The regular meeting of University Senate was called to order at 3:04 p.m., Tuesday, April 10, 2001 in the Ojibwa/Ho-Chunk Room of Davies Center.

1. Minutes of March 27, 2001 meeting of University Senate approved with correction
   - Typo on page 10, in Response to questions from floor, second bullet, general education applies

2. Chancellor’s Remarks – Chancellor Mash
   - On April 12th, provost and deans meet with academic department chairs
     - Work groups will report
       1) General education and upper division credits
       2) Staffing and class availability
       3) Drop/add policy
       4) Service learning
     - Next steps will be determined as result of discussions at meeting
   - Provost arranging best practices enrollment management analysis and workshops on May 24th and 25th with Noel-Levitz, company doing consulting work in enrollment management
   - As beginning point for future discussion on matters of admission, retention and enrollment management
   - New Director of Admissions, Robert Lopez, will begin in position next week
   - Student/Faculty Research Collaboration Day April 23rd
     - Culmination of year’s work with demonstration projects
     - This year also hosting system-wide conference on student/faculty research collaboration
       - UW-System schools here for our activity will stay additional day for conference
     - UW-Eau Claire Center of Excellence for UW-System on Student/Faculty Research Collaboration
       - Significant part is that research collaboration is at undergraduate level; mentoring occurring in significant ways
       - Program developed over last decade
research continues to confirm student/faculty interaction outside classroom at top of list of what makes difference in growth and development of undergraduates during college years

- Essentially what happens in our student/faculty collaborative research
- Program has grown in part because of differential tuition dollars students pay to enhance experience
  - Next year approaching 1,000 students
- Very powerful learning experience; going beyond learning information to higher order of thinking skills – application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation
  - Why critically important program touted, developed, and grown even more
- Planning Committee in process of trying to freshen role and mission to make distinctive
  - Suggested we mention student/faculty research collaboration explicitly
- Many of these projects connect knowledge across disciplines simply by nature of research
  - Big challenge and major shortcoming in liberal-arts based programs across country is to bring to life general education courses proscribed
  - Opportunity to talk more at August symposium about liberal arts here on campus
- UW Day Display will be set up on stage at Research Day
  - Impressive display, interchangeable to focus on different aspects of what we do, can be put in place for various special occasions

- Welcomed assignment as chair of UW-System task force committee on alcohol and other drug abuse
  - Committee composed of AODA coordinators, student affairs and state agency people, and others
  - Alcohol, and to lesser extent other drugs, seen as major impediment to academic performance
  - Says nothing of personal tragedy resulting from misuse
  - Reported to Board of Regents
    - Commented amount of education and awareness engaged in significant compared to other situations
    - However, problem critically acute requiring additional work
  - Real implications for everything we do in classes as well as in support offices
- Had pleasure of attending session with nursing faculty following accreditation site review of nursing program
  - Organization of self-study and follow-up visit done superbly
  - Visiting team had nothing but good things to say about process as well as substance; could not have been more complimentary of work being done
  - Would be very surprised if any result other than reaccreditation

3. Chair’s Report – Chair Harrison

- Chair’s reports on Senate website by noon on Tuesdays of Senate meetings
- Faculty reps discussed instructional and research academic staff titling report
  - Will summarize that discussion for Faculty Personnel Committee at next meeting
- Principle of freedom of speech reaffirmed by Board of Regents at last meeting
- Department of Administration sent letter to Joint Finance Committee requesting budget modifications
  - Among others was request for more positions
- Student Senate President Andy Oettinger unable to attend meeting today; newly appointed Student Senate liaison Sarah Schuh introduced

4. Academic Staff Representative Report – Senator Hallatt

- Academic Staff Rep’s meeting Thursday, April 19th

5. Committee Reports

- Academic Policies Committee – Senator Lozar
  - Next meeting April 17, 2001
  - Discussing dual degrees and implications for residency requirements
- Academic Staff Personnel Committee – Senator Hallatt
  - Next meeting April 26, 2001
- Budget Committee – No Report
- Compensation Committee – Senator Wick
  - Subcommittee continues to meet every Monday morning – 10:00 a.m., Eagle Room, Davies Center
Working on comprehensive pay plan

Nominating Committee – Senator Bushnell
- Nominee for University Senate Vice Chair
  - Andrea Gapko, Academic Skills Center
- No additional nominations from floor

Motion 37-US-21
Moved by Senator Mac Briar and seconded that rule requiring more than one person be placed on the ballot be suspended and thereby elect Senator Gapko to office of Vice Chair

Vote on Motion 37-US-21: Motion PASSED

Vice Chair Andrea Gapko to serve second term

Physical Plant Planning Committee – Senator Stuettgen
- Next meeting April 17, 2001
- Finish agenda not completed at meeting today

Technology Committee – Senator Lang
- Next meeting April 17, 2001
- Discussing all emails and phone calls received from senators and non-senators since last Senate meeting
- In response to questions about planning process, and rumors about conversion to PeopleSoft, received email from Associate Vice Chancellor Dwyer in regard to plan of action; with permission sharing following points
  1) Continue IT strategic planning process
     - Assume many have gone to meetings; all notified when and where
     - Goal to get input and listen to feedback; website set up
     - Give direction as to what people would like to be able to do that can’t currently
  2) Work with UW-System to initiate pilot this summer for use of Oracle Informatica, a data warehousing project
     - Allows experimenting without compromising live data bases
     - Allows users to create data queries to extract information for decision-making purposes
  3) If pilot project successful, will complete request for proposal to bring someone in to assist with developing transition strategy to Oracle including
     - List of deliverables enabling clear evaluation of existing systems
     - Suggestions for improved data base integration
     - Proposed timeline for implementation
     - No decision made to go to PeopleSoft; no truth to rumor people to lose their jobs because of this
     - Simply trying to adopt a data base platform that is not hardware dependent, while improving functionality for users

Chancellor Mash responded to question from floor on what exactly PeopleSoft is
- PeopleSoft basically software enabling campus to house financial records, student data, personnel records, and the like; software that runs administrative functions
- UW-Eau Claire currently using home-grown, or home-developed system
- One of first issues confronted with upon arrival on campus was UW-System suggestion that campuses go to PeopleSoft
  - Heard at that time that PeopleSoft untested and had great system in use here
  - After much discussion, told UW-System not ready to move to PeopleSoft
    - Schools that did adopt PeopleSoft received some funding and assistance
    - Schools that didn’t (just a few) received lesser amount of money to spend on technology improvements
  - We made purchase that moved us closer to a common system rather than a home-grown system
  - Now need to determine if time has come to accelerate efforts to move toward common system
  - System no longer as user-friendly as could be; need to put more power in hands of users
  - Continuing to develop, maintain and tweak current system will require additional staff
Data suggests our system personnel heavy

Other questions and comments
- If conversion frees up technology people, labs could always use help
- Have never heard anybody quote figures of less than millions for conversion, hear cost more than thought and ran into unexpected difficulties; are there projections on what cost might be and what tradeoffs might be necessary to cover costs?
  - Comments by Chancellor Mash
    - Cost one of issues looking at; many universities across country moved toward PeopleSoft and some having great difficulty implementing
    - Turns out in retrospect past caution was good decision; continue in prudent, cautious mode
  - Comments by Provost Satz
    - Comment on this question, but also to minutes of last meeting
      - Seems to be perception that on direct path to PeopleSoft
    - Our direct path is:
      - Listening to constituencies across university to find out interests, needs, and concerns
      - Looking at staff and knowledge base on campus
        - Will not be throwing people out of jobs here
        - Do not want people alarmed about future here
      - Looking at what is out there and available
      - Making decisions about what we should do long term
    - Can’t answer cost question until plan in place
    - If have concerns, show up at meetings and voice those concerns; plan will come out of that process
      - No secret plan; no predetermined goal; looking at best interests of university
  - Comments by Vice Chancellor Soll
    - PeopleSoft was adopted in mid-1990s by UW-System as common software for data base
      - Madison processing center supports all campuses in system
      - Reality is, whether or not move to PeopleSoft, need to be able to interface with PeopleSoft
      - Planning process will have to look at issue of sending data back and forth to System
      - Continuing to do what have done for last several years not an option
    - Oracle is data base system for all data we collect, store, maintain, and need to access; independent issue, not in competition with PeopleSoft; can use Oracle with current system
    - Provost Satz added
      - Pilot of Oracle part of commitment two years ago when determined not to go toward PeopleSoft and took system money to do pilot project
      - May fail, may succeed; whatever happens, will figure it out and make some decision based on pilot
      - Cost of pilot figures Associate Vice Chancellor Dwyer would have; could ask at any of meetings
      - Cost of full conversion would depend upon what exactly we do; how we wish to apply it, what version, and other parameters not in place yet
    - Wonderful mechanism on campus for communicating concerns within departments or units about technology planning and technology needs are college technology committees; IT directors always communicating with those committees

Executive Committee – Chair Harrison
- Next meeting April 17, 2001
- Last meeting discussed
  - Update on nepotism policy
  - Update on format for university-wide spring elections

Report on Awards Committee Motions – Senator Gapko
- Report from Executive Committee fairly lengthy; committee talked at length about why considering proposed motions
Process not changing from electing to appointing members of these committees; always been appointed

Motion 37-SE-02
Moved and seconded by Executive Committee (15-0-0) that the following language be added on page 3.7 of the Constitution, Article One: University Faculty, Section G University Faculty Committees

6. University Faculty Awards Committee
a. Membership: The committee includes six members of the University Faculty serving staggered three-year terms. Each year the Chancellor will appoint two members from at least three names recommended by the University Faculty Nominating Committee.
b. Function: The University Faculty Awards Committee solicits and receives nominations for the Excellence in Advising, Excellence in Scholarship, and Excellence in Service Awards. The Committee evaluates the nominations for each award and forwards its selections to the Chancellor.

Discussion
• Committee same as defined later in awards section of handbook; this lists as official committee in constitution

Vote on Motion 37-SE-02: Motion PASSED by University Faculty Senators

Motion 37-SE-03
Moved and seconded by Executive Committee (15-0-0) that the language of Article Two: University Academic Staff, Section G.4.a. on page 3.9 of the Constitution be revised as follows

Membership: The committee includes five members holding nonteaching academic staff or limited positions serving staggered three-year terms. Each year the Chancellor will appoint one or two members selected from seven at least two or three names, respectively, recommended by the University Academic Staff Nominating Committee and appointed by the Chancellor for staggered three-year terms.

Discussion - None

Vote on Motion 37-SE-03: Motion PASSED by University Academic Staff Senators

Motion 37-SE-04
Moved and seconded by Executive Committee (15-0-0) that the word full-time in reference to members of University Faculty be deleted from the Faculty Awards section of handbook (page 6.7) in the two instances where it occurs.

Discussion
• Would revert to half-time because of references elsewhere in handbook

Vote on Motion 37-SE-04: Motion PASSED by University Faculty Senators

Motion 37-SE-05
Moved and seconded by Executive Committee (15-0-0) that the word full-time in reference to members of non-instructional academic staff be deleted from the Academic Staff Award section of the handbook (page 6.7) in the two instances where it occurs.

Discussion - None

Vote no Motion 37-SE-05: Motion PASSED by University Academic Staff Senators

Faculty Personnel Committee – Senator Mack
• Next meeting April 17, 2001
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- Looking at Instructional Academic Staff report; been asked to consider making suggestions and recommendations to Provost’s Office to be forwarded to System  
- Looking at draft document on faculty workload

Report on Final Authority of Personnel Evaluation Criteria – Senator Mack  
- Senate passed motion regarding final authority of personnel evaluation criteria in May 2000  
- Chancellor at that time referred action back to Executive Committee for review  
- Motion referred back to Faculty Personnel Committee by Senate in fall 2000 for clarification on number of issues  
- Committee engaged in further dialogue with provost and identified additional code to support proposed motion  
  - Discussed feedback obtained, met with provost, considered language in UW-System Administrative Code, and reinforced importance of clear and fair communication to faculty  
- Pros of recommendation  
  - Motion provides for consultation with department chair, dean, and provost when department personnel committee (DPC) formulates original personnel plan or revisions to personnel plan  
  - Currently all departments have approved personnel plans  
  - Motion states no other plan or criteria may be used in personnel evaluation other than those stated in accepted personnel plan

Motion 37-FP-03  
Moved and seconded by Faculty Personnel Committee (6-0-0) that #2 Department Criteria (on page 5.18) under The Criteria for Review of Faculty Performance in the Faculty Personnel Rules in Chapter 5 of the Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook, be revised as follows:

2. Department Criteria

The review of faculty performance shall include, but is not limited to, consideration of teaching effectiveness, academic advising ability, scholarly activity, and service to the University, the profession and the public. The Department Personnel Committee of each department or functional equivalent shall develop and approve a written evaluation plan which further defines each of these general criteria and describes the relative emphasis to be given to each criterion. The emphasis may vary depending on needs of the department, individual interests, and the stage of a faculty member’s career. The plan shall be developed in consultation with reviewed and accepted by the Department Personnel Committee, Department Chair, Dean, and Provost and Vice Chancellor. The Provost and Vice Chancellor shall verify that the plan adheres to the constraints imposed by the UW-EC Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook, the UW System Administrative Code, and Wisconsin State Statutes. The criteria plan exclusively defines the procedures and artifacts to be used by the Department Personnel Committee, Department Chair, Dean, and Provost and Vice Chancellor in performance reviews. The Chair shall distribute the plan to department members, thereby informing them of the agreed upon criteria.

The Department Evaluation Plan shall be reviewed annually by the Department Personnel Committee and revised as deemed appropriate in accordance with the above procedures. No other plan or criteria may be used in this process.

Motion 37-US-22  
Moved by Senator Scott and seconded to table Motion 37-FP-03 until such time as the department personnel committees have an opportunity to react to this content

Vote on Motion 37-US-22: Motion DEFEATED by vote of 11 in favor, 20 opposed

Discussion of Motion 37-FP-03  
- Without objection, insertion of word approved before plan in last sentence of first paragraph accepted  
- Speak in favor of motion; see as direct reflection of policy now, just clarifying  
- Does not weaken or change role of DPC; just clarifies process to remain within state statutes
Do see it as changed policy, because now is role of DPC to develop criteria on which faculty judged
Proposal says in consultation with; seems to imply DPC not capable of developing own criteria
Favor administrative role up the line to determine whether law broken; not to tell departments what criteria
to use to judge faculty or to help develop those criteria
Believe faculty governance being violated because DPC expected to consult when they develop plan
Intent of motion is to empower DPC to make final decision
Policy now says plan reviewed and must be accepted up line; proposal says done in consultation with
  Is fundamental change, not same as current policy
Final authority resides with DPC; committee believes it belongs there
If this is a good thing, don’t think it hurts to give DPCs opportunity to react to it; if they haven’t seen, then
  should
Some department liaison senators felt inadequate time to share motion with members of departments

Vote on Motion 37-FP-03: Motion PASSED by University Faculty Senators 21 in favor, 13 opposed

Since this is a personnel policy change, review by system legal counsel and Board of Regents required prior to
implementation. Timeframe would allow sharing with department personnel committees.

Issue is right to choose, to vote on interest in collective bargaining for faculty and academic staff of UW-
  System
Came originally from UW-Milwaukee via Executive Committee here
  UW-Milwaukee passed motion February 15, 2001 in favor of granting right to engage in collective
  bargaining to faculty and academic staff on campuses in UW-System
  UW-Oshkosh also passed a motion on March 27, 2001 similarly supporting right to engage in collective
  bargaining
State Senator Grobschmidt currently looking for supporters and co-sponsors for bill giving faculty and
  academic staff right to choose collective bargaining
Almost duplicate of two major components of bill from last legislative session, Senate Bill 132
  Gives faculty and academic staff right to choose collective bargaining
  Establishes what separate bargaining units would be
Senator Grobschmidt’s bill also creates eight separate collective bargaining units, four for faculty and four
for academic staff to represent
  UW-Madison
  UW-Milwaukee
  UW-Extension and the Comprehensive Universities
  UW-Colleges
Response to questions on report
Debate not on right of collective bargaining itself, but right to make that decision
Faculty and academic staff would be in separate bargaining units
Current motion basically supports right to choose collective bargaining
  Does not support separate collective bargaining units at various campuses
  Resolution calls for two bargaining units, one for academic staff, one for faculty across entire state
  system
  Words engage in seen by committee as synonymous with choose
Confused as to why bargaining units part of motion
  See major difference between decision on right to choose collective bargaining vs. proscribing
  what collective bargaining units would look like
Language in Senate Bill 132 (and also Senator Grobschmidt’s version) dictates two questions on ballot
  First, whether employees shall participate in collective bargaining
  Second, if employees elected to participate, which labor organization they favor to represent
  That was reasoning for having in motion
  To determine who would represent you in legislation seems problematic
Main purpose of motion to give faculty and academic staff at this institution right to make choice on collective bargaining

Motion 37-FP-04
Moved and seconded by Faculty Personnel Committee (6-0-0) that the following motion be approved by the University Senate and forwarded to the Chancellor of the University of Wisconsin – Eau Claire

WHEREAS the faculty and academic staff of the University of Wisconsin System currently do not enjoy, under state statute, the right to engage in collective bargaining; and

WHEREAS that right is enjoyed by other professional employees of the State of Wisconsin; and

WHEREAS a bill before the state legislature, known as Senate Bill 132, would give the faculty and academic staff at the various campuses of the University of Wisconsin System the right to engage in collective bargaining; and

WHEREAS Senate Bill 132 would create separate bargaining units for faculty and academic staff at the University of Wisconsin – Madison, the University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee, and the other UW campuses (one unit for the faculty at all these campuses and one unit for the academic staff at all these campuses); and

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that the University Senate of the University of Wisconsin – Eau Claire requests that the Senate and General Assembly of the State of Wisconsin enact legislation that will grant to the faculty and academic staff of the campuses of the University of Wisconsin System the right to engage in collective bargaining; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the University Senate of the University of Wisconsin – Eau Claire requests that the Senate and General Assembly of the State of Wisconsin enact legislation that will create a single collective bargaining unit for the faculty of the University of Wisconsin System and a single collective bargaining unit for the academic staff of the University of Wisconsin System; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Regents and President of the University of Wisconsin System, to the Office of the Governor of the State of Wisconsin, and to the members of the Senate and General Assembly of the State of Wisconsin.

Discussion

- Don’t think matters whether or not motion proposes single or multiple collective bargaining units
  - Will be seen as support for allowing collective bargaining at UW-Eau Claire
  - Should not be denied opportunity afforded by State of Wisconsin to attorneys, medical doctors, and even teaching assistants in Madison to have a bargaining unit
  - Regardless of exact language, want to send message we would appreciate opportunity to choose
  - Many times people who are very lateral and equal in jobs choose collective bargaining because no place to rise to
  - Will allow to start to address issue of how salaries increase if no promotion involved

- In agreement to send forth idea we should have right to choose to collectively bargain
  - Not in favor of one collective bargaining unit for whole system
    - Problematic because not going to be able to negotiate being brought up to level of Madison salaries
    - May be some reason to have different units

Motion 37-US-23
Moved by Senator Mac Briar and seconded to separate the question to consider paragraphs one, two and three of the whereass with paragraphs one and three of the be it resolveds as one unit, and to consider paragraph four of the whereass and paragraph two of the be it resolveds as a second action

Discussion

- Be-it-further-resolved paragraph three accepted as part of both actions without objection
Second be-it-further-resolved paragraph has key word requests
- Not very strong word, simply asks for modification of this bill
- If support for bill in state legislature fails because UW-Eau Claire fails to react, may take another year
- Think request reasonable, states opinion rather than fact; think should stay together

Suggest wording change to stop separation of motion
- Drop fourth whereas paragraph
- Edit first be-it-resolved paragraph – that the University Senate of the University of Wisconsin – Eau Claire, while it does not endorse or oppose Senate Bill 132, requests that the Senate and General Assembly of the State of Wisconsin enact legislation ...
- Also drop second be-it-further-resolved paragraph about establishing particular collective bargaining units
- Then standing on principle that ought to have right to choose
- Chair Harrison ruled suggestion out of order at moment because only edited parts that would be germane if separated motion
- In favor of separation as would allow senators to vote in favor of collective bargaining without necessarily accepting or rejecting specific bargaining units
- Surprised bargaining units determined here as usually a measure determined by continuity or community of interest and other things
- Don’t know if now ready to be talking about it
- Would like to add friendly amendment to motion to divide question to add the words to choose to engage every time it says to engage so it becomes to choose to engage
- Chair Harrison ruled that would change content, now motion is whether or not to divide; can come back to this suggestion also after vote

Vote on Motion 37-US-23: Motion to divide the question PASSES

Discussion on paragraphs one, two and three of the whereases and paragraphs one and three of the be it resolves

Amendment 37-FP-04-a1
Moved by Senator Wick and seconded to add the clause to the first be it resolved paragraph while it does not endorse or oppose Senate Bill 132 between University of Wisconsin – Eau Claire and requests

Discussion continued
- Senate Bill 132 quite lengthy with lot of detail
  - For example, includes that some shared governance rights would be given up, but does not say who determines
  - Says will give right to choose collective bargaining, but only this way
  - Faculty Personnel Committee not opposed to Senate Bill 132 as group, but did not want to appear to endorse all details of bill
- Senator Grobschmidt’s bill appears to contain same language as Senate Bill 132
- Adding words to choose wherever to engage appears in motion accepted as friendly amendment
- Concern that adding to choose renders a bit more tentative than just to engage,
  - If that is intent of Senate, fine, but see difference between right to choose to engage and right to engage
- Wording in legislative bill says to engage not to choose
- Feel adding to choose slightly weakens motion
- Right to engage means you are making a choice, choice is implicit and is stronger language
- Senator Gapko, as seconder of motion, supports withdrawal of friendly amendment
- Senator Wick, as mover, agrees to unaccept friendly amendment

Amendment 37-FP-04-a1-a1
Moved by Senator Schneider and seconded to add the words to choose before to engage in each case where words appear

Discussion
- If amendment to amendment passes, but amendment fails, would have to go back and add to main motion
• In favor of amendment to amendment
  • Do not know for sure if want union
  • Do want to choose to think about it
  • To say to choose to engage clearly states that in language easy to understand; to engage implies going to do
  • Motion language says the right to engage; they would be giving us that right
  • Not saying we want to engage, saying we want the right to do this
  • Have struggled long time to get this
  • Would not confuse legislature by giving them another word to hang their hat on
  • Now we have separated motion so we can come back and say yes to collective bargaining
  • Don’t want to soften that

**Vote on Amendment 37-FP-04-a1-a1: Amendment DEFEATED**

Continued discussion on Amendment 37-FP-04-a1
• May be better off saying do not endorse all aspects of Senate Bill 132, because do not endorse or oppose suggests division on issue
• No longer current number of bill, but that is one that made it to legislature; one coming very similar

**Vote on Amendment 37-FP-04-a1: Amendment PASSED**

Discussion of Main Motion 37-FP-04 as divided, paragraphs one, two and three of whereases and paragraphs one and three of the be it resolves
• Whereas comparing system and state to other professionals might increase chance of passage
  • No such discussion in committee, but is information
    • Documented in Milwaukee proposal that universities in Michigan, Minnesota, Illinois and Iowa have collective bargaining power if they want it; among other university systems with those rights are the State University of New York, Rutgers, Florida, Florida State, Montana, and Hawaii
  • Would be one more whereas that could be added, but not choosing to make amendment
• Not voting on Senate Bill 132; can still oppose parts of that bill
• Have seen other important questions fail under exactly these circumstances
  • Since running out of time and people tend to get up and leave, call the question

**Vote on Motion 37-FP-04, divided: Motion PASSED**

**TEXT OF MOTION AS PASSED**

WHEREAS the faculty and academic staff of the University of Wisconsin System currently do not enjoy, under state statute, the right to engage in collective bargaining; and

WHEREAS that right is enjoyed by other professional employees of the State of Wisconsin; and

WHEREAS a bill before the state legislature, known as Senate Bill 132, would give the faculty and academic staff at the various campuses of the University of Wisconsin System the right to engage in collective bargaining;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that the University Senate of the University of Wisconsin – Eau Claire, while it does not endorse or oppose Senate Bill 132, requests that the Senate and General Assembly of the State of Wisconsin enact legislation that will grant to the faculty and academic staff of the campuses of the University of Wisconsin System the right to engage in collective bargaining; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Regents and President of the University of Wisconsin System, to the Office of the Governor of the State of Wisconsin, and to the members of the Senate and General Assembly of the State of Wisconsin.

Continued discussion of second part of Divided Motion 37-FP-04; paragraph three of whereases and paragraphs two and three of be it resolvesreds
Motion 37-US-24
Moved by Senator Steele and seconded that this portion of the motion be tabled because the Senate would need more time to consider what the best bargaining situation would be for our campus as opposed to rest of UW-System

Vote on Motion 37-US-24: Motion PASSED

Discussion on this portion of motion tabled. Would take someone voting on the affirmative to bring issue back to the floor since no timetable set in tabling motion. [Upon further investigation, determined question will die if not removed from table prior to end of current session. Anyone, however, may bring issue back.]

6. Miscellaneous Business – None

7. Announcements
   ● Next meeting April 24, 2001; will host open discussion on service learning at that meeting
   ● UW Day display in this room April 23, 2001
   ● Spring meeting of Academic Staff tomorrow at noon; Faculty meeting tomorrow at 4:00 p.m.
      ● For purposes of taking additional nominations for university committees and Senate vacancies

Meeting adjourned at 4:41 p.m. without objection.

Respectfully submitted by,

Wanda Schulner
Secretary to the University Senate