University of Wisconsin – Eau Claire  
University Senate Executive Committee  

Minutes from March 15, 2022  
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Present: Jasmine Case, Grace Crickette, Billy Felz, Abbey Fischer, Kent Gerberich, Elizabeth Glogowski, Marquell Johnson, John Mann, Colleen Marchwick, Jill Markgraf Sean McAleer, Kelly Murray, Geoffrey Peterson, Kristin Schaupp, James Schmidt, Charlotte Sortedahl, Pedro Sottile, Ryan Weichelt, Evan Weiher

Absent: Olga Diaz, Patricia Kleine

Guests: MJ Brukardt, Mike Carney, Margaret Cassidy, Marc Goulet, Mary Hoffmann, Debra Jansen, Corry Mahnke, David Miller, Jean Pratt, Jill Prushiek, Louisa Rice, Aleks Sternfeld-Dunn,

A meeting of the University Senate Executive Committee was called to order by Chair Weiher at 3:01 p.m. on Tuesday, March 15, 2022 via online (Microsoft Teams) meeting.

1) Approval of the University Senate Executive Committee Minutes of March 1, 2022
   • Approved as distributed

2) Review of the tentative agenda for the March 29, 2022 meeting of the University Senate
   • Approved as amended
   • APC will have some new business items  
     • Women’s Gender, and Sexuality Studies Program Rename
     • Women’s Gender, and Sexuality Studies Program for Academic Department Designation

3) Open Forum
   • Electric Vehicle charging stations
   • Funding donated from students but why do we have stations that cannot be used due top restrictions of one type or another
   • PPPC could be asked
   • VC Felz to check with Parking
   • Barron County Campus would like to say thank you to Mary Hoffman and Louisa Rice for coming up to talk to the Barron campus about the recent agreement that happened with CVTC
   • The face-to face was appreciated
   • I-VC Felz also came to campus with Library Director Jill Markgraf to speak to us about changes to the UW-Barron County library
   • Thanks to all for coming to the Barron campus and all are welcome to come join us

4) TTC Questions/Concerns
   • HR Director Miller’s Response to q3: “For the pay progression, UWS and several institutions have noted that they are not including positions that continue to have promotion in position (not faculty and IAS)” but thought promotion was separate than progression
   • No promotions for university staff and professional academic staff
   • Pay Progression applies to university staff and professional academic staff
   • System is working on guidelines and currently the use of the word “guidelines” means that we might have discretion
   • There is no pay progression for IAS as they do not have promotion like faculty (associate, full) and they do not have pay progression (if implemented) like academic or university staff so once they are hired, all they can expect is pay plan increases.
   • HR currently has 40 appeals and about ½ were from positions that will be impacted by a new title that System is coming out with
   • Department assistant was left out, but it will be rolled out and approximately 20 of our appeals will be changed to that title so those were essentially set to the side
   • HR is going through the other 20 appeals and is now writing up their justification
If they all the signing bodies agree, then the appeal is done
HR currently agrees with an additional 8 or 9 of those remaining appeals so that means that approximately 12 appeals will go forward to the appeal panel
The appeals committee should hear from HR in about 2 regarding those remaining appeals
Exit interviews are being done and they’re asked why they’re leaving but asking about TTC specifically is not asked
As of December 2nd, 2 people mentioned that TTC was a reason for leaving
Question on when HR can make a request for a new title and what criteria is used for initiation
System has final say over which titles are used and it is unlikely that many more titles will get added but if there are gaps then it is justified
First the campus has to be in support, then it goes to System HR and they ask each campus for support and if it is supported it gets added to the position bank and once in the position bank “we can map positions to that
Governance may end up looking at the teaching professor positions
Last Thursday morning the teaching professor positions were discussed with Louisa Rice and leadership of senate was invited
Very Preliminary discussions
Resignations are looked at in turnover rate, but you do not include retirements
We did a study on how UWEC compares to national average, and we came out lower as our turnover is less than 10% where private companies are over 20%
Faculty turnover is 1% and university staff turnover is around 7% and retirement is at 13% so that turnover is felt disproportionately
Staffing levels put a crunch on departments
Turnover is detrimental if you don’t have coverage to cover that work
Our turnover rates are very low, but we are lean in many areas to begin with, so the problem isn’t turnover but rather we need more people in units/departments, but we have lack of funding, so our other option is streamlining of processes and reduce workload
Filling open positions
Some positions we have trouble getting applicants but others we get a really good applicant pool
Our level of pay is concerning as we ask for expertise when Culvers is paying the same amount
HR uses a best fit analysis to ensure titles align with responsibilities
HR reviewed job descriptions then used a best fit for the job duties and where the majority of the duties fall
A FLSA test is always done too and that helps drive the decision
The department assistant pay range assignment is not yet done but budgeting in the position description is included
An advertisement with salary and compensation packet seems to help when filling positions
Total compensation is what we need to start advertising
Our benefits are not appealing to the younger job candidates as younger people would like to see tuition benefit(s)
System is looking at what flexibilities we have but we were told to stop our tuition benefit for employees

5) Discussion on modality for Executive Committee and Senate meetings (2022-2023)
Appreciate the flexibility of online/virtual
Virtual seems better as more can observe
Our attendance is much better this way
We should default to the option that brings the most people in as that is better representation of the campus
Hybrid complicates things and doesn’t work well with voting or engaging people, so everyone fails
We might have better attendance with the virtual option but maybe not better engagement as sometimes you can get distracted in your office
When we meet in person noise, we get noise complaints
If we got the right room, then perhaps hybrid might work with Senate but that would be difficult
• We had rules on the back of our Senate name tags and the new members who have only met virtually cannot see those rules
  • We should send our rules to the senators
• Online allows new people to join without pressure
• Once a semester or once a year in person would be good for Senate but also being active virtually is difficult
• Hybrid is inequitable
• Being virtual allows you to hear everyone clearly, unlike in person
• The vice chair could watch the chat if we decided on hybrid
• Inequity is a serious concern but would worry that we do not have those critical conversations when we meet virtually as we do in person
• Nonverbal communication is useful with a shared governance body
• In theory, a hybrid model does not work well
• We will revisit this

6) Academic Year Calendars
• We only currently have a calendar for next year but no additional calendars for the years to come after that and we are supposed to have 8 years in advance
• Are working on calendars through 2026 or for the next 3 years then the provost will come back to the Executive Committee with those in early or mid-April
• Will also be asking to amend the 2022-2023 to indicate non-face to face instruction to accommodate NCUR

7) Honorary Doctorate Update
• Nomination of Chih Ping Lui for an Honorary Doctorate was accepted, and he will be at graduation

8) Announcements
• Please join Chancellor Schmidt as he walks with Governor Thompson

9) Consultation with the Chancellor/Administration regarding committee appointments to the University Planning Committee. Pursuant to Wisconsin State Statutes 19.85 (c) the committee contemplates going into closed session for the purpose of discussion.

Without objection it was MOVED and seconded that the committee go into closed session under Wisconsin Statute 19.85 (c) for the purposes of discussion on committee appointments.

Motion PASSED without objection by Jasmine Case, Abbey Fischer, Kent Gerberich, Elizabeth Glogowski, Marquell Johnson, John Mann, Colleen Marchwick, Jill Markgraf Sean McAleer, Kelly Murray, Geoffrey Peterson, Kristin Schaupp, Charlotte Sortedahl, Pedro Sottile, Ryan Weichelt, Evan Weiher

Meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

Submitted by,
Tanya Neary (fka:Kenney)
Secretary of the University Senate