



LIBRARIES

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON

Minutes of the regular meeting of the Executive Committee of the Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System: September 8, 1976. 1976

Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Board of Regents of the University of
Wisconsin System, 1976

<https://digital.library.wisc.edu/1711.dl/SEEMH22OCELNK8A>

Copyright 2008 Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System

The libraries provide public access to a wide range of material, including online exhibits, digitized collections, archival finding aids, our catalog, online articles, and a growing range of materials in many media.

When possible, we provide rights information in catalog records, finding aids, and other metadata that accompanies collections or items. However, it is always the user's obligation to evaluate copyright and rights issues in light of their own use.

1046

MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE
BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SYSTEM

Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Held in the Red Carpet Inn
Wednesday, September 8, 1976, 10:34 A.M.

President McNamara presiding

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Erdman, Fish, Hales, Lavine, McNamara,
Neshek, Pelisek

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: None

OTHER REGENTS PRESENT: Barkla, DeBardleben, Gerrard, Grover, Lawton,
Sandin, Walter, Zancanaro

OTHER REGENTS ABSENT: Thompson

- - -

President McNamara stated that the Executive Committee of the Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System was meeting, with all Regents invited to attend, to consider the matter of the procedure to be adopted in the selection and the makeup of a search and screen committee for a President of the University System.

President McNamara introduced his administrative assistant, Mrs. Gloria Trice.

President McNamara made the following statement:

"I am certain I speak for the entire Board when I say that we consider the search for and the selection of a successor to President John C. Weaver as the most important single responsibility facing the Board this year.

"The University of Wisconsin System is a unique institution. In four years' time it has demonstrated that it can protect the autonomy and distinctive character of thirteen universities, fourteen centers, and a statewide extension service, and at the same time achieve responsible planning and coordination for the whole of higher education in the State of Wisconsin.

"We must seek the leadership which will assure the continued and growing strength of our institutions, continued and developing service for the people of Wisconsin, and the vitality which comes both from effective planning and protection of the differences among our institutions.

"In large measure, the ability of the Board to set wise policies and priorities for higher education in Wisconsin, and to achieve public and governmental support for these policies and priorities will depend on the leadership ability of our President.

1046

"If I were asked to list our number one priority from the aforementioned list and to specify the single most important policy matter facing this Board in the immediate years ahead, I would reply that it is preserving the unique character of each campus and developing the policies within the framework of the University System which assure that this will continue.

"It is obvious that the world famous quality of the Madison campus be preserved: It is equally clear that Milwaukee's role as a major metropolitan University be extended and that Stout's unique role in voc-tec education not be lost; but what may not be so obvious is that each of our other campuses has some special quality which must not only be preserved but should be intensified, if we are truly to meet the educational needs of the citizens of our state.

"Clearly this must be done within whatever budget constraints are placed on us by state government; but done it must be, and this most important responsibility must be uppermost in our minds as we begin the search for a new President of this great University System.

"This is why we should undertake the most intensive statewide and nationwide search possible as a step in securing the finest educational leader available to the people of Wisconsin. And this is why we are meeting today to seek general agreement on the nature of the search and selection process we must shortly initiate.

"As you know, I earlier circulated a draft protocol describing the process I would recommend, as well as stating a description of the position we are seeking to fill, and the qualifications we desire in the next President.

"As a result of discussions with a number of you, as well as with a variety of faculty and student leaders, I have prepared certain modifications in the document originally circulated. The document I am now distributing is the version which I think best reflects the generality of judgment of the Board, and is the one I would like used as the basis for our discussion. Places where changes were made in the original draft are indicated by underlining and a difference in type size.

"My hope is that in this meeting we can reach general agreement on the statement of process, and the position description qualifications. In this way we can approve, with appropriate amendments, a statement to be brought for ratification by the entire Board at its meeting on September 17.

"We should move quickly (after the Board approval of the document we develop today) to appoint the Special Regent Presidential Search and Screen Committee. I expect to be able to do this quickly since I have already solicited nominees from among whom to choose the faculty and student representatives on the Committee.

"I would also like to meet briefly in Executive Session before we conclude today to consider the possible immediate appointment of the Secretary for the Search and Selection process."

President McNamara referred to the amended proposal (attached as EXHIBIT A) and gave some background on how the numerical balance on the proposed committee was arrived at. He stated that he had received letters or talked to almost every Regent, in some instances, extended conversations. Discussions were held with the leaders of the principal faculty organizations and with University administrators at various levels. Communications from citizens and outside groups were considered.

September 8, 1976

Counsel and advice were sought from outstanding authorities in this field. He said that in his judgment the committee makeup represents a consensus of all sources of information and represents a chance to achieve a balance between the various groupings which collectively make up the University System. He noted that the proposed committee structure is as follows:

Voting Members: Four Regents, three Chancellors, seven faculty members, three students, for a total of seventeen voting members

and that in voting power the faculty and students outnumber the Regents and Chancellors by a ten to seven majority. The proposal provides for three non-voting members:

The President and Vice President of the Board and a Committee Secretary to come from Central Administration.

The entire committee would thus be twenty and in terms of talking power it is ten to ten. He stated that obviously two of the three students ought to come from the traditional Bachelor's-degree-seeking students and a third student is suggested because we have a substantial new constituency in the University community--mature adults--who are taking a major part of University work through Extension or in various forms. He continued that the faculty obviously should come from the various clusters, doctoral and University, and from other groupings. The three Chancellors would have to come from the clusters, and their special qualities as individuals would have to be taken into consideration. Obviously it would be desirable to have the four Regents represent a balance of the various viewpoints on the Board. He continued that in making the nominations to the committee, the representation of minorities and women would be considered.

Regent DeBardeleben inquired if just the Executive Committee members would be voting on the document. President McNamara said it has been our custom, when we have an augmented Committee, to let everyone vote. Regent DeBardeleben noted that there was but one Regent absent.

Regent Erdman stated that the general proportions of the committee are very good but that she felt the committee is too big. She continued that from the recommendations that she had seen from the professional outfits such as the American Association of Governing Boards, etc., fifteen people was the maximum recommended. She continued that it seemed to her that the three persons selected amongst the Chancellors and Provosts were too many. She stated that the faculty, students and Regents need representation but the Chancellors are running their own shows and here they would be deciding upon their own boss in a sense, and that therefore she felt that it would be a better committee if you cut the number down. Regent Barkla stated that she disagreed with Regent Erdman and that she felt the Chancellors have had the most experience working with the President of the System and that their number was not too large. She pointed out that in the document it says the faculty representatives will be appointed by the President on the basis of nominations received from faculty government, etc., and the same with the students, but it does not say who is going to appoint the Chancellors, and asked if they were going to do their own appointing. President McNamara stated that the President will select the Chancellors just the same as the others. He continued that obviously the doctoral clusters will have to be represented, the University cluster will have to be represented, and that in addition we have Extension and the Center System so that the third person would have to come within that group. Regent Barkla inquired

if the Chancellors would be nominated by the Council of Chancellors and was advised by President McNamara that it was his idea that he would pick them.

Regent Grover pointed out that paragraphs d) and e) on page 2 of the draft provide that the President of the Board appoints on the basis of nominations received from faculty governance and three students on the basis of nominations received from student government organizations and inquired if this would limit appointments to the names submitted by those organizations. President McNamara stated that he felt this was a limitation but that we do have a substantial number of nominations and in looking at the matter in a practical sense he would have no difficulty doing it. Senior Vice President Donald Smith stated that if the combined list of nominees is for any reason not representative of some interest that needs to be represented, for example, if there were no women on the list or no minorities, the usual practice would be to go back to the nominating body and observe that we had a problem and solicit additional nominations.

With respect to Item (c) on page 2, Regent Hales inquired why the Provost is equated with the Chancellors, noting that the Provost is a Central Administration officer. Senior Vice President Smith pointed out that the role of the Provost is a difficult one to describe because he is Provost and Chancellor of the Center System and Statewide Extension and the Chancellors of the two units are Vice Provosts and Chancellors. He stated that the Council of Chancellors invites the Provost to sit as one among them as well as the two Chancellors of the units. He stated that the Provost reports to Central Administration through his office but functions primarily in a planning and coordinating role with the Center System and UW-Extension. He said that we have a hybrid type of officer--he is not a staff officer in Central, purely, and he is not an administrative line officer purely. He stated that one of the reasons for including him was to give the President of the Board an additional option if he wanted to exercise it. President McNamara stated that before this was drawn up, there were all sorts of discussions and there were feelings on the part of some individuals that there should be no faculty representation, that it should all come from the Regents and Central Administration. On the other hand, there were points of view that only the faculty should be represented, and therefore the proposal is drawn sufficiently broad so that it can accommodate a variety of points of view. Professor Robert Baruch, President, TAUWF, stated that his organization felt very strongly that the members of the committee should have a majority of faculty and suggested that the number of faculty representatives be increased to ten, with the other representation remaining the same, so that each institution would be represented. President McNamara noted that everyone says we should have a smaller committee but each individual would like to have the group of which he is a part enlarged. He stated his problem is that when we start cutting, whom are you going to cut and still achieve a balance.

Regent Lavine stated that what we really want is input from people who have different ideas and that we get that whether we have representation from every campus or not. He said that he liked the present spread and that it is important to go across the clusters. He said he did not believe it important to have a representative from each school, but we have to face the reality that we are a University of Wisconsin System.

Regent Neshek stated that the recommendation includes all constituencies of the University community that have an interest and that there is a relative balance between these constituencies. If it is weighted in favor of one group or another, you are going to have dissension and hard feelings. He recalled that in the old State University Board the Regents constituted the majority of the committee and the faculty members did not have a vote but were advisory, and it was interesting

that there was seldom disagreement when it came to voting on the candidate--the faculty and the Regents were pretty much in agreement as to who the strongest and most qualified candidate was. He pointed out that there is a lot of mechanical work involved in that we may have 4-500 applicants and it would be impossible for a committee as such to screen each and every one of the applicants. He pointed out that in the past a secretary or a one or two person subcommittee screened the candidates to determine which have some of the basic credentials and that after you eliminate a good number of people on the basis of credentials alone, then the committee as a whole starts working with the nucleus of candidates to recommend. He stated that he felt the proposal will result in having all constituencies represented and no single group or constituency would be able to control the committee.

Regent DeBardleben stated that he supported the proposal as modified. He continued that if he had been doing it, he would have felt, theoretically at least, it would be desirable for the reasons stated by Regents Neshek and Erdman to have a smaller committee and to have the initial screening process done exclusively by faculty people, since the Regents will have the final voice in who is selected. He continued that it seemed from a philosophical standpoint it may be unsound to have Regents passing on recommendations that they themselves are making, as the four members of this committee will. However, granted that that is one viewpoint that is theoretically more defensible than this one, he recognized that there are other viewpoints on the Board that feel the Regents ought to have more of a voice in this whole process. He stated he felt this is a practical and pragmatic solution to the problem and one that is sound.

Regent Pelisek stated that he had been involved in the previous selection process and believed that the proposal represents a sound balance among the various conflicting constituencies within the System. He said all of us would enjoy seeing the committee fewer in number than the one that must evolve when one tries to balance all of the constituencies. He recalled the great difficulties encountered by the Merger Implementation Committee because of its very size but that it is essential that balance be achieved, and in order to do so, a convenient size must be sacrificed. He continued that the instructions to the committee, which are more important than the composition of the committee itself, are excellent and reflect the obligations that a search committee has, the parameters in which they must operate, and offered as a motion for the Executive Committee the approval of the search and selection process (attached as EXHIBIT A) and the recommendation for full adoption at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Board. The motion was seconded by Regent Neshek.

Regent Grover stated that it appeared that the committee should be called the Special Presidential Search Committee as the Regents do not have a profound voice in the initial construction. He stated that he agreed with Regent Erdman that the committee is too large and questioned why we have to have three Chancellors --giving them practically the same voice as the Regents. He also noted that the Regents' Presidential Selection Committee shall be a body of nine Regents and inquired if there were to be some arbitrary selection of those Regents. President McNamara stated that all selections are arbitrary.

Regent Grover moved that section c) on page 2 of the proposal be amended by deleting the words "Three persons selected from among the Chancellors and Provost of the UW System" and substituting the word "one" at the beginning of the section, and the motion was seconded by Regent Erdman.

Regent Barkla inquired if it was the intention to replace the two Chancellors with two other Regents on the committee. Regent Grover responded in the negative, stating that there is sufficient guarantee built into the mechanism of the committee in terms of Regent participation and that if we are going to give the Chancellors the opportunity of picking their boss, he was certain that one Chancellor could speak for all Chancellors. President McNamara stated that with respect to the amendment he could see nothing wrong with the principle of people selecting their bosses. If that is wrong in principle, then faculty participation in selection of a Chancellor is wrong because the faculty is expected to elect their administrative officers. If that is wrong, then in effect student participation is wrong because students are selecting their own bosses or managers; so the argument that Chancellors shouldn't be on the search committee because they are selecting their own bosses seems to be without merit. He stated the university by its very nature is a cooperative institution and has been since the Middle Ages. Therefore, rules that are fine for business corporations do not and should not apply to the university. Regent Fish stated that he felt the committee should be named the Special Regents' Presidential Search Committee because that is what it is, does not select the President of the University, and that is something we should not lose sight of. He pointed out that as you read the charge, it does not say "we shall select a President of the University". It is a search and screen committee which will go back to the Regents' Presidential Selection Committee and noted that the Regents may request additional names if necessary. He stated this has been done many times in the past, not only for the President of the University, but for Chancellors and other positions where the original group of names was not satisfactory for one reason or another. He said it is important to remember that the Special Regent's Search Committee does not select the President--the Regents select the President.

Regent Sandin noted that originally the search and screen committee was composed of just about everybody except Regents and then the names were sent to the Regents to make the selection. She stated she would like to hear the philosophy on why the basic concept had been changed. President McNamara stated there has been a basic change in the structure of the University System in the state from a single campus structure to a system of multi-campus. Heretofore, when we selected a President, we were really selecting an individual who would now be called a Chancellor, and when we select individuals like that, the committee is made up exclusively of faculty and students, and we still carry that on; so we have not changed our policy. The difference is that we are now selecting the President of a System--not the president of a university--and the System President has different responsibilities. He noted that he is an administrative officer primarily and is administering a whole collection of universities and other agencies. He is answerable to the Regents, and therefore Regents ought to be involved. He said that a committee such as this, which is going to select a panel, and which represents a cross-section of the University family, ought to and really can reach agreement in no other way but by consensus. You resolve your differences through discussion and reach a meeting of the minds. If you have no Regents on the committee to participate in that consensus and a panel comes up which is unacceptable to the Regents, then you must go back to the committee and say "Start all over again". He said it seems that this is a greater source of irritation and controversy and dissent, potentially, than to have Regents participate from the beginning as equals in the process of reaching consensus on the panel. He said it seems that we really can strengthen our ultimate selection by having Regent, Chancellor, faculty and student participation.

Regent Sandin inquired if we are still maintaining that the first quality we are seeking is academic excellence. President McNamara stated that that is one of the prime qualities sought but did not know if you can list them as one, two or three in importance.

Regent Hales inquired of Regent Grover if he would consider amending his motion to eliminate the Provost and adding another Chancellor. Regent Grover responded in the negative, that it was his intention to reduce the number of Chancellors to one.

Regent Lawton pointed out a typographical error on page 3, line 5, of Exhibit A, which should read "All Regents serving on the Search Committee shall also be requested to serve on the Selection Committee,". He stated that he was disturbed somewhat by the attitude that this is an adversary situation--the faculty versus the Regents--and the use of the term "both sides are represented here". He continued that he hoped that we are all going in the same direction and that it is not an adversary situation. He said that it seemed to him to be a large committee but that he did not feel it made all that much difference and that he would favor more faculty representation.

Professor Steven Chaffee, Chairman, University Committee, Madison, stated that the committee considered the proposal at length and favored the proposed distribution of its membership and did not favor a larger committee or that the number of faculty members should be expanded. He noted that in the previous presidential search and screen committee there were six faculty members out of sixteen and the present proposal provides seven faculty members out of seventeen, which is at least a 6% improvement. He stated that the previous committee was top-heavy with administrators, chancellors and deans, but felt that cutting chancellors from three to one loses the balance that President McNamara spoke of. He continued that it was his view that the President of the System is not the boss of the Chancellors--they are to a considerable extent the bosses of the individual campuses, and the faculty looks to the Chancellor rather than the President. He stated that it was the Committee's view that this is very much in line with tradition, which is to have a search committee composed of a majority of faculty, administrators and students, and that the change involved is to add Regents. He stated that the University Committee probably would not have made that change but understand why the change is being suggested and support it.

Professor Leon Schur, Chairman, University Committee, UW-Milwaukee, stated that the faculty committees on his campus discussed the matter in terms of the traditional search and screen committee, which has a faculty chairman and a faculty majority, and because of the persuasiveness of President McNamara, realized that this was a different search and screen committee. He stated that it was felt that the fact that the number of faculty members is equal to the number of Regents and Chancellors gives the type of input that might be necessary, and that they had found the present makeup of the committee both reasonable and acceptable.

President McNamara called upon Professor Joseph Kauffman, UW-Madison, for comments, as he was one of the individuals upon whom he had relied for advice. Professor Kauffman stated that this is an unprecedented search process--no one has ever defined the role of the President of the System before, or selected a President of the System; so you cannot really look for precedent anywhere else. He said that one of the important goals of the selection process is to provide legitimacy and acceptance for the person selected by the persons they have to be associated with, whose work perhaps depends upon the kind of leadership of the new person selected. He said this is an important goal and that is why the process should serve to facilitate acceptance of whatever candidate is selected by the Board of Regents. He said that he felt it is important that both Regents and Chancellors participate. He stated he did not feel you can have less than two Chancellors,

that you should have a Chancellor from at least a doctoral and a University cluster, and that what you are going to be doing in this committee by implication or inference is defining the role of Central Administration. The Regents, Chancellors, faculty and students are going to be talking about that when they consider the type of person they are trying to recruit. He said he felt all of these constituencies should be represented in the definition of the role of Central Administration, certainly the Chancellors, because the President of the System coordinates the Chancellors, very often speaks on their behalf to the Regents, and represents the Chancellors' point of view in relation to the legislative branch of state government.

With the consent of the second, Regent Grover moved to amend the motion to provide for two Chancellors on the Search Committee.

Regent Neshek noted that the University in its operation is a series of delicate balances. Any policy we would adopt that would have the effect of excluding one of our constituencies is ill-advised. The Chancellors are an important part of our constituencies and whether it would make any difference in the selection process or not is immaterial--it is how they feel as a group. He questioned if they are going to lend their wholehearted support to a President that we select if they feel that they have been excluded. He urged that the document be left as it has been proposed because it has been put together with delicate balance.

Regent Erdman stated that all constituencies are not represented in this committee--parents are not represented, and they are a very important part of the University family--wives are not represented--alumni are not represented, and they are a rather important constituency. She continued that an enormous amount of thought has been put into the proposal and commended President McNamara and Professor Kauffman for the results that we see here today, but she disagreed with the point that Regent Lawton made, that if we have a mob, we might as well have a big mob. She said every person that we can cut down will make a more workable committee. She stated that she disagreed with President McNamara's comments about Chancellors not selecting their bosses. The Chancellors work very closely with the President, but faculty members do not work with the President of the System. She stated that faculty are very important.

Regent DeBardeleben stated that he did not like the use of the word "boss" in a University context. Leaders are people ^{we accept} ~~involved~~, not those who drive us, and that concept has no place here at all. He stated he did not regard the Chancellor as a boss and did not regard the President as a boss. He continued that he feared that if this amendment is adopted, there will be additional motions for other amendments and this committee and this Board are going to be redrafting a very carefully thought-out arrangement. He said he felt the arrangement is sound, that all of us have reservations about it, but that it represents a sound compromise and the amendment ought to be defeated.

Regent Grover stated that he did not come all the way here to the meeting to paint this thing red, white and blue, and that it appeared it was going to be harder to amend than the budget bill. He stated he felt there are some improvements that can be made on the document and hoped that our collective mentality in an open meeting is not eroded by premeditated calculation and a certain amount of manipulation, and that if the document goes through unamended, it could say very little for the collective intelligence of this group, and that he had other amendments that he intended to propose.

Regent Lavine stated that it appeared the Chancellors have a dual role. They are at times judged by the President of the System, which puts them in a kind of secondary-level role. At other times they are very much co-equal because they run their campuses, and the President of the System is not going to be able to be in twenty-seven places at once. He stated that the change that impressed him is that we do not have on this committee, and properly so, a voting member from Central Administration. He said he felt it important to have the input of someone who has served in Central and referred to the point made by Professor Kauffman that we will be talking about the President's staff--the administrative employees who serve without tenure and at the pleasure of the President. He stated that if we had a student represent a campus, he was not sure the faculty on that campus or the administration would necessarily want that student as their representative. He stated that what he considered to be critical is that when the committee comes together, it asks good questions and has knowledge of people who will be good candidates who might not otherwise be available, and in that sense we would be hurt by having only one Chancellor because they know the different constituencies to draw names from.

The question was put on the amendment, and it was defeated on a voice vote.

Regent Hales asked for clarification of the meaning of "significant academic accomplishments" contained on page 6, line 24, of the proposal. Professor Kauffman responded that you want to communicate something in the three or four points mentioned. One of the things you want to communicate is that the person ought to have enough acceptability academically to be seen by the faculty in Wisconsin and by education generally as a person who can provide education leadership. He noted that there are some institutions that get into definitions and urged that we not do so, especially definitions that say you have to have a degree in this or that, be a faculty member somewhere, and have certain previous positions. What you want to communicate to the people outside is that you are seeking someone of significant education accomplishments so that the faculty, Chancellors, Legislature and national education leaders would say that this is a very respectable person you have selected.

Professor Baruch referred to item c) on page 1, and noted that the screen procedures which have been adopted for Chancellors and other academic Vice Presidents provide that the committee will submit not less than five names, with no limitation above that, and also provide that the committee will be dissolved unless the selecting group is displeased with nominees and feels that it needs additional nominees, and inquired if it might be advisable to amend items b) and c) accordingly. Senior Vice President Smith responded that the proposed language is desirable because the selection process itself is going to be unusually arduous because it involves a great deal of interviewing and that to the extent that the Search Committee feels that it is operating against a panel sufficiently small in number to make it feasible for the Selection Committee to operate, the range from five to eight gives them both latitude and constraints. He pointed out that if there were difficulty in reducing the number to eight, they could request the Board to permit them to consider a greater number.

Regent Grover inquired as to how the number of nine members of the Regent Presidential Selection Committee mentioned on page 3 was arrived at. Regent Pelisek responded that it consists of the Executive Committee of the Board plus three Regent members of the Search Committee. Regent Grover stated that the next step is the full Board and by the time it reaches full Board, it is going to be canned and that he would like to have all of the facts. Regent Pelisek stated that if you include the entire Board in the Selection Committee, you are then at

the interview process. The search and screen process will be somewhat limited in its interviews, and interviews will be rather cursory. The search and screen process will rely on what Regent Lavine referred to as the broad network of intelligence throughout the country, and there will be searching and screening process based on the credentials that the various candidates show on paper but very little personal involvement with the candidates. When you get the list of five or eight, you are in the middle of an interview process, and it becomes almost impossible for the entire Board to conduct the interviews. He called attention to the University of Minnesota system, where by virtue of their sunshine law they are required to conduct their interviews in public; so they do it with the entire board, and that has become a travesty, a totally unworkable situation in attracting reasonable and viable candidates. He stated that is the basis of the selection committee of a number less than the entire Board. Professor Kauffman stated that it is the intention to have the discipline of some group of Regents sitting in on all of the interviews, but any Regent would be welcome to participate. Regent Grover inquired if non-member Regents would be voting members. Regent Pelisek stated that the ultimate responsibility is vested in the entire Board. The Committee will make a recommendation of one or two or three. Regent Grover said that sounds good, but in practical terms five Regents will be preempted with the present figure of nine and would not have any voice in the selection because if the nine agree on whomever they interview, they would recommend them to the full Board, and it would be like the amendment today--lots of luck!--so therefore for all practical purposes, although at this point in time he will outlast all of the Board, the point is he is not going to have a piece of this action as a new member of the Board of Regents. "I feel this is the most important thing the University will be doing in a long time," he said. President McNamara stated that he objected to the entire premise--this is a Board of sixteen people, not one. He continued that we make our decisions collectively and up until now, they have not been political decisions, and that he did not know what was meant by "I" in this sort of thing. Regent Grover stated that it seemed that if nine people agree to a person and bring the name to the full Board, the simple mathematics is that if nine people agree, it is passed.

Regent Lavine stated that on the search and screen committees of which he had been a member there had generally been at least two closely qualified candidates and that he could not recall a time when a senior vice president and the president of a system had not come in and said "We have two or three candidates, and we would be happy with any one of them". He pointed out that when it does come to the Search Committee, it really doesn't matter if you vote--if you talk, you can persuade them. Regent Grover stated that if you are not in on the interview process, if you haven't participated at the committee level, you are hard-put to argue with other Regents that have done the job and gone through the interview stage and understand the qualifications of people and get at the full Regent meeting and you are arguing for someone that you haven't seen, all you have is a look at a list of credentials. You are hard-put to make any kind of point. Regent Barkla pointed out that all Regents are welcome to come to the meetings, and it does not say that they cannot talk. Senior Vice President Smith stated that any Regent is welcome to attend any meeting and that he had never known the Board, when other Regents plan to participate, to say you can participate but without vote, but in any event the vote does not become significant at that point--it is the interchange of conversation and discussion leading to some kind of reasonable consensus that is important. President McNamara stated that the meeting this morning illustrates the point. The Executive Committee is made up of six members, and if we operated in the manner suggested by Regent Grover, we would have a six-member committee this morning. He pointed out that the fact is all of the Regents

were invited and are all here except one, and this is generally the way in which we have operated--it is different from the Legislature. We are not involved in partisan politics, we are involved in administering the University, and it is not quite the same. Regent Grover stated that he hoped his background would not be held against him, noting that he has a Ph.D. from the University and strong academic credentials. President McNamara stated that he did not have the Ph.D., a B.A., or a B.S. degree, and it doesn't mean anything if you do or do not. Regent Grover stated that this is the second time he had been indicted for partisan politics and that he would direct President McNamara's remarks to Regent Fish and to other Regents who got here through participation in the political process. President McNamara stated, "If they do, I will."

Regent Fish stated that he took ^{exception} objection to Regent Grover's remarks and that he would leave it to the members of the Board of Regents whether he had been an asset or a liability to the Board, but that he did not like the accusation. Regent Grover responded, "Neither do I." Regent Fish stated, "I didn't make it!"

Regent Gerrard stated that he felt this has gone far enough and that he would come to Regent Grover's defense. He stated that he and many of the Regents know that Regent Grover is a battler but that this kind of conversation has gone far enough and that we ought to proceed with why we are here.

Regent Grover moved that the first paragraph on the top of page 7 be amended to read as follows, and the motion was seconded by Regent Pelisek:

Significant and successful experience in an administrative leadership position preferably in higher education. An understanding of the multiple purposes and constituencies of a public university with its missions of instruction, research and public service would be desirable but not mandatory.

The question was put on the proposed amendment, and it was voted, with Regent Barkla voting "No".

The question was put on the resolution (amended document attached as EXHIBIT B), and it was voted unanimously.

- - -

Regent Pelisek moved that the meeting recess into Executive Session to consider personnel matters, the motion was seconded by Regent Erdman, and it was voted, with Regents Erdman, Fish, Hales, Lavine, McNamara, Neshek, Pelisek, Barkla, DeBardleben, Grover, Lawton, Sandin, Walter, Zancanaro voting "Aye" and with Regents Gerrard and Thompson absent.

The meeting recessed at 11:55 A.M.

- - -

President McNamara reported the appointment of Senior Vice President Donald Smith as Secretary of the Special Regents' Presidential Search Committee.

- - -

The meeting adjourned at 12:20 P.M.

1 THE SEARCH AND SELECTION PROCESS: PRESIDENT, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN
2 SYSTEM

3 A. Committees and their functions

4 1. The Special Regents' Presidential Search Committee

5 The Special Regents' Presidential Search Committee shall be
6 a body of 17 voting and 3 ex officio members without vote appointed by the President
7 of the Board of Regents or by reason of Board office and charged with the following
7a responsibilities:

- 8 a) Seeking, receiving, and evaluating according to
9 established criteria, nominees for the office of
10 President, UW System. The Committee will solicit
11 nominees from all educational constituencies in
12 Wisconsin, from alumni and the public, and nationwide.
- 13 b) Selecting not fewer than five, nor more than eight
14 persons judged to be most highly qualified for the
15 position, and transmitting these names as unranked
16 nominees from the Search Committee to the Selection
17 Committee.
- 18 c) Providing additional nominees upon the request of
19 the Regent Presidential Selection Committee should
20 that Committee judge that such nominations are wise
21 or needed.
- 22 d) Carrying out the affirmative action policies of the
23 Regents in its search and evaluation activities.
- 24 e) Maintaining the confidentiality of its evaluations
25 of individuals in accordance with policies governing
26 the confidentiality of deliberations pursuant to the
27 selection of an Officer of the University System.

- f) Maintaining records showing the application of search criteria to the decisions made concerning all nominations received.
- g) Appropriately informing all active candidates for the position at the time when they are no longer under active or possible consideration for the position.

The members of the Committee shall include:

- a) A Chairperson who shall be a member of the Board of Regents.
- b) Three Regents in addition to the Chairperson.
- c) Three persons selected from among the Chancellors and Provost of the UW System.
- d) Seven members of the faculty of Institutions of the UW System appointed by the President of the Board of Regents on the basis of nominations received from faculty governance bodies of the Institutions of the System.
- e) Three students of the UW System appointed by the President of the Board on the basis of nominations received from student government organizations of the Institutions of the UW System, and from UW-Extension.
- f) Three ex officio members, who shall be without vote unless otherwise determined by the Committee as a whole: (1) a staff member from Central Administration appointed as Secretary to the Committee by the President of the Board; (2) the President of the Board; and (3) the Vice President of the Board.

No person serving on the Search Committee should be a candidate for the presidency, and persons accepting appointment to the Committee will be asked to indicate their intention not to accept candidacy.

1 2. The Regent Presidential Selection Committee

2 The Regent Presidential Selection Committee shall be a
3 body of not fewer than nine Regents, appointed by the President of
4 the Board and including as its Chairperson the President of the Board.
5 All Regents serving on the Selection Committee shall also be
6 requested to serve on the Selection Committee, and all members of
7 the Executive Committee of the Board of Regents shall also be
8 requested to serve.

9 The Regent Presidential Selection Committee shall be charged
10 with the following responsibilities:

- 11 a) Evaluating nominations received from the Search Committee.
- 12 b) Conducting interviews with all or a select number of the
13 nominations received.
- 14 c) Requesting additional nominations from the Search Committee
15 should this be deemed wise or necessary.
- 16 d) Maintaining the confidentiality of its evaluation of the
17 persons under consideration.
- 18 e) Maintaining records showing its application of the relevant
19 selection criteria to the evaluation of the nominees.
- 20 f) Selecting and bringing to the consideration of the full
21 Board the names and qualifications of one or more persons
22 judged to be most highly qualified and possibly available
23 for appointment as President, UW System.
- 24 g) Confirming the terms and procedures within which the Office
25 of President, UW System, may be offered to a particular
26 candidate.

27 Appointment of the new President shall be by action of the full
28 Board of Regents meeting in Executive session.

1 B. A Description of the Office of President, UW System

2 The President of the UW System is the Chief Executive Officer
3 of the System. As created in 1971 by the laws of Wisconsin, this
4 System includes all fifteen Institutions of higher education of
5 the state, identified by the Regents as follows:

- 6 1) Thirteen universities, organized as a doctoral cluster of
7 two universities with program entitlement at the baccalaureate,
8 master, specialist, advanced professional, and doctoral levels,
9 and a university cluster of eleven universities with program
10 entitlement at the baccalaureate, masters, and specialist levels;
- 11 2) A Center System of fourteen campuses offering two year
12 transfer and associate degree programs; and,
- 13 3) A University Extension Institution responsible in
14 cooperation with the campuses for statewide extension services.

15 Under Wisconsin law and Regent policies, the President of the
16 System carries the following responsibilities:

- 17 * Administering policies of the Board of Regents setting
18 statewide higher education standards, goals, and priorities.
- 19 * Directing a Central Administration which assists the
20 President and the Board in establishing Systemwide policies;
21 in monitoring, evaluating and reviewing these policies;
22 in coordinating program development and operations among
23 the Institutions of the System; in planning the programmatic,
24 financial, and physical development of the System; and in
25 maintaining fiscal control and recommending new educational
26 programs, operating budgets, and building programs to the
27 Board.

1 * Providing necessary leadership to interpret and gain
2 wide understanding and support for the fulfillment of
3 the purposes and missions of the System.

4 * Establishing and maintaining effective relationships
5 with the executive and legislative branches of state
6 government on behalf of the Board of Regents, and
7 maintaining appropriate accountability by the System to
8 the Board, state government, and the public.

9 * Assisting the Board in the selection and evaluation
10 of chancellors.

11 * Protecting and enhancing the maximum degree of
12 Institutional autonomy possible to the end that Chancellors,
13 faculty, staff, and students can most effectively fulfill
14 the responsibilities and missions established for their
15 Institutions. The Board delegates to each Chancellor
16 of an Institution the necessary authority for the administration
17 and operation of his/her Institution, and under state law
18 the faculty of each Institution shares in responsibility
19 for its governance and carries primary responsibility for
20 academic and educational activities and for faculty personnel
21 matters. Within the context of responsibilities delegated
22 to Chancellors and faculty, students have responsibility
23 and opportunity for active participation in the governance
24 of their Institutions.

1 The spirit of the merger which resulted in the establishment
2 of the University of Wisconsin System was to create effective
3 planning and coordination of higher education in Wisconsin while
4 decentralizing the operations of the Institutions comprising the
5 System. The President should lead the System in this direction,
6 abiding by the mandate of merger to promote and protect Institutional
7 identity and autonomy within the context of affective planning and
8 coordination, avoiding excessive centralization or elaboration of
9 administrative structure and functions, and seeking those policies
10 and priorities which will enhance the capacity of each Institution
11 better to fulfill its mission and better to serve the needs of
12 Wisconsin and the nation.

13 C. A Preliminary Description of Qualifications Sought in
14 The President of the UW System

15 The Board of Regents identifies at this time several
16 qualifications as among those most crucial to a search for a new
17 President. The Board recognizes that the Special Regent Presidential
18 Search Committee will necessarily need to refine and possibly expand
19 this listing in order to develop most clearly the criteria it will
20 apply in its evaluations, and in order to reflect appropriately
21 wise counsel which may be received from constituents. The Board
22 affirms at this time, however, that the new President should insofar
23 as possible be a person with:

24 * Significant academic accomplishments sufficient to
25 command the professional respect of the academic communities
26 of Wisconsin and higher education leaders nationwide, and
27 to provide educational leadership for the Board, the System,
28 and the people of Wisconsin.

1 * Significant and successful experience in an administrative
2 leadership position in higher education with particular
3 emphasis on tested understanding of the multiple purposes
4 and constituencies of a public university with its missions of
4a instruction, research, and public service.

5 * Outstanding abilities in establishing effective
6 communication and sound relationships among diverse
7 constituencies, including governmental relations.

8 * An understanding and appreciation of and commitment to
9 the scholarly values requisite to the potential for
10 serving the public good inherent in a major public
11 university system.

THE SEARCH AND SELECTION PROCESS: PRESIDENT, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SYSTEM

A. Committees and their functions

1. The Special Regents' Presidential Search Committee

The Special Regents' Presidential Search Committee shall be a body of 17 voting and 3 ex officio members without vote appointed by the President of the Board of Regents or by reason of Board office and charged with the following responsibilities:

- a) Seeking, receiving, and evaluating according to established criteria, nominees for the office of President, UW System. The Committee will solicit nominees from all educational constituencies in Wisconsin, from alumni and the public, and nationwide.
- b) Selecting not fewer than five, nor more than eight persons judged to be most highly qualified for the position, and transmitting these names as unranked nominees from the Search Committee to the Selection Committee.
- c) Providing additional nominees upon the request of the Regent Presidential Selection Committee should that Committee judge that such nominations are wise or needed.
- d) Carrying out the affirmative action policies of the Regents in its search and evaluation activities.
- e) Maintaining the confidentiality of its evaluations of individuals in accordance with policies governing the confidentiality of deliberations pursuant to the selection of an Officer of the University System.
- f) Maintaining records showing the application of search criteria to the decisions made concerning all nominations received.
- g) Appropriately informing all active candidates for the position at the time when they are no longer under active or possible consideration for the position.

The members of the Committee shall include:

EXHIBIT

B

2.

- a) A Chairperson who shall be a member of the Board of Regents.
- b) Three Regents in addition to the Chairperson.
- c) Three persons selected from among the Chancellors and Provost of the UW System.
- d) Seven members of the faculty of Institutions of the UW System appointed by the President of the Board of Regents on the basis of nominations received from faculty governance bodies of the Institutions of the System.
- e) Three students of the UW System appointed by the President of the Board on the basis of nominations received from student government organizations of the Institutions of the UW System, and from UW-Extension.
- f) Three ex officio members, who shall be without vote unless otherwise determined by the Committee as a whole: (1) a staff member from Central Administration appointed as Secretary to the Committee by the President of the Board; (2) the President of the Board; and (3) the Vice President of the Board.

No person serving on the Search Committee should be a candidate for the presidency, and persons accepting appointment to the Committee will be asked to indicate their intention not to accept candidacy.

2. The Regent Presidential Selection Committee

The Regent Presidential Selection Committee shall be a body of not fewer than nine Regents, appointed by the President of the Board and including as its Chairperson the President of the Board. All Regents serving on the Search Committee shall also be requested to serve on the Selection Committee, and all members of the Executive Committee of the Board of Regents shall also be requested to serve.

The Regent Presidential Selection Committee shall be charged with the following responsibilities:

- a) Evaluating nominations received from the Search Committee.
- b) Conducting interviews with all or a select number of the nominations received.

- c) Requesting additional nominations from the Search Committee should this be deemed wise or necessary.
- d) Maintaining the confidentiality of its evaluation of the persons under consideration.
- e) Maintaining records showing its application of the relevant selection criteria to the evaluation of the nominees.
- f) Selecting and bringing to the consideration of the full Board the names and qualifications of one or more persons judged to be most highly qualified and possibly available for appointment as President, UW System.
- g) Confirming the terms and procedures within which the Office of President, UW System, may be offered to a particular candidate.

Appointment of the new President shall be by action of the full Board of Regents meeting in Executive session.

B. A Description of the Office of President, UW System

The President of the UW System is the Chief Executive Officer of the System. As created in 1971 by the laws of Wisconsin, this System includes all fifteen Institutions of higher education of the state, identified by the Regents as follows:

- 1) Thirteen universities, organized as a doctoral cluster of two universities with program entitlement at the baccalaureate, master, specialist, advanced professional, and doctoral levels, and a university cluster of eleven universities with program entitlement at the baccalaureate, masters, and specialist levels;
- 2) A Center System of fourteen campuses offering two year transfer and associate degree programs; and,
- 3) A University Extension Institution responsible in cooperation with the campuses for statewide extension services.

Under Wisconsin law and Regent policies, the President of the System carries the following responsibilities:

- * Administering policies of the Board of Regents setting statewide higher education standards, goals, and priorities.

* Directing a Central Administration which assists the President and the Board in establishing Systemwide policies; in monitoring, evaluating and reviewing these policies; in coordinating program development and operations among the Institutions of the System; in planning the programmatic, financial, and physical development of the System; and in maintaining fiscal control and recommending new educational programs, operating budgets, and building programs to the Board.

* Providing necessary leadership to interpret and gain wide understanding and support for the fulfillment of the purposes and missions of the System.

* Establishing and maintaining effective relationships with the executive and legislative branches of state government on behalf of the Board of Regents, and maintaining appropriate accountability by the System to the Board, state government, and the public.

* Assisting the Board in the selection and evaluation of chancellors.

* Protecting and enhancing the maximum degree of Institutional autonomy possible to the end that Chancellors, faculty, staff, and students can most effectively fulfill the responsibilities and missions established for their Institutions. The Board delegates to each Chancellor of an Institution the necessary authority for the administration and operation of his/her Institution, and under state law the faculty of each Institution shares in responsibility for its governance and carries primary responsibility for academic and educational activities and for faculty personnel matters. Within the context of responsibilities delegated to Chancellors and faculty, students have responsibility and opportunity for active participation in the governance of their Institutions.

The spirit of the merger which resulted in the establishment of the University of Wisconsin System was to create effective planning and coordination of higher education in Wisconsin while decentralizing the operations of the Institutions

comprising the System. The President should lead the System in this direction, abiding by the mandate of merger to promote and protect Institutional identity and autonomy within the context of effective planning and coordination, avoiding excessive centralization or elaboration of administrative structure and functions, and seeking those policies and priorities which will enhance the capacity of each Institution better to fulfill its mission and better to serve the needs of Wisconsin and the nation.

C. A Preliminary Description of Qualifications Sought in The President of the UW System

The Board of Regents identifies at this time several qualifications as among those most crucial to a search for a new President. The Board recognizes that the Special Regent Presidential Search Committee will necessarily need to refine and possibly expand this listing in order to develop most clearly the criteria it will apply in its evaluations, and in order to reflect appropriately wise counsel which may be received from constituents. The Board affirms at this time, however, that the new President should insofar as possible be a person with:

- * Significant academic accomplishments sufficient to command the professional respect of the academic communities of Wisconsin and higher education leaders nationwide, and to provide educational leadership for the Board, the System, and the people of Wisconsin.
- * Significant and successful experience in an administrative leadership position preferably in higher education. An understanding of the multiple purposes and constituencies of a public university with its missions of instruction, research, and public service would be desirable but not mandatory.
- * Outstanding abilities in establishing effective communication and sound relationships among diverse constituencies, including governmental relations.
- * An understanding and appreciation of and commitment to the scholarly values requisite to the potential for serving the public good inherent in a major public university system.