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Members Present:
Mohammad Alasagheirin, Jason Anderson, Carey Applegate, Rose Marie Avin, Ryan Banaszak, Janice Bogstad, Jasmine Case, Selika Ducksworth-Lawton, Jeff Erger, Steven Fink, Mitchell Freymiller, Dan Gharrity, Jeffrey Goodman, Holly Hassemer, Staci Heidtke, Beth Hellwig, Bob Hooper, Phil Huelsbeck, Marquell Johnson, Jyl Kelley, Jennifer Kieffer, Pat Kleine, Jerry Kollross, Cheryl Lapp, Julia Lehman Caldwell, Colleen Marchwick, Sean McAleer, Marc McEllistrem, Robin Miller, Heather Pearson, Gretchen Peters, Geoffrey Peterson, Jim Phillips, Crispin Pierce, Sheryl Poirier, John Pollitz, Jean Pratt, Manda Riehl, Vicki Samelson, Lisa Schiller, James Schmidt, Lois Slattery, Carter Smith – Pedro Sottile, Todd Stephens, Paul Thomas, Ganga Vadhavkar, Bao Vue, Ryan Weichelt, Evan Weiher, Kate Wilson,

Members Absent:
Cindy Albert, Jana Armstrong, Maria Carvalho, Cynthia Chapek, Lisa Coen, Chip Eckardt, Luke Fedie, Marie Koissi, Leah Olson-McBride, Deb Pattee, Audrey Robinson, Dan Stevenson, David Tschida, Odawa White, Marty Wood

Guests:
Colton Ashley, Margaret Cassidy, Manny Fernandez, Jeff Janot, Debra Jansen, Jill Prushiek, Ann Rupnow, Ashley Sukhu

The regular meeting of University Senate was called to order by Chair Freymiller at 3:05 p.m. on Tuesday, November 8, 2016 in the Woodland Theatre of Davies Center.

1) Approval of the October 25, 2016 University Senate minutes
- Approved as distributed

2) Administrator Remarks – Chancellor Schmidt
- Rough week for this campus, but an opportunity for learning and engagement
  - Jan Larson is collecting video reflections of what our students hope to get from next president
  - Chancellor Schmidt drafted his own reflections; will distribute them following the election
  - Time for some healing and some learning
  - We can address some of the recent issues that have impacted our campus during the discussion of the EDI Resolution
  - Chancellor has accepted an invitation to visit Changshu Institute of Technology (CIT) near Shanghai, Jia University in Guangzhou for their 110th Anniversary, and Huaqiao University-Quanzhou (main campus) and Huaqiao University -Xiamen in China
  - Hosts will cover the costs for his travel

3) Reports
   a) Report from University Senate Chair Freymiller
      - At the last Senate meeting we approved a post-tenure review policy; it has come to my attention that we included language that could result in the rejection of this policy
      - Chancellor has not signed this motion, so we have an opportunity change that language
      - Parliamentary procedure allows a body to determine that it did something it should not have done or should have done differently, and subsequently remedy that action
      - Therefore, we will revisit Post-Tenure Review as unfinished business

Without objection, we will treat this as a motion to amend something previously adopted
b) For the Record: Academic Policies Committee

Motion to establish a Latin American Studies Certificate

- Provost will be talking with Deans about SAM/PAM implications
- Courses counted towards this certificate will be included in work that the department does
- May account for enrollment drops in the minor and that will be taken into consideration
- If students want to learn more of the language, they could take additional courses
- Some students already have the language background because of their heritage

Without objection, this item will be entered FOR the RECORD

c) For the Record: Academic Policies Committee

Dance Activities Certificate

Without objection, this item will be entered FOR the RECORD

d) Executive Committee Report

- On November 1, members of the EDI Implementation team met again with the Senate Executive Committee and provided a revised resolution in support of the EDI Implementation Plan that they hoped the University Senate could endorse
- Article Three: University Senate in the FASRP contains language regarding the size of the University Senate and distribution of senators
- In October, the Executive Committee reviews the number of University Faculty members and the number of University Academic Staff members eligible to vote in order to determine the percentage of University Faculty senators and the percentage of University Academic Staff senators within the University Senate
- Current numbers reflect changes in the size of the University Faculty and University Academic Staff that resulted from VSIP, other retirements, non-renewal of contracts, and resignations
- Executive Committee decided not to make any changes at this time, pending the outcomes of the numerous searches being conducted during this fiscal year

4) Unfinished Business

It was moved and seconded to amend the Post-Tenure Review policy that was previously adopted on October 25 by changing Part III; Article Five: Personnel Policies and Procedures; Section B.2.f.10(a) and b) in the following manner

System Legal will reject our current draft due to language in section 10 on remediation (bold type)

a) The Dean shall identify any performance deficiencies that result from the process described above and provide a written report to the faculty member. The faculty member may provide a written response to the Dean and may request that the Chancellor reconsider the assignment of the category “does not meet expectations”. The Chancellor or designee will inform the faculty member of the results of the reconsideration in writing.

b) In the case of a decision from the Chancellor to assign the category of “does not meet expectations,” the faculty member shall, in consultation with the Dean and the Department Chair, devise a remediation plan. The Dean has final approval over the remediation plan.

Previous Senate approved motion that was sent to the Chancellor

Language on the motion to be reconsidered
It was moved and seconded to amend the Post-Tenure Review policy that was previously adopted on October 25 by changing Part III; Article Five: Personnel Policies and Procedures; Section B.2.f.10(a) and b) in the following manner:

a) The Dean shall identify any performance deficiencies that result from the process described above and provide a written report to the faculty member. The faculty member may provide a written response to the Dean and may request that the Chancellor reconsider the assignment of the category “does not meet expectations.” The Chancellor or designee will inform the faculty member of the results of the reconsideration in writing.

b) In the case of a decision from the Chancellor to assign the category of “does not meet expectations.” After receiving the report from the Dean, the faculty member shall, in consultation with the Dean and the Department Chair, devise a remediation plan. The Dean has final approval over the remediation plan.

Debate
- One can still provide additional information to the Dean, but cannot provide additional information to the Chancellor requesting a change in the decision
- Once the Chancellor has made the decision to implement remediation, it goes back to the Dean
- Remediation recommendation from the dean is in a different section; faculty member would have already responded to the Dean’s decision
- Does our policy violate the intent of the BOR policy against allowing an appeal?
  - It would be interpreted as an appeal
    - Not being able to ask someone to look at it again when they are the one who is actually making the decision is not right; does not conflict with UWS 6.02, so it would seem to be a reasonable request
- If we do not approve this amendment, System Legal will probably refuse to present our policy to the Board of Regents, using argument that the BOR will likely reject our policy and rewrite it for us
- Many other campuses are having their policies returned
- Lack of appeal was a source of considerable debate; BOR decided that reconsideration is equivalent to an appeal
- Once the Chancellor decides that a faculty member is in remediation, Chancellor is no longer involved and additional information can be provided to the Dean

MOTION by Senator McAleer to amend the motion as follows:

a) The Dean shall identify any performance deficiencies that result from the process described above and provide a written report to the faculty member. The faculty member may provide a written response to the Dean and may request that the Chancellor reconsider the assignment of the category “does not meet expectations.” The purpose of reconsideration of an assignment of “does not meet expectations” shall be to provide an opportunity for a fair and full reconsideration of the assignment and to ensure that all relevant material is considered. Reconsideration is not a hearing or an appeal, and shall be non-adversarial in nature. The Chancellor or designee will inform the faculty member of the results of the reconsideration in writing.

b) In the case of a decision from the Chancellor to assign the category of “does not meet expectations,” After receiving the report from the Dean, the faculty member shall, in consultation with the Dean and the Department Chair, devise a remediation plan. The Dean has final approval over the remediation plan.

MOTION to amend dies for lack of a second

VOTE on Motion to amend the Post-Tenure Review policy that was previously adopted on October 25: PASSED
5) New Business
   a) First Reading: Motion from the Academic Policies Committee

   Kinesiology Majors

   Debate
   • No changes in terms of Chemistry requirements

   Without objection, we will vote on this today

   Vote on Motion: PASSED

   b) First Reading: Motion from the Academic Policies Committee

   Transfer Equivalency for Select Associate Degrees meeting all LE Core Requirements except Design for Diversity

   • Many of the required integrated learning experiences will be filled at higher levels
   • We need to get students on campus because they will be here for two years during which time they will fulfill integrated learning requirement through additional coursework
     • More interested in what Blugolds look like leaving campus rather than what they look like arriving on campus
     • We cannot guarantee the transfer work is as rigorous as on our campus, but we can expose them to a high quality of learning here
   • All LE requirements, except Design for Diversity, would be met
   • Students will be exposed to other learning experiences that will still satisfy that outcome
   • Transfer students would not be required to meet any additional LE objectives
   • This motion is specific about which degrees would be accepted, because some associate degrees would not be eligible

   Debate
   • Associate degrees are an important part of academics; in terms of LE requirements, some students might be better served at other institutions

   Without objection, we will vote on this today

   Vote on Motion: PASSED
c) First Reading: Motion from the Faculty Personnel Committee

Reorganizing Faculty Periodic Review Criteria

- Years ago, Faculty Senate voted to create a category for advising so we would have more emphasis on the quality of advising in our own programs

Without objection, Chair Freymiller presented motion on behalf of Faculty Personnel committee

Without objection, Part III, Article Five: Personnel Policies and Procedures, Section B.2.b.2) will be amended to read “. . . Many faculty activities may contribute to more than one of these criteria, which are defined . . .

Debate
- None

Without objection, we will vote on this today

Vote on Motion: PASSED

d) First Reading: Motion from the University Senate Executive Committee

Resolution in Support of the EDI Implementation Plan

Resolution of the EDI Implementation Plan

Additional Documents:

https://insider.uwec.edu/sites/chancellor/Pages/EDI.aspx

It is moved and seconded by committee to endorse the EDI Implementation Plan

Debate
- Lines 51 through 56 seem to be more specific than just endorsing the plan
- Full Senate is being asked to support this resolution from the EDI Implementation team
- Initial opposition was because the resolution was too narrow; we need to focus on starting with the group that is on the receiving end of discrimination and hate crimes and divisiveness
- Endorsement would make positive steps to making our entire campus more welcoming to all
- Opposition to lines 64 through 67 and the action steps; leaves it to shared governance processes to review, revise or replace action steps
- We must support all marginalized students on this campus
- Last Tuesday we had an interesting learning experience on campus and many students felt like they had experienced that for the first time and that is why we need a plan and why we need to endorse this plan
- This shows commitment to taking steps forward; symbolic aspect of taking that next step
- Concern about our marginalized students and pitting marginalized students against each other

MOTION by Senator Ducksworth-Lawton to amend resolution starting in line 11: . . . students of color and other marginalized student groups and to support other social group and individual identities (such as sex and gender, sexual orientation, economic class, ability, nationality, religious belief, etc.) with proactive and equitable educational practice;
Debate on amendment
- Share these sentiments; but this always happens on this issue and we get bogged down by words
- More satisfied with actions
- Is it the language that is bothersome or is it the fear of taking action?

VOTE on amendment: FAILED

Continued debate on resolution:
- We need to move forward with action
- The events of last week are not acceptable for our faculty or our students

Without objection, we will vote on this today

Vote on Resolution: PASSED

6) Announcements
- Next meeting of the University Senate is November 22nd in Dakota Ballroom of Davies Center
- Student Senate
  - Introduced a bill to excuse absences from class on November 1 for a variety of reasons
  - May have a resolution from Student Senate next week encouraging faculty and staff to show leniency regarding absence from class on November 1 if a student missed class
  - Attendance Policy in the FASRP gives complete control to faculty to deal with attendance issues

Without objection, meeting adjourned at 4:58 p.m.

Submitted by,

Tanya Kenney
Secretary to the University Senate