The regular meeting of University Senate was called to order by Chair Freymiller at 3:06 p.m. on Tuesday, April 26, 2016 in the Dakota Ballroom of Davies Center.

1) Approval of the April 12, 2016 University Senate minutes
   • Approved as distributed

2) Administrator Remarks – Chancellor Schmidt
   • It was CERCA week; Chancellor attended student research presentation in Math Department
   • We will be graduating many students in the coming month
   • Please go out and enjoy activities around campus and in the community

3) Reports
   a) For the Record: Motions from Academic Policies Committee
      Establish a Certificate in Social Diversity
      Additional Handout: Social Diversity Certificate Proposal
   b) For the Record: Motion from Academic Policies Committee
      Establish a Certificate in Transnational Asian Studies
      Additional Handout: Transnational Asian Studies Certificate Proposal

Debate
   • None
Without objection, **MOTION to Establish a Certificate in Social Diversity was entered FOR THE RECORD (52-AP-FTR-15)**

Without objection, **MOTION to Establish a Certificate in Transnational Asian Studies was entered FOR THE RECORD (52-AP-FTR-16)**

c) Report from University Senate Chair Freymiller
   - Due to the length of today's agenda Chair Freymiller will defer his report until the next University Senate meeting scheduled for May 10th

d) Compensation Committee Report

   **Flat-dollar Merit Pay Proposal**
   - All pay plans approved last spring allow each department to choose the one they will
     - Very few departments use flat rate pay plan
   - Some departments vote on the pay plan; in other departments/units chair/director makes that decision on their own
   - Pay plan requires ranking members of each department; merit must be part of the pay plan
     - Pay plan establishes rules for ranking
   - Merit rankings are being done even though pay plan isn't enacted
   - Four-point rating scale is only scale used within each department and relative ranking is a predetermined share
   - Seems that no two departments use the four-point scale in the same way
   - Thanks to Senator Riehl for her hard work

4) Special Orders
   a) Chair-elect Election: Nominations will also be taken from the floor

      Nominee(s):
      - Mitch Freymiller, Biology
      - Jean Pratt, Information Systems

   **Elected to position of Chair-Elect: Jean Pratt, Information Systems**

5) Unfinished Business

   **There was an objection to limiting the debate to 15 minutes**

   a) Second Reading: Motion from the Technology Committee

      **Polling within the Classroom**

Debate
   - There were no interaction concerns in the test pilot
     - Software interactive problems occurred with the BETA test, but were resolved
   - Concerns about cellphone usage because students could give their phone to their friends
   - Student choice is important and phones might be a distraction, but we should use technology
   - Math department voted to support this if it is not included in the FASRP
   - Could this policy be located somewhere instead of the FASRP?
   - There are still classrooms without adequate access to technology
   - Because technology changes so quickly, this shouldn't be in the FASRP
• Student Senate supported this as part of the “bring your own device campaign”
  • Students have devices with them at all times; using dollars to support infrastructure on
    campus makes sense
  • Ability of students to connect to technology allows students to become engaged
  • Polling probably wouldn’t be used on heavily weighted tests, but to gauge whether the class
    understands the content; could be used to assess how far student learning has progressed
  • By not making smartphone taboo, it could be used as an academic and educational tool
  • Policy would not require students to purchase additional equipment, therefore Student Senate
    support this policy
• Are Instructional Technologies included in the FASRP?
  • The FASRP is not the appropriate place for this policy.
  • Faculty will have to follow this policy if it is in the FASRP, but this would be the first time that
    instructional technology policy is listed in the FASRP
  • We don’t force faculty to use other instructional technology
    • Because this is a prescriptive policy, it should be in the FASRP

MOTION to DIVIDE the QUESTION, seconded

Debate on dividing the question
  • Division of the question would require first vote on the policy proposed in the motion; second vote
    would determine whether the policy would be included in the FASRP
  • Only reason to divide the question would be to enable instructors to ignore the policy
  • Instructors would have a choice unless the policy is in the FASRP
  • Use of “would be” or “recommend” would make a difference in the motion

VOTE on MOTION TO DIVIDE: FAILS

QUESTION was MOVED

VOTE on MOTION to MOVE the QUESTION: FAILS

Continued debate
  • Use of other polling techniques has not been addressed; if we approve this policy, then we can’t
    use those other options
  • This is an unnecessary motion and is based on financial and educational concerns and
    pedagogical reasons and it ties the hands of faculty members
  • Protect our pedagogical issue and the education our students are receiving
  • Motion in its current form is excessive; we don’t need to be punitive
  • Motion is about providing assistance to students
  • It would cost students more if this policy isn’t passed
  • It’s a choice for faculty to use polling or not
  • Against this policy in principal because it puts restrictions on instructors that shouldn’t be there
  • Don’t understand the concern about students having a cellphone in the classroom; we are
    educators and students are here to learn what they choose to learn
  • Hard for students to participate and engage when others are using their phones
  • It takes polling away as an option if it destroys the atmosphere of the classroom

MOTION to POSTPONE until the next meeting of the University Senate, second

Debate on postponing
  • Individuals already know how they want to vote

VOTE on MOTION to POSTPONE: FAILED

Continued debate on motion
  • Thanks for the discussion
  • Points have been articulated but this option should be available
  • Policies are sometimes integral to advancing liberal education
MOVE the PREVIOUS QUESTION

VOTE to MOVE the QUESTION: PASSED

VOTE on MOTION: FAILED

b) Second Reading: Joint Motion from Faculty Personnel Committee and the Academic Staff Personnel Committee

Without objection, debate is limited to 15 minutes

Administrator Review Committee

This motion has already been amended on page five, first full paragraph, third sentence to read “The comprehensive review is a two part process that will be implemented according to the schedule outlined in Personal Policies and Procedures; 1., b. Review of Administrator Performance.” The motion has also been amended to eliminate section 3) Procedure for Reviewing Vice/Assistant Chancellors (page 110).

At this time, we have a motion to amend page 6, section 1) Procedure and Timeline for University Faculty, University Academic Staff, and University Staff Review of Upper Level Administrators, second paragraph to read “Upper level administrators shall be reviewed within three years of the initial appointment and every five years thereafter and that the results be shared with the entire university community.

MOTION to AMEND the AMENDMENT to read “Upper level administrators shall be reviewed within three years of the initial appointment and every five years thereafter. The University Senate will be informed by the reviewee’s supervisor that a review has been completed, along with any conclusions that can be shared, by the end of the semester in which the review is completed. In the case that the review is completed during the summer, the University Senate will be informed before the second meeting of the Senate in the Fall Semester. In all cases, the University Senate will in turn inform the larger campus community the results of such reviews”, seconded

Debate on the amendment to the amendment

- When the Chancellor is reviewed, would President Cross need to inform us?
  - No, because President Cross is not confined by our handbook
  - Intention is for the campus community to be informed about the results of the review
  - We never hear anything from UW System at the conclusion of any chancellor’s review; don’t expect that any UW System president would feel compelled to comply with this, but our wishes can be in written into our policy
  - Far more concerned about other administrators on campus; should support this amendment

VOTE on AMENDMENT as AMENDED: PASSED

Continued discussion on motion as amended

- Language refers to an external professional development review team; what is this?
  - It used to be Administrator Review Committee; this motion changes it so members from that committee are on the external professional development
  - Original language was “member of the administrator review committee”
  - Without a process in place, upcoming administrator reviews will be postponed another year
  - We can make changes in the future if necessary

MOTION to AMEND: To strike the last sentence and replace it with the following: The external professional development review shall be considered an integral component of the annual performance evaluation conducted by the administrator’s supervisor and progress towards the professional development plan shall be included in the annual performance evaluation., seconded

Debate on amendment

- Move this forward based on the wonderful work of the committee
VOTE on AMENDMENT: PASSED

Continued debate on motion as amended
- This motion is a problem
- Some reviews are less than friendly, but this is taking responsibility away from faculty and giving it to an external professional development review team, which encroaches on faculty prerogative

Vote on MOTION as AMENDED: PASSED

c) Second Reading: Joint Motion from Faculty Personnel Committee and the Academic Staff Personnel Committee

Administrator Search Processes

It is moved and seconded by these committees that changes be made to the Faculty and Academic Staff Rules and Procedures, Part III, Article Five: Personnel Policies and Procedures; Section D – Joint Personnel Policies and Procedures; 1. Faculty and Staff Role in Selection and Review of Administrators (page 105) to strike the sentence “For guidance on internal searches, consult the Affirmative Action Office” and replace it with “This policy applies to both internal and external searches”.

This motion has been amended in the second paragraph to read “The Chancellor appoints administrators at or above the rank of Director/Chair at UW-Eau Claire. The policy detailed in Section D – Joint Personnel Policies and Procedures; 1. Faculty and Staff Role in Selection and Review of Administrators; a. Selection, including subsections 1); 2); and 3); governs the formation and procedures of the committees that assist the Chancellor in searching for those administrators and applies to both internal and external searches.”

Debate on the amended motion
- Section of the FASRP that is being changed was provided as a copy

Vote on MOTION as AMENDED: PASSED

6) New Business
   a) First Reading: Motion from Academic Policies Committee

Changes to the FASRP Action Table

AMENDMENT from Committee as follows:

1. Majors:
   a. Suspend or reinstate major
      i. College/School Faculty: Change “N” to “Y”
      ii. Univ. Senate APC: Change “N” to “Y”
      iii. University Senate: Change “--” to “Y”
      iv. System Administration: Change “N” to “Y” “I”
      v. Board of Regents: Change “N” to “I”
b. Change major requirements
   i. Add a new row: “Change major requirements substantively.” Position this row immediately below the “Change major requirements” row.
   ii. Specify the following action indicators:
       1. Department: “Y”
       2. College Curriculum Committee: “Y”
       3. College/School Faculty: “Y”
       4. Univ. Senate APC: “Y”
       5. University Senate: “Y”
       6. University Faculty: “I”
       7. Administration: “P”
       8. System Administration: “Y” “I”
       9. Board of Regents: “I”

Debate
   • None

Without objection, we will vote on this today

Vote on MOTION: PASSED

b) First Reading: Motion from Academic Policies Committee

Activity Credits Counting Towards Baccalaureate
   • Original text required “no more than 4 credits in any single activity or 12 in combination”; that language was retained, but “KINS courses and no more than 1 credit of physical activity required” was removed
   • Not changing what the previous University Senate had done, but removing references to nonexistent wellness requirements because Kinesiology department can no longer provide all these activities.

Debate on the motion
   • This motion would allow up to 12 credits in any combination to count towards a baccalaureate degree, so students could include up to 12 credits of KINS courses
   • Theoretically it is possible, but not practical because there are only a limited number of courses designated
     • Most courses probably won’t be taught
     • We still get transfer credits that must be dealt with
   • Not comforted by the practical argument
     • Should students be able to satisfy 10% of their credits with volleyball, etc.?
   • We don’t have enough instructors in Kinesiology and other activity courses can also be taken, so don’t be concerned about the possibility of only taking KINS courses

OBJECTION to voting on this today

Vote on MOTION: POSTPONED

MOTION to ADJOURN, seconded
7) Announcements
   • On Wednesday, May 4th the University will conduct its annual “Day of Remembrance” to remember and honor members of the UWEC community who have died over the past year
   • The ceremony will be held in the Dakota Ballroom from noon to 1:00 pm
   • All senators are invited to attend
   • The next meeting of the University Senate is scheduled for May 10th in the Dakota Ballroom of the Davies Center

Without objection, meeting adjourned at 5:04 p.m.

Submitted by,

Tanya Kenney
Secretary to the University Senate