

*Draft distributed – not yet approved*

**University Committee Meeting Minutes  
December 12, 2006  
The Pyle Center – Madison, WI**

**Call to Order/Certification of Open Meeting Notice Compliance**

Chair Burke called the meeting to order at 11:55 and certified compliance with the Wisconsin Open Meetings Law. Members present: Rob Burke, Mark Kopecky, Karen Nelson, Mary Gruenewald, David Nack, Tom Hooyer. Others attending: David Wilson, Ray Schultz, Kate Wodyn.

**Approval of Minutes of November 8, 2006 meeting**

Hearing no suggested changes Burke considered them approved.

**Chancellor Remarks**

Chancellor David Wilson indicated he would give a brief update at this meeting and will go into a longer discussion at the Faculty Senate meeting. The Board of Regents have approved a 5.23% pay increase for each year of the biennium (all from GPR) and this request will go to the state. Personnel updates: On December 15 he plans to announce the interim dean for Cooperative Extension. Wilson has spent the last couple of weeks in an exhaustive consultative process around this appointment. He is looking at this appointment being longer, two years, with a national search conducted in the third year. Next week he will be charging a search and screen committee for the Chief Information Officer position; Melissa Mayo will chair this committee. The Dean of Continuing Education Outreach and E-Learning search is moving along; final interviews will be conducted in January. In Communications and Marketing, he is nearing end of his consultation process regarding that appointment and will be making a permanent appointment in the next couple weeks. Also, we will use existing personnel for permanent appointments in Human Resources and Administrative Services.

At the February 7 Shared Vision event, the “shared themes” will be the focus of his address. After February 7, he is hoping to engage Dennis Jones of NCHEMS (National Center for Higher Education Management Systems), as a consultant to assist us with an institutional strategic plan, although he also stated that this is not set in stone, the process is fluid. This means we’ll come up with a set of broad goals that would encompass the four divisions of UWEX and UW Colleges. From those broad goals, each entity would then be responsible for devising its own strategic plan. It is not his intent to dictate to Cooperative Extension how to do its strategic planning, but rather that they would know what the broad institutional goals are, and he expects to see kinship. He emphasized that to his knowledge UWEX has never had a strategic plan across the institution, but rather has operated as four units. He is attempting to set some broad goals across the institution. The divisional plans would be a mini-version of the institutional plan. He hopes that when one division puts together its team for strategic planning, the first four members would be one person from the other units, so from the beginning you are listening to voices from outside your unit but still within the institution. This is one means to create greater awareness in the institution of what we do and what we will do going forward. Hooyer asked what role there is for faculty as a group to shape the institutional shared vision and themes and the strategic plan. Chancellor Wilson responded that is what he has been doing for the last seven months with the listening sessions. When the reports from the listening sessions are made public, everyone will see “how honest the Chancellor has been” in identifying these themes. At the town hall meeting on Jan 8 he will share the themes. Hooyer expressed that he has heard concerns that, as a group, faculty have not had the opportunity to participate in the development of these themes. Wilson said this question came up very early in this process; so he determined that he would consult with Academic Staff Council and Faculty Senate. Rather, he was told that he needed to interact more widely with the faculty and that’s why they designed the process as they did instead of working with just the governance groups. Nack expressed that to the extent the themes result in changes to policy/governance, Faculty Senate would have to be involved. Wilson commented that, for instance, one theme that has emerged is the need to market our institutions more aggressively. Also, we cannot continue to exist just on public dollars; how can we make our institutions more attractive to private money? Another theme might be innovation; how do we continue to be on the cutting edge of instruction, rather than in the traditional paradigm?. Nelson asked about seeing information on the web. Wilson responded that as soon as the Commission report reaches him he will

post it on web. Reports on the internal and external listening sessions will also be posted. Burke expressed that a critical part of the process is ferreting out the themes and he thinks faculty would like to be involved in that process; and asked if the Jan 8 town hall meeting will be to present already determined themes? Wilson responded that he has no objection to faculty playing that role. He is willing to turn over reports to faculty leadership and have them look at them and have them identify themes before Jan 8. Hooyer explained that he has no problem with themes being identified on Jan 8 but then to have subsequent discussion on them, with an opportunity to take them back to colleagues for further input. The report from the professional facilitator will have identified some themes from the external listening sessions. Burke feels that what would not work is that if the themes are presented on Jan 8 as cast in stone. He indicated that if there is no opportunity for input it is not a shared vision. Wilson indicated that the Jan 8 meeting is the "first cut" on the themes. Feb 7 is "where we see the world". Jan 8 is the road to get to Feb 7. He will not be presenting anything that is set in stone. Gruenewald said maybe we also need to think about what happens after February. Wilson commented that he has had no concerns expressed from the faculty/staff in UW Colleges regarding this process – the cultures are very different. We are trying to design a process that is almost in the middle so that it is acceptable to both institutions. He is walking a tightrope. On the Colleges side they are seeing an almost endless consultation process; on the Cooperative Extension side it is seen as not having enough involvement. Wilson asked if there is only 50% kinship with themes at the end of the Jan 8 meeting, what would the next steps be before Feb 7? What do we need to do to be more open and transparent? Karen Nelson felt that the communications about the Jan 8 meeting may have given people the impression that there would be no opportunity for input on the themes unveiled on Jan 8. Wilson has said that they have tried to open this process up as much as possible when conducting the focus groups and listening sessions and he commended the staff involved in doing this. Nack commented that we should consider a different timeline than Jan 8/Feb 7 so that each unit has time to reflect on the themes, because there is a lot to consider. Burke suggested that if on Jan 8 there does not seem to be a lot of agreement, to consider moving back the February date. Wilson said this would be difficult because this date has already been shared and other external forces are exerting pressure to move forward quickly. Burke appreciated that clarification on the purpose of the Jan 8 meeting was made.

**Adjourned to the Faculty Senate meeting at 1:05 p.m.**

Recorded by Wodyn, 12-12-06