

University of Wisconsin – Eau Claire
University Senate Executive Committee

Minutes from October 1, 2019
Volume 56, Number 4

Present: Robert Bell, Albert Colom, Chip Eckardt, Bob Hooper, Marquell Johnson, Patricia Kleine, Colleen Marchwick, Jill Markgraf, Bill Miller, Geoffrey Peterson, Kristin Schaupp, James Schmidt, Charlotte Sortedahl, Pedro Sottile, Ryan Weichelt, Evan Weiher

Absent: Elizabeth Glogowski, John Haven,

Guests: Kathy Binder, MJ Brukardt, Becky Dienger, Karen Havholm, Heather Ann Moody

A meeting of the University Senate Executive Committee was called to order by Chair Weiher at 3:02 p.m. on Tuesday, October 1, 2019 in the Council Oak Room of Davies Center.

- 1) Approval of the Minutes of September 17, 2019
 - Approved as distributed
- 2) Ten Minute Open Forum
 - VC for EDI and Student Affairs
 - October 14th will be the week that the candidates will be on campus
 - Did video interviews with 11 candidates and settled on 5
 - Trying to figure out the logistics now but the candidates are selected for the on-campus interviews
 - No candidates have backed out as of yet
 - Using a search firm so they wanted to leave time so a background check can be done
 - That is what is being done now
 - Have a good pool of candidates
 - Honorary Doctorate
 - Left feeling troubled so want to look at that process to see how we can slow it down so we can do due diligence
 - Should make a change to FASRP to require that we have time to investigate those nominations as we did not have a heads up
 - Want to ensure we do what UW System expects of us as a committee
 - Chair office hours are Monday from 3-5 so will meet this coming Monday at 3 to discuss possible language
 - If unable to attend feel free to email Chair Weiher with questions/suggestions/concerns
- 3) Review of tentative agenda for October 8, 2019 meeting of the University Senate
 - Approved as amended
 - Nominees to be added
 - Time(s) adjusted
 - Addition of New Business item
 - First Reading: Resolution in Support of the Chancellor's Investment Framework
- 4) NCUR 2023
 - Site visit team is on our campus today
 - Many gave presentations and it is our hope that they will award us the 2023 conference
 - Student Senate passed a resolution and presented it to the team today
 - No cons are listed on this resolution but questioning if there is no cost to the institution
 - We have committed \$50,000 to support this, UW System also committed to \$50,000 and we have a \$25,000 grant
 - We also plan to seek sponsorships so may be able to reduce our institutional contribution

- Our students are invited to attend, and the idea is to invite faculty to repurpose their classes during that time
 - We are required to host during class times so students can participate
 - To accommodate this the classrooms are then used so that is why faculty are encouraged to repurpose

MOTION to approve and forward to Senate, second

Further discussion

- None

VOTE on MOTION: PASSED

- 5) University Planning Committee membership
- Questioning at what point could a library representative be added
 - Senate owns the motion so it can be altered
 - Concern that library is not part of the colleges or part of UWEC-BC

MOTION that library faculty are represented by altering the follow language: members be increased from 14 to 15 and that “and the Library” be added afteras well as UWEC-Barron County

Discussion

- The planning committee should not be a committee where everybody has to be represented
 - This is a position as a leader and not as a representative to a particular unit
 - The concept of representation is building fences around units
- Want a collaborative image of what we want the university to do
- Then all colleges and divisions should be removed
- Chancellor should choose members that have a vision
- This debate has come full circle from several years ago
 - Too prescriptive vs. the alternative
- Removing colleges gives flexibility
- Want forward looking people
- Do not want suspicion if we do not pick from different colleges that there was no one that represented appropriately
- Could be problematic as not all input would be heard

MOTION to TABLE the QUESTION, seconded

- Will come back to this motion in two weeks

- 6) Resolution in Support of the Chancellor's Investment Framework
- An alternate resolution had been presented
 - Avoided using hard numbers
 - Senate Exec. should not take numbers and put our stamp of approval on them
 - Chancellor was seeking some kind of shared governance support for this motion/resolution
 - Chancellor would add that most of the plan is just framework so many things would still need to be determined
 - There is nothing to be approved but Chancellor Schmidt wants to get a sense of the university
 - The pros that are listed sound like we are trying to save our jobs instead of moving EC forward
 - This extends into the community
 - Can add that this will produce high quality graduates and that it will be good for the community as we will stay the same size or slightly larger
 - Important to keep the pros that are currently listed
 - We need to maintain academic quality
 - Chancellor feels that this is sustainable

- Concern is that the reduction in staff has led to larger class sizes and courses not being available so if we hope to maintain quality then we need faculty to come here and know that their presence is appreciated
 - We have the highest percentage of tenure track faculty
 - Chancellor is not unsympathetic as there have been many cuts, but this is meant to be clear
- Questioning if we are voting on framework or specific strategies
 - There are a few things that are very specific
- Chancellor won't do this unless we got the support
- We are at a window
 - Do not want to get nervous during a culture of scarcity
- Retention is about multiple things
- A large percentage still needs to be figured out
- Glad to see that we are making these plans
- We applaud this initiative, but Senate is not in a good position to agree to the specifics as we do not have the details
 - The framework may not be compatible with values
 - To support without specifics is premature
- This is a starting point but it could change as more data and strategies become clear
- We need conversations on how we strengthen the university as this is important
- Uneasy with approving framework without details
- Most of the details would allow our normal processes to decide
 - This is a framework and we will figure it out over time

MOTION to remove third paragraph, seconded

Discussion on motion

- Do not see a problem with this paragraph
 - Is a positive paragraph
- This is the paragraph that we do not know what we are asking of faculty and what we are promising to do
 - Do not see what it entails when decisions are being made as we do not have the content
 - We are supporting, not implementing
 - This is a vote of confidence
 - Is a draft at this point
- Confused over how to vote as some things are specific and others are broad
- Seems like it would be worthwhile for us to work on the language

MOTION to CALL the QUESTION

VOTE on MOTION to remove the third paragraph: FAILED

Continued discussion on motion

- This should be revised before it goes to Senate
 - The alternative is to move it forward and let senate decide
- Perhaps the background should be in the resolution
- Questioning what the investment framework is specifically

MOTION to AMEND the language to read as follows, seconded:

The University Senate appreciates the Chancellor's leadership in planning for the future.

The University Senate agrees with and supports the Chancellor's overall strategic approach: work to strengthen the university.

The University Senate agrees with and supports the Chancellor's Investment Framework, noting that there are substantial details that will need to be finalized.

The chancellor has presented a tactical Investment Framework that seeks to invest \$4.1 million in base funding for faculty and staff in order to:

- strengthen our ability to retain students,
- grow enrollment by 405 students,
- leverage scholarships and co-curricular programs to attract and retain new students, and
- enhance our reputation through the maintenance of high-quality programs and the addition of new high-quality programs.

The University Senate therefore calls on faculty, staff and students to contribute to the goals of strengthening the university via the investment framework and the University Senate will work with the Chancellor to support implementation and ongoing review of the investment framework.

Upon passage, a copy of this resolution will be sent to Dr. James Schmidt, Chancellor; Dr. Patricia Kleine, Provost/Vice Chancellor; and Dr. Evan Weiher, Chair, University Senate.

Discussion on amendment

- This allows flexibility
- Like the specificity of the Blugold marching band and athletics
 - Reason for the removal is to make it more global

VOTE on MOTION to AMEND: PASSED

Continued Discussion:

- APC works on ongoing evaluations to see where our strengths are
 - Is embedded in what we do in our academic master plan

MOVE to CALL the QUESTION

VOTE on MOTION to send to Senate: PASSED

7) Land Recognition Statement

- There is an indigenous connection to this campus, so this was brought forward by the Native and American Indian students
- Indigenous People's Day is next week
 - We recognize all 12 nations
- UWEC does occupy indigenous tribal lands so are here to get formal recognition
- Thanks for the work that has gone into this
 - Efforts are applauded
- The seal has always been here but The Power of AND was used by the students so the relaunch was a way to bring it back so we can now use it on posters
 - Thrilled that the seal is coming back
- Should be used as a part of the education on campus
 - Would like this to be one of the stops on the campus tour
 - New employee training
- Is a great way for us to educate so people can understand it as a value to UWEC
- Is not a logo but a seal

- Encourage you to use it in appropriate places
- The seal has been cleaned up, so it is more clear
- Template availability
 - An email will be sent to campus for the Indigenous People's Day and that will include the seal

8) Announcements

- ORSP Search
 - Suggestions can be given or emailed to the Provost

Meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Submitted by,
Tanya Kenney
Secretary of the University Senate