Members Present:

Members Absent:
Robin Baker, Jennifer Brockpahler, Lyle Ford, Larry Honl, Robert Hooper, Todd Hostager, Dale Johnson, Brian Mahoney, Karl Markgraf, Jill Pastrana, Geoffrey Peterson, Rick Richmond, Jeanne Skoug, Marie Stadler, Sharon Westphal, Deborah Wright, Rebecca Wurzer

Guests:
Donald Christian, Debbie Gough, Marc Goulet, Lisa LaSalle, Scott Lowe, Kris Retherford, Gail Scukanec

The regular meeting of University Senate was called to order by Interim-Chair Harrison at 3:03 p.m. on Tuesday, April 14, 2009 in the Council Fire Room of Davies Center.

I. Minutes of March 10, 2009 University Senate meeting approved as distributed

II. Chancellor’s Remarks – Chancellor Levin-Stankevich

• Budget
• Still working on the budget with Dave Gessner
• Plan to implement after we receive final word from the legislature
• Hearings going on for the next few weeks and will probably not get to UW System for a little bit yet
• Will point out the benefits of investing in higher education in general and at regional campuses to the legislatures
• At end of the month will have an idea of how we will respond to the Governors budget
• Will probably not be a lot of changes in the democratic budget due to the democratic legislature
• Legislative interest in the variable distribution of the reductions to auxiliary saving funds across the campuses
• Considerable interest in that decision by the System
• Regional legislatures will have continued interest in that
• Continue to work with legislatures at getting the planning money for the next academic building
• One of our local legislatures will be on the building commission next year and will be on the building commission when it votes on the next enumeration list priority in 2011
• If we can get planning money we will be in a better position for the 2011-2013 budget for actual construction

• Provost Search
• No official announcement on Provost as we are waiting to get some information but will tell you that Pat Klein will be starting July 1st
• She is coming from Eastern Connecticut University
• Is a public Liberal Arts College in Connecticut
• She was the Dean of Education and Professional Studies
• Positive responses from all that met with her
Will have other interim positions to fill in the coming weeks so will work with Marty and Pat to make sure we have smooth transitions

Thanks to Marty Wood for taking this on as he has done a remarkable job

Student elections going on and is important that student leaders elected be as representative as they can

Encourage students to participate as we have some exciting and interesting candidates

Department of Public Instruction Superintendent election was held a couple of weeks ago and will try to remember to remind you in the future to pay attention to that election

III. Special Orders of the Day – Nominations for Senate Vice-Chair

- Linda Spaeth

MOTION by Vice-Chair Gapko to suspend the rules to allow the nominee, Linda Spaeth, to stand as the Vice-Chair of the University Senate seconded passed without dissention.

IV. Unfinished Business

Second Reading – Motion from the Faculty Personnel Committee on DPC Membership

Continued Debate

- None

Vote on Motion 45-FP-02 as amended: Motion PASSED without dissention

IV. New Business

A. First Reading – Academic Policies Committee

COEHS motion to merge CI and FED into the Department of Educational Studies – Senator Lozar

- Previous proposals remained in the college and had not been brought to Academic Policies Committee

Motion 45-AP-09

MOVED and seconded by committee (8 for, 1 against) recommends to the University Senate that the Departments of Curriculum and Instruction and Foundations of Education be eliminated and that the two departments be merged to create a new department called the Department of Education Studies.

Debate

- This is a significant motion but specific evidence for or against the proposal cannot be presented as the Academic Policies Committee did not receive any specific evidence
- There are a number of issues of evidence as to why the merger should take place under the pros
- 3 levels voted in support of the merger
- Not unanimous votes but the majority
- All located on one floor right now
- 10 Curriculum & Instruction Faculty will be affected and 6 Foundations
- The question of evidence has come up at each of the levels
- The claims expressed as pros are simply claims and not evidence so would be nice to have tangible evidence
- The evidence and reasoning behind the claims, that are listed as pros, have never been presented
- One person to chair both departments can be an advantage but can also be a disadvantage as there may be a smaller pool to draw from but a larger department could have the ability to use subcommittees
- That is a great point because those in the Foundations Department have to be on everything because of the small numbers and have only had DPCs for 2 of the last 12 years due to the small numbers
- Merger would help in the efficiency of the Chair and the assistance in advising issues
- Departments are separate right now so together advising could be divided and there would be representation to disburse the workload
There are several potential positive effects for serving our students

Vote on Motion postponed until the next meeting

B. First Reading – Academic Policies Committee
Liberal Education Learning Goals Outcomes – Senator Hollon

Motion 45-AP-10
MOVED and seconded by committee (9 for, 0 against) recommends to the University Senate that the “Liberal Education Learning Goals: Proposed Outcomes” be accepted as presented.

Liberal Education is an approach to learning that empowers individuals and prepares them to deal with complexity, diversity, and change. It provides students with broad knowledge of the wider world (e.g. science, culture, and society) as well as in-depth study in a specific area of interest. A liberal education helps students develop a sense of social responsibility, as well as strong and transferable intellectual and practical skills such as communication, analytical and problem-solving skills, and a demonstrated ability to apply knowledge and skills in real-world settings. - Association of American Colleges and Universities

The Liberal Education Learning Goals identify the broad and general knowledge, skills, and values for all UW-Eau Claire graduates.
The Learning Outcomes define the LELGs so that academic departments and programs, and administrative and support service units can develop specific outcomes.
All UW-Eau Claire students will develop and demonstrate concentrated learning in more than one of the Liberal Education Learning Goals and Outcomes via the major.
All UW-Eau Claire students will develop and demonstrate connected learning across the Liberal Education Learning Goals and Outcomes via General Education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liberal Education Learning Goals (approved, 12/2007)</th>
<th>Learning Outcomes (pending University Senate approval)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Knowledge of Human Culture and the Natural World (knowledge) | ● UW Eau Claire students will develop a depth of knowledge about human culture.  
● UW Eau Claire students will develop a depth of knowledge about the natural world. |
| Creative and Critical Thinking (skill) | ● UW-Eau Claire students will develop and use creative thinking skills in academic and social contexts.  
● UW-Eau Claire students will develop and use critical thinking skills in academic and social contexts. |
| Effective Communication (skill) | ● UW-Eau Claire students will effectively use writing, reading, speaking and listening in academic and social contexts. |
| Individual and Social Responsibility (value) | ● UW-Eau Claire students will develop skills and values for ethical reasoning.  
● UW-Eau Claire students will use ethical reasoning in civic and professional contexts. |
| Respect for Diversity Among People (value) | ● UW-Eau Claire students will develop knowledge for living in a pluralistic society and a globally interdependent world.  
● UW-Eau Claire students will develop and use skills for promoting equity, diversity, and inclusivity in civic and professional contexts. |
Debate

- None

Amendment 45-AP-10-a1
MOVED by Senator McAleer and seconded to amend motion under the Effective Communication (skill) goal to read: 

**UW-Eau Claire students will effectively write, read, speak and listen in academic and social contexts**

PASSED without dissention.

MOTION by Senator Lozar that we suspend the rules to vote on this today seconded and defeated.

Vote on motion to be postponed until the next meeting

C. First Reading – Academic Policies Committee

Physical Activity Credit for students who have completed basic training – Senator Hollon

Motion 45-AP-11
MOVED and seconded by committee (9 for, 0 against) recommends to the University Senate approval of the following academic policy: 

*Students who have completed basic training/boot camp for the military will be given one credit of physical activity. Evidence would be provided to the Registrar or Admissions office through presentation of military identification, a transcript from the American Council on Education Registry showing completion of the Basic Combat Training Course, or a copy of a D.D. 214.*

Debate

- A Policy for exemptions, waivers or exceptions is already in place but is not readily used and one would have to petition to receive that
- This would make it easier and remove a hurdle
- May be appropriate to put in catalog so others could apply as well
- This language speaks to those who completed basic or boot camp regardless of rank
- All ranks must go through physical training
- There is language in the discussion for suggestions to where this would be in the catalog
- Statute of limitations has not been considered
- UWEC teaches theory along with physical activity so there is actual content in the courses
- Other exemptions would be more difficult to show in order to have this credit waived and that is the problem with being more specific because how detailed would you have to get

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

Continued debate

- None

Vote on Motion 45-AP-11: PASSED without dissention

D. First Reading – Academic Policies Committee
Service Learning Requirement for students who are completing, or who have completed active military service – Senator Hollon

Motion 45-AP-12
MOVED and seconded by committee (9 for, 0 against) recommends to the University Senate approval of the following academic policy: **Students in active military service or who have honorably completed military service are presumed to have met the service-learning graduation requirement. Evidence of military service is provided to the Admissions office through a copy of a D.D. 214, a transcript from the American Council on Education Registry or a similar document.**

Debate
- A general discharge under honorable conditions is also included
- Time frame was not considered
- Notion of a presumed reflection component
- The intention is that their work is connected and that is not seen here
- Use retroactive approval but still engage in reflection
- Seems that we are focusing on a particular group of individuals
- We have strayed away from our concept of service learning
- Mission Statement points out that helping people and giving back to the community is continually a part of what you are doing and service is part of your life once you move on from UWEC; it sends a message that you have completed giving back to society
- This comes up through the Veterans Advisory Committee so we need to be careful that if 100% of our service learning has a reflective component and if there are cracks in that and this motion is denied then there will be questions asked in the public
- Waivers are currently being granted and some with reflection components
- Most students connect to their major while some to their minor and others connect to interests

45-AP-12-a1
MOTION by Senator Freymiller and seconded to amend the language to reflect: **Students in active military service who have honorably completed military service and who submit a reflection component may be considered to have met the service learning graduation requirement.**

- Wouldn’t have to pass anything
- Give permission to service learning to come up with a procedure as it is currently unclear where/who to submit this to
- No reflection that UWEC imposes would do anymore than what those in the military are going through every day after coming back from Iraq or Afghanistan
- Everyone that will be coming through our doors in the next few years probably has served or will serve at least one tour so them getting a few signatures wouldn’t benefit them or us
- Director of Service Learning has been consulted and he approved that along with the Advisory Committee
- They both felt that this is appropriate and parallel to our 2nd degree seeking students
- Every service should then have a reflection
- Can be discharged in a variety of ways or with honorable or general discharge are presumed to have met the service learning requirements
- Honorable discharge does not include those who have been found to be gay or lesbian but general discharge does

Without objection, amendment language 45-AP-12-a1 changed to reflect: **Students in active military service or with an honorable or general discharge from military service are presumed to have met the service learning graduation requirement,** Amendment, as changed, PASSED without dissention.
Continued Debate

- Thoughts on the last motion is that our service learning requirement on campus currently is for all students but is not uniformly carried out for all students and we are asking a subset of our students who have significantly out served everybody else and we are having them do extra
- It just doesn’t seem necessary with a reflection piece on top of that
- Consider what we currently do for our 2nd degree seeking students
- We just presume they have met the service learning requirement
- Those in the military reflect everyday but the reflection component is what makes service learning a service and we do not just ask them to learn but rather to document what you have learned
- Anyone who did service learning outside of a course should have done a reflection to meet that requirement but have heard that we are not all doing that so if a student does not want to do reflection do they still get the credit
- Rationale for 2nd degree students not doing service learning is that there is an assumption and does that assumption hold true for those in the military
- Website states that you have to take the one of the following 4 options and one is a reflection component
- Military students would welcome the chance to communicate and share their experiences with us

Vote on Motion postponed until the next meeting

E. First Reading – Executive Committee
Mission Statement –Vice-Chair Gapko
- Commend the committee who brought this to us for responding the changes people wanted to see as over 175 comments were received and looked at

Motion 45-SE-03
MOVED and seconded by the University Senate Executive Committee (8 for to 1 against) on April 7, 2009
 Recommends that the University Senate approve the Mission Statement as shown:

UW-Eau Claire Mission Statement

We serve the public good by educating tomorrow’s leaders.
Our integrated, transformative liberal education emphasizes experiential learning and prepares responsible citizens to work toward a more equitable world.

We fulfill our mission through a pervasive university commitment to provide:
- Rigorous, intentional and experiential undergraduate liberal education for life and livelihood;
- Strong, distinctive professional and graduate programs that build on and strengthen our proud tradition of liberal education;
- Multicultural and international learning experiences for a diverse world;
- Exemplary student-faculty research and scholarship that enhance teaching and learning;
• An inclusive campus community that challenges students to develop their intellectual, personal, and social competencies;

• Educational opportunities responsive to the needs of our communities, state, region and beyond; and

• Academic leadership in transforming liberal education.

Debate
• Is really inappropriate
• Not opposed to more equitable world but we are public institution and we are taking one sliver and this is what we are preparing you for as a state institution
• Not something we should be choosing for our students
• Doesn’t work as a public institution
• Equitable does not mean equal
• Equity has a flavor of fairness
• Equitable is not defined
• This is not imposing values on fairness or justice
• Come to an idea and work to move the world in that direction
• In the dictionary equity is defined as equal and fair
• Objecting that they are supposed to be working toward a more equitable world and that is not our place to do that
• Have a problem with educating tomorrow’s leaders as we are not all leaders so what happens to those that are not leaders
• Don’t see a mission but a statement about what we do
• Not forward looking

Vote on Motion postponed until the next meeting

F. First Reading – Executive Committee
Senate Representation – Vice-Chair Gapko

Motion 45-SE-04
MOVED and seconded by Executive Committee (12 for, 0 against) on April 7, 2009 recommends that the Bylaws of the University Senate, Membership of University Senate 1. In the Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook, be changed as shown:

The voting members of the University Senate include:
• 44 42 University Faculty (defined in Article One, Section C)

1 University Faculty member from each academic department or equivalent with 4 or more members
University Faculty senators at large:
• 3 University Faculty from the College of Arts and Sciences
• 1 University Faculty from the College of Business
• 1 University Faculty from the College of Education and Human Sciences
• 1 University Faculty from the College of Nursing and Health Sciences
• Additional faculty elected by and from each college as needed to have a minimum of 3 faculty senators from each college (the minimum of 3 includes any departmental senators)

• Additional Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) with faculty status elected by and from each college as needed to have at least 1 IAS from each college (the minimum of 1 includes any departmental senators)

• Additional University Faculty from any area elected at large as needed to total 44

• 23 28 University Academic Staff (defined in Article One, Section C)

  1 University Academic Staff member from each Unit with 4 or more members

  1 University Academic Staff member from Instructional Academic Staff without faculty status from each department with 9 or more such members

  University Academic Staff senators at large:

  • 2 University Academic Staff from the instructional academic staff without faculty status

  • Additional University Academic Staff from any area as needed to total 23 28

The Chancellor and Provost and Vice Chancellor shall be non-voting members of the University Senate.

Debate

• Concerned about the role of Instructional Academic staff as they do not have any contract obligations and this requires that they do but cannot be evaluated on it

• Some IAS contracts should have this component so a person could get recognition

• Concern has merit as Academic Staff without Faculty status often have no representation

• Seeking a way to give them a way to have some governance

• Concern about the numbers as there seems to be a big error with the numbers

• Numbers came from the frozen files

• Frozen files include those that may not be regulars in the department

• Numbers represent those with voting rights

• Must have a 50% appointment or more to have voting rights

• Snap shot taken every year in October, which are then called the frozen files, then the frozen file numbers go to the Executive Committee and they either change the Senate Representation or change the numbers to reflect more accurate representations

• This helps larger departments so more people can participate

• 2 of the 4 colleges could lose representation provided how they fill the seats

Vote on Motion postponed until the next meeting

G. First Reading – Executive Committee
University-Wide Administrator Review Committee Handbook Language –Vice-Chair Gapko

Motion 45-SE-05
MOVED and seconded by Executive Committee (12 for, 0 against, 0 abstain) on April 7, 2009 recommends that the language on page 86 of Chapter 5 of the Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook be changed as shown:

PROCEDURE FOR UNIVERSITY-FACULTY-AND-UNIVERSITY-ACADEMIC-STAFF REVIEW OF ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS: CHANCELLOR, PROVOST AND VICE CHANCELLOR, ASSISTANT OR ASSOCIATE VICE CHANCELLOR, DEANS, ASSOCIATE DEANS AND ASSISTANT DEANS

CHANCELLOR
PROVOST
VICE AND ASSISTANT CHANCELLORS
SPECIAL ASSISTANTS TO THE CHANCELLOR
ASSISTANT AND ASSOCIATE VICE CHANCELLORS
DEANS, ASSOCIATE AND ASSISTANT DEANS
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS

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. If a successful search has not been completed within two years of a position being filled with an interim administrator, the supervisor to whom the administrator is responsible shall formally consult with the Senate Executive Committee, and shall continue to consult with the 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. (US 4/06)

The review is to be conducted by a committee of University Faculty and University Academic Staff. The committee to review the Chancellor, Provost, and Vice Chancellors, Assistant Chancellors, Special Assistants to the Chancellor, Assistant or Associate Vice Chancellors and Administrative Officers will include seven members serving three-year terms—one faculty member elected by and from each of the colleges; one member elected by and from the Instructional Academic Staff; and two members selected by and from the Administrative and Professional Academic Staff. Two or three members will be elected each year during the spring election. Each year the review committee elects its own chair. The review committee will be facilitated by the Director of Human Resources. (When the supervisor of the Director of Human Resources is the one being reviewed, the review committee will be facilitated by the Secretary to the Faculty and Academic Staff within the University Senate Office.) (US 3/05, 4/09)

The committee to review Deans, Associate Deans, and Assistant Deans will include three members elected by the University Faculty of the College. All members will serve three year terms. One member of the committee will be elected each year during the spring election. Each year the review committee elects its own chair. (US 03/05)

The committee will receive a written statement from the administrator being reviewed which describes how his or her performance meets the requirements of the position, successful accomplishments, and planned improvements and activities for the subsequent five-year period. The committee will also receive a description of the administrator’s position, statements describing the university’s mission and goals, and other information as needed to place the administrator’s performance and position in an institutional context. The committee may interview the administrator being reviewed.

The committee will survey the faculty, and academic staff, and classified staff and may, in response to the results of the survey, conduct interviews with representatives of the faculty, and academic staff, and classified staff. Any such survey shall include a summary evaluative question granting faculty and academic staff an opportunity to express confidence in the administrator’s performance. All information obtained from the surveys and interviews will be held in confidence by the committee.

The committee will write a review report. The administrator being reviewed will receive a copy of the report and will meet with the committee to discuss it. Following the discussion, the report will be revised, as appropriate, by the
committee. Copies of the revised report will be forwarded to the administrator being reviewed and to his or her immediate supervisor, (see page 88, Chapter 5) and data from the surveys shall become available to the administrator.

A copy of the review report will be filed in the administrator’s personnel file and will be available to committees conducting subsequent reviews. Immediately after the report is written the surveys and other information gathered by the committee will be destroyed, except for the numerical results or statements which are incorporated directly into the final report.

The review report will be part of the information used by the immediate supervisor in making personnel recommendations concerning the administrator and in improving the administration of the University.

(US 3/05)

Debate
- None

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

Continued Debate
- None

**Vote on Motion 45-SE-04: PASSED without dissention**

H. First Reading – Budget Committee

*Functions of the Budget Committee* – Senator Eckardt

**Motion 45-BC-01**

MOVED and seconded by Budget Committee (8 for, 0 against) on March 12, 2009 recommends that the University Senate approve the change in function for the Budget Committee, Chapter 3, page 15, of the Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook, 22nd Edition as shown:

FROM:

b. Functions: The Budget Committee serves as a liaison to Faculty and Academic Staff to disseminate budget related information, investigates any matters of concern related to the University budget, and serves as an advisory group to the Vice Chancellor for Business and Student Services. As such, members will receive periodic updates from the Vice Chancellor for Business and Student Services regarding the status of the budget and will make recommendations for setting planning reserve levels. Other responsibilities may include, but are not limited to, the following: review and endorse base adjustments; review past, current and future budget allocations and policies; examine future budget challenges facing the University and suggest possible solutions; review recommendations or policies associated with budget cuts or program discontinuations; consult about the allocation of newly available discretionary funds; and consult about other budget-related matters as appropriate.
TO:

b. Functions: The Budget Committee serves two roles. First, it observes the budget process—giving ongoing feedback to all participants on how well the process is executed and suggestions to improve it; in this role, the committee will meet regularly throughout the year at appropriate times with the Chancellor, Provost, Assistant Chancellor for Budget and Finance, deans, and other participants in the process to develop and discuss the feedback and suggestions. Second, each year shortly after the budget process is complete, the committee will submit a written report to the University Senate formalizing the feedback and suggestions.

Debate

- Will attend some meetings but due to the amount of the budget committees on campus cannot attend every meeting

Amendment 45-BC-01-a1
MOVED by Vice-Chair Gapko and seconded to amend the language to reflect: The Budget Committee serves two roles. First, it observes the budget process—giving ongoing feedback to all participants on how well the process is executed and providing suggestions to improve it; in this role, the committee will meet regularly throughout the year at appropriate times with the Chancellor, Provost, Assistant Chancellor for Budget and Finance, deans, and other participants in the process to develop and discuss the feedback and suggestions. Second, each year shortly after the budget process is complete, the committee will submit a written report to the University Senate formalizing the feedback and suggestions, and PASSED without dissention.

Vote on Motion postponed until the next meeting

I. First Reading – Executive Committee on behalf of the Academic Policies Committee

Undergraduate Advising at UWEC – Vice-Chair Gapko
- University policy states an assigned advisor or someone else in the department

Motion 45-SE-05
MOVED and seconded by Executive Committee (12 for, 0 against) on April 7, 2009 recommends that the Undergraduate Advising language be adopted.

Amendment 45-SE-05-a1
MOVED by Senator Lozar and seconded to amend the motion to reflect an assigned advisor and DEFEATED

Debate
- None

Vote on Motion postponed until the next meeting

V. University Senate Chair’s Report – Interim-Chair Harrison
- Next University Senate meeting is April 28, 2009
- Will have a special presentation by the Davies Redevelopment Committee and architects
• Greater Community is invited to join us for that presentation which is scheduled to begin at 4:30
• If the University Senate meeting is not concluded by 4:30 then we will have to call another University Senate meeting for May 5, 2009

VI. Faculty Representative’s Report – Senator McAleer
• Will report at the next University Senate meeting

VII. Academic Staff Representative’s Report – Senator Brockpahler
• Academic Staff Representative’s report was sent electronically

VIII. Reportable items from Committees
◊ Executive Committee – Interim-Chair Harrison
• Will share a report at the next meeting

IX. Special Reports
A. PEEQ – Marty Wood
• PEEQ Report is almost complete

B. General Education Reform Committee – Scott Lowe for Kate Lang
• Cautiously optimistic
• Had much valuable feedback
• It is clear that we will have to simplify dramatically and are in process of doing that
• May be ready by fall to be discussed

X. Miscellaneous Business
• Tickets are still available for the Viennese Ball for Friday night

XI. Announcements
• None

Without objection, meeting adjourned at 5:02 p.m.

Submitted by,

Tanya Kenney
Secretary to the University Senate