The meeting was called to order by Chair Harrison at 3:07 p.m. in Schofield 202.

1. Without objection, minutes of April 3, 2001 approved as distributed

2. Open Forum Items
   • e-mail from Senator with four issues listed distributed to committee for discussion
     1) Riverbank project
        • Acknowledged not as much early communication as should have been on this issue to university and community
     2) Possibility of 12-month pay plan for academic year unclassified staff
        • Chancellor Mash indicated he has been relentless (almost obnoxious) on this issue with System
          • Had seen this as fairly easy personnel change to make
          • Apparently new software to process payroll being discussed
          • System would prefer to wait until after conversion if new software adopted
          • Will continue pressure on System
          • Recalling from last time issue surfaced, problems were that state employees must be paid in timely manner and secondly 12-month plan currently an option through State Credit Union
          • University of Wisconsin System employees exempt from requirement that be paid within 30 days
          • When instituted, nine-month pay plan was sold on an efficiency basis as payroll changed to central processing
     3) Phillips Hall renovation
        • Faculty in Phillips Hall told very possible that next phase of renovation may not be complete by beginning of fall semester
        • Vice Chancellor Soll first heard of possibility last week
        • Contractor confirmed concern at progress meeting last week with Terry Classen of Facilities Planning and Management
        • Immediately contacted registrar
          • Work with chairs in progress to change location of some 51 lecture classes
          • At this time, all but three relocated; still working on those three and expect resolution
        • Also meeting with chairs to discuss possibilities of changing order of work to accommodate; for example, if can complete two floors, which two to complete, etc.
        • Typically, state contracts do not include a penalty clause for not completing work by specified date because simply increase cost of project as contractors raise bid to cover such a contingency
        • Part of reason for late completion results from changes university requested; for example, continued to occupy and work in areas previously said would be vacant for construction
     4) Calendar – why April break with Monday and Friday off when spring semester already shorter than fall
        • Related to riverbank issue, people in Third Ward noticing survey flags among trees along road through Putnam Park
          • Because of lack of communication in past, worried what plans might be for that area
          • Vice Chancellor Soll confirmed will be some work done in area west of State Street toward Nursing Building
            • Will be installing water main related to fire protection for dorms
            • Will run directly down center of road; work to commence in November in order to cause least amount of damage to nearby vegetation as more dormant at that time
- Putnam Park Commission involved in design of project; engineers presented at January open meeting
- Do not know formal communication process; had thought representatives of various entities on that commission would report back
- Will contact Third Ward Association
- Apparent from this and riverbank project that many people concerned about such issues, perhaps need broader sense of awareness and pay special attention to communication about these sensitive issues

3. Review of tentative agenda for April 24, 2001 meeting of University Senate
- Will be clarification of Final Authority of Personnel Evaluation motion as strikeouts inadvertently left off distributed motion
- Organization of Service Learning open discussion
  - Provost Satz indicated working group reported recommendations at all chairs’ meeting last week
  - Jack Hoggatt, chair of that working group, could let Senate know process but was unable to attend that three hour meeting to hear discussion
  - Perhaps Jack Hoggatt could cover what has been done; Provost Satz the next steps
- Faculty Personnel Committee passed a motion at 1:00 p.m. meeting today to request open discussion of Instructional and Research Academic Staff (IRAS) titling recommendation be on Senate agenda
  - Apparently some faculty kept silent on issue as motion passed University Senate on March 27, 2001 thinking it was strictly an academic staff issue; have since heard concerns from faculty members

Discussion
- Motion as passed clearly stated Academic Staff Personnel Committee looking for University Senate support
  - Informed by chair at time of voting that because seeking University Senate endorsement, vote would be by both University Faculty and University Academic Staff Senators
- Titling truly academic staff issue; however, evaluation for promotions of instructional academic staff appear in faculty personnel rules
- Provost Satz noted System has requested a single institutional response on Instructional and Research Academic Staff Report by May 1, 2001
  - Has requested responses from several areas
  - To date have received some responses; will pull together coordinated response
- Academic Staff Representative Hallatt indicated information given to both faculty and academic staff during entire time System working group drafting report
  - When discussed at Senate, only one faculty member asked question
  - Is an Academic Staff Personnel Committee matter
    - Asked for endorsement of full Senate to strengthen support for academic staff and titling
  - Faculty play role in evaluating teaching academic staff; but do not make up academic staff personnel rules
  - Academic Staff Representative has not received one call of concern from faculty
  - Academic staff are not taking over university
    - Academic staff clearly second class citizens on campus
    - Teaching academic staff clearly third class citizens
  - As community, need to support academic staff
  - Academic Staff Representative’s report of February 27, 2001 clearly stated academic staff had no interest in replacing faculty; and clearly calls for hiring faculty where appropriate
  - Key is to support people on campus for 25 or 30 years in teaching academic staff positions
  - No one trying to pull wool over anyone’s eyes
  - No excuse for those interested not doing homework all year long
  - Reaction to Instructional and Research Academic Staff Report started in Madison
    - Chair Harrison heard concerns at faculty representative’s meeting at end of March
  - Don Reynolds, UW-Eau Claire representative to IRAS working group, made presentation at Senate
    - Also reported to Academic Staff Personnel Committee several times
  - Since information disseminated in advance, do feel Senators have responsibility to know what voting on
    - Possible to bring it up again, but don’t want to start at the beginning
    - Do not support putting on agenda
• Is academic staff issue; academic staff come up with title choices; department personnel committees do promotion evaluations
  • Between Academic Staff Personnel Rules and Faculty Rules, is process in place
• Talking here about changes in titling and career opportunities
• All information available for long time
• Hope that if standing committee of University Senate looking at issue, we won’t prohibit them from telling University Senate what they think
  • Appropriate order of business might be as part of regular committee report
  • Certainly any Senate member can bring up anything under miscellaneous business
• If seeking input, suggest might submit statements to provost for his response to system
• Would help to know depth of concern
• By Robert’s Rules, can no longer reconsider motion on IRAS titling that was passed at March 27, 2001 meeting; would have had to been done before meeting ended
  • Motion to rescind could still take place
• Concern expressed that things are coming out of Faculty Personnel Committee which should be joint issues with Academic Staff Personnel Committee
  • Nepotism policy affected both groups
  • Also collective bargaining issue affects both groups
  • Collective bargaining was referred to both personnel committees; Academic Staff Personnel Committee unable to fit on agenda
• Institutional response to title issue may not be a single voice according to Provost Satz
  • Will try to express all views: University Senate action, committee action, etc.
  • Asked to do things in timeframe that can create problems
• Consensus to forward this portion of Executive Committee minutes to Faculty Personnel Committee
  • Committee can bring up issue as part of regular committee report
  • Motions from either the committee or an individual can be brought forward under miscellaneous business
  • Item not listed separately on agenda
• Senator Hallatt commented predecessors that combined Faculty and Academic Staff Senates did a good thing
  • At UW-Eau Claire single University Senate, not divided body; important to act as one unit, value and nurture each other
  • Exception to colleagues around state serving in divided bodies

4. Language changes to description of Institutional Ethics Committee membership
• Ad hoc subcommittee composed of members from faculty and academic staff personnel committees met to draft nepotism policy to parallel current System nepotism policy (that policy now being reviewed by System legal counsel)
  • Current System nepotism policy refers to Ethics Committee
  • Although included in Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook, no one could remember an Ethics Committee existing at UW-Eau Claire
  • Did not feel nepotism policy should refer to nonexistent committee
    • Suggested committee appointed each year in case services necessary
  • Drafted language for composition of Institutional Ethics Committee distributed

Discussion of Proposed Motion
• Language includes few editorial changes to handbook (change in numbering for Student Research Protection and reference to Institutional Ethics Committee to match System language)
• Changes include membership, appointed by University Senate Executive Committee, from existing members of Executive Committee, Faculty Personnel Committee and Academic Staff Personnel Committee and requirement that at least one teaching academic staff member be appointed
  • Certainly makes sound like Senate committee, but not
    • If pass this would make committee of Senate, do we want that?
  • Reasoning for taking the chancellor out of the loop
    • Know of no other university committees where chancellor is out of loop
  • Not same committee that listens to research concerns
Nepotism policy states should consult with Affirmative Action Office and lists other committees and places to consult; if none applies, consult Institutional Ethics Committee

System policy states shall have Institutional Ethics Committee
- Purpose from System is interpretation of UWS 8
- Ethics Committee falls under heading of Unclassified Staff Code of Ethics which includes such things as reportable outside activities, institutional policies, and student research protection
- Nepotism policy would be in this part of handbook
- Perhaps chancellor and Executive Committee could be committee
  - Do represent colleges and school
  - Not lots of work; perhaps willing to do
  - But Executive Committee does not necessarily include teaching academic staff
- Are cases where chancellor is held legally responsible for actions of this sort
- Some issues, like those in research, already covered by policies in place
- Perhaps should be looking to resource people on campus whose expertise is ethics
- Assume committee to deal with personnel issues because came up with nepotism policy
- Function stated as providing consultation and advice
- Point was to make sure that such committee exists

MOVED by Senator Gapko and seconded that original wording in Institutional Ethics Committee motion remain with single addition of member from teaching academic staff

Wording of Motion
UWEC 8.03 (4) Student Research Protection

UWEC 8.035 Institutional Ethics Committee

1. Membership
   The committee consists of six members who will serve staggered three-year terms, with two being appointed each year by the Chancellor in consultation with the University Senate Executive Committee. At all times there will be at least one member from each of the Colleges, at least one from the teaching academic staff, and at least one from the non-teaching academic staff.

2. Function
   The function of the committee shall be to provide to any member of the unclassified staff consultation and advice on the application of UWS 8. Committee deliberations and actions upon requests for consultation or advice shall be in meetings not open to the public. Records obtained in connection with requests for consultation or advice shall be considered confidential university information. However, summaries of advice provided by this committee, which does not disclose the identities of persons requesting such advice, shall be made public in an annual report to the Chancellor.

Discussion
- Is purpose of committee reactive or proactive?
  - Is apparently to be place where faculty with complaint or question can go for consultation and advice if can’t find elsewhere
- Are certain issues that come up again and again; perhaps if all came to same group, could spot those issues and institute policy
- Apparently would also be interpreting nepotism policy
- Maybe need some ethicists and lawyers on committee
  - Certainly would be reluctant to serve; fear of being sued over advice
- Chancellor Mash indicated campus in Nebraska chose not deal with such issue when state board tried to institute
- Seems to revolve around financial gain and conflict of interest
- Faculty and academic staff rules very explicit about procedures for complaints
- Suggestion to add Director of Business and Student Services as ex officio and non-voting member
  - Since much goes back to finances seems reasonable; often consult Dave Gessner with such issues now
  - Keeps abreast of laws and regulations
• Depends upon background of person filling that position; not everyone in that position would have depth and breadth of current director
• Could add into function that committee has right to invite campus or other experts to consult
  • Currently not open meetings
  • Perhaps could add someone from central administration to obtain administrative viewpoint
  • Could be determined at time of appointment
  • Or perhaps chancellor designee
• Against motion – concern that function states deliberations in closed session
  • Closed session generally reserved for personnel functions
  • Then more comfortable with people familiar with personnel issues as in printed motion
• Not strictly personnel, could be questions of particular source of income, conflict of interest, etc.
• UWS 8 is not personnel policy; is concerned with financial matters
  • Would help to be able to read UWS 8 prior to determining vote on issue

MOVED by Senator Leutwiler and seconded to postpone the motion until the next meeting of Executive Committee to give members of committee time to read UWS 8

Motion PASSED

• Copy of UWS 8 to be distributed to committee in mailing for next meeting
• Will check with Research Office to determine if mechanism already in place in this regard for such things as misconduct

5. Sample end-of-year survey for Senators
• Survey will be sent out as distributed without objection

6. Miscellaneous Business
• Item from Physical Plant Planning Committee about use of campus facilities for faculty organizations not affiliated with a campus department or unit
  • Determined ought to be policy for recognizing faculty organizations; also determined Physical Plant Planning Committee not entity to be determining that process
  • Suggested Executive Committee as source
• Off-campus groups must rent facilities
• Is University Centers Advisory Board
• Policy would affect all university facilities, not just Davies Center; may have implications beyond that
• Student Senate made up a similar process for student use of facilities
• Three faculty/staff groups grandfathered in by action of chancellor
  • Perhaps that is role chancellor would be willing to take on
• Consensus that Senator Schneider and Chair Harrison draft process of how to officially recognize faculty/staff groups
  • May query chancellor on role willing to take
  • May use ethicists in Philosophy & Religious Studies as resource

7. Announcements – None

Meeting adjourned at 4:47 p.m. without objection

Respectfully submitted by,

Wanda Schulner
Secretary to the University Senate