Members Present:

Members Absent:
Jon Bollinger, Linda Carlson, Todd Glaser, Beth Hellwig, Jerry Hoepner, Fred Kolb, Jason Mathwig, Mary Nienow, Kate Reynolds, Lois Slattery, Odawa White

Guests:
David Baker, Mary Canales, Michael Carney, Bernard Duyfhuizen, Debbie Gough, Jennifer Fager, Greg Falkenberg, Susan Harrison, Mary Hoffman, Debra Jansen, Teresa O’Halloran, Jill Prushiek, Gail Scukanec, Tim Vaughn, Michael Weil

The regular meeting of University Senate was called to order by Chair Freymiller at 3:04 p.m. on Tuesday, April 22, 2014 in the Woodland Theatre of Davies Center.

1) April 8, 2014 University Senate minutes approved as distributed

2) Administrator Remarks
   • Last week we unveiled/revealed the Power of AND
     • Had a good response to that
     • We had 138,974 “clicks” on the website to find out more about it
       • Many things do not get that kind of attention
     • 1,880 people had their pictures taken in the photo booth in one day
       • Many posted it themselves on Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, and so on
     • 9,680 people saw the video that was put forward to explain what it is
       • It is not a slogan, but a series of promises that the institution makes about who we are
       • It shows our true strengths
     • It is important that we continue to strengthen our outreach and become more attractive to prospective students
     • Enrollment Management Taskforce will have a report for the Chancellor in June

• In the last week the Governor proposed freezing tuition
• We need to better articulate the financial condition of the UW System and figure out a way to talk to policy makers and the public differently about that
• By the end of the year the Chancellor hopes to have some reports out to create a dialog that people can better understand how we talk about finances
• As the academic year comes to a close, Chancellor will have met with all academic departments
  • Just a few left to visit
  • Looking for ways to build our reputation, create a greater sense of joy, and be a little bit more audacious in our thinking
  • Thanks to those departments that have met with the Chancellor thus far

3) Reports
a) Report from University Senate Chair Freymiller
  • The Chancellor has signed off on the following motions passed by the University Senate to:
    • Add language to Part III, Article Five, Section B 1. F. of the Faculty and Academic Staff Rules and Procedures clarifying DPC Voting procedures
    • Add language to Part III, Article Five, Section D 1. A. 2) of the Faculty and Academic Staff Rules and Procedures clarifying committee formation for Associate/Assistant Deans, Chairs, and Directors
  • On April 8, 2014 the University Senate passed a motion to delete the second paragraph under the heading “CROSS-LISTED COURSES” as published on page 48 of the 2013-14 Undergraduate catalog. That motion was to have been implemented in the 2015-2016 Undergraduate Catalog. However, it has been determined that this change could be implemented immediately, therefore,

Without objection, the Chair will change the implementation date on the motion titled Cross-Listed Courses to immediate

• Committee Reports
  • Executive committee
    • On April 15, the sub-committee of the University Faculty members of the Executive Committee presented a Liberal Education Core compromise proposal that was negotiated with the Chancellor’s designees to modify the Liberal Education Core motion that has been held for further consideration since May 31, 2013
    • After much thoughtful discussion, that compromise proposal will be presented to the full University Senate during the New Business portion of today’s agenda

4) Special Orders

Election for Chair-Elect:

Nominees:
  • Mitch Freymiller, Biology
  • Lori Bica, Psychology

Elected to position of Chair-Elect: Mitch Freymiller, Biology

5) New Business
a) First Reading: Motion from Academic Policies Committee
   **ENPH Prefix for GE**
   
   Additional Handout: **ENPH Request for GE Placement**

   **Without objection, we will vote on this today**
   **Vote on Motion 50-AP-16:** PASSED

b) First Reading: Motion from University Senate Executive Committee
   **Academic Year Calendar**
   
   - Comment that more cons should have been listed
   - Felt that the reason was because many of the cons fell into the statement that shortened spring semester by five days

   **Without objection, the question will be divided**
   - There was an objection to dividing the question

   **Moved and seconded to divide the question**
   **Vote on motion to divide the question:** FAILED

   **Debate on the full motion**
   - The motion will be voted on as a package even though the points in the motion are really separate issues
   - 13 years ago we shortened Spring semester; 13 years later we are trying to shorten it again
   - We used to end one week later in May
   - We could expand Winterim to four weeks and we could actually keep the semester the same and keep the schedule the same
   - We were ensured that the academic calendar would not go further into December, but in the draft calendar it goes an additional day and staff should not be expected to work through university recognized holidays
   - The days highlighted in the draft calendar show a range of how Fall semester could end
   - Students lose out if we shorten the Spring semester
   - During the four years that students normally attend UWEC (averaging 15 credit hours per semester), they would lose out on a substantial number of weeks
   - The academic year calendar affects every person on this campus
   - It is impossible to teach courses with unequal lengths
   - An extra week in winterim would be beneficial
   - Student-faculty collaborations are done in the spring due to the extra time
   - Shortening the semesters does not seem like a great gain
   - Many rely on an extra week in spring
   - This change would force everyone on campus to make changes
   - There will be some changes, but semesters would be equal length
   - It is difficult to do a good job preparing students, so a longer winterim would be welcomed

   **Vote on Motion (50-SE-01) to take place at the next University Senate meeting**
c) Compromise Motion from the University Faculty Senators of the University Senate Executive Committee

**Liberal Education Core Compromise Proposal**

**Comments from Chair Freymiller**

- On May 7, 2013, the University Senate passed a motion to establish a new Liberal Education Core. On May 31, 2013 Interim Chancellor Gilles Bousquet indicated to the Senate Executive Committee that the motion was “being held for further consideration.” Since that time, the university community has been engaged in extensive analysis and reflection regarding our ability to effectively implement this Liberal Education Core. Over the past year, department chairs, faculty and academic staff advisors, University Faculty senators, ULEC, and APC have worked to assess the viability of the Liberal Education Core. UWEC must be able to offer the necessary curriculum for satisfying the Liberal Education Core. After careful consideration of all of the information available, members of the Liberal Education Steering Group informed the Chancellor of their inability to endorse the Liberal Education Core motion as approved by University Senate. This action was taken in accordance with some of the principles of a liberal education that Chancellor Schmidt has shared with the university community since he arrived in July, 2013. Among these principles are his beliefs that a Liberal Education Core should allow students to earn their degree in 120 credits over four years; that the Blugold degree implies that the Liberal Education Core is infused into a major as well as being foundational; that a Liberal Education Core should be receptive to transfer students and non-traditional students; that the Liberal Education Core should be easily understood and communicated; that the Liberal Education Core should be delivered within the resources available to the institution; and that a Liberal Education Core should be the basis for life-long learning once a student has earned a UWEC baccalaureate degree.

- On April 1, 2014, Chancellor Schmidt informed the Senate Executive Committee that he would not be able to approve the Liberal Education Core motion that University Senate passed on May 7, 2013. He shared with the committee those aforementioned principles that guide his vision of a liberal education at UWEC. Upon communicating this decision to the Senate Executive Committee, the response of University Senate is clearly outlined in FASRP Section F “University Senate Actions Directed to the Chancellor”

c. In the event that the Chancellor finds a University Senate recommendation unacceptable in whole or in part, these procedures will be followed:

1) For University Senate or faculty concerns:
   a) If the recommendation deals primarily with matters of concern to the University Faculty, a subcommittee composed of the University Faculty members of the Executive Committee will consult with the Chancellor concerning those aspects of the recommendation which are unacceptable. (subcommittee was formed on April 1, 2014)

   b) If the Executive Committee or subcommittee feels that a modification of the recommendation would be acceptable to both the Chancellor and the University Senate, they may work with the Chancellor in an attempt to modify the recommendation. (negotiations were held on April 8, 2014 and a compromise proposal was discussed and approved by the University Faculty members of the Senate Executive Committee on April 15, 2014)

   c) If the parties agree on the modification, it shall be presented to the University Senate for action. (University Senate will begin debate on this modification in a few minutes)
e) If the University Senate does not agree to a modification of its original recommendation, the original recommendation shall be returned to the Chancellor for final action.

- **Debate**
- **Comments from Chair Freymiller**
  - I would like to remind the body of the procedures we adopted at our opening meeting on September 10, 2013
    - During debate, Senators may speak only twice to any motion. Each speaking term is limited to ten (10) minutes
    - The Chair, with the assistance of the Secretary of the Senate, will add names of those wishing to speak to a speakers list upon recognition
    - Everyone wishing to speak to an issue will be allowed to speak once before second-round speaking terms begin
  - In order to adhere to the rules and procedures outlined in Section F of FASRP, the Liberal Education Core Compromise Proposal will be open to debate, but not open to amendment. Senators must vote on the EXACT version of the approved compromise
  - If any changes are desired, the compromise proposal should be approved and then any motions for changes to the Liberal Education Core that we pass should be presented to the APC chair as soon as possible
  - APC already has five Liberal Education issues on its agenda for fall
  - Need to have Liberal Education Reform passed now so changes can be made next fall
  - Any changes can be sent to APC
  - This is the best that we will be able to do
    - One can make changes later
    - Seems clear that if we want to increase learning experiences it will not happen right now, so let’s keep what we can and continue to work on it in coming years
  - If the compromise proposal is rejected, the Chancellor will not sign the original motion and we will have to start all over
  - The university did an exercise and called on departments to send in courses that they thought would apply to various outcomes; there were gaps in some of the outcomes
    - Disagree that we cannot meet the current goals with the resources we currently have
    - It does not mean that these are the only courses/goals that can be put forward
      - Other courses might be put in
      - Some classes might have another goal added
    - Would hope that another request, pointing out where we need more resources, could be made to determine whether any current resources can meet the original proposal
  - This is not an end product
    - Will look to improve and assess it
    - Is an educationally based plan that makes sense
    - Doesn’t go as far as I would like, but it goes far enough in a good direction at this point that I will support it
  - In terms of R2, as a Chair on Internationalization and Global Engagement, the move from two experiences to one experience isn’t what I wanted; I can accept it only because of other endeavors
    - I see the university doing so many different things that also benefit and pursue Internationalization and Global Engagement
    - If it is important enough to us as a Senate, then we make changes to this in the future
    - It is not a perfect document, but it is a good starting point and we still have each other to work together and advise each other
  - Thank you to everybody who was involved in this
We are in a unique position as there are many significant changes, particularly in Integrative Learning and Creativity as a Skill
- Is a rather significant change
- In many ways it actually goes against the whole premise of Liberal Education Reform
- We provide higher order thinking skills into a liberally educated group of individuals
- If you look at what we are doing, it seriously undermines Liberal Education and highlights how few of the higher order thinking skills actually made it into our original framework and outcomes
- We should think about the unintended consequences and impact that this might have
  - Liberal Education Core no longer has critical thinking, creative thinking, problem solving, teamwork, substantial information literacy
  - Framework that we pass will create a lot of work for individual faculty
  - We are aiming at lower level thinking skills and we want to be honest about the consequences
  - If we don’t pass this, it give us an opportunity to fix the situation that we find ourselves in
  - Liberal Education is the heart of our institution
    - Signing off on this means it can be implemented; if we vote to accept this, then we vote to implement it as it stands
      - This will have a serious impact and there will be serious consequences
    - Am not in the habit of signing a blank check and there will no pressure to fix it, much less, in the right way
- Question about Footnote 4 why the “three credits” is crossed out
- We are still in compliance
- Anything that is going through ULEC are courses
- This proposal will not change anything in my classroom, but will affect how I do assessment activities

Moved and seconded to suspend the rules and vote on this today: PASSED
Vote on Motion 49-AP-13-V2: PASSED

d) Resolution from the Compensation Committee
   Compensation: Seek Additional Resources

Debate
- None

Moved and seconded to suspend the rules and vote on this today: PASSED
Vote on Motion 50-CP-01: PASSED
Resolution from the Compensation Committee

Tuition Assistance

- Peer institutions include Minnesota State Colleges, Idaho State System, Illinois, and Iowa
  - We are surrounded by states with systems in place for tuition assistance
- There is no recommendation for how such a program would be implemented long term and system-wide
  - Asking for a pilot program so we could have an idea of the financial impact on implementing such a program across the system
  - The vision for the pilot program would be for credits taken at UWEC
    - A system-wide program may be different
  - Would be a way for System to gauge cost/benefit/utilization
- Is not listed as a con that UWEC could lose income
  - Is not a con that UWEC could lose income because it is not clear whether we would lose income
  - Part of the pilot would be to determine actual cost
- We are asking for permission to develop a program, so all options would be on the table
- Compensation Committee presented the motion “that UWEC University Senate encourage the UW Board of Regents to explore the possibility of allowing UW-Eau Claire to develop a two-year pilot test of a new employee tuition assistance benefit at UW-Eau Claire”.

Debate

- The “energy” of this type of assistance would compensate for the loss of revenue
- Comment to strike the word “new”
  - There is already a system for employees to receive tuition assistance, so this would expand the benefit
  - The intent could be misinterpreted
  - It should read “The UW-Eau Claire University Senate encourage the UW Board of Regents to explore the possibility of allowing UW-Eau Claire to develop a two-year pilot test of a new benefit for employee tuition assistance benefit at UW-Eau Claire

Moved and seconded that the committee recommendation and the BE IT THEREFORE REESOLVED section read as follows: The UW-Eau Claire University Senate encourage the UW Board of Regents to explore the possibility of allowing UW-Eau Claire to develop a two-year pilot test of a new benefit for employee tuition assistance benefit at UW-Eau Claire.

Vote on amendment: PASSED

Continued Debate

- Clarification was sought on the reason that we do not have this type of program
  - There was a thought that this is because of legislative statute
    - Think it is a statute not a BOR policy
    - If this is the case, then more people should be sent this letter
  - The Government Documents Librarian has been researching this topic and has found no evidence that would prohibit such a program
  - Do we need permission to be allowed to explore?
    - Original wording was to allow UWEC to develop, but upon recommendation new language would allow more flexibility for negotiations between Chancellor Schmidt and BOR
    - The way it is worded we are allowing the BOR to look into it
• A pilot project is an exploration; does the language need to be stronger?
  • Seems like a composition of wishy-washy words, but we do not have a structure for
    the pilot program, we do not know how much this will cost, we do not know which
    sectors would be impacted, we do not know what limits would be imposed
  • We can’t answer what it looks like
• Why can’t we develop a pilot program and then ask for permission?
  • Language like this serves a purpose; by asking to explore the possibility of allowing
    it is asking if it is even possible or to see what such a program might look like
• We should increase compensation in any way we can
  • It may not benefit everyone, but it is still a benefit
  • Suggest turnover costs when doing these calculations as it may benefit the
    university
    • It will be a positive one
  • If a handful of people stick around because a partner or child can get a degree, then
    it is a benefit to this university
    • No one will leave the university in objection to this benefit

Moved and seconded to suspend the rules and vote on this today: PASSED

Vote on Motion 50-CP-02: PASSED

f) Resolution from the Compensation Committee
Wisconsin Retirement System

Debate
  • Different people determine what “weakens” means
    • This is reporting the results of a study and the study can stand or fail on its strengths
  • Interest groups are trying to destroy pension systems
    • This is not going away as long is there is money to fund opposition
      • The idea of allowing individuals to opt out is a core part of the opposition
        • Then it is used a few years later as evidence of weakness of the system; we
          must just abolish the system so if you support a defined benefit plan then you
          need to fight for it
  • This is a good resolution, but this letter does not prescribe how we oppose it
  • Until the bill makes it out of committee it is hard to predict how our University Senate
    could respond effectively to such a move; this does become part of the public record
  • If the body passes the resolution, University Senate could decide how to proceed

Without objection, we will vote on this today

Vote on Motion 50-CP-03: PASSED

6) Announcements
  • The next meeting of the University Senate is scheduled for May 6, 2014 in the Dakota Ballroom

Without objection, meeting adjourned at 5:06 p.m.

Submitted by,

Tanya Kenney
Secretary to the University Senate