

Approved 11/06/07

**Ad Hoc Documents Committee Meeting**  
**Department of Family Development**  
**Thursday, April 26, 2007**  
**WisLine**

Present: Nancy Crevier, Bev Doll, Kathy Eisenmann, Jane Jensen, Peggy Nordgren, Linda Olson, Michelle Tidemann, Janay Ziebell, Judy Knudsen

Absent: Chris Kniep, Jackie Carattini, Angela Flickinger (on medical leave),

**Call to order** - Meeting was called to order by Peggy Nordgren at 12:30 p.m.

I. **Welcome and Introductions** –

II. **Certification of Wisconsin Open Meeting Law compliance** - Peggy Nordgren certified the meeting was in compliance with Open Meeting Law by indicating it was posted through Mary Detra's office as required by Open Meeting Law Section 19.84 of the Wisconsin State Statutes.

III. **Review Purpose of Committee/Committee Tasks** – reviewed minutes of previous meeting pertaining to purpose.

IV. **Discussion of New Issues Pertaining To Our Documents since Last Meeting**

- SRP is discussing better integrating of faculty documents with department documents.

V. **Review Other Departments Documents** – Began discussing other documents using at chart developed by Nordgren. Discussed the top of the organizational chart first, and then moved into differences in committees. Questions posed included:

- Why the Executive Committee? If it delegates all of its jobs out to committees, it becomes a grievance committee only.
- Why is the secretary an annual appointment?
- Why does the Department of Youth Development separate the Research & Studies Committee from the Professional Development Advisory Committee?

Became clear there were differences in how departments handled the mentoring and review process for promotion and tenure. This affected SRP committees, vice chairs and mentoring team processes. Also discussed the need to have a "leadership council" for the chair to call upon for counsel and discussion about major decisions department chairs need to make. Could be chairs of all committees.

Also discussed role of probationary faculty. If vice chairs become tenured, what role will probationary faculty have? Why should they care? This has to be kept in mind when making changes in our department's procedures.

**VI. Next Steps**

- Knudsen will email Ray Schultz to get answers about the purpose and role of the executive committee. Why have one if it delegates all its responsibilities to other committees? Wouldn't a grievance committee be as useful?
- Knudsen will ask Donna about what decisions she makes now which could be delegated to another committee or would a "leadership council" for advice be more appropriate?
- Committee felt it was time to open up the discussion on three items to the whole department at the next department meeting before more work was done. At next meeting, committee will develop talking points for the department meeting discussion on:
  - The role of probationary faculty
  - Potential role of a new "leadership council"
  - How to improve the tenure process as it relates to mentoring, vice chair committee and SRP committee.

**VII. Assign New Tasks**

- Knudsen will report at next meeting on information from Secretary of the Faculty and department chair and invite Donna to next meeting.
- Before the next committee meeting, committee members will review how each department handles the tenure process, including mentoring, three year reviews, reviewing tenure documents, etc. Review SRP, vice chair and mentor teams' roles.
- Think of potential talking points for department meeting.

**VIII. Set Meeting Date** – June 11 from 2:00-4:00 pm.

**IX. Adjourned** at 2:20 pm.

Submitted by Peggy Nordgren, chair