

**UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-EAU CLAIRE  
UNIVERSITY SENATE MEETING  
VOLUME 56, NUMBER 6**

**December 10, 2019**

Members Present:

Jan Adams, Jim Boulter, Jasmine Case, Bart Dahl, Chip Eckardt, Jeff Erger, Joel Friederich, Wendy Geniusz, Gail Hanson Brenner, Ryan Harrison, Peter Hart-Brinson, Dan Herman, Tom Hilton, Jarrod Hines, Kate Hinnant, Bob Hooper, Phil Huelsbeck, Heather Iverson, Marquell Johnson, Jennifer Johns-Artisensi, Chris Jones, Jyl Kelley, Carol Koroghlanian, Bridget Kurtenbach, Cheryl Lapp, Der-Fa Lu, John Mann, Colleen Marchwick, Jill Markgraf, Barbara Meier, Bill Miller, Robin Miller, Tamara Miller, Geoffrey Peterson, Nick Phillips, Linda Pratt, Jim Rybicki, Jonathon Rylander, Vicki Samelson, Kristin Schaupp, Alyssa Slaby, Charlotte Sortedahl, Pedro Sottile, Andrew Suralski, Charles Vue, Ryan Weichelt, Evan Weiher, Katie Wilson

Members Absent:

Jose Alvergue, Heather Amthauer, Robert Bell, Wayne Carroll, Lisa Coen, Albert Colom, Kent Gerberich, Liz Glogowski, John Haven, Pat Kleine, Ellen Mahaffy, Dave Nesvacil, Leah Olson-McBride, Sheryl Poirier, Barb Ritzinger, Audrey Robinson, James Schmidt, Dan Schumacher, Ka Vang, Isabel Walters

Guests:

Michael Carney, Rodd Freitag, Debra Jansen, Carmen Manning, Darrell Newton, Jill Prushiek

The regular meeting of the University Senate was called to order by Chair Weiher at 3:07 p.m. on Tuesday, December 10, 2019 in the Dakota Ballroom of Davies Center.

- 1) Approval of the December 3, 2019 University Senate minutes
  - Approved as distributed
- 2) Administrator Remarks
  - None
- 3) Reports
  - a) Report from University Senate Chair Weiher
    - Thanks to the Provost for our snacks today
    - This so awesome as we have had Senate two weeks in a row  
Chair Weiher loves the fact that fall semester starts in the summer and ends in full blown winter
- 4) Unfinished Business
  - a) Second Reading: Motion from the Academic Policies Committee  
Proposal for UW System Collaborative Online Associate of Arts and Sciences Degree

Debate

- Students decide which institution
- When UW Colleges went away then an alternative was wanted for an online AAS degree
- A collaborative model basically means that they need UW institutions to provide the degree
  - 7 institutions came together and met and came up with this degree
    - It was built from what Colleges had been working on for many years
- We already have a Masters in Data Science
- The students choose which campus they would like to sign-up through
  - Students would use the UWEC-BC website
- Services would come through the students home campus

- Money is distributed evenly
  - Concern that the funds can be disproportionate
- If Barron County cannot fulfill services to the students, then the students would have UWEC services
- UW Extension was dissolved but they had contracted with UWEC for library services
  - Concern that money is not based on student enrollment
- Once the courses are developed then will see if there are faculty available to fulfill load that are available
- Might see 100's of students who enroll as that is what was enrolled at Barron County
  - BOR meetings talked about doubling the student enrolled in this over the next 4 years
- Only students seeking an AAS degree can take courses offered in the online program
- Student segregated fees are not be required to be paid for these students
- Might come out to about \$300 per credit
- When changes are made to the online curriculum then all the campuses must agree
  - There is a built-in revision process for the courses themselves
- Each campus has the decision to participate or not
- Program approvals would go through our regular processes
- If UWEC opted-out then automatically UWEC-BC also does not participate
- UWEC is behind the other institutions because we cannot do the courses until this passes where some of the other campuses do their courses at the same time
- If more faculty and staff are needed then UW Extended campus pays for instruction but it is our responsibility for staffing
- UWEC-BC students passed a resolution in support of this
  - Resolution was outlined
- The issues are not insurmountable
- We need to be creative in our enrollment concerns
- This is an area where we can grow our students

**VOTE on MOTION: PASSED**

- b) Second Reading: Motion from the Academic Policies Committee  
Proposal for New Course Prefix UW System Collaborative Online Associate of Arts and Sciences Degree

Debate

- None

**VOTE on MOTION: PASSED**

- c) Second Reading: Motion from the University Senate Executive Committee  
Honorary Degree

Debate

MOTION to amend the language to read.....The executive committee along with UW System president (as per motion 09/2009) shall serve as the UW-Eau Claire Honorary Degree Committee (<https://www.wisconsin.edu/regents/policies/honorary-doctorate-degrees/>). ***This committee will confidentially accept, evaluate and decide on nominations for the honorary doctorate submitted to them by UW-Eau Claire students, faculty, or staff members within the scope of Regent Policy Document 4-20. The executive committee will not make a recommendation on an honorary,*** seconded

Debate on amendment

- 420 indicates the supporting documents but not on who can make recommendations
- Nominations from administration is not addressed but was not intending to exclude
- This allows nominations from university at-large
- Process itself on making a recommendation is considered confidential until BOR says its approved

- Concern about expectation for the committee as the bulk of the work is already done before it comes to the Executive Committee
- 420 Policy is outlined in our policies
- This is about the time given to consider
- Students are not included in this

**VOTE on amendment: FAILS**

Continued Debate

- Cannot expeditiously approve an honorary degree so if this becomes part of the FASRP then this is how it has to happen
- We only have 2 graduations a year
- We cannot nominate someone if deceased
- 2 weeks to wait is a minimum bar
- We must exercise due diligence and ensure that the nominee is of high moral character so we need this
- Honorary degree requirements for submission were outlined
- We are just trying to protect the timeline on our end
- This is a problem, so this is a response to that
- Concern about the amendment made last time as it can be used as a loophole

**MOTION to amend the language to read:** to discuss honorary degree **nominee** in question, seconded

Debate on amendment

- The committee might just discuss the nature of the honorary degree than 2 weeks later might discuss the nominee
- The second sentence addresses the concern that a nominee was not presented
- We should keep it consistent

**VOTE on AMENDMENT: PASSED**

**MOTION to change the language after the hyperlink to read....Honorary degree recommendations require a minimum of two regularly-scheduled meetings during which the nominee is discussed. No recommendations will be made until the second regularly scheduled meeting., seconded**

Debate on amendment:

- None

**VOTE on AMENDMENT: PASSED**

Continued debate on motion as amended

- None

**VOTE on MOTION as AMENDED: PASSED**

5) New Business

- a) First Reading: Motion from the University Senate Executive Committee  
FCGTRC Membership

Debate

- None

**Without objection, we will vote on this today**

**VOTE on MOTION: PASSED**

- b) First Reading: Motion from the Physical Plant Planning Committee  
Campus Building Resolution

- Only things required is to meet state building codes
- Financial impact is tens of thousands of dollars

Debate

- We as an institution are behind
  - We need longevity and accountability
- The nations of the world are gathering about the crisis that is affecting us and our students
  - If we, as a body, do not take the students long term well-being into consideration then we are doing them a disservice
    - We should be setting examples for the rest of society
- What do we get with the certification and the tens of thousands of dollars that it would cost
  - It would give us data
  - Someone other than the builders would come in to evaluate

**Without objection, we will vote on this today**

**VOTE on MOTION: PASSED**

- c) First Reading: Joint Motion from the Faculty and Academic Staff Personnel Committees  
Bias Incident Reporting
- 24-hour notice allows sufficient time for administration
  - Bias incident is defined in the handbook
  - The 24-hour timeline is when the Dean of Students defines that the student or putting others at-risk
  - Safety concerns are not defined
  - Affirmative Action has signed off but haven't heard back from System Legal
  - 24-hours is at most
  - Campus Police might have a definition of safety concerns
  - This has to go through the Dean of Students or Affirmative Action
  - We do not control housing

Debate

- The policy is well written but might not cover all incidences or alerting all of the campus
  - Language was considered but then we get into FERPA issues
- All of us handle outrage differently
- Concerns raised by faculty members because they were not informed that the investigations were even taking place
  - If they knew they were being investigated then what would they do differently
    - Gives time to build a case or gather support
- No requirement to notify if no investigation
- 72 hours allows time over a weekend among other scenarios
- Seems like this satisfies the concerns brought up at the faculty meeting

**Without objection, we will vote on this today**

**VOTE on MOTION: PASSED**

- d) Announcements
- The next meeting of the University Senate is February 11<sup>th</sup> in the Woodland Theatre

Without objection, meeting adjourned at 4:42 p.m.

Submitted by,

Tanya Kenney  
Secretary to the University Senate