



# LIBRARIES

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON

## **Minutes of the regular meeting of the Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System: April 6, 1979. 1979**

Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System, 1979

<https://digital.library.wisc.edu/1711.dl/PAZ7SK5I4TL4U8O>

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.

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING  
of the  
BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SYSTEM

Held in Room E245 Student Union Building,  
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

Friday, April 6, 1979  
9:05 A.M.

President Hales presiding

PRESENT: Regents Barkla, Beckwith, DeBardleben, Elliott, Erdman,  
Fitzgerald, Fox, Gerrard, Grover, Hales, Lavine, Lawton,  
McNamara, Majerus, Thompson and Walter

ABSENT: None

Upon motion made by Regent Lavine and properly seconded, it was  
VOTED, That the minutes of the regular meeting of the Board of  
Regents of the University of Wisconsin System held on March 9, 1979, be  
approved as sent out to the members of the Board.

- - -

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD

President Hales called upon Regent Lavine for the report of the  
March 27, 1979, meeting of the Vocational, Technical and Adult Education  
Board. Regent Lavine reported there is a proposal in the Legislature to put  
a student on the VTAE Board. Under the same rationale that the Board of  
Regents had used in dealing with that question, the VTAE Board has taken a  
position against it that it would limit access to the Board, politicize the  
Board, and the fact that one VTAE school would have their student there and  
others would not, plus the rapid turnover in the VTAE System. He reported  
there is a legislative proposal relating to the manner in which state aids  
would be paid to districts. If the proposal went through, it would substantially  
hobble, in the opinion of the VTAE Board, the flexibility of the districts to  
deal with the changing enrollments from semester to semester. Some of the  
moneys would not be paid out until near the end of the VTAE year. Assembly  
Bill 233 was also discussed at some length. It would require legislative  
approval of the action of many state boards, including the VTAE Board, by  
the appropriate legislative committee prior to those actions becoming valid,  
and would, in the VTAE Board's opinion, replace the Board by the Committee,  
and involves a constitutional question relative to a bill of that nature.  
He reported there was discussion of rural and urban members of the Board.  
There is a bill which would require a majority rather than a unanimous vote  
on picking district Board members. This arises out of a rural-urban split and  
would eliminate the necessity for the two groups to get together and solve  
their differences which the unanimity clause requires.

Regent Lavine reported further there was extensive discussion on the Wisconsin Occupational Informational Coordinating Committee. The Executive Committee report of the report dealt with a variety of items; one particularly was a recommendation for Senate Bill 101 which would provide state aids to elementary and secondary school districts, which is designed to strengthen the secondary school education and improve coordination with VTAE districts. He stated there was some exchange between Regent Thompson and himself on the one hand and the Secretary of the Industry and Human Relations Board on the other about the problems that this would create in nonurban areas where district vocational schools are upwards of 30 to 50 miles away from local highschools. The Secretary's thrust was that highschool students ought to take their vocational school work in district vocational schools, the concern being that it was an all day or more commute for out-state districts. Regent Lavine stated that he and Dr. Thompson were concerned that that would not be functional and at the same time their reading, writing, and other educational aspects of their highschool program would be hurt. He reported the Board approved, with only one dissenting vote, the support of Bill 101 to strengthen vocational efforts in the secondary schools. He reported there was a discussion of their educational committee's review of new academic programs coming to the VTAE Board. He noted that eight or ten years ago there was almost no coordination between the VTAE System and the UW System on new program proposals whereas now there is virtually absolute coordination on each new program proposal which might affect the missions of either system. He stated there was an extensive report about a new program at the Milwaukee Area Technical College relating to the program targeted for working with educationally disadvantaged and minority students and those who have no contact with any system of education. He stated they have been quite successful when bringing them in and providing an extensive counseling and follow-up procedure that sends them on the appropriate career track, and if that does not work out, there are ways to target them so that when they do come out they have a skill that is usable.

President Hales called upon Regent DeBardeleben, Chairman of the Regent Hearing Panel in the Matter of the Appeal to the Board of Regents by David Trojan, James Williams, Marion R. Earnest, Shirley P. Wright, Myron R. Utech, Joseph C. Hisrich, and John M. Hunnicutt From Decision Granting Tenure to J. Kenneth Davidson, Sr. (EXHIBIT A, attached)

Regent DeBardeleben reported the hearing panel met at Eau Claire March 23, 1979, pursuant to proper notice to the attorneys for the petitioners and to the Chancellor. The contending parties were heard at that time on the sole question of whether Section 3.08 of the Wisconsin Administrative Code precludes the Board from reviewing the matter at this time. Regent DeBardeleben reported the committee concluded, subject to the approval of the Board, that the matter should be heard on the merits, and recommends to the Board at this time that the appeal be heard by the Board or by a committee of the Board constituted for that purpose, that the hearing be on the record, but that the petitioners and the Chancellor respectively be given an opportunity to supplement the record in advance of the hearing if they desire to do so, and if they do desire to supplement the record, they be requested to indicate the probable extent of the supplementation, and if there is going to be testimony taken, recommended that a hearing examiner be appointed for that purpose.

Regent DeBardleben moved adoption of the following resolution, the motion was seconded by Regent Lavine, and it was voted:

Resolution 1852: That the following recommendations made by the Regent Hearing Panel in the Matter of the Appeal to the Board of Regents by David Trojan, James Williams, Marion R. Earnest, Shirley P. Wright, Myron R. Utech, Joseph C. Hisrich, and John M. Hunnicutt From Decision Granting Tenure to J. Kenneth Davidson, Sr., be approved:

1. That the appeal of the petitioners be heard by the Board or by a Committee or Panel of the Board constituted for that purpose;
2. That such hearing be upon the record, but that the petitioners and the Chancellor, respectively, be given a reasonable opportunity, in advance of the hearing, to make an election to amplify the record;
3. That if either the petitioners or the Chancellor elect to amplify the record, the party or parties so electing shall indicate the respects in which it is desired to amplify the record in sufficient particularity to permit a reasoned decision as to the amount of time probably required therefor;
4. That in the event of an election to amplify the record and if it shall appear that such amplification of the record will involve the presentation of testimony, a hearing officer be appointed; and
5. That following the settling of the record, the hearing of the petitioner's appeal proceed upon 10 days notice in writing to the petitioners and the Chancellor at such place as the Chancellor shall designate at University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire.

President Hales referred to his letter of March 28, 1979, to each member of the Board requesting that they come to the meeting prepared to discuss the process we are to follow in searching for a new President of the UW System. Regent McNamara noted that he was involved in the selection of our current president, which was the first time the University System had selected the System's president. He stated we carefully researched all of the material that some of the experts in the field advised us about and worked out a method which seemed ideal--before we tried it out. He said it was a very broad and large committee with Regents on the initial selection committee, along with faculty, students, and administrators. This departed from the tradition that Regents do not sit on the preliminary committee, but rather reserve their judgment to be used in the end as the final selectors. He recalled that we had four Regents on the committee and it did a good job. He stated that when we got down to the final selection, the Regents simply ignored the participation of the Regents on the initial committee, and all Regents then participated in the final selection--the hearings, the personal interviews, etc.-- and it seemed afterward that the original committee did not work out according to plan.. He said that as one of the co-authors, he was naive in assuming that only some of the Regents could

be involved in the final selection and have the rest ratify it. He said he had come to the conclusion that in one form or another the entire Board would have to be involved as a kind of a preliminary Committee of the Whole, and then meet formally in the final selection. He said it is his judgment, based on experience, that we ought to go back to the traditional method the University has used in selecting its administrative officers, that is, use a search and screen committee made up of faculty, students, and administrators, with faculty in the majority, and then that committee would, as it traditionally does, bring back a final list of nine or ten candidates, or four or five, or whatever number the search and screen process develops, and then develop an appropriate system of interviews in which all of the Regents could be involved. He continued that he felt all of the Regents ought to have the opportunity to personally sit down and talk with the final list of candidates, and therefore to have just a part of them on the search committee itself denigrates the job of the rest of the Regents.

Regent Lavine stated the committee never interviewed anybody-- that is appropriate for the search and screen committee. He stated what they did was first they searched and that is perhaps the least understood, but most important job of any search committee, which is to really go across the entire country and get a superior quality list of names. He said his feeling has always been that if the committee does that job well, the Board cannot go wrong with whoever is chosen for President or any other position. He noted that in the screening aspect of the search and screen process the committee used letters of reference and the work history of the person involved, and extensive conversation with people at institutions where the candidate had held positions as a member of the faculty or as an administrator. He stated he agreed that the overwhelming majority of the search committee ought to be faculty members because we would do a great University System a tremendous injustice if the candidate chosen for chancellor or president were not first and foremost an outstanding academician. Regent Lavine said he did not feel that the faculty members on the committee were inhibited in any way in pursuing that goal, that he felt the Regents who served on the committee felt that we play a role that is helpful in the search and screening part of the two-step process--we too know academics, administrators, and Regents at institutions where these candidates come from and we can help making sure that the people involved had a record that was the kind that all of us would want to look at when the final list came to the Board of Regents. He noted that the President of the System is not a campus officer and felt that the legislature, the people of the state, and all of us want to be particularly sure that we do as careful a search and screen job as possible. He said the results of our last search was that we created a list as fine as it could be. He continued that he did not believe that anyone could say we could have made a mistake with the candidates on that list, but at the same time did not believe that Regent prerogatives were in any sense infringed even slightly, since none of the Regents from the search committee had met or talked with, or interviewed any of the candidates; so when the list came from the committee of the faculty to the full Board, the Board could set up any process it wished. He stated that if the entire Board could be involved, it probably should be in the interviews. He reiterated that he did not think the Regents on the initial committee in any sense inhibited, and at the same time stated they did a great deal to enhance its credibility, to be sure that the search and screen aspect of this process was done carefully. He noted the President of the System is a unique role-- some systems in the country have separate staffs for the Board and separate staffs for the president--they operate as two houses. One of the strengths of our system is that we do not do that. That being the case, he stated he felt it would be particularly important that each step of the process of choosing the president be very careful. He noted that there were significant compromises involved in the whole process and he felt that if we could end up this next search for a president with the same quality as we ended up the search that recruited President Young, that commends the system that we used.

Regent Erdman noted that she came on the Board four years ago and two years later was on the committee that helped select the new president, and this was an enormous learning experience because she saw how nonessential the Regents were to the scholarly endeavor of a great university system. She stated we are a policy-making Board and we all have to remember that the faculty is what makes an educational institution great. She stated the administration is the glue that keeps this rather fragile institution together, and we are the liaison with the state and the essential ingredient that provides us wherewithal; so when she sat on the first search and screen committee she saw that the faculty must be dominant in the search for their president. She continued that this did not mean that the Regents should in any way give up the prerogative of deciding, or making the final decision from among the men and women who are nominated by the faculty, the students and the few administrators that would be on that committee. She said she felt the direction of letting the faculty, in their wisdom, in their realization of what their aims are and what their perceptions of academic greatness are, select nominees should go ahead, and we will then as Regents, as the policy-making body, choose from among those nominees.

Regent DeBardleben noted that he too served on the search and screen committee which resulted in the selection of the president who has recently announced his resignation. He said his perceptions, as a member of that committee and as a member of this Board for a period of fourteen years, support the views of Regent Erdman. He said he did not feel then and did not feel now that the Regents' role on that committee was helpful in determining the academic qualifications of the people who would be on the list. He said he felt the Regents on that committee acted constructively and responsibly and did not mean to suggest otherwise, and did not mean to suggest that Regents on another committee would not endeavor to do the same thing, but the initial determination is not one of compromise. He stated compromises came when the Board got into the act. The initial determination is one of the determination of academic administrative excellence, and that is a determination that the members of the faculty and the administrators of this System are peculiarly qualified to make. It involves a matter of peer judgment on a national scale and calls for the exercise of the highest ability on the part of faculty members and administrators to judge their peers, nationwide, to determine whether they belong on this list to lead this system. It is not a matter that can be a subject of compromise. Regent membership on such a committee introduces into that initial selective process factors which Regents very properly should consider when the list of qualified people comes before them, but Regents are not competent to make the kind of judgment that faculty members who have devoted their lives to academic pursuits can and should make in this area. He stated that he supported what Regent McNamara has said and feels strongly that what Regent Erdman has said is correct, that the Regent process, which may involve compromises and probably will, should involve compromises from a list that has been selected first by people who have only one end in mind, and that is the judgment of their peers in that sort of a selective process. He urged preparation of a resolution setting forth the thoughts expressed by Regent McNamara.

Regent Gerrard stated we have heard from some of the Regents that were on the last search and screen committee and he felt we made a good selection. He noted they obviously did not mind serving then, but now they want to make an about-face. He said if there is something wrong with a few Regents being involved in the process, perhaps we shouldn't be here at all. He continued that he felt that the committee should have plenty at the academic level, but to say that a man like Ben Lawton cannot add something to the committee is completely ridiculous, or a man like Regent Beckwith with his background. He stated the taxpayers fund the University and he felt that once in a while we ought to

think of the taxpayers. He stated that he and the rest of the Regents are taxpayers and he did not see anything wrong with having taxpayers on the committee. He said he was appalled that we want to change signals--we did a good job before and now we want to change the whole process. We want to give all of our authority away. He noted that President Young was quoted in the Milwaukee Journal recently as saying that the biggest single job of the Regents is to select a president, and now some of the members of the Board want to eliminate them completely from the process. He noted the president of the university is running a billion dollar operation and that he felt the President of the University of Wisconsin should be considered as an administrator more than anything else -- a man who has to get along with the government, the legislature and do many things. He stated the procedure last time worked very well and now the people that did it last time want to run out on the process.

Regent Beckwith agreed that this is the most important job that we have, but meanwhile the question is at what stage we will be involved in the process. He stated we will make the ultimate decision and that he would not be a party to any protocol that would give our authority away. He states what is now before us is what is the proper procedure to bring this matter to the Regents for their consideration. He noted we have a tradition of selecting our senior administrators using a committee consisting of a majority of faculty members, with some administrators on the committee. He noted we select the chancellors of the institutions, which are really the heart of the whole system, by that process, and we do so for good reasons. He said it is as Regent DeBardeleben has said, because it is the perception and the wise thing that first and foremost chancellors, president, and our senior officers in the system must be scholars and academicians of national repute. He agreed that they must also be administrators and we have to be concerned with that aspect, but he raised the question as to what do Regents add to the search and screen committee that the faculty and chancellors on the committee cannot do, and if they do not add something significant, then there may be some disadvantages. He said he was not sure it was wise to have a few Regents engaged in the process of calling up other senior administrators at other institutions to make these kinds of inquiries and that he felt that it is probably better done by academic people that are nationally known. He said he was concerned that in this process where you have a few Regents on the search and screen committee, then when the list comes to the full Board, inevitably some members are not quite in the same standing as others. We have some Regents who were involved and some who were not and some Regents have special inside information that the other Regents do not have. He said that he believed the faculty should be unfettered in collecting the best possible list of scholars and academicians with administrative skills, and would be concerned that in the process some choices might be discouraged because a Regent member or two expressed a view in the search and screen committee that a certain choice was not appropriate. He said he wanted to see the Board of Regents as a whole receive from the search and screen committee a complete list that is their best judgment of a group from which we can select a new president. He said that apparently some of the Regent committee members who did this previously do not feel that the change in tradition really added a great deal, and consequently he felt we should return to where we were before.

Regent Majerus stated that he felt Regent Beckwith had asked the right question--what would the Regents add or take away from the committee? He said he felt this committee and this Board ought not to be abandoning its initial interest in the selection of a president of the University and to say that we do not as a group want any representation in that process to reject those candidates we do not want to see on the final list. He continued that everyone knows our job is to finally select a president, that

the list is going to come to the Board and will be a selective list, and there will be a sorting out process. He said he did not feel that we should abandon our rights of determining what the final list is going to look like to the faculty, students, and administrators. He said it was his understanding that the committee does not do a great deal of interviewing until the final list and that he felt the Regents ought to be represented on preparing the list which will finally come to the Board for the president of the University.

Regent Lawton stated the potential for intimidation of the faculty members by Regents is a bit frightening and he would prefer not to have us involved. Regent Fox noted that having Regents on the committee last time did not taint or compromise the process and inquired why everyone is sure that it will at this time. Regent Walter stated that she was very much in favor of staying off the first search and screen committee. Regent Barkla stated that she did not believe it was a matter of inhibiting anyone but she felt the problem is that if Regents are involved at the start of the process, then those Regents may have a predisposition one way or the other and felt it better to have the list come to us without knowing in detail what went on previously. Regent Barkla stated that if we are talking solely about procedure, we ought to be more concerned about how that selection was made rather than whether Regents were on the committee or not.

Regent McNamara stated that if he gave the impression that the Regents' role in selecting a president is a minor one, that was erroneous. He noted the Regents received a list of nine nationally known outstanding candidates, the best men in their field. The Board then interviewed them and spent three to four hours personally interviewing them over a period of days, and then had almost a full day of discussion after those interviews, so that clearly the selection was made by the Regents and properly so. He said the most that you could have on the preliminary committee is three or four Regents and this creates a problem in itself determining which should serve. He stated there is a position in the university worldwide, dating back to the twelfth century, that a university is made up of students and scholars and they select to the extent possible their own leadership. He said it is recognized that the System President is an administrator, and if we are to continue building outstanding universities throughout the state, the person selected, in addition to being a very capable administrator, has to be an outstanding scholar and has to be acceptable to the faculty; that is why he felt that going back to the traditional system is a better way. He said that he was confessing an error that he was instrumental in making, and suggesting that we go back more or less to the traditional procedure. He said the ultimate decision is still made by the Regents after hours and days of careful study, interviews and analysis of the individuals.

President Hales stated that he felt it is rather interesting that there is the hue and cry about the process, because if there were all these difficulties, why did not those Regents who served on the committee, and the other members of the Board, do something about the process after the President was elected? He noted President Young has been in office for two years and no one has raised these questions before and it is interesting that we now want to change the process. He said he agreed with a previous comment that the Regents are a policy-making body and the President of the University of Wisconsin System is the person responsible for carrying out the policies the Board establishes. He said there has been a tradition in the UW System and many university systems about picking administrative officers, presidents and positions of that nature but submitted that times have changed. We have



a merged university system now and the President of the UW System does not have the kind of constituency that the chancellors have, who are the chief executive officers of their campuses. He said Regent members of the search committee can add an understanding of what a chief administrator in this System has to confront. No one knows what it is to be a Regent of the University of Wisconsin System until you sit in this chair and no one other than Regents understands the administrative role of the President from our perspective. He said he agreed that the majority of the members of the search committee ought to be composed of faculty members, and was certain that the Regents would not intimidate any of the high quality faculty people that we would place on a search committee. He said he felt that one of the other important features that Regents may serve by being on the initial search committee is that when the Regents are deliberating, oftentimes questions would come up as to how the search committee felt about a particular item, and we had Regents on the search committee who said the committee felt this way, and we could consult the four Regents as to whether or not the kinds of perceptions that we have received from the search committee were accurate. He noted one of the things that the Board has been criticized for recently is the fact that we are giving away some of our responsibility and we are not doing the kinds of things we should be doing as a Board. Picking the President of the University of Wisconsin System is the major function of the Board of Regents. We can delegate it if we want to and we can give it all away to somebody else, but he felt in this day and age, the day and age of accountability, it would behoove us to be involved in the process from day one. He said he had not heard any complaints from the faculty groups in the System relative to Regent involvement on the search committee. He said he received a letter from the University Committee at Madison stating that the Committee takes no position on whether or not the Regents ought to be on the initial committee. President Hales said he strongly objected to Regent McNamara's suggesting that the outgoing president of the UW System should select the members of the search committee. He said he felt it is highly inappropriate for the outgoing president to be in the process at all.

Regent DeBardleben objected to making statements from the President's Chair and requested that President Hales step down from the Chair.

Vice President Lavine assumed the Chair.

Regent Hales stated that he felt the major function of the Board of Regents is to pick the President of the System and will support the position of maintaining Regents on the initial search committee.

Regent DeBardleben stated he did not hear Regent McNamara say how the search and screen committee should be selected, but felt it obviously should be selected by the President of the System. He noted the President of the Board had just said that the President of the System does not have a constituency and therefore supposed by implication it is not an academic position, it is not a position that academics are concerned with, and perhaps we ought to hire management and planning to come in and run the System. He said perhaps we ought to hire something analogous to a city manager to come in and serve as staff director for the Board of Regents. He emphasized the President of the UW System does have a constituency--a constituency of every single academic unit in the System. He continued that he felt his constituency for the State of Wisconsin is all of public higher education in Wisconsin and if the day comes that this Board decides that it is going to appoint a staff head to represent the Board who isn't truly a national academic leader, then you will not be picking up a Lipsett and Ladd Report and reading the kind of ratings that the University of Wisconsin-Madison has today. He said this is an important question, the President does have a constituency, and the question of accountability is academic accountability, not political accountability.

Regent Hales stated that he had said that the President of the University of Wisconsin System does not have the type of constituency that the Chancellors of our University have and he stuck by that statement. He said that he did not feel that in terms of accountability this Board has ever taken political positions on academic matters. He noted that he had been on the Board seven years and did not think that there has been any political involvement in academic matters that have come before this Board.

President Hales resumed the Chair.

Regent Elliott stated that we have heard about what we have done in the past and how it has functioned since the twelfth century, but submitted that in 1979 the President of the University and the Board of Regents do not function the same as five or ten years ago. He said there is only one group in this room that is responsible ultimately for what happens in this System and that is the people sitting around this table. He continued that if the process has not changed, then why have we heard from people that are leaving that the life expectancy in top management is only about ten years? He submitted that the System is different than it was five or ten years ago and that we have to get into the matter early and be responsible for making the ultimate decision.

Regent Beckwith stated we are at the question of how we select the search and screen committee, apart from its composition. He said he believed that the President of the Board of Regents, consulting with the President of the University, and the Senior Vice President can make that selection and he did not feel it has to be an adversarial project. He said he assumed that the President of the Board of Regents in selecting a search and screen committee would consult with fellow Regents, President Young, Senior Vice President Smith, the Chancellors, etc. He continued he felt that is the way the process should work and felt the composition of that selection committee is of such importance that the membership should come back to us at the May meeting for our approval. He said that he felt we all have a responsibility of having some input to the President of the Board and to the President of the System as to our thoughts and suggestions as to who might be on that committee. Regent Beckwith stated that he understood the previous committee functioned very well in a major part at least because of the splendid services of Don Smith, who acted as a sort of staff or executive secretary. Whether or not he can serve that function this time, he did not know, and would like to leave that for his consideration, but he did feel that is a role that has to be filled by someone of academic distinction. He stated the Regents did not have to be uninvolved in the search and screen process in the sense that he would have no hesitation to write to the chairman of the committee and request that some consideration be given to a certain person. He said he did not know if this is traditional or not, but if it is not traditional, he was going to break that tradition. He said the search and screen process should be undertaken by academicians on a committee-- a committee which we are involved in selecting and a committee that has the benefits of our advice and suggestions as it goes along.

Regent McNamara moved adoption of the following resolution, and the motion was seconded by Regent Walter:

Resolution 1853:

The Regents affirm that the following principles should be followed in conducting the process for search and selection of the next President of the University of Wisconsin System:

1. The search for applicants, candidates, and nominees shall be conducted by a faculty, administrative staff and student committee drawn from the institutions of the System. A majority of the members of this committee shall be members of the ranked faculty, and its chairperson shall be selected from the faculty. The committee shall include chancellors and it shall include minority and women members. The committee shall have as its primary goal the certifying to the Regents of an unranked list of not fewer than five persons, nor more than nine persons believed to be interested in further consideration for the presidency, each of whom is thought by the committee to merit the highest consideration for this position.
2. The selection and recruitment of the person to be appointed shall be conducted by the Regents in a manner to be determined by the Board after consideration of appropriate alternatives.
3. The Search Committee shall be established by the President of the Board in consultation with the System President and the committee shall be approved by the Board.

Regent McNamara stated that the resolution makes it clear as to what he considered should be the makeup of the committee. It does not propose to take away any powers from the President of the Board that he or she has traditionally had. The matter of selection is the one that we have traditionally used--the President of the Board, along with the President of the System and anyone else that he chooses, makes an initial selection and that is ultimately approved by the Regents. The matter of how we finally select the candidate we can determine ourselves. He said he was addressing the problem which he saw as a very real one of getting Regent involvement at too early a stage in the selection process, and that those who came away with the impression that his proposal was in any way denigrating the function of the Board got that viewpoint because of his inability to more thoroughly express himself. He said he agreed with all of those who have spoken that the final decision is ours to make and he did not want to take it away, and it is only the preliminary search and screen committee to which he was addressing himself, based on the experiences we had the last time.

Regent Lavine moved to amend the resolution to include in the makeup of the committee four members of the Board of Regents, and the amendment was seconded by Regent Gerrard.

Regent Lavine apologized for having given the impression that there was compromise involved in the process of selecting a president. He said he never saw any compromise involved. It was a first-class list and there was no compromise involved in picking the academic qualifications of the nominees. He said there was not the faintest hint on his part or on the part of other members of the Board that they would not be wholly involved in the interviewing after the list came to the Board. None of the committee members had the benefit of interviewing candidates during the committee process and all Regents had that benefit when it came to the Board. He said he had never seen a faculty committee intimidated by Regents on it, by Regents upset with it, by Regents talking to it, or whatever. He noted there is usually a request that Regents submit names to search and screen committees. He continued that he felt we should answer the questions that Regent Beckwith asked because

it is really the heart of what we are talking about--what can Regents add to a search and screen committee? He said he felt we add that when the list comes forward, no matter how high a quality staff the committee had (and Don Smith was superb), we had not one but three or four voices who sat through the process and were able to express the Regent viewpoint. He said he agreed with President Hales that the constituency of the President is different from the chancellors and that it is far broader and different than that of a chancellor, but the Regents know better than the faculty some of the other duties that a President of the System must carry. He said the faculty are experts in academic decisions and quality and background, but in dealing with the public, the legislature, and all the different constituencies, the Regents do have some expertise. He said he would feel a great deal more at ease if the list came forward to this Board knowing that the screening process included the input of four Regents who have that expertise. He said he was somewhat concerned that we have talked only about the faculty. He agreed they should be overwhelmingly dominant on the committee in numbers, but we also have students and administrators on the committee, and questioned if it is really true in the University of Wisconsin System that they can have input into searching and screening. He noted they are not faculty members and yet they will have more input than the body that is ultimately responsible for the System. He said he didn't believe that is the kind of balance that is in the best public policy interest. He stated the Regents represent the public and to say that students or chancellors can have that initial input, but representatives of the people of the state can not have the same input, he felt to be unwise.

Regent Thompson stated that as she had looked at administration of local school districts it would be unfortunate if school board members in local districts were not initially involved with the selection of their school administrators and from that perspective will support the amendment. Regent Erdman stated that the question raised by Regent Fox as to whether or not the Regents would intimidate or taint the committee is not a matter of issue. She said she learned from the previous experience that all the nominees for the presidency must be acceptable to the faculty and that we must give the faculty a very strong place in the decision-making process as to who shall be their leader. She said it was on the basis of our previous experience of selecting a president that she had changed her mind. She said she was a part of the committee and saw how invaluable and absolutely essential the faculty are to the entire makeup of what a school is all about, and unless we give them the dominant place in the selection of a nominee, we are possibly relegating our University System to a kind of mediocrity because the leader of the University must be a faculty member acceptable, admired, and respected in every respect.

Regent Grover stated that he was concerned by the unsubstantiated allegation of error and flaw in the last process. He said he had not heard one substantive demonstrative fact about what error encountered in the last selection process so derailed the procedure that we need to massively change it. He said he had not seen anything in writing in terms of how the last process operated that showed where the previous system dysfunctioned. He inquired what would happen in terms of the concept of faculty governance if the faculty collective bargaining bill would pass during this session, what would that do to the institution? He said that to rely on the traditional and to look to the past seemed to him to ignore the present and look to the future. Regent Majerus stated he would like to see the committee "tainted" by members of the Board of Regents because he would not want it "tainted" in any one direction by all academics or otherwise. He said the Regents have a special interest because he felt it is critical that this Board have representation on the committee so that the list that comes to us is representa-

tive of everybody's point of view. Regent Elliott stated that he viewed the committee as no more than a subcommittee of this Board and did not think it should be exclusive to any one group. Regent Walter stated that she opposed the amendment and supported the original resolution, and supported the idea that the President of the Board of Regents should have the authority to appoint that committee.

Regent Lawton stated that Regents do intimidate faculty and students by their very position and that he could not believe that on that committee this does not have that potential. He said he would be the last one to suggest that it happened last time but that he did think it could exist. He also noted that Regents are not involved in search and screen committees at the chancellor, dean, or whatever level--they are strictly involved in the selection. He said he opposed the amendment. Regent DeBardleben said he would plead with the members of the Board to remember that although the Board has the ultimate responsibility for the government of the University of Wisconsin System, the proper exercise of that responsibility involves some humility. It involves some circumscription of our own powers for the greater good of the System. He noted we have the power to do anything we want, we have the power to disregard other constituencies, we have the power to impose our will in many ways, but he did not share Regent Grover's idea that some great thing has changed in the last five years so that we no longer value the traditions that have made the University of Wisconsin-Madison a great institution. He said he felt those traditions do mean something and that history is something that we look at in order to find the reason why we are where we are and the reasons why we find the University in Milwaukee on the ascendency. He said it isn't anything that the Board of Regents has done and it isn't anything that the Legislature has done except in the terms of providing the money taken from the people of the state to run the institution, and urged the members of the Board to remember the provisions of the statutes under which the Regents serve which give to the faculty primacy in the academic governance of the System. He noted that includes academic leadership.

In response to Regent Beckwith's inquiry as to what Regent involvement at the committee level would add to the committee, Regent DeBardleben stated it is not going to mean anything unless Regents are going to see to it that certain names get reported so they come to the Board for consideration. As to the competency that the members of the Board have to determine the academic qualifications of people who should be on that final list, he said those judgments should be made on an academic basis--they should not be made on a political basis, nor should they be made on a business basis. He recalled that Regent Grover inquired "what was wrong with the way we did it five years ago?". He recalled that at that time Regent Grover was a new member of the Board and was not appointed as one of the four members to go on the combined committee. He said at that time Regent Grover expressed his dissatisfaction, in his exact words "I want a piece of the action!". Regent DeBardleben stated that what he was saying is that at that level Regents should not have a piece of the action--the action at that level is the selection by academic people of their outstanding peers. Regent action comes in when that list of qualified people comes before us, and then we act. He continued it is not correct to say that not to put Regents on this committee will be anything different from what we do on chancellor's committees. Regents do not serve on committees of faculty members who make recommendations as to those who are to serve as chancellor. Only when the screening process is completed and after the academic tests have been met does the Regent involvement come in to play. He said it is not a question of Regent power, it is a question of whether or not we are going to use it wisely. He said that if we put ourselves on that committee--if we insist on a piece of the action in Regent Grover's words--at a time when academic qualifications are going to be determined, we are making the whole process suspect and submitted that the amendment should be defeated.

Regent Beckwith stated he felt there are two separate distinct functions involved--one is the search for academic excellence, and there is the ultimate decision by the Board of Regents. He said he felt those functions should be kept separate and urged serious consideration of that fact. He said the thrust of this committee is not the Regent search and screen committee. The Regents have their own role to play. He noted that if there are reasons for putting Regents on the committee to select a president of the university system, there would be equally valid reasons for putting Regents on the search and screen committee for the Madison and Milwaukee Campuses, and no one has ever suggested that we do that, and wisely so. He stated Regents bring to the search and screen process an understanding of the need for the System president to deal with many constituencies and to have administrative skills, but the chancellors also bring to the search and screen committee those same qualities. He said that Chancellors Shaïn, Baum, and the other chancellors have a much better understanding of what it is to administer a university than he did and they have a lot better understanding of what you are looking for in the president of the university as an administrator and as a person to deal with the various constituencies, including the Board of Regents, than he did. He said the chancellors can counsel the search and screen committee in those respects, and he did not feel we need Regents on the committee.

President Hales recalled that during all of the deliberations of the previous committee, faculty and student representatives were present, and he felt that the Board had done a yeoman's job in terms of shared governance in trying to select a president of the University System.

Regent Barkla recalled that she had not been a Regent member of the committee the previous time and that she felt either all Regents should be on the committee so that they have a piece of the action or there should be none, because she felt very much left out of the process and felt that the Regents who were on the committee were telling her that they had looked over the list and will bring in the finalist, this is our judgment and you should listen to us. She said we have a duty to go out and affirmatively recruit people that we know would make fine candidates for that position and bring them to the search and screen committee, and let the committee check out their academic and administrative qualifications.

Regent Gerrard inquired of Regent DeBardleben why he had served on the committee a previous time if it was such a bad idea. Regent DeBardleben responded that he was concerned that if he did not serve, Regent Gerrard would have been appointed to the committee. Regent Grover stated that he did not want to be one of the Regent members doing the initial screening, noting that he had served as a consultant for the Kenosha Board of Education, had read eighty-five applications, and when he finished his fee was 75¢ an hour. With respect to his comment relative to a "piece of the action", he said he had asked to get on the final committee that did the interviewing in Chicago because at that time the scope of the committee was that all Regents were not going to get to interview all the final candidates, and he could see that it is an improvement in this procedure that all of us will have an opportunity to sit in and look at the final five, seven, or nine. He said we ought to down-play our power and when we get down to it, maybe we could just give it all away because then when we go to public bodies and have to answer what are you doing as Regents, we can always say somebody else made the decision. He noted he was not happy this year when we reviewed the University budget--\$51,000,000 worth of additional spending and we looked at it for two hours--he had to fight to get one amendment attached--it went over to the Legislature

and they said they are going to tear it apart, and that is what they did. We gave that power away and that discretionary authority in that decision-making. He said we have not looked tough at the campuses to see what are the future projects, noting that State Representative Offner is moving to make Superior a two-year campus and we go around with these excuses--ultimately the job can be relegated to a cocktail hour once a month on Thursday night. He said that is the reason that he got on the Board of Regents--he wanted a piece of the action --he would like to bear the burden for making major critical educational policy decisions that ultimately impact upon the stature and future of one of the nation's finest universities. He said that pushing the authority and responsibility away from us with all sorts of cliches to cover up why we do it in his estimation really aborts the process and responsibility of the job. He stated the argument that picking a Madison chancellor is in any way comparable in terms of the procedure and the involvement of faculty as opposed to picking a president of the System is just a lot of balderdash. He said he felt the president of the System has to be more than a scholar, and if you get yourself as the next president of this university a pure scholar with no social, political, societal, and public skills, in the era this university is going to face in terms of retrenchment, in the decline, in the culling, this University is going to suffer massively because the locus of decision-making is going to switch to another body, and we all know where that is. He said he felt it is important that we have a person with internal credibility and external skills in the State of Wisconsin, so we can protect this precious resource that we have built up. He said we need massive public leadership that transcends a Rhodes scholar mentality.

Regent Lawton said that he felt that any Regent who goes on the committee with the attitude described by Regent Grover is really a detriment to our selection process.

The question was put on the proposed amendment, and it failed on a tie roll call vote, with Regents Elliott, Fitzgerald, Fox, Gerrard, Grover, Hales, Lavine and Majerus voting "Aye" (8), and with Regents Barkla, Beckwith, DeBardleben, Erdman, Lawton, McNamara, Thompson and Walter voting "No" (8).

The question was put on Resolution 1853, and it failed on a tie vote, with Regents Barkla, Beckwith, DeBardleben, Erdman, Lawton, McNamara, Thompson and Walter voting "Aye" (8), and with Regents Elliott, Fitzgerald, Fox, Gerrard, Grover, Hales, Lavine, and Majerus voting "No" (8).

The meeting recessed at 10:55 A.M., and resumed at 11:05 A.M.

Regent Grover stated that upon reviewing the resolution and understanding that really all of us here are concerned about the ultimate good and the protection of the process of making it valid and creditable, he felt it appropriate that reconsideration be moved, and the motion for reconsideration was seconded by Regent Beckwith.

The motion to reconsider was voted, on a roll call vote, with Regents Barkla, Beckwith, DeBardleben, Erdman, Fox, Gerrard, Grover, Hales, Lavine, Lawton, McNamara, Thompson and Walter voting "Aye" (13), and with Regents Elliott and Fitzgerald voting "No" (2), and with Regent Majerus absent.

The question was put on resolution #1853, and it was voted on a roll call vote, with Regents Barkla, Beckwith, DeBardleben, Erdman, Fox, Gerrard, Grover, Hales, Lavine, Lawton, McNamara, Thompson and Walter voting "Aye" (13) and with Regents Elliott and Fitzgerald voting "No" (2), and with Regent Majerus absent.

Regent Erdman moved adoption of the following resolution, the motion was seconded by Regent Lawton, and it was voted:

Resolution 1854: That, the responsibility of the Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System in the matter of the appeal to the Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System from decision granting tenure to J. Kenneth Davidson, Sr., be delegated to a Regent Hearing Panel appointed by the President of the Board.

President Hales appointed Regents DeBardleben, Chairman; Barkla and Lavine as members of the above Regent Hearing Panel.

Regent Lavine moved adoption of the following resolution, the motion was seconded by all Regents present, and it was voted:

Resolution 1855: WHEREAS, Chancellor Werner A. Baum of the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee will retire from that position on August 31, 1979, in order to be able to devote more time to scholarly activities as Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and Professor of Meteorology at Florida State University, where he previously served on the faculty for 14 years, and

WHEREAS, under his strong and distinguished leadership for the last six years the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee has become a prototype of a new version of the American university -- a major university in an urban setting which has gained respect and renown in the world of scholarship,

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Regents, on behalf of the people of Milwaukee and Wisconsin, expresses sincere thanks to Dr. Baum for his dedicated service and his important contributions to the cause of public higher education, wishes him and Mrs. Baum well in their new assignment, and grants to Werner A. Baum the status of Chancellor Emeritus in the University of Wisconsin System.

- - -

#### REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE SYSTEM

Regent Lavine moved adoption of the following resolution, the motion was seconded by Regent Barkla, and it was voted:

Resolution 1856: That the Report of Non-Personnel Actions by Administrative Officers to the Board of Regents and Informational Items Reported for the Regent Record be received for the record; and that actions included in the report be approved, ratified, and confirmed. (EXHIBIT B, attached)

-



President Young stated there is very little new to report on the budget except that it is a very difficult situation. He reported we have appeared before the Joint Finance Committee, have met with individual members and with subcommittees and Vice President Smith and staff have done yeoman service. He said we have tried to stress things that we think are most important, and the most important thing is the enrollment funding. Another important matter is that of student wages, basic skills are high on our list and we are talking about some of the outreach programs. He said one of the difficulties we face is that we have not made any dramatic recommendations for change, arguing that we have our responsibility to preserve quality. He continued there are some who would like us to demonstrate the intention to cut the System back very sharply. He said he had been telling people who ask his view that the State of Wisconsin will not pay us to teach students that are not there, that we will have to have retrenchment, but we have a large responsibility to preserve quality and the access to opportunity. He said there is a responsibility to the future which is very great, and is tremendously important to this System. If ever there was a time when this state had an opportunity to do things that haven't been done in terms of improving quality and access, now is the time because there isn't a pressure for enrollment growth. He said it is clear to him that if we have fewer young people, as we obviously are going to, each of them becomes more precious to us, to the state, and to the nation, and therefore they ought to have more opportunity; we ought to encourage them to develop themselves to the utmost in order to make the biggest contribution. He continued the scarcest thing we have is human talent, something that we can develop and inflation will not erode. He said he was not talking about our System alone, he was talking about the world-famous Vocational, Technical System, about the private schools that the state supports through tuition grants, and about the opportunities outside the State of Wisconsin, but primarily opportunity exists in the public post-secondary education in the state, and he hoped that somebody somewhere will begin to think about this because there are so few things that the State of Wisconsin can invest in that will have such a sure return as an investment in its young people.

President Young noted that a female student at UW-Whitewater had placed first among 45,000 students taking a CPA exam. This is the second time in three years this has happened and obviously we are all very pleased. He also noted that three students from the UW-Eau Claire were in the top 78 in the same examination.

At the request of President Young, Associate Vice President Robert Polk introduced Dr. Tyrone Baines, lecturer and Director of the Public Administration Program at North Carolina Central University at Durham, who is interning in the Office of System Administration.

President Young recognized Mr. Paul Rusk, President, United Council of Student Governments. Mr. Rusk stated the United Council considers the proposed collective bargaining bill SB 121 in its present form as a serious threat to the role students play in the governance of the University. He noted that S. 36.09(5) guarantees student participation in the government of the University and also gives students the primary responsibility for the segregated fee allocation, something that most other states do not have. He said United Council has proposed several amendments to the collective bargaining

bill including several prohibitive practices clauses that would mean that the allocations and policies of segregated fee-funded activities, as well as auxiliary services funded by segregated fees, would be exempt from the bargaining process. He noted this is the position that the Regents held. He stated that further since the collective bargaining process has such a tremendous impact on the students of the state, he would like to see a modified observer-participant role in the process by providing that three student delegates would have the opportunity to make oral presentations during the bargaining process. They should be chosen with 36.09(5) in mind and they should also have information through all of the written documents that are exchanged by the bargaining parties.

- - -

#### REPORT OF THE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

The report of the Education Committee was presented by Regent Lawton.

Regent Lawton reported that in the committee meeting on the previous day, with all Regents invited to attend, there had been a presentation made by Vice Chancellor William Walters, UW-Milwaukee, relating to research on the Milwaukee Campus. He reported Dr. Walters commented about the diversity of disciplines represented in the University's research projects and about the many different agencies which provide the support grants. He also furnished information showing UW-Milwaukee's relative ability to attract extramural funding for research, noting that UW-Milwaukee ranks 150th in total research and development expenditures among universities nationally. Regent Lawton reported Board members asked questions dealing with the breakdown between pure and applied research and the amount of federal government grants as compared to grants from other sources.

-

Regent Lawton moved adoption of Resolution 1857 relating to the request to the Trustees of the William F. Vilas Trust Estate for support of scholarships, fellowships and professorships, attached as EXHIBIT C, the motion was seconded by Regent Fitzgerald, and it was voted.

-

Regent Lawton noted the requirement contained in the Public Telecommunications Financing Act of 1978 that Community Advisory Boards be established for public broadcasting stations receiving funds from the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. He indicated that the four stations for which the Board of Regents holds licenses are affected by this requirement. He reported Regent DeBardleben expressed concern as to the extent to which the required public input might inhibit the freedom of the persons responsible for the stations' operations.

Regent Lawton moved adoption of the following resolution, and the motion was seconded by Regent Thompson:

Resolution 1858:

That, upon recommendation of the President of the University of Wisconsin System and the Chancellors of UW-Extension and UW-Milwaukee and the Acting Chancellor of UW-La Crosse, the following authorization is approved:

In recognition of the Public Telecommunications Financing Act of 1978, and according to provisions contained therein, the Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System authorizes the Chancellors or their designees of the institutions operating public broadcasting stations WHA-AM, WHA-TV, WLSU-FM, and WUWM-FM to establish Community Advisory Boards which reasonably reflect the diverse needs and interests of the communities served by each station.

Regent Lawton stated that he expressed the concern that these advisory boards will be token do-nothing boards mandated by the government. Regent Fitzgerald stated that she too did not feel that they have the force that they should have; she said she would like to see the entire radio program looked at, before we go with these advisory boards. Regent DeBardleben stated he did not feel we have any choice but to approve this recommendation. We have to have the advisory boards and he was certain that the chancellors, if they were to give the kind of individual attention to these boards that they should be given, would meet his concerns. He said he was sure the chancellors would act responsibly and was not suggesting otherwise by this statement, but feared that the existence of advisory boards would tend to restrict diversity and restrict freedom of expression and freedom of choice so far as the people who sponsor programs are concerned. He said he feared that a local community advisory board might have a repressive influence rather than an influence encouraging diversity and freedom. He said he felt that this Board should express enough interest in those concepts to require that personnel on these advisory boards be confirmed either by Central Administration or by this Board as a means of insuring that the composition of these boards will receive the careful and deliberate attention of the chancellors and that it will not just be a rubber-stamped thing and we end up with people who, although their decisions do not have any binding effect, would have a stultifying effect on the operation of the program.

Regent Erdman stated she felt it is an important issue. She said she didn't know how many of the stations are listed here, but did know that WHA/FM and AM have changed drastically in the last decade - It used to be an educational radio station and the mission was clearly defined and quite clear throughout its broadcasting hours. The programs were aimed to cover a spectrum that was not available on commercial radio stations. Now it seems that there is a new look at trying to get more listeners, at trying to draw listeners from the commercial stations and trying to emulate the commercial stations with talk shows and three minute segments of this and that, so you don't have the kind of indepth approach that used to be so very much admired and wanted by all of us. She said she was hoping that this advisory board which would be set up would have the very salutary effect on WHA/FM and AM because it might bring in some of the listeners who wanted a return to the true educational radio station by offering the alternatives that the University System should offer. She said soap opera or country music or giggly editorializing is not what a radio station of the University System should offer, and that it seemed to her that the directors do not have a sense of the educational mission that they once had. She said a good number of people had called or written her expressing this concern. She said she hoped the advisory board would have a broad spectrum of citizens who could give this kind of input.

Senior Vice President Smith agreed with Regent DeBardleben that it is desirable that we proceed to confirm the establishment of these boards as required by federal law if we are to continue to receive federal support for the enterprise. He said the issue of policy formation and programming

policy in the entire area of public broadcasting is an enormously complicated one in which the Board does, as the license-holder, have an interest, although obviously no capacity to provide day-to-day or year-to-year supervision on all of these outlets throughout the state. He suggested that we work on how we can bring back to the Board next year a report on the constitution of these boards, what activities they have undertaken, what kinds of considerations have been brought before them, and a report which would be substantive in nature and give some feeling as to whether or not this was successfully achieving effective purposes or if there are other interests that need to be exercised. He agreed with Regent Erdman that it will be a requisite that the mission of the advisory boards be established, the means by which it is to achieve the mission, and then the nature of its activity. Dr. Smith continued that with this kind of experience we will sense whether or not the boards are really a barrier to effective conduct of public broadcasting or whether they make a contribution, and whether or not they do bring into the public domain a very serious question about the mission and role of the whole public broadcasting enterprise in this country. He noted that the Carnegie Commission has said that it is a national treasure and somehow we have got to find the wisdom in this country to make it a treasure for the benefit of the nation as a whole. He said he had no lack of confidence in the care with which the chancellors will exercise this authority, but if the Regents wanted to have the list brought back, he would not object.

Regent Lavine suggested that it be brought to the Board at least the first time, and the only thing we have to carry out as the license-holders is knowledge of who the people are that are going to serve on these committees. He noted that in the process of bringing this all back there ought to be a review also of the other stations for which we hold licenses. He said he had some concern that the mission of the campus stations around the System for which we hold licenses is unclear. In some instances they look to be community stations, in others they appear to be teaching facilities, and he was not objecting to either but simply saying that we have asked departments and institutions to set missions and it seemed not unreasonable to ask what the missions of those various stations for which we hold licenses are. He said he was concerned with the remarks made by Regent Erdman because an experiment should be allowed to be just that, and once we have authorized it, we all ought to keep our comments minimal so that the people who are trying to frame this year-long experiment can do it. He continued that on the other side of the coin he would like some assurance that the report we get next year would not look only at what's going on, but would carefully analyze that experiment and the people involved at the station would understand that if we are asked to accept some sort of policy thrust, we are not to be given a fait accompli, that we be given the results of the experiment in a timely enough fashion that if the thrust is going to go one way or another and we are supposed to ratify that, we know what it is and are not simply told this is what we are doing and you have to rubber-stamp it.

Senior Vice President Smith stated that we understand that the ECB is shortly going to be asking the System to participate in a comprehensive study of educational broadcasting for the entire state, and it may be that we will want to define that before we get too far down the line on finding a separate kind of enterprise so that we gear ourselves for it. Regent DeBardeleben stated that his concerns were fully met by what Senior Vice President Smith had said, and that he was certain that the fact that this matter had been discussed is going to lead to the kind of attention to the composition of these panels that we have in mind.

The question was put on Resolution 1858, and it was voted.

Regent Lawton reported that in the Committee meeting on the previous day Regent DeBardleben raised questions about the possibility that the proposed agreement between the UW-LaCrosse and Viterbo College violates constitutional prohibition against use of public funds to establish a religion or support a sectarian institution, and expressed concern as to the extent to which the services of each institution were being used by the students of the other. He was apprised that the Viterbo students participation at UW-LaCrosse was approximately 4 to 1 greater than LaCrosse students participation at Viterbo. Regent Lawton reported the resolution was approved 3 to 1, with Regent DeBardleben voting "No".

Regent Lawton moved adoption of the following resolution, and the motion was seconded by Regent Fitzgerald:

**Resolution 1859:** That, upon the recommendation of the Acting Chancellor of the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse, the "Agreement for Inter-Institutional Cooperation" between the UW-La Crosse and Viterbo College, to enhance educational opportunities for students of both institutions and optimize the use of personnel and financial and physical resources, be approved for the 1979-80 academic year.

In response to Regent Erdman's questions, Regent Lawton advised that approximately 250 students of Viterbo attended UW-LaCrosse over a five-year period and 50 students from LaCrosse attended Viterbo. He advised further that approximately 700 credits were earned at LaCrosse over the five-year period and approximately 150 credits were earned at Viterbo during the same period. Regent Erdman stated that she was concerned that one institution can send students to our publicly-supported institution and not pay what our regular students are paying, which is one-fourth of the instructional cost, and that irrespective of the church and state constitutionality problem it appeared we are unduly supporting another constituency with whom we should not be involved.

Senior Vice President Smith urged that the resolution be approved, mindful of the fact that the institution has reappraised its relationship recently with Viterbo and will further monitor and re-appraise as we continue. He said we have for a long time held generally the cultivation of inter-institutional relations with the independent sector was a very desirable thing. He noted we have a very large number of similar relationships, such as the Lake Superior consortium of Colleges and Universities involving St. Scholastica in Duluth, and independent colleges and universities both in this state and across the border and the many side effects are beneficial. He pointed out the possibility through this kind of cooperative arrangement of joint scheduling of functional events, lectures, etc., so the students have better opportunities. He also noted there is improvement in the exchange of wisdom among the faculties of the institutions as they work together. He said there is a legitimate concern on the exchange, and if the level of exchange grew to a point where it became a serious financial consideration, he was certain the institutions themselves would be the first to call it to everybody's attention. He advised that no money was exchanged, but the students must register through their college.

Regent DeBardleben noted we are hearing adjectives like "desirable", "precious", "good", etc.--but for whom. He pointed out they are good for the people who believe in the standards for which Viterbo exists. Some of us abhor those standards and we should not be required to pay for them. That is what the first amendment is all about. He said he did not think we should be in this, we should not be doing it, and he was going to vote against it.

Chancellor Baum agreed with Regent Beckwith's statement that if a student at Alverno or Marquette takes courses at UW-Milwaukee, he has to pay for them. He asserted that it would be easy and simple to work out if Viterbo recognized credits from LaCrosse and students went to LaCrosse and bought those credits, and vice versa if LaCrosse students went to Viterbo and bought credits. Senior Vice President Smith agreed this could be done, but it would result in effect establishing a stipulated fee, because you would not be able to get agreement on the accounting. Regent DeBardeleben pointed out a religious organization does not have any restrictions against interfering with the state, but we do have restrictions against getting involved with religious organizations. Regent Gerrard noted that someone had suggested locking up the UW-Superior because enrollment is going down, but noted that it contributes much to all of northern Wisconsin, there are many other factors involved, and we should do anything we can to help smaller struggling schools.

Regent Lavine stated that he felt private education is critically important to the state and the country because it offers all kinds of alternatives, but he said their activities should not be supported with taxpayers' dollars. Regent Erdman stated that she felt we should continue this kind of an agreement as the small schools help us too, but we should not utilize taxpayers' money in this kind of way to support them when already we are supporting the individual student through HEAB grants. She said that if the individuals paid their additional fees for the courses, this would solve the whole problem.

The question was put on Resolution 1859, and it was voted, with Regents Beckwith, Fitzgerald, Fox, Gerrard, Hales, Lawton, McNamara, Thompson, and Walter voting "Aye" (9), with Regents DeBardeleben, Elliott, Erdman, Grover, and Lavine voting "No" (5), and with Regents Barkla and Majerus absent (2).

Regent Lawton reported Senior Vice President Smith reviewed his March 26, 1979 memorandum dealing with the System response to Regents' concerns for a uniform application of the nonresident tuition statutes throughout the System. Plans have been made to conduct audits of residence determinations, a brochure has been prepared for distribution to students, and a System committee is completing work on the document entitled, Guidelines for Residency Tuition Decisions. The committee will provide the Guidelines to the Board when they have been completed. Regent Lawton reported Regent DeBardeleben stated his concern about the absence of the right for a student to appeal a residency decision to the Board of Regents. It was noted that in September 1978 when the Board delegated authority to each Chancellor to make final decisions concerning the residence classification of students, it was agreed to review a year's accumulation of cases to see if there were appearances of inequity and lack of conformity with the law. Such an audit will be available in about a year's time following the promulgation of the rules and procedures for the planned review.

Regent Lawton reported Senior Vice President Smith reviewed briefly the recommendations contained in the System Administration's Summary Statement of the Education Professions Advisory Council's Analysis of the Z-Group (Special Education Task Force). They included the recommendation to limit special education teacher preparation programs to those currently existing. System Administration did not support a recommendation that certain special education programs be reduced or eliminated solely on the basis of employment market conditions.

Regent Lawton reported Senior Vice President Smith called the Committee's attention to Draft 2 of the Analysis Paper: UW System Planning Studies Relevant to the Fiscal and Academic Problems Associated with Probable Decline in Degree Credit Enrollments, 1983-1993. Draft 2 has now been distributed to Chancellors, Vice Chancellors, and Faculty Representatives for suggestions and comments. Dr. Smith discussed at some length the two studies that need to be initiated immediately, a need confirmed by the request of the Governor, in his recommendations on enrollment funding for the 1979-81 biennium, that the System promptly undertake studies leading to recommendation concerning the enrollment funding formula, and concerning procedures for the allocation of resources within the System in a period of declining enrollments. The System is to report its findings and recommendations to State government not later than November, 1979. Regent Beckwith stated it was his understanding that it is anticipated that the study of part-time student costs will come to the Board as early as August or September.

Regent Lawton reported Senior Vice President Smith informed the Committee of the decision to postpone an annual term fee experiment at UW-Parkside which had been scheduled to begin the fall of 1979. The experiment involves the annualizing of the fees of part-time students. The decision to postpone was necessitated by the change in the enrollment funding situation since November, base budget cuts required at several institution, the System's inability to fund growth where it occurs, and the inadequacy of the budget reserve.

Regent Lavine moved adoption of the following resolution, the motion was seconded by Regent Walter, and it was voted:

Resolution 1860:

That, upon the recommendation of the President of the UW System and the Chancellor of UW-Madison, the following named professorships be approved, effective immediately, with no change in salary:

John R. Cameron	to	Farrington Daniels Professorship in Radiology and Physics
Warrington W. Colescott	to	Leo L. Steppat Professorship in Art
Alfred Kadushin	to	Julia C. Lathrop Professorship in Social Work
Kemal H. Karpat	to	Abdi Ipekci Professorship in History
Peter J. Lang	to	Clark Leonard Hull Professorship in Psychology
Charles J. Sih	to	Frederick B. Power Professorship in Pharmaceutical Chemistry
Champ B. Tanner	to	Emil Truog Professorship in Soils

The meeting recessed for lunch at 12:13 P.M. and resumed at 12:57 P.M.

REPORT OF THE BUSINESS AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

The report of the Business and Finance Committee was presented by Regent Grover.

Regent Grover reported a total of nearly \$9.6 million in newly-approved federal proposals was received in March. Largest categories of increase for the year to date are in instruction, which is up \$7.5 million and Research, which is up \$6.5 million. The total of all activity for all campuses is \$10.4 million greater than for a comparable period last year, with approximately \$7 million of this coming from the federal government.

Regent Grover moved adoption of the following resolution, the motion was seconded by Regent Lavine, and it was voted:

Resolution 1861: That, upon recommendation of the President of the System, the gifts, grants and contracts presented at this meeting (copy filed with the papers of this meeting) be accepted, approved, ratified and confirmed; and that, where signature authority has not been previously delegated, appropriate officers be authorized to sign agreements.

Regent Grover reported that the late Hazel P. Caldwell bequeathed one-half of the residue of her estate to UW-Madison for the care or treatment of cancer or for the care, rehabilitation and treatment of cancer patients. He stated it is estimated approximately \$50,000 will be realized from this bequest, which will be administered by the Chairman of the Department of Human Oncology in the UW-Madison Medical School.

Regent Grover moved adoption of the following resolution, the motion was seconded by Regent Lavine, and it was voted:

Resolution 1862: That the bequest of the late Hazel P. Caldwell, Menlo Park, California, to the University of Wisconsin be accepted by the Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Last Will and Testament of Hazel P. Caldwell, Deceased; and that the Secretary or Assistant Secretary be authorized to sign a receipt on behalf of the Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin for this bequest, and to do all things necessary to effect the transfer of this bequest to the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Regent Grover reported the Vice President and Controller presented the monthly report on projected year-end balances which reflects an anticipated balance of \$981,000 at the close of the fiscal year. The increase from last month is largely attributable to an apparent higher retention rate of students into the second semester and to release of a Systemwide contingency allocation in the annual budget. This will now be used to build toward the \$1.5 million the System hopes to have available to carry forward into the next fiscal year.



Regent Grover reported there was discussion of a letter from HEW detailing additional reporting requirements requiring accounting for 100% of professional and non-professional employee time, to reflect direct and indirect time and effort charged to federal grants and contracts, mandatory and non-mandatory cost sharing, and all other institutional activities.

Regent Grover noted the report on proxy votes cast on behalf of the Business and Finance Committee was reviewed in the committee meeting. In response to a question relating to the Bendix Corporation proxy, Regent Walter stated that the company has a prohibition against any political contributions and that was the reason the company management opposed publication of the details of any contributions.

- - -

REPORT OF THE PHYSICAL PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

The report of the Physical Planning and Development Committee was presented by Regent Gerrard.

Regent Gerrard reported that the committee agreed to hear five UW-Milwaukee students speak in support of a request to the committee to reconsider its action approving naming of the library at UW-Milwaukee after Golda Meir. He reported that after completion of the presentation the committee took no action to change its previous recommendation. Regent Beckwith noted that he had written to the President of the Board suggesting that a future policy on naming of buildings ought to be considered by the appropriate Regent Committee.

Regent Gerrard moved adoption of the following recommendation, the motion was seconded by Regent Fox, and it was voted:

Resolution 1863: That, upon the recommendation of the UW-Madison and UW-Whitewater Chancellors and the President of the University of Wisconsin System, the concept and budget reports for the following projects be approved and authority be granted to plan, bid and construct them, at the cost and from the funding sources indicated:

UW-Whitewater

Mechanical and Electrical Monitoring System Project,  
\$276,000 GOB/GPR

Plant Sciences Greenhouse, \$369,000 (\$270,500 - GOB/GPR,  
\$98,500 - BTF/GPR)

UW-Madison

Safety and Improved Access Project, \$1,627,000 GOB/GPR

And further, that authorization be granted to enumerate the Plant Sciences Greenhouse project at UW-Whitewater in the 1979-81 state budget, with funding authority provided in 1977-79.

Regent Gerrard moved adoption of the following resolution, the motion was seconded by Regent Fox, and it was voted:

**Resolution 1864:** That, upon the recommendation of the University of Wisconsin-Madison Chancellor and the President of the University of Wisconsin System, the President or Vice President and Secretary or Assistant Secretary of the Board be authorized to sign a use agreement with the Veterans Administration for leasing 3,205 square feet of space for use by the University's Department of Radiology. The term of the agreement will be from May 1, 1979 through April 30, 1981 at an annual cost of \$11,313.65 and funded from the Medical School operating budget.

Regent Gerrard moved adoption of the following resolution, the motion was seconded by Regent Erdman, and it was voted:

**Resolution 1865:** That, upon the recommendation of the UW-Green Bay, Madison, River Falls and Superior Chancellors and the President of the University of Wisconsin System, authorization be granted to plan, bid and construct the following minor projects, at the cost and from the funding source indicated:

Maintenance and Storekeeping Building Site Drainage Project, \$18,400 BTF/GPR, UW-Green Bay

Storage Structure Replacement Project, \$29,500 Non-GPR, Insurance Receipts, UW-Madison

Student Center Remodeling Project, \$90,300 PR/Non-GPR, UW-River Falls

Music Annex Insulation Project, \$15,300 BTF/GPR, UW-Superior

Regent Gerrard moved adoption of the following resolution, the motion was seconded by Regent Lavine, and it was voted:

**Resolution 1866:** That, upon the recommendation of the UW-Milwaukee Chancellor and the President of the University of Wisconsin System, authorization be granted to purchase a 0.12 acre parcel of land located at 3237 North Maryland Avenue in the City of Milwaukee, Wisconsin at a purchase price of \$72,000 from Land Acquisition Funds. This parcel is more fully described as:

South 41 feet of Lot 8, Block 2 Campus Subdivision and easement as recorded in Volume 2633, page 416, Office of the Milwaukee County Register of Deeds.

Regent Gerrard moved adoption of the following resolution, the motion was seconded by Regent Walter, and it was voted:

Resolution 1867: That, upon the recommendation of the UW-Milwaukee Chancellor and the President of the University of Wisconsin System, the Campus Development Plan, as updated, be approved to document physical facilities and campus boundaries for UW-Milwaukee.

Regent Gerrard moved adoption of the following resolution, the motion was seconded by Regent Lavine, and it was voted:

Resolution 1868: That, upon the recommendation of the UW-Green Bay and Madison Chancellors and the President of the University of Wisconsin System, authorization be granted to plan, bid and construct the following minor projects, at the cost and from the funding source indicated, and to seek an increase in the Systemwide allocation for small energy conservation projects:

Utility Control Center Chiller Repairs Project, \$33,200  
BTF/GPR, UW-Green Bay

Arlington Farms Livestock Handling Barn Remodeling Project,  
\$18,000 Operating Budget/GPR, UW-Madison

Small energy conservation projects, \$200,000 BTF GPR  
(revised total allocation of \$600,000), UW System

- - -

Regent Lavine moved adoption of the following resolution, the motion was properly seconded, and it was voted, with Regents Beckwith, DeBardeleben, Elliott, Erdman, Fitzgerald, Fox, Gerrard, Grover, Hales, Lavine, Lawton, Majerus and Walter voting "Aye":

Resolution 1869: That the meeting recess into closed session to consider personnel matters as permitted by S. 19.85(1)(c), WIS. STATS.

The meeting recessed into closed session at 1:17 P.M.

---

The Board arose from closed session at 1:56 P.M.

President Hales announced that the following resolutions had been approved in the closed session:

Resolution 1870: That, upon recommendation of the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater Chancellor and the President of the University of Wisconsin System, the following appointments to the Board of Visitors, University of Wisconsin-Whitewater, be approved:

Term ending June 30, 1981

John A. Formella, Milwaukee, Wis.  
 Mrs. Doris Highsmith, Fort Atkinson, Wis.  
 Richard I. Jensen, Mukwonago, Wis.  
 Lester Jones, Beloit, Wis.  
 Erwin H. Voigt, Madison, Wis.

Term ending June 30, 1982

Mrs. Mary Ebbott, Helenville, Wis.  
 William B. Fardy, Mequon, Wis.  
 John F. Graham, Whitewater, Wis.  
 George Murphy, Madison, Wis.  
 William Wolfe, Waukesha, Wis.

Term ending June 30, 1983

Mrs. Lea Argiris, Whitewater, Wis.  
 Stephen Nass, Whitewater, Wis.  
 Quinn C. Smet, Whitewater, Wis.  
 Donald R. Tully, Jefferson, Wis.  
 Mrs. Fern Young, Palmyra, Wis.

Resolution 1871: **That the status of William Kuepper be changed from Associate Professor of Regional Analysis and Geography at UW-Green Bay to Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Associate Professor of Regional Analysis and Geography at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay effective July 1, 1979, at an annual salary of \$38,000.**

(The announcement of the above resolution was contingent upon the finalization of administrative arrangements at UW-Green Bay, which was accomplished on April 11, 1979.)

Resolution 1872: **That the resignation of Edwin Young as President of the University of Wisconsin System effective January 31, 1980, be received with regret.**

(Announcement of the following resolution approved at the March 9, 1979, meeting was withheld pending notification from the recipients of the honorary degrees that they would be present at Commencement to accept the degrees.)

Resolution 1873: **That upon recommendation of the President of the System and the Chancellor of the UW-Madison, the following persons be awarded Honorary Degrees, contingent upon acceptance, to be awarded at Commencement exercises in May, 1979, at the University of Wisconsin-Madison:**

Gene M. Amdahl, Doctor of Science  
 Ray D. Owen, Doctor of Science  
 Fernando Garcia Roel, Doctor of Science  
 Veda Stone, Doctor of Humane Letters  
 Manfred Swarsensky, Doctor of Humane Letters

The meeting adjourned at 1:57 P.M.



or a properly constituted Committee or Panel of the Board, is precluded by UWS 3.08 (3) from hearing the appeal of the petitioners. Chancellor Haas then made the statement of which a copy was filed with the Hearing Panel and is annexed.

The Chairman of the Hearing Panel then called upon the attorney for the petitioners for his responsive statement. The attorney for the petitioners reviewed the factual background and contended, among other things, that the granting of tenure to Doctor J. Kenneth Davidson, Sr., other than upon recommendation of the Department of Sociology at University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire, was a violation of §36.13 (1) (a), Wisconsin Statutes, and of UWS 3.06 (1) (a) and UWS 3.08 (3), Wisconsin Administrative Code, and that it would be improper to allow the decision of the Chancellor to stand as final, under the concluding sentence of UWS 3.08 (3), Wisconsin Administrative Code, in the face of a challenge to the procedure which had led to the Chancellor's decision. The question was posed as to whether a chancellor could be properly a final judge when the procedures he had approved were brought into question. The attorney for the petitioners did not contend that the Board had exceeded its authority under §36.13 (3), Wisconsin Statutes, in respect to the adoption of the appeal procedures contained in UWS 3.08, Wisconsin Administrative Code.

It was noted by a Hearing Panel member that inasmuch as only the president of the University of Wisconsin System has authority to grant tenure, giving to a chancellor the right of final decision on an appeal involving the validity of a grant of tenure would, in effect, confer upon a chancellor the power to review the acts of the president and that, therefore, the concluding sentence of UWS 3.08, Wisconsin Administrative Code, probably means something less than its language suggests.

An opportunity was given to Chancellor Haas and Vice Chancellor Morris to present rebuttal statements. A further opportunity was given to all of those in attendance to make any further statements desired.

The hearing was then closed, and the Hearing Panel met in executive session for the purpose of deliberating upon the issue presented.

Upon the record and upon the respective contentions made, the Hearing Panel unanimously concludes that the appeal of the petitioner should be heard by the Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System, or by a Committee or Panel thereof, upon the merits, and the Hearing Panel unanimously recommends to the Board as follows:

1. That the appeal of the petitioners be heard by the Board or by a Committee or Panel of the Board constituted for that purpose;
2. That such hearing be upon the record, but that the petitioners and the Chancellor, respectively, be given a reasonable opportunity, in advance of the hearing, to make an election to amplify the record;
3. That if either the petitioners or the Chancellor elect to amplify the record, the party or parties so electing shall indicate the respects in which it is desired to amplify the record in sufficient particularity to permit a reasoned decision as to the amount of time probably required therefor;
4. That in the event of an election to amplify the record and if it shall

appear that such amplification of the record will involve the presentation of testimony, a hearing officer be appointed; and

5. That following the settling of the record, the hearing of the petitioner's appeal proceed upon 10 days notice in writing to the petitioners and the Chancellor at such place as the Chancellor shall designate at University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire.

Dated the 27th day of March, 1979, nunc pro tunc the 23rd day of March, 1979.



Arthur DeBardleben,  
Chairman of Hearing Panel.

## DAVIDSON STATEMENT

The question before us today is whether section UWS 3.08(3) precludes the board of regents, or a committee of the board, from considering the merits of the appeal which has been requested by members of the Sociology Department at UW-Eau Claire concerning the granting of tenure of Dr. J. Kenneth Davidson? I believe the answer is yes. That is, section UWS 3.08(3) precludes board consideration of the matter. In the alternative, even if that section permits such board consideration, I'd argue that the board should not consider the matter in this case.

The plain language of section 3.08(3) provides that appeal procedures are complete and exhausted at the institutional level, not the board level. The last sentence of the section reads: "The decision of the chancellor will be final on such matters." The clear intent, meaning, and effect of that provision is that decisions relating to appeals from a nonrenewal of a probationary faculty appointment, including one which involves the granting or denial of tenure, shall be made at the university level. Unlike other sections of the board faculty personnel rules that specifically provide for review or action by the board of regents, this section explicitly forecloses that possibility by declaring that the decision of the chancellor shall be final. Thus, under its own rules, the board is precluded from hearing the matter requested by the faculty here.

Even if the section allows the board to hear the matter, I believe that it should not in this case. If the rule permits board action, I believe that the regents should--indeed, must--require a high standard from a petitioner to justify why the board should intervene in what the rules treat as an institutional matter. Given <sup>that</sup> how the rules have established an appeals



procedure which is complete at the university level, and the presumed seriousness and good faith with which faculty and a chancellor approach their duties and responsibilities in an appeal, the board should intervene only in the clearest cases of claimed error. I don't believe that such a case exists here.

As the petitioners state in their reply brief, dated February 7, 1979, there is no factual dispute here. If there is a significant dispute that warrants board action, it is whether the faculty appeals body's decision not to return the case to the department for another consideration comports with the remand requirements under section UWS 3.08(3). In my judgment, since there is no argument on the facts, the remaining issue is simply not one serious enough to warrant board intervention here. It may be appropriate in some circumstances that the board should give an interpretation of what it believes is acceptable conduct to meet the requirements of its rules. But given the facts in this case--which have already been presented to you in the statements and supporting documents offered by each of the parties--I do not believe that the petitioners have presented a case of such importance to warrant your consideration an action on the merits.

REPORT OF NON-PERSONNEL ACTIONS BY ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS  
to the  
BOARD OF REGENTS  
AND INFORMATIONAL ITEMS REPORTED FOR THE REGENT RECORD

6 April 1979

I. CONTRACTS AWARDED.

A. UW-EAU CLAIRE

1. 1977-79 Small Energy Conservation Projects  
University of Wisconsin - Eau Claire  
(Project No. 7803-19)

<u>CONTRACT AWARD</u>	<u>CONTRACT AMOUNT</u>
a. <u>HVAC Modifications</u> -- Brewer Hall (7803-19B) Johnson Controls 2720 Commerce Street P. O. Box 815 La Crosse, WI 54601	\$ 14,990.00
TOTAL CONTRACT AWARD	\$ 14,990.00

B. UW-LA CROSSE

1. 1977-79 Wittich Hall Handicapped Barrier Removal  
University of Wisconsin - La Crosse  
(Project No. 7802-22)

<u>CONTRACT AWARDS</u>	<u>CONTRACT AMOUNTS</u>
a. <u>General Construction</u> Fowler & Hammer, Inc. 157 Summer Street La Crosse, WI 54601	\$ 119,252.00
b. <u>Plumbing, Heating, Ventilating &amp; A/C</u> Hengel Brothers, Inc. W1950 Abbey Road Onalaska, WI 54650	\$ 34,514.00

EXHIBIT B

c. <u>Electrical</u>		
Wettstein & Sons, Inc.	\$	19,885.00
215 North Third Street		
La Crosse, WI 54601		
d. <u>Elevator</u>		
Northwestern Elevator Company	\$	30,899.00
6070 North Flint Road		
Milwaukee, WI 53209		
		<hr/>
TOTAL CONTRACT AWARDS	\$	204,550.00

C. UW-MADISON

1. 1973-75/1977-79 Additional Accelerator  
Facilities, Physical Sciences Lab.  
Synchrotron - Radiation Center (Aladdin)  
University of Wisconsin - Madison  
(Project No. 7707-21)

	<u>CONTRACT AWARDS</u>	<u>CONTRACT AMOUNTS</u>
a. <u>General</u>		
J. H. Findorff & Son, Inc.	\$	672,322.00
601 West Wilson Street		
Madison, WI 53701		
b. <u>Plumbing</u>		
Osborn's, Inc.	\$	87,400.00
145 West Grand Avenue		
Beloit, WI 53511		
c. <u>Heating, Ventilating &amp; A/C</u>		
Badger Mechanical	\$	253,879.00
1825 Nelson Street		
Madison, WI 53704		
d. <u>Electrical</u>		
Wiersma Electric	\$	87,121.00
175 Hopkins Drive		
Randolph, WI 53956		

e.	<u>Elevator</u>		
	Northwestern Elevator Company	\$	21,829.00
	6070 North Flint Road		
	Milwaukee, WI 53209		
f.	<u>Balancing</u>		
	Johnson Controls, Inc.	\$	2,650.00
	1119 Jonathon Drive		
	Madison, WI 53713		
			<hr/>
	TOTAL CONTRACT AWARDS	\$	1,125,201.00
2.	1978 Chadbourne Hall Roof Replacement		
	University of Wisconsin - Madison		
	(Project No. 7807-19)		
	<u>CONTRACT AWARD</u>		<u>CONTRACT AMOUNT</u>
a.	<u>Roofing &amp; Related Work</u>		
	D. C. Taylor Company	\$	55,138.00
	2610 Seiferth Road		
	Madison, WI 53716		
			<hr/>
	TOTAL CONTRACT AWARD	\$	55,138.00
3.	1977-79 Charmany Farms Dairy Barn and		
	Biohazard Laboratory Remodeling		
	University of Wisconsin - Madison		
	(Project No. 7805-20)		
	<u>CONTRACT AWARDS</u>		<u>CONTRACT AMOUNTS</u>
a.	<u>General Construction</u>		
	Joe Daniels Construction	\$	168,318.00
	901 Stewart Street		
	Madison, WI 53715		
b.	<u>Plumbing</u>		
	PHC, Inc.	\$	35,110.00
	1017 Jonathon Drive		
	Madison, WI 53713		
c.	<u>Heating, Ventilating &amp; A/C</u>		
	Advance Temperature Technicians, Inc.	\$	80,855.00
	4900 U.S. Highway 51		
	McFarland, WI 53558		

d. <u>Electrical</u>	
Wiersma Electric	\$ 34,520.00
175 Hopkins Drive	
Randolph, WI 53956	
e. <u>Air System Testing and Balancing Work</u>	
Bal-Air & Associates, Inc.	\$ 1,325.00
1109 North Mayfair Road	
Milwaukee, WI 53226	
TOTAL CONTRACT AWARDS	\$ 320,128.00

4. 1975-77 Zoology Cold Room/Refrigeration  
System Modifications (Noland Hall)  
University of Wisconsin - Madison  
(Project No. 7605-06)

<u>CONTRACT AWARD</u>	<u>CONTRACT AMOUNT</u>
a. <u>Compressor Work</u>	
Vilter Sales & Construction Company	\$ 2,500.00
2217 South First Street	
Milwaukee, WI 53207	
TOTAL CONTRACT AWARD	\$ 2,500.00

D. UW-MILWAUKEE

1. 1977-79 Studio Theater Dimmer and  
Sound Systems Replacements  
University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee  
(Project No. 7807-26)

<u>CONTRACT AWARDS</u>	<u>CONTRACT AMOUNTS</u>
a. <u>Dimmer System</u>	
Staff Electric Company	\$ 23,500.00
P. O. Box 1441	
1659 North Jackson	
Milwaukee, WI 53201	
b. <u>Sound System</u>	
American Audio Systems, Division of	\$ 27,900.00
American Television of Madison, Inc.	
2202 West Beltline Highway	
Madison, WI 53713	
TOTAL CONTRACT AWARDS	\$ 51,400.00

2. 1977-79 Three Boilers Tube Acid Cleaning  
University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee  
(Project No. 7810-21)

<u>CONTRACT AWARD</u>	<u>CONTRACT AMOUNT</u>
a. <u>Boiler Tube Chemical Cleaning</u> Ohman Industrial Chemical Service P. O. Box 583 Geneva, IL 60134	\$ 23,085.00
<hr/>	
TOTAL CONTRACT AWARD	\$ 23,085.00

E. UW-OSHKOSH

1. 1977-79 Computer Center Modifications  
(Dempsey Hall -- Building No. 0002)  
University of Wisconsin - Oshkosh  
(Project No. 7711-22)

<u>CONTRACT AWARDS</u>	<u>CONTRACT AMOUNTS</u>
a. <u>General</u> August Pitz & Sons 459C Church Avenue Oshkosh, WI 54901	\$ 29,990.00
b. <u>Plumbing, Heating, Ventilating &amp; A/C</u> E. C. Merrill, Inc. 804 Witzel Avenue Oshkosh, WI 54901	\$ 12,000.00
c. <u>Electrical</u> Reigel Electric Corporation 3050 West Elberg Avenue Appleton, WI 54911	\$ 24,160.00
<hr/>	
TOTAL CONTRACT AWARDS	\$ 66,150.00

F. UW-PLATTEVILLE

1. 1977-79 Rountree House Masonry Repairs  
University of Wisconsin - Platteville  
(Project No. 7805-56)

CONTRACT AWARDCONTRACT AMOUNTa. General

B&B Quality Building  
Restoration, Inc.  
118 West Broadway  
Madison, WI 53716

\$ 6,860.00

---

TOTAL CONTRACT AWARD

\$ 6,860.00

G. UW-RIVER FALLS

1. 1977-79 Small Energy Conservation Projects  
University of Wisconsin - River Falls  
(Project No. 7803-19)

CONTRACT AWARDCONTRACT AMOUNTa. A/C Modifications -- Library (7803-19E)

Twin City Trane Service  
5916 Pleasant Avenue South  
Minneapolis, MN 55419

\$ 5,970.00

---

TOTAL CONTRACT AWARD

\$ 5,970.00

H. UW-STEVENS POINT

1. 1973-75 Masonry Repair and Tuckpointing/  
Nine Buildings (Phase 2 - Nelson Hall)  
University of Wisconsin - Stevens Point  
(Project No. 7406-43)

CONTRACT AWARDCONTRACT AMOUNTa. Masonry Restoration

Quality Building Restoration  
Company, Inc.  
1024 East Park Ridge  
Appleton, WI 54911

\$ 9,200.00

---

TOTAL CONTRACT AWARD

\$ 9,200.00

I. UW-STOUT

1. 1977-79 Communications Center  
Energy Conservation  
University of Wisconsin - Stout  
(Project No. 7810-25)

CONTRACT AWARDCONTRACT AMOUNTa. Mechanical

Hovland Sheet Metal, Inc.  
East Melby Street  
Eau Claire, WI 54701

\$ 12,612.00

---

TOTAL CONTRACT AWARD

\$ 12,612.00

J. UW-SUPERIOR

1. 1977-79 Small Energy Conservation Projects  
(Holden Fine Arts Building)  
University of Wisconsin - Superior  
(Project No. 7803-19)

CONTRACT AWARDCONTRACT AMOUNTa. HVAC System Modifications

Honeywell  
7400 Metro Boulevard  
Edina, MN 55435

\$ 11,140.00

---

TOTAL CONTRACT AWARD

\$ 11,140.00

K. UW-WHITEWATER

1. 1979 Temperature Control System  
Calibration  
University of Wisconsin - Whitewater  
(Project No. 7902-38)

CONTRACT AWARDCONTRACT AMOUNTa. Temperature Control  
System Calibration

Johnson Controls  
417 East Chicago Street  
Milwaukee, WI 53202

\$ 6,102.00

---

TOTAL CONTRACT AWARD

\$ 6,102.00





G. To Be Published by UW-Press:

<u>TITLE</u>	<u>AUTHOR</u>
"The Nichols File of 'The Gentleman's Magazine': Attributions of Authorship and Other Documentation in Editorial Papers at the Folger Library"	James M. Kuist
"Louis Sullivan's Theme of Nature"	Narciso G. Menocal
"Commentary on <u>The Brothers Karamozov</u> "	Victor Terras

IV. REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE STATE BUILDING COMMISSION ON 20 MARCH 1979 AFFECTING THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN SYSTEM.

UNIVERSITY	PROJECT	ACTION
UW-MADISON	Requested authority to increase the budget for the 1978 Union South Snack Bar Addition project, by \$18,200, for a revised total project cost of \$93,200.	APPROVED
2. UW-OSHKOSH	Requested allotment of an additional \$13,850 of State Building Trust Funds for the 1977-79 Computer Center Modifications project for a revised total project cost of \$81,850.	APPROVED

NOTE: Because the March 1979 meetings of the Sub-Committee for Higher Education and the State Building Commission were primarily devoted to actions related to the 1979-81 State Building Program, the following Agency Requests have been deferred to the April 1979 meetings:

- MAJOR:
1. Requests approval of the Concept and Budget Report; authority to use an additional \$10,000 of Gift Funds for the preparation of final plans and specifications; and authority to bid and construct the 1977-79 Lakeshore Improvements project, on the campus at UW-Madison, for an estimated project cost of \$250,000.
  2. Requests approval of the Concept and Budget Report and authority to prepare final plans, bid, and construct the UW-Oshkosh portion of the UW-System 1977-79 Mechanical and Electrical Monitoring project for an estimated total project cost of \$340,000.

- MINOR:
1. Requests allotment of \$168,400 of State Building Trust Funds to plan, bid, and construct a 1977-79 Steam and Condensate Line Insulation project on the campus at UW-Green Bay.
  2. Requests approval of the Concept and Budget Report, release of an additional \$6,500 of Advance Planning Funds, and authority to prepare final plans, bid, and construct the 1977-79 Wilder Hall Handicapped Accessibility project, on the campus at UW-La Crosse, for an estimated total project cost of \$141,200.
  3. Requests allotment of \$55,500 of State Building Trust Funds to plan, bid, and construct a 1977-79 AGS Collections - Library Modifications project on the campus at UW-Milwaukee.
  4. Requests authority to plan, bid, and construct a 1979 Four Residence Halls Masonry Repairs project, on the campus at UW-River Falls, for an estimated total project cost of \$40,000.
  5. Requests authority to plan, bid, and construct a 1979 Six Building Masonry Repair/Caulking project, on the campus at UW-Stout, for an estimated total project cost of \$34,000.
  6. Requests allotment of \$45,000 of State Building Trust Funds for the preparation of a 1977-79 Campus Heating/Chilling Plants Energy Conservation Study/ Report on the campuses at UW-Eau Claire, UW-Green Bay, UW-La Crosse, UW-Oshkosh, UW-Parkside, UW-Platteville, UW-River Falls, UW-Stevens Point, UW-Stout, UW-Superior, and UW-Whitewater.

Request to the Trustees of the  
William F. Vilas Trust Estate  
for Support of Scholarships,  
Fellowships and Professorships

EDUCATION COMMITTEE

Resolution 1857:

That, upon recommendation of the President of the University of Wisconsin System, the Board of Regents request that the Trustees of the William F. Vilas Trust Estate supply the following funds for the fiscal year July 1, 1979 to June 30, 1980, subject to the availability of funds, as provided by the terms of the William F. Vilas Trust:

- |  |                 |             |
|--|-----------------|-------------|
| 1. Continuation of 10 Vilas Undergraduate Scholarships<br>at \$400.00 each                                       |                 | \$ 4,000.00 |
| 2. Continuation of 10 Vilas Graduate Fellowships:  |                 |             |
| a. 5 at \$600.00 each  | \$ 3,000.00     |             |
| b. 5 traveling Fellowships at \$1,500.00 each  | <u>7,500.00</u> | 10,500.00   |
| 3. Continuation of 16 Vilas Research Professorships<br>at \$10,000.00 each for the academic year, as<br>follows: |                 | 160,000.00  |

Leonard Berkowitz - Vilas Research Professor  
in Psychology, College of Letters and Science,  
UW-Madison

Robert B. Bird - Vilas Research Professor of  
Chemical Engineering, College of Engineering,  
UW-Madison

Steven H. Chaffee - Vilas Research Professor  
of Journalism and Mass Communication, College  
of Letters and Science, UW-Madison

Fred Harvey Harrington - Vilas Research  
Professor in History, University of Wisconsin

Ihab Hassan - Vilas Research Professor in  
English and Comparative Literature, College  
of Letters and Science, UW-Milwaukee

Jost Hermand - Vilas Research Professor in  
German, College of Letters and Science,  
UW-Madison

J. Willard Hurst - Vilas Research Professor  
in Law, Law School, UW-Madison

Robert J. Lampman - Vilas Research Professor  
of Economics, College of Letters and Science,  
UW-Madison

EXHIBIT C

4/6/79

Henry A. Lardy - Vilas Research Professor  
of Biological Sciences, College of Agricultural  
and Life Sciences and Graduate School, UW-Madison

Willard F. Mueller - Vilas Research Professor of  
Agricultural Economics, College of Agricultural  
and Life Sciences, UW-Madison

Walter Rudin - Vilas Research Professor of  
Mathematics, College of Letters and Science,  
UW-Madison

Antonio Sanchez-Barbudo - Vilas Research  
Professor in Spanish and Portuguese, College  
of Letters and Science, UW-Madison

William H. Sewell - Vilas Research Professor  
in Sociology, College of Letters and Science,  
UW-Madison

Jan M. Vansina - Vilas Research Professor of  
History, College of Letters and Science,  
UW-Madison

Professor to be named - Fellman replacement

Professor to be named - Willard replacement

4.	Auxiliary Allowances per detailed budgets previously submitted to the Trustees for the 16 Vilas Research Professors named above		\$160,000.00
5.	a.	Continuation of 50 additional Scholarships at \$400.00 each	\$20,000.00
	b.	Continuation of 50 additional Fellowships at \$600.00 each	<u>30,000.00</u> 50,000.00
6.	Continuation of eighty (80) additional Scholarships at \$400.00 each under the provisions of Paragraph (E), Article Fourth of the Deed of Gift and Conveyance by the Trustees of the Estate of William F. Vilas		<u>32,000.00</u>
	TOTAL		\$416,500.00