The regular meeting of University Senate was called to order by Chair Harrison at 3:02 p.m. on Tuesday, February 22, 2005 in the Tamarack Room of Davies Center.

I. Without objection, minutes of February 8, 2005 meeting of University Senate approved as distributed

II. Chancellor’s Remarks

- One sheet summary of governor’s budget distributed with name tags – at later senate meeting, Vice Chancellor Soll to go through proposed budget
  - Governor’s budget sets direction, but will be played out for weeks or months
  - While legislature discusses and debates budget over long period, seems when all dust has settled, approved budget ends up pretty close to what governor recommended
  - Much better budget message than heard two years ago; still some real challenges
- Task group appointed on service-learning issue working through basis for service-learning
  - Some people of group were part of initial discussions when service-learning put into place ten years ago
    - Have sense of expectations, vision, and what requirement supposed to do
  - Group defining and sharpening service-learning to give clear definition so future decisions about appropriateness of activities relating to service and learning will be addressed more easily
    - Will be very closely related to educational purposes and less to legal standards
    - Must be aware that decisions made every day at university by folks in offices and in classrooms about right thing to do
      - When group’s work discussed and eventually approved in some form, Service-Learning Office and advisory group will certainly be in position to make those decisions
General comments related to my departure and our work

Today at chamber luncheon, I was thanked for work I do here

Several people made comments; if you heard those comments, you would have very clear sense of how important and valued university is in this community

I thanked them on behalf of myself for the kind remarks, and noted great work done at university was instrumental to me getting acclaim for work I have done

This was a great place when I arrived – why I came

Was great because of people, work done here, and culture of excellence in place for many years

Inspired daily by work done here – from sparkling floors in older buildings, to condition of grounds, to glowing comments from students about services, support, teaching, mentoring and general respect they feel, and wonderful opportunity they realize they have here

University will continue to be great in future – have weathered worst of storm, but storm isn’t over

Have come through last several biennial budgets very soundly not by simply waiting it out and grumpling, but by doing things to help ourselves

Maintained level of quality and increased our focus; will be instrumental in capitalizing on support we are able to get in future

With modest and steady support, work done here can blossom

Interim chancellor is very good fit for campus – she will be respectful of tradition and at same time prepared to embrace change and provide leadership during search for new chancellor

Given this campus and its reputation, will be very strong pool of candidates for chancellor position

Will be search consultant, working with search committee, to interest candidates who might not be in market to look at position

I’m not yet excited about new position, am anxious – will get excited when I get into job and am more comfortable

Going now simply because I was asked – President Reilly asked me some time ago to consider joining him in Madison to fill this position that a management study suggested be created as part of restructuring of UW-System

He felt I could complement some things he wants to do

I think I can complement him and bring very strong campus perspective to system

Will miss this campus very much – have been on a campus my entire career, so this will be different

Some challenges are significant and some things I am thinking about will take some time, but I jotted a couple of pages of things down that I think we could do almost immediately that won’t cost anything and would make a difference

Some affect morale, some affect sense of campus belief that we are doing the right things

Important not only to do the right things, but also to do them right

Major challenge is tied to communication – communicating clearly to general public, as well as leaders, what has been happening to state investment in UW-System and why that isn’t a good thing for Wisconsin’s future

President Reilly believes he needs to be out talking to community leaders, state leaders and others to turn tremendous good will for UW-System into urgency for support

I am going to be attending to other matters to free him up to be able to do more of that

In every public opinion poll, UW-System practically off the chart – viewed with pride and may be state’s most recognizable asset; doesn’t square with dwindling state investment

Need to reach point where general public says enough is enough, system needs to become priority

In this system, we have managed reductions and finances so well for so long that damage isn’t immediately apparent

Will become apparent down road – system downsized 20 years ago to manage quality and still enrolls fewer students than in mid-1980s

Hope citizens hearing and understanding implications of things this system not doing, will conclude ought to be investing to enable us to do those things

That is message that needs to be taken to leaders and people; have seen some editorials to that effect over last year or so
Has been privilege and honor to serve as your chancellor – no secret that it is general belief this may be best campus in system

Plan to stay connected here – not going to say good-bye, simply going to say until we meet again

MOTION by Vice Chair Gapko to present the Thanks of the University Senate to Donald J. Mash extending the sincere appreciation of the faculty and academic staff members of the University Senate for his important contributions to our University and expressing gratitude for the sound financial legacy he has established for UW-Eau Claire approved by acclamation.

III. Chair’s Report – Chair Harrison

- Karen Pope, co-chair (with La Vonne Cornell-Swanson) of Commission on the Status of Women, asked for input

  - Commission functions include:
    1) to make recommendations to University Senate, Student Senate, and administration on new or changed policies concerning status of women;
    2) to undertake initiatives with appropriate administrators to implement existing policies;
    3) to inform Affirmative Action Council of its activities and recommendations.

- Membership includes:
  1) two faculty members
  2) two members of the academic staff
  3) two members of the classified staff
  4) two students
  5) ex officio and nonvoting

    One administrator from Academic and Career Services
    Affirmative Action Director
    Associate Vice Chancellor for Student Development and Diversity, or designee
    Representative from Women’s Studies Program

  Chair: Designated by Chancellor
  Term: Three years, rotating

- Request your help in finding people who might make contributions as members of commission
  - Forward names both for immediate consideration and to develop pool of individuals interested in serving

- Recent issues addressed by commission include
  - Work/life issues
  - Childbearing and childcare issues and policies for women
  - A family-friendly campus environment, and
  - Establishing a women’s center

- Other topics addressed include
  - Women in science initiatives
  - Campus safety for students
  - Providing a forum for discussion of issues facing women in higher education and in leadership positions

- Current members include Marc Goulet, Math, Rexann Lempke, University Police, and Cathy Hanson appointed by Student Senate leadership; Lisa Huftel has been proposed by Student Senate and is awaiting appointment

- Two items to highlight on chair’s report
  - Many topics being discussed by sister institutions
    - Some of their resolutions posted on our website
    - Provided in case anyone would like to create resolutions to present before senate
    - Issues will not come forward unless senators feel important
    - Report includes list of topics and URL

- Next faculty representatives meeting is by teleconference on March 4, 2005
- Next Board of Regents meeting March 10 and 11, 2005 in Madison
IV. Academic Staff Representative’s Report
  ● No report

V. Unfinished Business
  A. Second Reading – Motion from Faculty Personnel Committee
     Voting in Personnel Actions
     ● Faculty senators will be voting on motion

Continued Debate
  ● Motion not putting forth stricter regulations than already in state statutes; are details that aren’t within statues, such as filling out form, but substantive portion not more restrictive
  ● Is Wisconsin Statute that says any member of governing body can call for a roll-call vote

Amendment 41-FP-02-a1
  Moved by Senator Smith and seconded to amend motion to say that votes pertaining to a personnel action will be conducted by signed ballot, or by roll call ballot.

Debate
  ● In Math Department, have always done signed ballot – were under misguided impression that supposed to by Wisconsin Statute
  ● If have possibility of voice vote, could have two people up for personnel action, one decided by voice vote, the other decided by signed ballot
    ● Then if information requested, one would get details and other only the count
    ● Setting ourselves up to treat two people unequally
  ● Might be preference for people in other departments to have option for show of hands vote so would have count, but specifically who voted which way would not be available
  ● No way to avoid candidates knowing how someone voted simply by having a show of hands because they can be present for DPC meeting, assuming it is an open meeting
    ● If you have signed ballot, you have to keep records, which candidates can then request; departments have provided that information in past without difficulty
    ● Think concern is if vote by show of hands and candidate not there; should have right to that information and it would not be available
  ● Are allowed by state statute to carry out voice vote in closed meeting, so candidates do not have legal right to know who voted which way unless that is actually recorded as part of process
  ● That is different story than one I received
  ● Would like to see same kind of open-mindedness apply to compensation information on who got raises greater than their peers for use by Compensation Committee
  ● Oppose amendment – each individual department should have flexibility necessary to decide how to conduct votes
    ● Physics Department does with hand vote; some people may not be happy with signed ballot or roll call
    ● Wording as it stands allows flexibility
  ● Flexibility is nice, but concern is could end up treating two candidates unfairly and unequally
  ● Clearly state has faced same issue and doesn’t see as legal problem – can’t be anything new
  ● If two candidates come up, probably are unequal – different people under different circumstances
    ● Roll-call or signed ballot seem somewhat more extreme version of taking a vote
    ● Are situations in which that might be important; not necessarily for legal, but for political, reasons where people need to actually step forward and identify themselves by voting one way or the other
    ● Would be extreme situation, not one we want to be the norm - important to be able to choose that if we feel circumstances warrant it
    ● Speaking against amendment
  ● Voice vote would also have to include number for and number against to be reported on form to go forward
  ● Speak against amendment, freedom allowed by original motion important
● Speak for amendment – we insist our representatives in Wisconsin Legislature as well as Congress make hard votes and vote by name; don’t think we should hold ourselves to a lower standard

**Vote on Amendment 41-FP-02-a1**: Amendment FAILED by vote of faculty senators.

Continued Debate on Main Motion
● Will always be a form to be filled out for any personnel action – promotion, tenure decision or retention of probationary faculty

**Vote on Motion 41-FP-02**: Motion PASSED by vote of faculty senators.

**TEXT OF MOTION**: *Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook*, Chapter 5, page 10, immediately following section “Procedures”:

**Voting**

All votes pertaining to a personnel action will be conducted by voice, by show of hands, by signed ballot, or by roll call. If any member of the voting body requests a roll call or signed ballot vote, then the vote must be conducted in that manner. In the case of signed ballot or roll call, the name and specific vote cast by each voting member must be recorded, preserved, and be available for public inspection.

In reporting the results of any personnel action requiring a vote, the vote count (votes for, votes against, votes abstaining) will be recorded on the appropriate official personnel form. That form will be provided to the individual under consideration in the personnel action at the same time that it is forwarded to the next appropriate administrative level (Chair, Dean, etc).

B. Second Reading – Motion from Faculty Personnel Committee

FPC Function
● Part of University Senate Constitution, all senators vote

Continued Debate – None

**Vote on Motion 41-FP-03**: Motion PASSED without dissent

**TEXT OF MOTION**: *Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook*, Chapter 3, page 14, Faculty Personnel Committee functions:

b. Functions: The Faculty Personnel Committee shall consider and recommend policies affecting the faculty in regard to status, salary, tenure, promotion, and working conditions. It shall also consider and recommend the practices and procedures for implementing those policies and serve as the primary agent for recommending revisions and amendments of the UW – Eau Claire Faculty Personnel Rules.

VI. Reports of Committees

◆ Executive Committee – Chair Harrison
  ● Committee continued working on constitutional language changes reflecting reorganization of colleges
  ● At next meeting March 1, 2005, will wrap up rest of committee discussions

◆ Faculty Personnel Committee – Senator Wick
  ● Next meeting March 3, 2005 to discuss issues including
    ● Dismissal for Cause policies
    ● Review of Department Chair policies
    ● Absentee Voting policies
    ● Tenure Density language in handbook that needs to be revised
    ● Promotion language in handbook needing revision
    ● Other pending issues
  ● Response to question on tenure density
- Language in handbook refers to tenure density – in past, term used to make sure didn’t have 100% of faculty tenured in any given department
  - No longer a practice, so language misleading and should be removed

◆ Academic Staff Personnel Committee
  - No report

◆ Academic Policies Committee – Senator Syverson
  - Last week approved dual degree in geological engineering – coming forward next senate meeting
  - Next meeting March 1, 2005, to discuss two proposals from Center for International Education

◆ Physical Plant Planning Committee – Senator Bredle
  - Met February 7, 2005
  - Heard from Vice Chancellor Soll – no progress on when state money will be released for building projects on campus
  - Spent time discussing outdoor classroom/park/focal point for entire campus at end of Putnam Park
  - Next meeting after spring break

◆ Budget Committee – Senator Smith
  - No Report

◆ Compensation Committee – Senator Wick
  - Next meeting March 3, 2005 to discuss outcome of senate discussion of 2005-2006 Salary Plan and update on several pending issues being looked at by subcommittees

◆ Nominating Committee – Senator Whitfield
  - No report

◆ Technology Committee
  - No Report

VII. Special Reports - None

VIII. Special Orders
A. University Academic Staff Election to fill vacancy of University Academic Staff Senator At-Large
   Report of the University Academic Staff Nominating Committee – Senator Russell, Chair
   NOMINEES: Jacqueline Bonneville, Advising/New Student Initiatives
   Lisa Schuetz, University Recreation
   Deborah Wells, Business Services
   - No additional nominations from floor

Elected as University Academic Staff Senator At-Large: Jacqueline Bonneville

B. Election to fill vacancy on University Senate Faculty Personnel Committee
   Report of the University Senate Nominating Committee – Senator Whitfield, Chair
   NOMINEES: Gary Don, Music and Theatre Arts
   Thomas Kemp, Economics
   Bruce Lo, Management Information Systems
   Sean McAleer, Philosophy and Religious Studies
   - No additional nominations from floor

Elected to University Senate Faculty Personnel Committee: Thomas Kemp

IX. Miscellaneous Business
A. First Reading – Motion from Executive Committee
   Senate Membership Report – Vice Chair Gapko
   - Executive Committee looked at variety of questions about senate membership – each fall, committee reviews frozen files and determines number of University Faculty and University Academic Staff eligible to vote
Based on that information, changes to the numbers of University Faculty and University Academic Staff comprising University Senate may be suggested to this body.

During review, committee also looked at changes to language in the constitution and noted that no Chapter 37 faculty remain, so removed reference to that group.

Motion 41-SE-07
Moved and seconded by University Senate Executive Committee (13-0) that the language in the Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook, Twenty-first Edition, October 2004, Chapter 3 Faculty and Academic Staff Organization, Article Three: University Senate, Section B Membership, page 11 be changed as shown:

4. Senator Balance
Each year the Senate Executive Committee will review the size of the University Senate and distribution of senators, as described in the Bylaws of the University Senate. The percentage of University Faculty senators and the percentage of University Academic Staff senators within the University Senate shall reflect, as close as possible, the percentage of University Faculty and the percentage of University Academic Staff, respectively, within the total number of University Faculty and University Academic Staff eligible to vote. To monitor these percentages, the following steps shall be followed:

a. Each spring the Senate Executive Committee or authorized representatives will work with the appropriate administrators to determine the numbers of University Faculty and University Academic Staff eligible to vote using the official frozen file created the previous fall for that academic year. (Eligibility to vote is defined in Article One: Section D and Article Two: Section D of this constitution.) Based on this information, recommendations pertaining to the number and distribution of senators may be made.

b. The Senate percentages will be compared to the eligible to vote percentages.

c. If the Senate percentages differ by more than five percent from the eligible to vote percentages, the Senate Executive Committee shall recommend to the University Senate the necessary minor adjustments to the number of University Faculty and University Academic Staff senators at large to maintain the proper percentages.

All recommendations for changes in the number and distribution of senators at large and procedures for implementing the changes must be approved by the University Senate. Upon approval, such changes shall be reflected in the spring elections of senators at large.

And that the language in the Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook Twenty-first Edition, October 2004, Chapter 3 Faculty and Academic Staff Organization, Bylaws of the University Senate, Membership of University Senate, Page 22 be changed as shown:

1. The University Senate shall consist of University Faculty and University Academic Staff senators and will reflect the appropriate percentages of University Faculty senators and University Academic Staff senators as described in Article Three, Section B, 4 of the Constitution of the University Faculty and the University Academic Staff.

The voting members of the University Senate include:

45 44 University Faculty (defined in Article One, Section C)
    32 1 University Faculty members, 1 from each academic department or equivalent
    with 4 or more members
    1 University Faculty member from Library Services
    1 University Faculty member from Chapter 37 faculty (Article One, Section C,
definition 3)
1 Provost and Vice Chancellor
30 University Faculty at large:
    3 University Faculty from the College of Arts and Sciences
    1 University Faculty from the College of Business
    1 University Faculty from the College of Professional Studies
    1 University Faculty from the College of Education and Human Sciences
    1 University Faculty from the College of Nursing and Health Sciences
5 Additional University Faculty from any area as needed
23 University Academic Staff (defined in Article Two, Section C)
- 2 University Academic Staff members: 2 from each Unit with 20 or more members
- 9 University Academic Staff members:
  - 1 University Academic Staff from each Unit with 4 to 19 or more members
- 4 University Academic Staff senators at large:
  - 4 University Academic Staff from Units with less than 4 members
  - 2 University Academic Staff from the instructional academic staff without faculty statues
- 6 Additional University Academic Staff from any area as needed.

The Chancellor shall be a non-voting member of the University Senate.

Debate
- Phrase To monitor these percentages, the following steps shall be followed: striken without objection because steps being removed

Amendment 41-SE-07-a1
Moved by Senator Spaeth and seconded that the motion be amended to 26 University Academic Staff with five University Academic Staff from the Instructional Academic Staff without faculty status.

Debate
- Was person at Executive Committee that moved to set number at 23 for University Academic Staff; did so without looking carefully or seeing actual frozen files
- Frozen files indicate proportion of University Academic Staff to University Faculty is 262 to 426
  - According to constitution, percentage of University Faculty Senators and percentage of University Academic Staff Senators within University Senate shall reflect, as close as possible, percentage of University Faculty and percentage of University Academic Staff respectively within total number of both those groups
- Setting number of University Academic Staff Senators at 26 would more closely represent percentage of University Academic Staff
- Would like to see Instructional Academic Staff (IAS) without faculty status raised from two to five to be more representative of that group and allow more representation on committees

POINT OF INFORMATION – Would like history of combined University Senate at this university
- Vice Chair Gapko reported UW-Eau Claire never had separate Academic Staff Senate; had Academic Staff Personnel Committee before governance rights granted by state statute
  - Faculty, at this institution under Chapter 37, originally had Faculty Senate
  - In 1973, two systems – University of Wisconsin System and Wisconsin State University System – merged and faculty gained governance rights under Chapter 36
  - Students also granted governance rights at that time
  - Academic staff governance rights granted by legislature in 1985; in November of 1985, Chancellor Schnack appointed a joint study group of faculty and academic staff to look at how to incorporate academic staff into governance process at Eau Claire
  - Made recommendation that faculty and academic staff senate be created for following reasons
    - To avoid duplication involved in parallel senates
    - To avoid likelihood of contrary recommendations coming forth from faculty and academic staff groups
    - To provide appropriate participation in university governance to all unclassified staff employees
    - To protect legislative responsibilities of faculty for two major areas – curricular and faculty personnel matters and to protect legislative responsibilities for academic staff on academic staff personnel matters
    - Felt a joint senate would encourage broad-ranging discussion on issues that affect university as a whole and thus better the interests of university
  - Recommendation went to another group that created separate constitutions for faculty, for academic staff, and for a joint faculty and academic staff senate
University Senate was formed in 1987 when constitutions were ratified by all faculty and academic staff by two-thirds vote

In 1997, another study group recommended a combined constitution – since 1997 we have had one constitution for all faculty and academic staff

Stevens Point has combined University Senate; senate at Superior used to include faculty and academic staff; Stout at one time granted all academic staff faculty status and had one body, now they have two

Prior to term academic staff being created, all unclassified employees would have been called faculty

Had extensive discussion at Executive Committee on how University Faculty (UF) and University Academic Staff (UAS) numbers have changed over past few years

Long-term trend at university of losing faculty and gaining academic staff for number of reasons

In 1997, were 451 UF on campus and 234 UAS; currently, are 423 UF and 262 UAS

University Senate revised in 1997 to include 45 UF members and 23 UAS members

If allow senate membership to be pegged to fixed percentage of individuals from UF and UAS, clear we are headed toward senate with fewer UF members and more UAS members

For that reason, faculty on Executive Committee preferred to fix number at current level

Done with understanding number of UF and UAS on campus would be reviewed every year and recommendation could come forward regarding membership of senate

Is dangerous precedent for faculty to accept automatic percentage applied to membership of senate

Would be giving up voice

Faculty have special role in shared governance granted by Chapter 36

Not trying to drive wedge between two groups, but want faculty to be aware if pin senate membership to a percentage, probably looking at a reduction of influence in shared governance

Speak for amendment: primarily because IAS as a group do not have very large voice

Carry heavy teaching loads and many out of loop on governance issues even though guaranteed them under state statute

Faculty have two areas of responsibility guaranteed to them – curricular and faculty personnel issues

Doesn’t matter if there are 47, 17 or seven faculty, they still control those two areas

Academic staff have only academic staff personnel area guaranteed

Did find in information from 1984 that there were 140 IAS of half-time or more; now 72 IAS without faculty status and another 35 who have faculty status

IAS without faculty status, the 72, are ones least represented in this body

Also have many IAS hired for under 50% appointment, add up to about 35 FTE, without any governance representation, but used and contribute to institution

With more IAS representation, could at least have input on things that affect them

Respectfully submit that senate is representative body of both faculty and academic staff with voting status

Decline in number of faculty is not issue of representation

Equal representation for academic staff on this body is the issue here

Speak against motion, although hesitant to do so – seems divisive

Are issues we vote on as a body, for instance post-tenure review salary adjustments, when largely impact faculty; worry about those kinds of joint votes

Would like to hear faculty voice on issue separate from academic staff voice

Speak in favor amendment – amendment doesn’t say anything about percentages, simply changes number of UAS from 23 to 26 by adding three additional IAS without faculty status

Is major concern that number of faculty at institution declining; is reality that number of academic staff going up

Current senate is joint body which requires faculty and academic staff to work together; constitution specifies which group votes on which issues

Adding three more academic staff senators should not impact issues of curricular or faculty personnel matters

Important to raise number of UAS senators to give better representation on university-wide issues

Those less than half-time still would not have voting rights

Seventy-two IAS without faculty status now represented by two positions, don’t have much voice on committees
Has been practice that election to senate position is for contract year, even if percentage appointment dips below 50% for spring semester
- Could always write a bylaw to be more specific
- Current 262 UAS is headcount of those eligible to vote, not FTE
- Those with appointments of 0.5 or more FTE equal one person
- Currently, 423 UF occupy 418.33 FTE positions and 262 UAS occupy 237.65 FTE
- Is fact faculty numbers are declining; in next biennium or two, given governor’s budget, demographics may change
- When we look at numbers or proportions, are reflecting on past; sometimes have to look to future

**Vote on Amendment 41-SE-07-a1:** Amendment DEFEATED

MOTION by Senator Wick that Motion 41-SE-07 be postponed until the Executive Committee can develop a scenario as to what it would look like if we were to divide into a separate faculty senate and a separate academic staff senate so have that information before deciding on these changes seconded.

**Debate**
- General description of what separate senates would look like
- Speak against motion
  - Sounds like asking for split senate
  - Message for at least last 20 years has been this institution chooses to vote in united fashion, in group fashion, in collaborative fashion
  - Own chancellor and new interim chancellor both indicate they find it helpful to have combined senate
    - Don’t have to make presentations twice, don’t have staff doing things in duplicative manner, hear voting of faculty and academic staff at same time
    - Would vote against postponing if interest is to get two senates

Motion to Postpone DEFEATED.

**Continued Debate on Main Motion**
- Adding to total of 44 to Additional University Faculty from any area as needed and to total of 23 to Additional University Academic Staff from any area as needed accepted without objection
- Actual number of additional members left out to add flexibility in case new departments/units come into being or mergers occur; at-large members fluctuate based upon number of department/unit representatives
- Change from as close as possible to as closely as possible under Senate Balance accepted without objection
- Official Frozen Files will also be capitalized

Without objection, vote on this motion postponed until next meeting

**C. First Reading – Motion from Executive Committee**

**University and University Senate Committee Membership Report** – Vice Chair Gapko
- Motion results from organizational change to four colleges; membership on various university and senate committees need revision
- Response to question for clarification
  - Executive Committee primarily focused on correcting colleges part, and changing slightly because of way that changed numbers; was some discussion of workload issue and decreasing committee size, but did not look at that issue for each committee

**Motion 41-SE-08**
Moved and seconded by Executive Committee (13-0; 11-0; see motion form) that the language in the Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook, Twenty-first Edition, October 2004, Chapter 3 Faculty and Academic Staff Organization, Article Three: University Senate, Section F Committees, page 13, be changed as shown:
1. The Executive Committee
   a. Membership: The committee shall include ten University Faculty, four University Academic Staff, the Chancellor, and the Provost and Vice Chancellor. The ten University Faculty and four University Academic Staff shall be composed of the Chair and the Vice Chair of the University Senate, the Chair-elect or the immediate past chair of the University Senate (whoever is serving), the Academic Staff Representative, (the Faculty Representative is included as either the Chair or Vice Chair), and ten to eleven additional senators elected for two-year terms. Of the additional senators, there must be one from each of the colleges, three University Faculty from the College of Arts and Sciences, one University Faculty from the College of Business, one University Faculty from each of the schools of the College of Professional Studies, one or two additional University Faculty from any area (as necessary to total ten University Faculty), and one or two additional University Academic Staff from any area (as necessary to total four University Academic Staff). The Chair of the University Senate shall serve as Chair of the Executive Committee. The Chancellor shall be a non-voting member of the Executive Committee.

   That the language in the *Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook*, Twenty-first Edition, October 2004, Chapter 3 Faculty and Academic Staff Organization, Article Three: University Senate, Section F Committees, page 13, be changed as shown:

2. The Faculty Personnel Committee
   a. Membership: The committee includes nine members: four faculty senators elected by the faculty members of the Senate, four University Faculty elected by the University Faculty, at large, and one administrator selected by the Chancellor. In any given year the committee must have at least one member from the College of Arts and Sciences, College of Business, and each of the schools of the College of Professional Studies. The University Faculty Nominating Committee shall take the responsibility for assuring this representation of Colleges and Schools. Members shall serve three-year terms unless committee membership is terminated by expiration of a Senate membership as described in the bylaws.

   That the language in the *Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook*, Twenty-first Edition, October 2004, Chapter 3 Faculty and Academic Staff Organization, Article Three: University Senate, Section F Committees, page 14, be changed as shown:

4. The Academic Policies Committee
   a. Membership: The committee includes the Provost and Vice Chancellor, nine University Faculty senators elected for three-year terms by the University Faculty members of the Senate, and one ex officio and nonvoting University Faculty representative from Library Services elected by members of the Library Services professional staff. There shall be at least one member from the College of Arts and Sciences, College of Business, and each of the schools of the College of Professional Studies.

   That the language in the *Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook*, Twenty-first Edition, October 2004, Chapter 3 Faculty and Academic Staff Organization, Article Four: College Faculties, Section A, page 18, be changed as shown:

   The faculty of University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire shall be organized into the faculties of the Colleges of Arts and Sciences, Business, *Education and Human Sciences*, and *Nursing and Health Sciences and Professional Studies* which includes the Schools of Education, Human Sciences and Services, and Nursing, and other colleges or schools which may come into being.

   That the language in the *Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook*, Twenty-first Edition, October 2004, Chapter 5 Personnel Policies and Procedures, Faculty and Staff Role in Selection and Evaluation of Administrators, Selection, page 77, and Faculty and Academic Staff Review of Administrator Performance, page 82, be changed as shown:
2. Search and Screen Procedures for the Nomination of Academic Administrative Officers—UW-Eau Claire

Academic administrative officers at or above the rank of Associate Dean are appointed by the Chancellor, following appropriate consultation with University Faculty, University Academic Staff, students, and administrators. Such consultation shall include a search and screen committee; the purpose, structure, and procedures of which are described below:

a. Purpose of the Search and Screen Committee
   The committee shall advise and assist the Chancellor by identifying candidates and by assessing their qualifications for the position. It shall recommend candidates for possible appointment.

b. Structure of the Committee
   The structure of the committee shall be dependent upon the scope of authority and area of jurisdiction of the administrative officer to be selected.

1) For selection of academic administrative officers whose authority is essentially university-wide, the committee shall consist of one faculty member from the College of Arts and Sciences, College of Business, and each of the colleges and schools in the College of Professional Studies; two three University Faculty members from the faculty at large; two University Academic Staff; two students; and at the Chancellor’s discretion, one or two appointed by the Chancellor from the unclassified staff.
   a) The Dean of each College shall announce and conduct an election. Using its established procedures, the College will elect one person for appointment to the committee and will transmit to the Chancellor the name of the person elected with concurrent notice to the chair of the University Senate.
   b) The University Faculty Nominating Committee shall then nominate at least five six University Faculty as candidates for the two three at large seats, being attentive to affirmative action, equal opportunity, and other considerations. The committee shall report to the Chancellor in a timely fashion, and the Chancellor will include the Nominating Committee report on the agenda of a regular or special meeting of the University Faculty. Any University Faculty member will be eligible to nominate from the floor at that meeting. The University Faculty at large will then, on a ballot including names of the five persons already named to the committee, elect two three at large from the slate of nominees resulting from the procedures described above. If no member of the graduate faculty is among the those five elected from the Colleges and Schools, one of those elected at large must be a member of the graduate faculty.
   c) The University Academic Staff Nominating Committee shall nominate at least three Administrative and/or Professional and two Instructional and/or Research University Academic Staff. Using its established procedures, the University Academic Staff then will elect two representatives.
   d) The Student Senate shall appoint two student members.
   e) The Chancellor may appoint one or two additional members from the unclassified staff.

2) For selection of academic administrative officers whose authority is largely vested in one College or School, such as Dean or Associate Dean, the committee shall consist of five faculty members from the College in the case of Dean, and from the School in the case of Associate Dean; in Colleges or Schools where there are three or more instructional and/or research academic staff, one instructional and/or research academic staff member from the College or School; two students within the College or School; and at the Chancellor’s discretion, one or two appointees by the Chancellor from the unclassified staff.
   a) The College or School will, through its established elective procedures, elect five (5) members from and by the faculty.
   b) The instructional and/or research academic staff member will be elected from and by the instructional and/or research academic staff in the College or School through its established elective procedures.
   c) The Student Senate shall appoint two student members.
   d) The Chancellor may appoint one or two additional members from the unclassified staff (US 10/91)
Chapter 5 Personnel Policies and Procedures, Faculty and Academic Staff Review of Administrator Performance, page 82:

PROCEDURE FOR UNIVERSITY FACULTY AND UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC STAFF REVIEW OF ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS: CHANCELLOR, PROVOST AND VICE CHANCELLOR, ASSISTANT OR ASSOCIATE VICE CHANCELLORS, DEANS, ASSOCIATE DEANS AND ASSISTANT DEANS

Each administrator is reviewed within three years of the initial appointment and every five years thereafter.

The review is to be conducted by a committee of University Faculty and University Academic Staff. The committee to review the Chancellor, Provost and Vice Chancellor and Assistant or Associate Vice Chancellors will include eight seven members serving three-year terms—one faculty member elected by the College of Arts and Sciences, College of Business and from each of the colleges Schools in the College of Professional Studies; two one members elected by and from the University Instructional Academic Staff; and two members elected by and from the Administrative and Professional Academic Staff one faculty or academic staff member elected at large. Two or three members will be elected each year in the spring elections. Each year the review committee elects its own chair.

The committee to review Deans, Associate Deans, and Assistant Deans will include three members elected by the University Faculty of the College in the case of Dean and of the School in the case of Associate and Assistant Deans. All members will serve three-year terms. One member of the committee will be elected each year during the spring election. Each year the review committee elects its own chair.

Debate
- All senators to vote on every motion except one about college faculty; that part of Article Four, which can only be amended by University Faculty
- Passing motion today does not matter for spring election, those nominations already requested
  - If we do go beyond next meeting, may have trouble getting constitutional changes ratified this year
- We have reorganized, our committees need to match new organization

MOTION by Senator Gallaher to suspend the rules to vote on this motion today seconded and PASSED by two-thirds vote.

MOTION by Senator Syverson to postpone motion for two weeks for us to consider the number of people on these committees seconded.

Debate
- Suggest we don’t vote on this today; do support these changes, but would like us to consider if this might be chance to look carefully and ask about number of people on these committees
  - We talked about it when University General Education Committee came up and decided that wasn’t good timing because issue was so political
  - This is not political thing and we are going to be modifying this language, seems ideal time to reduce number of people on these committees
  - Think we would be better off taking our time and exploring the numbers
- Have two issues here – one is workload, which we would like reduced, the other is getting bylaws in shape so we can start next year knowing who is eligible for what
  - Getting into how many people should be on each committee in whole senate takes lot of our time – need working document
- Speak for postponement – is more than just name change, is a change in way we do things
  - On some committees, representation changes to one from each college, which represents a change in dynamics of committees
  - More members come from general election in senate versus being elected from a constituency
Would caution to go slow, look through proposals, talk with colleagues, evaluate changes, and come back in two weeks to make sure it is really what we want.

Whole point of second reading of motions was take issues back to those we represent – can’t do if we vote on first reading without compelling reason to do so.

Motion to postpone for two weeks PASSED.

No official deadline for any remaining items on agenda.

Compensation Committee asked to get salary plan in front of faculty as soon as possible so department chairs and directors know how to proceed.

- Too important to dismiss with ten minutes of conversation; ought to postpone first reading of all items.
- Think clarification is needed on salary plan motion, having first reading that doesn’t include that would be premature.
- Hearing concerns now might lead to further discussion; need to hear it all in context.

Without objection, next meeting to continue from this point, picking up with items C, D, E and F.

X. Announcements

- Next meeting March 8, 2005 in Oneida/Menominee Room.

Meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

Wanda Schulner
Secretary to the University Senate