Members Present:


Members Absent:

Robin Baker, Paul Butrymowicz, Dan Drumm, Jeff Erger, Warren Gallagher, Robert Hollon, Larry Honl, Todd Hostager, Bill Jacobsen, Sallie Kernan, Fred Kolb, Karl Markgraf, Tarique Niazi, Scott Robertson, Roger Selin, Carter Smith, Lorraine Smith, Daniel Stevenson, Troy Terhark, Charles Vue, Rebecca Wurzer

Guests:

Mary Ellen Alea, Craig Ernst, Erik Hendrickson, Amanda Krier, John Lee, Katherine Rhoades, Kathy Sahlhoff, Andrew Soll, Patricia Turner, Chris Wagner

The regular meeting of University Senate was called to order by Acting Chair Gapko at 3:05 p.m. on Tuesday, April 25, 2006 in McIntyre Library, Room 2023.

- Without objection, fifth motion under Miscellaneous Business from Faculty Personnel Committee on Chairs as DPC Tie-Breakers added to agenda
- Report attached to name tags
- Introduction of new senator from Advising and New Student Initiatives, Jacqueline Bonneville

I. Minutes of April 11, 2006 University Senate meeting approved as corrected

II. Chancellor’s Remarks – Chancellor Larson

- Agenda is long so will keep remarks short
- Invite all to 9th Annual Devroy Forum with speaker Dana Milbank tonight

III. Chair’s Report – Acting Chair Gapko

- Joint Committee on Employment Relations holding public hearings on modifications to 2005-2007 compensation plan for non-represented classified and certain unclassified employees on April 26, 2006
  - Believe that covers faculty and academic staff salaries
- Been asked to provide formal response from UW-Eau Claire on proposed criminal conviction background checks resolution
- Chair referred draft proposal to personnel committees and Executive Committee in order for governance to formulate response needed by May 10, 2006

IV. Faculty Representative’s Report – Senator Wick

- Next Faculty Representatives Meeting is April 28, 2006 in Madison
- Next Board of Regents Meeting is May 4 and 5, 2006 in Madison
- Also have UW-System Compensation Advisory Committee meeting on April 27, 2006
  - Presume will get update from proceedings of JCOER meeting Wednesday

V. Academic Staff Representative’s Report – Senator Blackstone

- Met in Madison on April 20, 2006 – report included with name tags
- If anyone would like information on per credit tuition, would be glad to share report
Assembly Bill 1147 would permit Board of Regents, Technical College System Board, or Technical College District to refuse to employ or to terminate from employment an unpardoned felon
- UW-System has not taken any position on bill, believing it would not come out of committee
  - Is now coming out for a hearing
  - May concern some worried about civil liberties

VI. Announcements
- Students from Senator Dorsher’s Public Affairs Reporting class observing senate today; some may be requesting interviews

VII. Unfinished Business
A. Second Reading – Motion from Faculty Personnel and Academic Staff Personnel Committees
   Review of Interim Administrators

**Amendment 42-FP-02-a1 and 42-AS-02-a1**
Moved and seconded by University Senate Executive Committee (12 for, 0 against) that the Review of Interim Administrators motions be amended so all three paragraphs are identical as follows:

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.

Without objection, motions amended.

Continued Debate on Motion 42-FP-02
- None

**Vote on Motion 42-FP-02:** Motion PASSED as amended without dissention.

B. Second Reading – Motion from Academic Staff Personnel Committee
   Review of Interim Administrators – Vice and Assistant Chancellors and Directors

Continued Debate
- None

**Vote on Motion 42-AS-02:** Motion PASSED as amended without dissention.

VIII. Reports of Committees
- Executive Committee – Chair Gapko
  - Next meeting May 2, 2006 to discuss proposed draft of language from UW-System on Criminal Conviction Background Checks
- Faculty Personnel Committee – Senator McAleer
  - Met April 24, 2006 and approved motion on Chairs as DPC Tie-Breakers
  - Next meet on May 8, 2006 to finalize response to Provost Tallant on advising as stand-alone category for evaluation and also to consider background checks proposal
- Academic Staff Personnel Committee – Senator Blackstone
  - Meet on April 27, 2006 to consider motion on criminal background checks referred by chair
- Academic Policies Committee – Senator McIntyre
  - Today completed review of Biology Department and began review of Public Health Professions Department
  - On May 2, 2006 to complete Public Health Professions review and begin Special Education Department review
  - May 9, 2006 to hold last meeting to complete Special Education Department review
- Physical Plant Planning Committee – Senator Russell
  - Met April 24, 2006
    - Heard report from University Police Director Sprick on campus safety including
      - Hazards posed by queue of cars waiting for meters
• Lighting on campus
• Monthly checks done on campus and regular tests of fire alarms
• Handling of suspicious person on campus
• Where to report any threats or threatening behavior
• Impact of background checks for employees
• Role of building coordinators

• Next meeting May 1, 2006 for walking tour of campus to look at Putnam Park and some of Garfield Avenue Redevelopment areas

◆ Budget Committee – Senator Gallaher
• Next meeting May 1, 2006 to receive report on current state of university budget

◆ Compensation Committee – Senator Wick
• Next meeting week of May 8th to discuss ideas for 2007-2009 pay plan
• Chair Gapko requested that academic staff senators respond to Academic Staff Subcommittee of Compensation Committee email so have information to bring to Compensation Committee meeting

◆ Nominating Committee – Senator Lo
• No report

◆ Technology Committee – Senator Ducksworth-Lawton
• Next meeting Friday, May 5, 2006 to discuss outcome of clicker demonstration
• Motion on setting single standard for clickers coming to senate today

IX. Special Reports
• Demonstration on Clickers in the Classroom – Matt Evans, Physics and Astronomy, with assistance from Don Bredle, Craig Ernst, Patricia Turner, and Senator Raleigh
• Survey results and comparison of vendors handouts distributed
• Strengths of all systems
  • Know what is going on in classroom based on answers to questions – know how well students are absorbing material
  • Engages classes; little different than traditional lecture
  • Promotes discussion
  • More flexible instruction – actively participating
  • Captures attention, students focus if think something graded will come up soon
  • Merely a tool, not a magic bullet
  • Proven to be effective for instruction
• Single system standard would benefit four groups
  • Faculty
    • Don’t have to try new technology each semester
    • If standard system, more people willing to put in work to use
  • Students
    • Cheaper to buy only one clicker for all classes
    • Will be market for used clickers if know they will be used again in future semesters
  • Learning and Technology Services (LTS)
    • Would not take personnel intensity that supporting four systems does
    • Would eliminate software/hardware conflicts of two different systems in same room
  • Network for Excellence in Teaching (NET)
    • Could help instructors learn technology more effectively – more than one system stretches NET too thin
    • Know literature on how to do well, could help effectively implement technology
• If adopt single standard, manufacturers will warranty units, offer economy of scale pricing, and lower receiver costs
• Benefits and drawbacks of each of systems
  • iClicker – cheapest, easiest to use, but also bare bones system
  • Simple programs can be used with any question – Power Point, Word, Excel, pictures
  • Most flexible – can use anything on screen
  • When done, can go into grading program and edit
• Costs more time after start because have to key in which answers are right or wrong for each question – very difficult to set up correct answers in advance
• Can be brought up within one minute
• Has about 3% failure rate
• Turning Technologies
  • Lot of faculty currently using
  • Usually used in Power Point
  • Color-coded graphs come up automatically; can pre-assign correct answers for immediate feedback
  • Very robust system, able to easily generate all sort of reports with output directly into Excel file
  • Can take up to five minutes to set up in classroom
  • In classes, have experienced 2% failure rate
• eInstruction
  • Similar to Turning Technologies, but has self-paced scoring
  • Most robust, also most expensive
  • Takes about two minutes to set up in class
  • Seldom have problems

• Discussion
  • Clicker use is instructor driven
    • Will go in all large classrooms, installation in smaller classrooms will be faculty driven
  • Clickers very useful to get responses and tailor teaching
    • Also can use for assessment, such as quizzes
  • Couple of colleagues love clickers – think great for assessment and instant feedback
    • But amount of discussion in classes has dropped since using clickers
    • Students who don’t like clickers are often top students in class
  • Don’t understand why senate deciding if there should be a standard – didn’t decide on web-based learning system, web editor, etc.
  • Because is academic issue and senate is venue on campus with representatives from every academic department
    • Have been complaints that faculty not involved in creation of those standards
    • This allows faculty input before standard set
    • Will be making recommendation to LTS and provost
    • Technology Committee should be there to show us technologies and help make decision of how to use limited resources
  • Purpose of demonstration is to show clickers to people who have never seen them and so can take issue back to people in departments who might think about using clickers in classrooms
    • First decision is whether to adopt a single standard; and then for people interested to help with decision as to which one that might be

X. Special Orders
Election of University Senate Chair-Elect
• Each candidate asked to give brief presentation to answer three questions
  • Why they are interested in serving faculty and academic staff in this important leadership role?
  • What skills they bring to the position?
  • What would their plans be for the future direction of the University Senate?
• Senator Dorsher
  • No idea who or why someone nominated me for this – surprised and flattered
    • Both other candidates have much more experience in this body and at university
  • Do have about 20 years experience attending and reporting on meetings of legislative bodies, from zoning commissions to United States Senate
    • Have observed legislative bodies working well and working poorly and thinking about how they could work better
    • Have some ideas and experience using Robert’s Rules of Order
  • Would look forward to senate in future being more proactive, less reactive to issues; passing more legislation than we kill; and being more forward-looking, standard-setting, consensus-building body
Senator Freymiller
- On senate since 1998 serving on variety of committees – Physical Plant Planning Committee, Academic Policies Committee, Executive Committee, Academic Staff Personnel Committee, and Service-Learning Committee
  - Come to realize shared governance is one of most important things we have going for us as part of higher education
- As instructional academic staff with faculty status, in unique situation
  - With University Senate being joint senate of faculty and academic staff, might be time to contemplate electing an instructional academic staff member as chair
  - Have foot on faculty side, in curriculum and those tremendously important issues; we must maintain our excellence in academics
  - At same time, have personnel rights with academic staff and realize importance of administrative and professional academic staff and how an institution of higher education cannot operate without their support
  - Think I bring both perspectives to campus
- While am willing to express opinions on floor of senate, am good listener and can bring together whole bunch of ideas and distill them to get to bottom of issue
- Would like to
  - Bring in legislators or community members on regular basis to address us and get our feedback
  - Increase articulation with Student Senate
    - We can do better job of working together with Student Senate as strive for same goals
  - Increase articulation with Chippewa Valley Technical College as it attempts to implement an associate degree program in liberal arts which would have serious implications for us, Stout and River Falls

Senator Wood
- Been here 20 years; involved in governance since beginning
- Love this place and love serving this place – been on almost every kind of committee there is
- Eight years as chair of English Department seems like enough – seems senate chair would be good way to continue to serve if in tune with what senators want
- Know Chancellor Larson would like UW-Eau Claire to be more nimble institution – not a word that springs to mind when think about structure here
  - Some of ways do things across campus seem meant to protect what already in place rather than look for openness and scrutiny and critical examination of way we do things
  - Like full representation from every possible entity in every question
    - While laudable in some ways, can become a mechanism for protecting what sometimes is mediocrity
  - Senate is not innocent in that; although doesn’t have power to streamline or nimblize UW-Eau Claire, certainly could be a player in that process
- Have perhaps lost sight of what governance is by trying to apply it to everything
  - Are some questions these highly-paid administrators can figure out without talking to us
  - If we don’t like decisions, we do have recourse, but don’t need elaborate discussion on all issues
  - Can spend a lot of time in senate talking about things not as crucial as issues we don’t get to
- One thing I do well, and like doing, is looking at complex complicated systems and organizations and finding ways to address their problems
  - Would want to reinvent way governance happens on this campus
- If you are interested in doing that, vote for me; if not, we can have excellent leadership under other gentlemen running today

Elected as University Senate Chair-Elect: Marty Wood

XI. Miscellaneous Business
A. First Reading – Motion from Academic Staff Subcommittee of Executive Committee
  Report on Modified Academic Staff Review of Performance Senate Action – Senator Brockpahler
  - Originally passed by Senate and approved by the chancellor; not accepted by UW-System legal, so subcommittee reevaluated and made changes
  - System legal felt language for people with no intent to rehire contracts was too similar to those without that clause
Counsel felt paragraphs for fixed term – no intent to rehire parts that are lined out were too specific.

Motion 42-AH-01
Subcommittee composed of University Academic Staff members of the Executive Committee and University Academic Staff Senators on the Academic Staff Personnel Committee, by joint consensus with the Chancellor, recommends the attached motion regarding UWEC 10.03(3), Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook, Chapter 5, page 43, Review of Performance be approved.

UWEC 10.03(3) Review of Performance
1. Fixed Term—Instructional and/or Research Academic Staff (IRAS)
   a. Fixed Term—Renewable
      4a) Performance Review

      The performance review of instructional and/or research academic staff for reappointment will follow procedures outlined in the departmental evaluation plan and similar to those employed for probationary faculty for peer review (UWEC 3.05) including the consideration of student evaluations. The Departmental Personnel Committee will conduct a review of performance and forward a report to the Department Chair.

      The performance evaluation by the Department Chair, including the Departmental Personnel Committee’s report, will be given to the staff member in writing at the same time the report is forwarded to the appropriate Dean. The staff member shall have the right to comment on the evaluation in writing within ten calendar days of receipt of the departmental evaluation. To make appropriate personnel decisions and to support the individual’s personnel record, the Department Chair’s performance evaluation and the academic staff member’s comments, if any, shall be filed in the staff member’s personnel file.

      The Department Chair’s performance evaluation is to be forwarded to the Dean prior to January 15 in the instructional and/or research academic staff member’s first two years of service; prior to October 15 of the third through sixth years of service; and prior to February 15 for appointment to the seventh and subsequent years of service.

      When an IAS member holds a multiple year contract and has been employed at the University for six or more continuous years, a performance review need only be done during the year in which reappointment is to occur.

   b. Fixed Term—No Intent to Rehire
      1) Performance Review

      For an instructional and/or research academic staff member whose contract indicates there is no intent to renew/rehire, the department may conduct a more limited review as outlined in the departmental evaluation plan. The staff member will meet with the department chair at the beginning of the contract period to discuss evaluation criteria. At minimum, a written evaluation by the department chair or a member of the Department Personnel Committee shall be provided to the staff member following the review. The staff member shall have the right to comment on the evaluation in writing within ten calendar days of receipt of the department chair’s evaluation. The written evaluation and the academic staff member’s comments, if any, shall be placed in the staff member’s personnel file. This process shall conclude not later than 30 days prior to the end of the contractual period.

      2) Areas of Evaluation

      The performance review for instructional and/or research academic staff whose contract indicates there is no intent to rehire shall be an evaluation based on contractual responsibilities. At the written request
of the instructional academic staff, the evaluation may include professional growth and appropriate
service to the department, the university, the profession, and the community. (US 3/05)

2. **Fixed Term**—Administrative and/or Professional Academic Staff (APAS)

   a. Fixed Term—Renewable

   1a) Performance Review

   Within the first month of each contract period, the immediate supervisor shall call a meeting with the
   academic staff member to review and explain work assignments and performance expectations for the
   period. Performance expectations shall be determined in the context of the areas of evaluation specified
   below. The performance evaluation process shall be completed by January 15 in the first two years;
   by October 15 in the third through sixth years of service; and by February 15 for appointment to the
   seventh and subsequent years of service. (US 5/04)

   The supervisor shall give results of the performance evaluation to the academic staff member in writing
   at the same time they are forwarded to the appropriate official. The academic staff member shall have
   the right to comment on the evaluation in writing within ten calendar days of the receipt of the
   supervisor’s evaluation. To make appropriate personnel decisions and to support the individual’s
   personal record, the supervisor’s evaluation and the academic staff member’s comments, if any, shall
   be filed in the academic staff member’s personnel file.

   2b) Areas of Evaluation

   Administrative and/or professional academic staff shall be evaluated on their contributions to the
   development and strengthening of their respective areas of responsibility. Professional growth and
   effectiveness in dealing with people in employment capacities, as well as appropriate service to the
   unit/department, the university, the profession, and the community shall be considered in the
   evaluation.

   For a staff member whose contract indicates there is **no intent to renew/rehire**, the supervisor
   may conduct a more limited review based only on contractual responsibilities.

   b. Fixed Term—No Intent to Rehire

   1) Performance Review

   For an administrative and/or professional academic staff member whose contract indicates there is no
   intent to rehire, the supervisor may conduct a more limited review. If a review is to be conducted, the
   supervisor will meet with the staff member at the beginning of the contract period to discuss evaluation
   criteria. A written evaluation by the supervisor shall be provided to the staff member following the
   review. The staff member shall have the right to comment on the evaluation in writing within ten
   calendar days of receipt of the supervisor’s evaluation. The written evaluation and the academic staff
   member’s comments, if any, shall be placed in the staff member’s personnel file. This process shall
   conclude not later than 30 days prior to the end of the contractual period.

   2) Areas of Evaluation

   The performance review for APAS whose contract indicates there is no intent to rehire shall be an
   evaluation based on contractual responsibilities.

   c. Probationary Administrative and/or Professional Academic Staff

   1a) Performance Review

   Within the first month of each contract period, the immediate supervisor shall call a meeting with the
   academic staff member to review and explain work assignments and performance expectations for the
   period. Performance expectations shall be determined in the context of the areas of evaluation specified
   below. Performance evaluation process shall be completed by January 15 in the first year of service, by
   October 15 in the second year of service, and by February 15 thereafter. (US 5/04)

   The supervisor shall give results of the performance evaluation to the academic staff member in writing
   at the same time they are forwarded to the appropriate official. The academic staff member shall have
   the right to comment on the evaluation in writing within ten calendars days of the receipt of the
supervisor’s evaluation. To make appropriate personnel decisions and to support the individual’s personal record, the supervisor’s evaluation and the academic staff member’s comments, if any, shall be filed in the academic staff member’s personnel file.

An affirmative review process resulting in the change of status from probationary to indefinite appointment may take place at any time during the probationary period.

2) Areas of Evaluation

Probationary academic staff members shall be evaluated on their contributions to the development and strengthening of their respective areas of responsibility. Professional growth and effectiveness in dealing with people in employment capacities, as well as appropriate contributions to the unit/department, the University, the profession, and the community public shall be considered in the evaluation.

44. Indefinite Administrative and/or Professional Academic Staff

4a) Performance Evaluation

Annually by February 15, the supervisor and academic staff member on indefinite appointment shall meet and review the performance of the academic staff member. The result of the evaluation shall be considered in making appropriate personnel decisions.

The supervisor shall give results of the performance evaluation to the academic staff member in writing at the same time they are forwarded to the appropriate official. The academic staff member shall have the right to comment on the evaluation in writing within ten calendars days of the receipt of the supervisor’s evaluation. To make appropriate personnel decisions and to support the individual’s personal record, the supervisor’s evaluation and the academic staff member’s comments, if any, shall be filed in the academic staff member’s personnel file.

2b) Areas of Evaluation

Members of the academic staff on indefinite appointment shall be evaluated on their contributions to the development and strengthening of their respective areas of responsibility. Professional growth and effectiveness in dealing with people in employment capacities, as well as appropriate contributions to the unit/department, the University, the profession, and the community public shall be considered in the evaluation.

Debate

- Debate limited to accepting or not accepting results of modified language developed in consultation with chancellor and system legal counsel; motion itself cannot be edited on floor

Without objection, continued debate and vote postponed to next senate meeting.

B. First Reading – Motion from Faculty Personnel Committee

Report on Promotion Criteria Approval – Senator McAleer

- Committee asked by Chair Harrison to clarify language on who is responsible for developing promotion criteria in Department Personnel Committee – would like to clarify that it is promotion subcommittee
- If there is disagreement once Departmental Evaluation Plan (DEP) voted on, is chance for those who disagree with criteria to be heard

Motion 42-FP-03

Moved and seconded by the Faculty Personnel Committee (6 for, 0 against, 1 abstention) that the following changes to the Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook, Chapter 5, be approved:

Page 5.19

CRITERIA FOR PERIODIC REVIEW OF FACULTY PERFORMANCE

2. Department Criteria

Each phase of periodic review of faculty performance shall include, but is not limited to, consideration of teaching effectiveness, academic advising ability, scholarly activity, and service to the University, the profession and the
public. The Department Personnel Committee (DPC) of each department or functional equivalent with input from the Department Chair shall develop and approve a written evaluation plan that defines each of these general criteria and describes the relative emphasis to be given to each criterion. The emphasis may vary depending on needs of the department, individual interests, and the stage of a faculty member’s career. Upon approval by the DPC, the plan shall be submitted to the Department Chair, the Dean, and the Provost and Vice Chancellor who shall review the plan and, if it is determined to be acceptable, approve it in writing. The Department Chair shall distribute the approved plan to department members, thereby informing them of the agreed upon criteria. The Department Personnel Committee, the Department Chair, the Dean, and the Provost and Vice Chancellor shall use the agreed upon criteria in considering performance reviews. Any members of the DPC who object to any aspect of the DEP may submit a minority report outlining those objections. This report shall be forwarded with the plan to each level of administrative review and may be incorporated in the acceptance, rejection, or proposed modification of the plan.

The Department Personnel Committee shall annually review the Department Evaluation Plan and revise the plan as deemed appropriate. Revisions shall be approved in the same manner as the original plan. The Department Chair shall inform the department in writing of any agreed upon revisions in the plan.

If at any point during the development or revision of the plan subsequent to DPC approval of a plan, agreement cannot be reached over any aspect of the plan, the next higher level (Department Chair, Dean, or Provost and Vice Chancellor) shall attempt to informally mediate any differences to secure agreement so that the plan may move forward. If the Provost and Vice Chancellor’s effort at informal mediation fails, the Faculty Complaint and Grievance Committee shall be convened by the Chancellor to examine the issues and to make a recommendation to the Chancellor concerning that portion of the plan for which an agreement could not be reached. The decision of the Chancellor is final. When the Faculty Complaint and Grievance Committee recommendation is supported by three-fourths of those voting, the Committee can expect that its recommendation will be supported except for only the most compelling reasons. (US 12/03)

Page 5.26

CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION IN RANK

The criteria to be followed in determining promotion in rank are provided in the Department Evaluation Plan (see UWEC 3.05, Periodic Review) and are established by the members of the promotion subcommittee responsible for recommendation of promotion to each rank (pending the approval and acceptance process outlined in UWEC 3.05). Peer judgments of faculty performance and student evaluations shall be considered by the promotion subcommittee in making promotion recommendations. Promotions from one rank in the schedule to another shall not follow automatically when a faculty member shall have raised his or her qualifications to meet the requirements of the rank above.

Debate

- So even though majority of DPC recommends one thing, formal report by one person can go forward for higher administration to pay attention to, effectively removing democracy from issue?
- DEP approved by entire DPC, although promotion subcommittee establishes these criteria, they are then voted on by DPC
  - So, for example, associate professors might not like what full professors specify and not approve that in DEP
  - Then professor subcommittee can include objections up line so there would be checks and balances in process
  - Those arguments then are heard although may or may not influence decisions; gives opportunity for both sides to be heard outside department
- Provost indicated this happens frequently with individuals coming to speak to him who don’t feel they are being heard at department level; this formalizes that process

Without objection, continued debate and vote on motion postponed until next meeting.

C. First Reading – Motion from Budget Committee
Report on Budget Committee Functions – Senator Gallaher
- When committee first met last fall, looked at functions in handbook, which didn’t help
So spent year discussing functions and coming up with list
• Requesting that handbook be revised to reflect list created by committee
• You join Budget Committee believing committee actually controls money – this is not true
• Function is to advise and consent

**Motion 42-BC-01**
Moved and seconded by the Budget Committee (8 for, 0 against) that the functions of the Senate Budget Committee in the Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook, Chapter 3, page 15 be changed as follows:

**From:**
b. Functions: The Budget Committee is responsible for continuously investigating all matters related to the University budget. As such, it shall regularly review current budget allocations and existing budget related policies and their implementation. It shall also investigate and initiate budget proposals, recommend priorities for existing and new programs, and serve as an advisory body to the Vice Chancellor for Business and Student Services on all budget-related matters including the University biennial budget and annual budget reviews and allocations.

**To:**
b. The Budget Committee serves as an advisory group to Vice Chancellor for Business and Student Services and as a liaison to Faculty and Academic Staff to disseminate budget related information and to investigate any matters of concern related to the University budget. 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.

**Debate**
• Not speaking for or against function change, but if committee changes to advisory group, would like Executive Committee to discuss whether this is really a senate governance committee, which typically sets policies and procedures for campus, or should it be put under administrative advising groups

MOTION by Senator Carpenter that the 42-BC-01 be referred to the Executive Committee for comment seconded and PASSED.

**D. First Reading** – Motion from Technology Committee

**Report on Single Standard for Clickers** – Senator Ducksworth-Lawton
• Asking senate to recommend, as voice of faculty and academic staff, that a single standard for clickers be adopted at UW-Eau Claire
• Are number of issues involved because are two systems currently in use on campus; are number of faculty who would like to see both continued
• Response to questions on report for clarification
  • Faculty can decide whether to use clickers in classes – it is whether LTS will support use of clickers
    • This would direct LTS not to support more than one
    • Is recommendation; not empowered to mandate LTS to go to single standard
    • If voted no, would be important signal to LTS to rethink that single standard

**Motion 42-TC-01**
Moved and seconded by Technology Committee (6 for, 0 against) to recommend adoption of a single standard for clickers in classrooms at UW-Eau Claire.

**Debate**
• Have heard more useful system is more unreliable so is this right time to be moving ahead
• Seems always assumption that have to integrate into Microsoft software
• iClicker doesn’t depend on Microsoft and neither does elnstruction; Turning Technologies is linked to Microsoft Power Point
• Clicker use no longer tied to textbooks as now have extra units on campus – LTS would like faculty to direct them to system it wants
If motion passes, Technology Committee would further discuss with LTS and LTS would probably hold another open meeting

If motion passes, Technology Committee would further discuss with LTS and LTS would probably hold another open meeting

Ultimately standard would be set by LTS

Believe any decision for single standard can be reconsidered as technology comes forward, although each manufacturer has agreed to automatic upgrades if single standard adopted

Think it would be wise to adopt single standard both for cost of equipment and personnel, but not convinced clickers are necessarily best use of scarce resources

Have not heard whether one kind of clicker serves one kind of constituency better than another

Six faculty from across campus participated in research project

Didn’t notice a particular kind of clicker served one area better than another

Clickers in classrooms are designed to get responses from students and encourage active learning despite area of study

Think it is premature to come up with a standard; sympathetic to cost issues and efficiency issues, but don’t think there is enough information

For example, think it is critical that clickers have a function for students to record confidence level with their votes

Is debate on which clicker is better and whether we should have clickers period

Speak against motion because issues are not clear

MOTION by Senate Wick that the motion be postponed indefinitely seconded.

Debate

Oppose postponement; it is worth having discussion to reach decision

Have used clickers, think they are important

Complain that faculty locked out of other decisions; have opportunity here

If don’t take those opportunities when afforded to us, cannot complain afterwards

Ought to rethink why we have Technology Committee if just going to hand off decisions to other people

Motivation for motion

Don’t believe this is academic issue

Think we are involved in decision making

Concern is don’t believe technology is mature enough yet to force a choice

If adopt a single standard, don’t see how I will know enough about various clickers to vote on next motion that is indicated to be coming about which system to go with

Think it is premature to pass motion, yet don’t want to defeat because that sends signal saying LTS must support ten clickers

Let’s wait and decide this issue when we have more information and experience

If don’t set single standard, then students will have to be buying three clickers for three different classes; do not want that to happen

My students knew within a matter of days that most important thing for them was to have clicker system that was affordable and reliable

This will allow them to move forward with their learning

Although I have seen benefits, not every faculty person needs to use clickers in every class

Cost and reliability are really discouraging to students

Vote on Motion to Postpone Indefinitely: Motion DEFEATED.

Debate

Argument that technology keeps changing so should not lock in will also hold true in five years

Without objection, continued debate and vote on main motion postponed to next meeting.

E. First Reading – Motion from Faculty Personnel Committee

Report on Chairs as DPC Tie-Breakers – Senator McAleer

Committee asked by Chair Harrison to consider what role, if any, department chairs should have when DPC vote for tenure results in a tie

Language in handbook not conclusive

One of points discussed by committee was distinction between making vs. breaking ties

Important pro is that change can only benefit faculty member, cannot harm
Main con is concern that DPC losing some of its voice
Motion may be controversial as evidenced by split vote of committee
Response to questions for clarification
  • Abstentions don’t figure in vote count
  • If department’s DEP already says that a tie is a no, this would supersede that
  • Is optional, so chair could break a tie, but would not have to
    • If chair did nothing, then a tie already would not be an affirmative recommendation, so chair breaking tie can only help faculty member

Motion 42-FP-04
Moved and seconded by Faculty Personnel Committee (5 for, 2 against) that the Faculty and Academic Staff
Handbook, Chapter 5, page 5 be changed as follows:

UWS 3.06 RENEWAL OF APPOINTMENTS AND GRANTING TENURE

UWEC 3.08 Granting Tenure

Granting tenure shall result from an affirmative recommendation of the department and approval by the administration. A department’s recommendation is affirmative when either (a) the Department Personnel Committee makes a positive recommendation for tenure or (b) if the Department Personnel Committee’s vote results in a tie and the Department Chair recommends tenure. Such recommendation shall proceed in the same manner as a recommendation for reappointment.

Debate
  • Seems like this gives chair a double vote
  • Chairs can be part of DPC and on most campuses in system, they are; we have chosen not to do that
  • Chairs don’t vote, chairs make recommendations; DPC votes
    • DPC vote must be affirmative in order for tenure to be granted
    • If DPC says no, answer is no; if DPC says yes, answer is yes; when DPC vote is tied, this allows chair to say let this be considered up the line
    • Because department chairs required to make separate evaluation, allows chair to let it continue forward
    • Still no way for chairs to stop it when DPC makes definitive decision
  • Since statement in handbook currently says that a tie is a no vote, more language may need to be changed
    • Committee will bring that forward for next meeting
  • Current motion only applies for tenure

Without objection, continued debate and vote on motion postponed until the next meeting.

Without objection, meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Submitted by,

Wanda Schuler
Secretary to the University Senate