Present: Rodd Freitag, Andrea Gapko, Margaret Hallatt, Susan Harrison, Tim Lane, Don Mash, Cleo Powers, Lori Rowlett, Kathie Schneider, Nick Smiar, Jean Wilcox

Absent: Tim Leutwiler, Barbara Mac Briar, John Melrose, Ronald Satz, Todd Stephens

Guests: Kathy Mitchell, Andrew Soll

The meeting was called to order by Chair Harrison at 3:03 p.m. in Schofield 202.

1. Without objection, minutes of March 6, 2001 approved as distributed

2. Open Forum Items - None

3. Review of tentative agenda for March 13, 2001 meeting of University Senate
   - Copy of resolution from UW-Oshkosh on collective bargaining available from chancellor
   - Tentative agenda approved without objection

4. Update on Nepotism Policy
   - Ad hoc subcommittee composed of members from faculty and academic staff personnel committees met
   - Drafted nepotism policy that paralleled current System nepotism policy
   - Draft policy will be sent by Kathy Mitchell to System legal counsel for review
   - Will eventually be brought back to Executive Committee for continued negotiation with Chancellor
   - Nepotism policy refers to Ethics Committee
   - Currently, although in handbook, Ethics Committee does not exist at UW-Eau Claire
   - Did not feel could write nepotism policy if referred to nonexistent committee
   - Therefore, ad hoc subcommittee also drafting language for composition of University Ethics Committee
   - Would be distinct committee to be composed of members from University Senate Executive Committee, Faculty Personnel Committee and Academic Staff Personnel Committee
   - Plan to get language back to Executive Committee prior to end of semester
   - No earthshattering changes to nepotism policy as approved before, just updated to match current System policy with some clarification

5. Report on University Spring Election Format
   - Committee talked in past about conducting university spring elections by electronic means to enable serial elections
   - Would allow vacancies from specific areas to be filled first
   - Then vacancies from any area could be filled in separate election
   - Those not elected from specific areas would be on any area ballot
   - Advanced computer science students working on electronic process determined could not be easily done considering both confidentiality and ensuring one vote per person
   - Have used two methods of paper balloting in past
     1) Lump all nominees together
        - One from specific area with most votes elected
        - Any area vacancies filled by next highest vote-getters with specific area winner removed from consideration
     2) List elections separately with those nominees in specific area repeated on any area ballot
        - Top vote-getter from specific area elected
• Any area vacancies filled from highest vote-getters, once again removing specific area winner from consideration
• Has been some confusion both ways, and some concerns both ways about fairness of any area election without knowing winners from specific areas
• First option seemed to cause fewer voter questions
• Without objection, first method will be used in spring election with note included to help clarify process
  • Note to read as follows with modifications to fit actual election:
  • NOTE: THE INDIVIDUAL FROM THE SPECIFIC AREA RECEIVING THE MOST VOTES WILL BE ELECTED TO THAT POSITION. OF THOSE REMAINING ON THE BALLOT, THE NEXT HIGHEST VOTE-GETTERS WILL BE ELECTED TO THE OTHER VACANT POSITIONS

6. Miscellaneous Business – None

7. Announcements – None

Meeting adjourned at 3:17 p.m. without objection

Respectfully submitted by,

Wanda Schulner
Secretary to the University Senate