of such a coalition of volunteer faculty and staff

MOTION by Senator Serros that the University Senate endorse the formation of a Faculty/Staff coalition whose voluntary members pledge to become familiar with the laws and campus policies about alcohol; know about programs and services for students seeking help for alcohol problems and post a sticker or magnet on office doors identifying their participation in the pledge; and promote “safe and responsible” attitudes toward alcohol in classroom or office discussions

Deliberation on the motion
Propose that someone would organize
Don Reynolds
Since faculty/staff are role-models and so students can turn to us for help students will not be included as volunteers

MOTION by Senator Freymiller that we suspend the rules and vote on this today seconded and PASSED by two-thirds vote
MOTION passed without dissenting vote

IX. Miscellaneous Business
None

X. Announcements
None

Without objection, meeting adjourned at 4:03p.m.
Submitted by,
Tanya Kenney
Secretary to the University Senate