Members Present:


Members Absent:

Gene Decker, Bruce Dybvik, Jeannie Harms, Gretchen Hutterli, Maureen Mack, Cleo Powers, Vicki Reed, Jean Wilcox, Rebecca Wurzer

Guests:

Mary Ellen Alea, Robert Bolles, Margaret Cassidy, Pat Christopherson, Mark Clark, Tom Dock, Gina Duwe, Bernard Duyfhuizen, Debbie Gough, Dale Johnson, Allen Keniston, Tom King, Carol Klun, David Lonzarich, Kay Magadance, Andy Phillips, Jack Pladziewicz, Craig Smith, Sheila Smith, Andrew Soll, Steve Tallant, Ted Wendt, Marty Wood

The regular meeting of University Senate was called to order by Chair Harrison at 3:03 p.m. Tuesday, April 23, 2002 in the Tamarack Room of Davies Center.

1. Unfinished Business

Academic Policies Committee – Second Reading – Motion #2 of General Education Requirement Revisions
Establish GE Category V

Motion by Senator Mac Briar that vote on motion 38/AP-14 be taken by paper ballot seconded and DEFEATED by vote of 13 to 16

Continued Debate:

- Strong GE program should be cohesive, coherent, and emphasize way of knowing as well as content
  - Existing general education program does
    - GE category definitions in catalogue present philosophy for each category
  - No core philosophy for proposed Category V
  - Could introduce courses from Colleges of Business and Professional Studies into existing category structure
- Copies of resolution passed last night at Student Senate distributed
  - Supported motion on grounds students should be allowed to explore opportunities in other colleges and count them toward graduation instead of being penalized

Motion by Senator Mac Briar that vote on motion 38/AP-14 be taken by roll call seconded and DEFEATED by vote of 12 to 22
Substitute Motion 38-AP-14

Moved by Senator Freymiller and seconded to substitute for motion 38-AP-14 that GE courses from the Colleges of Business and Professional Studies be incorporated into the existing categories I through IV. GE courses from these colleges would retain their departmental prefixes and be placed into the IDIS subcategory of the appropriate category.

Debate

- One reason for proposing Category V was to allow departments to keep own prefixes in interdisciplinary courses that cross category boundaries.
- Substitute motion still creates Category V for courses that cross GE categories.
  - Eliminates Colleges of Business and Professional Studies courses from Category V.
    - Courses from those colleges deemed appropriate for general education would fit into existing four categories because of coherence to category philosophy.
    - Would be subcategory underneath designating college course came from.
- Amendment sounds complicated.
  - Now courses offered in Colleges of Business and Professional Studies are under existing GE structure.
  - Could just have Part C of original motion reading courses which cross GE categories will be listed under general education Category V.
- Adding subcategories sounds complicated.
  - GEII already has subcategories biology, chemistry, physics, geology, and geography.
  - Suppose nursing offered a GE course deemed to meet requirements of natural science, then would add subcategory for nursing.
  - Would allow nursing to retain identity of particular course.
- Decisions on category placement would be made by committee not yet voted on.
  - Any course proposed for GE would indicate which category it fits.
  - Could be overridden by committee.
- Acceptance of concept of Category V highly influenced by implications of decisions to be made once concept supported.

Amendment 38-AP-14-a1 (to substitute motion)

Moved by Provost Satz and seconded to include all of the wording of Motion #3 in substitute Motion #2.

Debate

- Would have professional college courses listed in existing GE categories, interdisciplinary courses listed in Category V, and committee making decisions on where courses belong containing members from all colleges.
- Caution body about tinkering too much with proposed language.
  - Considerable work on part of Academic Policies Committee went into proposal.
  - Elements hashed and rehashed with opportunity for anyone to attend open meetings and forums.
  - May not understand all implications of changes to original proposal.
- Seems like quick move – already have GE Committee in Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee.
  - If don’t pass committee proposal, that committee would make decisions.
  - Would like to talk about university-wide committee separately; expect much discussion.
- Concerned substitute motion could pass but motion allowing opportunity for professional colleges to participate in review committee could fail greatly diluting proposed changes.
- Issues very complex; have to be very careful about wording.
- Support combination motion – extremely hard to separate two issues.
  - If knew Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee was making decisions for Category V, would not vote for establishing Category V.
  - Only difference between combined motion and what APC brought forward is allowing departments to retain own name in GE courses; now just under IDIS.
- Original proposal also limits number of credits in Category V to six.
  - Substitute proposal allowing courses from business and professional studies into existing categories I through IV would make it hypothetically possible for an individual to complete all GE requirements without taking a single course in arts and sciences.
- Already rules in place about how many credits students can count toward GE from individual departments.
- Colleges of Professional Studies and Business not here to flood GE categories.
• Do demand respect for broad educations and skills that can support and strengthen GE programs on campus
• Seems with substitute motion, could take all nine credits in natural sciences and never go near any established
gen. ed. disciplines – doesn’t make sense
• Discussion currently centered on substitute motion rather than amendment of combining
• To clarify – intent of substitute motion was that professional studies and business courses be added to existing

IDIS subcategory, but be labeled differently

Motion by Senator Tlushy to move the previous question seconded and PASSED by two-thirds vote of University

Faculty Senators

Vote on Amendment 38-AP-14-a1: Amendment DEFEATED by vote of 15 for, 21 against by University Faculty

Senators

Continued Discussion on Substitute Motion
• Would like to see motion on paper or up on screen prior to voting because is big issue
  • What now hearing doesn’t seem to be what heard read

Motion by Senator Tlushy to move the previous question seconded and DEFEATED by vote of 8 for, 26 against by University Faculty Senators

Motion by Senator Mac Briar to postpone indefinitely the substitute motion under discussion seconded and

PASSED by vote of 19 for, 15 against

Chair ruled consideration of Compensation Committee motion out of order at this point

Motion from Senator Mac Briar to table Motion #2 until a future meeting DIED for lack of second

In order to bring back motion at same meeting would have to suspend rules

Continued Discussion of Motion #2
• Struck by existing GE categories having coherent philosophical underpinnings and students wanting
  opportunity to try out courses in professional schools
  • Could put something in catalogue to give philosophical underpinnings for four general education categories
  and add if you want to try something new and innovative, can explore professional courses or truly
interdisciplinary courses that cross categories
  • Would be something other liberal arts-based institutions don’t offer; could clearly market

Amendment 38-AP-14-a2
Moved by Senator Lang and seconded to change the word except to the word including in Part C of Motion

Debate on Amendment
• For clarification, would also include IDIS courses in Category V
• Discussion of exception took place both in open forum and in APC meetings
  • Faculty members and department administrators argued convincingly that courses already approved to fit
under IDIS keep that designation
  • Do not remember specific reasoning
• Raises issue of students taking courses just within their field
  • Could avoid most traditional arts and sciences general education courses
  • Would bring real clarification if all IDIS courses in one category
  • IDIS subcategory created last time redefined baccalaureate to allow professional school courses into
appropriate category even though by definition basically crossed categories
  • Creating fifth category redundant and confusing
• If courses meet philosophical requirement for a GE category, should stay in that category
  • Shouldn’t be arbitrarily placed in a category because professional school course
  • If where philosophically belong, doesn’t matter whether social work course, or sociology course
• For amendment – clarifies and addresses concerns about breadth in GE
Against amendment – if two natural sciences departments want to offer interdisciplinary course still exclusively in natural sciences, see no reason they should be moved out of natural sciences into fifth category
Registrar’s Office concerned that moving existing IDIS courses out of current GE designation affects people who have taken course previously and need to repeat it
Examples of cross-category courses include Speaking/Singing Voice (Music and Communication Disorders) and Science of Science Fiction (Physics)

Vote on Amendment 38-AP-14-a2: Amendment DEFEATED by vote of University Faculty Senators

Continued Debate on Motion #2

• Apparently in chair’s council, discussed possible availability of business and professional school GE courses only to arts and sciences students to broaden education
• Colleague against motion – already impose too many GE requirements in unnecessarily complicated way
  • Large new GE category furthers bureaucratization of general education
• If attempting to prepare students to see world in broad lens, eliminating professional ways of looking at things instantly cuts out sizable segment of population and skews students’ views
  • Support bringing in category to allow courses from professional studies and business
• Against motion – complicates issue
  • Favor including courses from Colleges of Business and Professional Studies in general education, but would fit into existing GE categories within IDIS subcategories already there
• Should be mechanism to ensure changes are reviewed and evaluated in reasonable period of time
  • GE program not reviewed on periodic basis
  • No formal structure to do so
  • Motion #5 covers only course availability
• Easy to add motion to say whole process be reviewed by APC when current motion resolved
• Favor motion – gives students broader choice of general education courses and recognizes wisdom of Student Senate
• Against motion – thinking about general education requirements separate from established university requirements
  • GE traditionally assumed to be based in liberal arts disciplines with teaching consistent with message and content of liberal arts
  • Have whole other category of university requirements separate from liberal arts, such as wellness, foreign culture, writing, and math requirements
  • Issues raised in Category V should be thought of in context of larger picture and not part of general education

Motion by Senator Pederson to postpone motion 38-AP-14 until Academic Policies Committee has a chance to look at Category V in relationship to the larger framework of university requirements seconded

Debate

• Should at least think where they belong instead of fighting about what a liberal arts course might be
• Against referring back to APC – this is maximum of two courses toward general education
  • APC did debate for long time
  • Can come back a year from now and pull out Category V if not working well

Motion DEFEATED by vote of University Faculty Senators

Continued Debate on Motion #2

• Oppose motion – found earlier changes acceptable
  • With part C including courses across GE categories
  • GE courses from business and professional studies incorporated into existing categories I through IV under subcategory IDIS but maintaining own department prefix

Motion by Senator Freitag to suspend rules and bring back postponed amendment seconded and DEFEATED by vote of University Faculty Senators
Continued Debate on Motion #2
- Favor motion - Any course added to general education will be reviewed by general education committee
  - Will be course reinforcing general education of students or won’t be passed by that committee

Motion by Senator Syverson to move the previous question seconded and PASSED by two-thirds vote of University Faculty Senators

Vote on Motion 38-AP-14: Motion PASSED by vote of University Faculty Senators

TEXT OF MOTION
A fifth General Education Category be established, as defined below:
- GE V Category is to be entitled “University Wide General Education”
- Students may take up to six credits of GE Category V courses
- Courses which cross GE categories and courses offered by College of Professional Studies and College of Business (except courses with IDIS prefix) will be listed under General Education V Category

Motion by Senator Mac Briar to amend agenda to bring Compensation Committee motions before us at this time seconded and PASSED by vote of 31 for, 20 against

Motion by Provost Satz to call a special meeting one week from today for purpose of continuing debate on whatever remaining items are left at end of this meeting seconded and PASSED

Compensation Committee – Second Reading – Comprehensive Salary Plan for 2003-2004

Motion 38-CP-03
Moved and seconded by Compensation Committee (6-0-0) that the proposed Comprehensive Salary Plan be submitted to the Chancellor as the recommended 2003-2004 Salary Plan

- After first reading of Comprehensive Salary Plan proposal, committee received feedback which resulted in two friendly amendments as distributed
  - Internal equity comparisons loosened
    - Too focused; if only single individual in department, would not allow comparison for equity adjustment
    - Was not intent of committee, so changed
  - Since instructional academic staff not included in compression adjustments, were added to longevity adjustments
    - Was original intent of committee
- Friendly amendments accepted without objection
- Summary of Plan – Senator Wick
  - Working for two and one-half years through open forums and surveys of faculty and academic staff attempting to overcome procedure problems with current standard pay plans and alternative pay plans
  - Split plan
    - Administrative and professional academic staff under continuation of current standard plan with familiar $400, $800, and $1200 merit levels
    - Faculty and instructional academic staff under different plan
      - Control over 90% of money generated by department in hands of immediate supervisor of that department
        - As opposed to recommendation-style system that moves recommendations up
        - Decisions made more locally
      - Familiar two thirds solid performance, one-third merit being continued
    - 10% of pay plan used for both faculty and academic staff to address compression, longevity, and equity concerns
    - Departments comfortable with current system have option of $650 fixed dollar amount for merit; plan opens other options for percentage, flat-dollar, or combination flat/percentage-based rates
    - Subsumes everything doing now and adds additional options
- Rationale for change was to address concerns brought up through surveys and forums
  - Falling behind peer institutions was concern, so added percentage basis so as rest of world moves up don’t fall further and further behind
  - Complexity of plan was issue
    - Using both standard plan and alternative plans, each with own set of policies, made analysis difficult
    - Makes rules consistent between alternative pay plans and standard plan to ensure everyone following same rules and to level playing field
  - Recognition of recipients of awards addressed, so know who models should be
    - Are still restrictions - can’t publish who receives merit
  - Equity concerns, on which current plan silent, firmed up
  - Distance between work being done and person making final decision on salary recommendations too great – most decisions would be made locally
  - Introduced feedback loop to keep informed of progress on issues that are recommendation based
    - Accountability so informed who made what recommendation concerning salary
  - Options to address concern that use of flat-dollar awards is causing additional compression with people falling behind market which uses percentages
  - Still forced into merit-based system by System policy so did not address whether merit-based system actually encourages increased performance
  - Fixed-amount merit awards dictate how many people can be outstanding performers, rather than people’s performance itself
  - Teamwork not directly supported in current plan; giving more control to immediate supervisor means better chance of rewarding teamwork within department
  - Distribution difficult as was distribution analysis because of alternative pay plans
    - Some people have salaries contribute to pay plan, but have no way of sharing in those funds throughout entire career
  - Use of equity adjustments limited to internal equity because everyone behind outside world
  - Very difficult to address all these issues
    - Trying to build teamwork-based approach and take ownership of how money distributed
    - May make us more comfortable with how divide up small pot
- Response to questions from floor
  - Proposed pay plan would grandparent in alternate pay plans already existing
    - Committee decided not to continue encouraging alternate pay plans
    - Comprehensive plan for faculty subsumes alternative pay plan models
    - For administrative and professional academic staff, idea is to freeze alternative pay plans to allow their pay plan to be reexamined in next few years without addition of new alternative plans
  - Academic staff chose to maintain major changes made in last few years
    - After review of how faculty part of plan works, can adopt that model if desire
    - Problem for some academic staff because many people not in unit of large enough size
  - Departments not necessarily equal in terms of merit; taking away deans ability to reward better departments
    - Committee discussed at length - no one believed was a department that didn’t deserve 90% of pittance given from state
    - When lift control to higher level, is to every immediate supervisor’s benefit to argue for as much of that money as they possibly can and results in losing merit-based system
    - Proposed plan gives immediate supervisor a pie to divide up as believe appropriate on merit

Debate
- Existing plan is Robin Hood plan attempting to take from rich and give to poor
  - Fixed awards makes someone with twice the salary subject to same award
  - Also money going to a fund, such as equity fund, with idea that someone deserving could get that money
    - Data show that could become superfund with very little control; in some years given exclusively to certain categories of employees
  - Agree fixed dollar amounts work against people at higher end of scale; don’t know about other because don’t know specifics
  - Concerned that external equity written off
• Recently lost faculty member to job elsewhere with significant increase in pay; did get him pay raise here, but wasn’t enough
• This plan could make it more difficult to keep quality people here; would hurt university in long run
• Proposal creating two distinct categories of equity argument
  • Must use other UWEC employees as your argument basis
    • Pay plan based on salaries currently paid; to allow someone to compare themselves to outside world and get pay increase at cost of everyone else’s pay increase did not seem fair or appropriate
    • Almost everyone on campus could make that argument
    • If want to compare yourself to people not living in Eau Claire or Wisconsin, can do so, but those adjustments should come from base dollars, not pockets of other faculty and academic staff
  • In past practice, have not been granted except for extreme cases for salary matching offers
    • Would make those arguments less common
• If administrative and professional academic staff see major reasons, could move to faculty model in next few years
  • Have been pretty pleased with current model – virtually no complaints in last two or three years
• Concerned with removal of discipline as basis for internal equity adjustments
• Differences in disciplines due to reality of market; leveling may be bigger change than intended
• Discussed at most recent Compensation Committee meeting
  • Use of word similar positions, while not concrete, recognized that administration should be looking at similar positions
  • Don’t consider appointments in computer science and biology similar positions, nor foreign language and accounting, but if administration were to choose to listen to that argument, committee believed it should be allowed
  • Any way tried to word equity comparisons more constrained than intended
  • Not automatically funded; concluded that should make case if you believe you have one; if case sells, congratulations; if case doesn’t sell, you have had opportunity to make it
• Bigger question over equity in past was who paying for it – we shouldn’t have to fund this
  • Probably have some endowed seats in different departments funded by equity pool as foundations might fund on other campuses
  • Proposal tries to solve this problem
• Have extracted discipline from internal equity, but clarify similar position with comparable duties, performance, history, qualifications, and experience
  • Geography just went through painful hiring process for specialist in remote sensing; $20,000 to $30,000 below target population trying to hire at geography level when these people more like computer scientists
  • Proposal allows for necessary flexibility to look at qualifications and experience and make appropriate adjustments

Vote on Motion 38-CP-03: Motion PASSED

Motion by Senator Gapko that agenda be rearranged to consider at this time Salary Plan Handbook Language Revisions seconded and PASSED without dissention

Compensation Committee – Second Reading – Salary Plan Handbook Language Revisions

Motion 38-CP-04
  Moved and seconded by Compensation Committee (6-0-0) that the proposed changes to the Salary Recommendation sections (p. 5.19 and 5.42) of the UW-Eau Claire Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook be approved

Summary – Senator Wick
• Comprehensive salary plan just approved subsumes all existing alternative pay plans
  • Everything that can be done on approved alternative pay plan list can be done under current comprehensive salary plan
  • Attempting to unify everyone under one set of rules by eliminating future option of alternative pay plans while grandparenting in current alternative pay plans for comfort of people already in them
  • Believe comprehensive pay plan will meet all needs and once seen in practice, others will choose to join
Motion also removes language from handbook specific to old standard pay plan so handbook will not need to be changed annually when salary plan approved.

Response to questions from floor:
- Adoption of comprehensive pay plan necessitates change in handbook, regardless of whether prefer this change or not.
- Eliminating term alternative pay plans; all those ways of structuring compensation possible under current plan.
- Closes new alternative pay plans for everyone, but academic staff portion of Compensation Committee already engaged in evaluating how new faculty plan goes.
  - If decide that not direction want to go, have every right to open alternative pay plan model for academic staff.
- Concern with alternate pay plans is that committee charged with analysis of distribution data.
  - In past, presence of two radically different models complicated analysis process – looking for simplification.
  - Current policies not being implemented consistently across all departments – want to make it more consistent and ensure all departments contributing to university-wide issues of compression, equity and longevity.
  - Bringing everyone under one model so can use same model to evaluate everyone’s distribution.
  - Make sure accountable to external sources asking about analysis of distribution – fact that not analyzed for some departments is problem.

Motion by Senator Pitts to move the previous question seconded and PASSED.

Vote on Motion 38-CP-04: Motion PASSED without dissention.

TEXT OF CHANGES TO HANDBOOK
For Faculty (p. 5.19)

**SALARY RECOMMENDATIONS**

Recommendations for salary adjustments recognizing merit are initiated annually by the Department Chair based on his/her review of faculty performance. They shall be made in accordance with the state-approved pay plan, the pay plan guidelines from UW-System, and the UW-Eau Claire Comprehensive Salary Plan developed by the University Senate and approved by the Chancellor. Salary recommendations shall be based on the General Criteria as specified in the Department Evaluation Plan, performance of assigned duties, and must include consideration of student evaluations.

The salary recommendations for a faculty member in his or her third and subsequent years of service shall be made known to the faculty member in writing by the Department Chair at least two weeks prior to the transmission of these recommendations to the Dean of the College. First and second year faculty will be informed of their salary recommendation after reappointment has been determined. The Comprehensive Salary Plan shall provide at least two weeks for faculty to respond to all salary recommendations submitted on their behalf. The Comprehensive Salary Plan must also provide a mechanism to be used during those two weeks for hearing and resolving any faculty objection to a salary recommendation.

The salary base of a member of the faculty or academic staff will ordinarily be based on the previous year’s rate. The Comprehensive Salary Plan shall use the base salary rate of the faculty member in calculating the next year’s rate. The base salary rate may be reduced for a change in position with significantly different duties and responsibilities; disciplinary action; or by request of the individual faculty or instructional academic staff member. (US 10/93)

The Comprehensive Salary Plan shall include a grandparent clause allowing all departments on “alternative pay plans” as of 01-Oct-2001 and that have not since selected to follow the Comprehensive Salary Plan to continue to use their existing alternative pay plans for the distribution of all performance-based salary adjustments.
The Office of the Provost and Vice Chancellor shall maintain a copy of the Comprehensive Salary Plan as developed by the University Senate and approved by the Chancellor and shall ensure department compliance. (US 4/02)

**Salary Plans**

Departments may choose to use the standard pay plan established each year by the Chancellor following recommendations from and in consultation with the University Senate Compensation Committee or one of three alternative pay plans.

The standard pay plan recognizes three levels of adjustment—across the board, merit, and extra merit—and has recently been structured as follows: (1) distribute any minimums mandated by the Board of Regents or State Legislature; (2) set aside a designated amount to be used to adjust, on a percentage basis, the base salaries of unclassified staff awarded a merit adjustment; (3) set aside a dollar amount to add to the merit adjustment for those awarded an extra merit adjustment; (4) set aside a designated percentage to use for equity adjustments.

Alternative pay plans allow a department to distinguish different levels of merit. Three general plans have been recommended by the University Senate and approved by the Chancellor (US 5/90). Detailed information on alternative pay plans is available from the Provost and Vice Chancellor’s office.

For Academic Staff (p. 5.42)

**SALARY RECOMMENDATIONS**

Recommendations for salary adjustments recognizing merit are initiated annually by the immediate supervisor and proceed through the Unit Director or Dean to the appropriate Vice Chancellor to the Chancellor.

Recommendations for salary adjustments shall be made in accordance with the state-approved pay plan, the pay plan guidelines from UW-System, and the UW-Eau Claire Comprehensive Salary Plan developed by the University Senate and approved by the Chancellor. Salary recommendations for non-teaching administrative and professional academic staff shall be based on the criteria established for by the unit. For teaching instructional academic staff salary recommendations shall be based on the General Criteria as specified in the Department Evaluation Plan performance of assigned duties and must include consideration of student evaluations.

The Comprehensive Salary Plan shall provide at least two weeks for academic staff to respond to all salary recommendations submitted on their behalf. The Comprehensive Salary Plan must also provide a mechanism to be used during those two weeks for hearing and resolving any academic staff objection to a salary recommendation.

The salary base of a member of the faculty or academic staff will ordinarily be based on the previous year’s rate. The Comprehensive Salary Plan shall use the base salary rate of the academic staff member in calculating the next year’s rate. The base salary rate may be reduced for a change in position with significantly different duties and responsibilities; disciplinary action; or by request of the individual faculty or instructional academic staff member. (US 10/93)

The Comprehensive Salary Plan shall include a grandparent clause allowing all units on “alternative pay plans” as of 01-Oct-2001 and that have not since selected to follow the Comprehensive Salary Plan to continue to use their existing alternative pay plans for the distribution of all performance-based salary adjustments.

The Office of the Provost and Vice Chancellor shall maintain a copy of the Comprehensive Salary Plan as developed by the University Senate and approved by the Chancellor and shall ensure unit compliance. (US 4/02)

**Salary Plans**
Units or departments may choose to use the standard pay plan, established each year by the Chancellor following recommendations from and in consultation with the University Senate Compensation Committee or one of three alternative pay plans.

The standard pay plan recognizes three levels of adjustment—across-the-board, merit, and extra merit and has recently been structured as follows: (1) distribute any minimums mandated by the Board of Regents or State Legislature; (2) set aside a designated amount to be used to adjust, on a percentage basis, the base salaries of unclassified staff awarded merit adjustment; (3) set aside a dollar amount to add to the merit adjustment for those awarded an extra merit adjustment; (4) set aside a designated percentage to use for equity adjustments. Alternative play plans allow a department to distinguish different levels of merit.

Three general plans have been recommended by the University Senate and approved by the Chancellor (US 5/90). Detailed information on alternative pay plans is available from the Provost and Vice Chancellor’s office.

Without objection, will go directly to Agenda Item #2 leaving all remaining motions for special meeting

2. Without objection, minutes of April 9, 2002 meeting of University Senate approved as distributed
   Without objection, minutes of April 11, 2002 meetings of University Faculty and University Academic Staff approved as distributed

3. Chancellor’s Remarks – Chancellor Mash
   • On Friday will publicly kick off University of Wisconsin – Eau Claire and Foundation’s first ever comprehensive campaign
   • Have been in silent phase for one and one-half years gathering leadership gifts
   • Invite University Senators to social reception/buffet Friday evening
   • Will publicize leadership gift of $4.5 million from couple from Fairfax, Virginia prior to Friday
   • Goal of campaign and how far toward reaching that goal to be announced Friday evening
   • Coming at time when need to do everything we can to build resource base beyond state support and students’ cooperation and willingness to support and pay tuition costs

4. Chair and Faculty Representative Report – No report

5. Academic Staff Representative Report – No report

6. Announcements
   • Wordstock – Seventh Annual English Festival on May 1 and 2, 2002
   • Please turn in Senate surveys

7. Reports of Committees
   • Executive Committee – Chair Harrison
   • At last meeting, committee expressed appreciation for classified staff and unanimously supported extending
     Thanks of the University Senate to classified staff
   • Resolution included in agenda for today’s meeting

Motion 38-SE-06
   Moved by Senator Pitts and seconded to support Thanks of the University Senate to the classified staff resolution by acclamation

Motion 38-SE-06 PASSED by acclamation (applause)

Certificate of Thanks of the University Senate will be sent out to all classified staff to read as follows:
   Thanks of the University Senate presented to UW-Eau Claire Classified Staff – We, the members of the University Senate, wish to extend our sincere appreciation to all classified staff for their important contributions to our university. We also wish to express our support for appropriate recognition of their contributions when salaries are determined – presented by University Senate, University of Wisconsin – Eau Claire on Tuesday, April 23, 2002
Next meeting May 7, 2002

Faculty Personnel Committee – No Report

Academic Staff Personnel Committee
  Next meeting April 25, 2002

Academic Policies Committee – Senator Lozar
  Next meeting April 30, 2002
  Today reviewed American Indian Studies Program and Department of Art
  Next Tuesday will do Departments of Foreign Languages and History and School of Nursing

Physical Plant Planning Committee – Senator Pitts
  Reviewed current efforts to reduce and maintain energy consumption levels to figure out ways to save
  Decided to maintain current hours of parking enforcement for Hibbard lot

Budget Committee – Senator Carpenter
  Met April 19, 2002
  Discussed with Chancellor and Provost communication systems and mechanisms for Budget Committee to provide feedback to administration
  Next meeting May 3, 2002 to continue discussion

Compensation Committee – No Report

Nominating Committee – No Report

Technology Committee – No Report

8. Special Reports – None

9. Miscellaneous Business – None

Meeting adjourned at 4:58 p.m. without objection

Wanda Schulner
Secretary to the University Senate