

Department of Family Development

Committee of Professors Meeting Minutes

Meeting conducted via teleconference

October 29, 2010

Met via teleconference 1:00 -3:45 p.m.

1. Call to order and verification of open Meeting Law Compliance.
Chairperson Mary Meehan-Strub called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. The meeting was posted as required by Open Meeting Law Section 19.84 of the Wisconsin state Statutes.
2. Roll Call:
Members present included: Faye Malek, Marilyn Herman, Chris Kniep, Joan LeFebvre, Marma McIntee, Mary Meehan Stub and Karen Dickrell.
3. Approval of January 29, 2010 minutes.
Marilyn Herman moved and Marma McIntee seconded to approve the minutes of the January 29, 2010 meeting and place on file. Motion carried.
4. Election of Officers
Marilyn Herman nominated Mary Meehan Strub as Chair of the Professors Committee. Joan Lefebvre seconded. Joan Lefebvre moved to close nominations and cast a unanimous ballot. Faye Malek seconded. Motion carried.

Marma McIntee nominated Karen Dickrell as secretary and Joan Lefebvre seconded. Joan LeFebvre moved to close nominations and cast a unanimous ballot. Faye Malek seconded. Motion carried.
5. Candidates Request for Mentor

We reviewed the department members who have had and currently serve in mentor roles. We also discussed the timing of when to assign a mentor to a department member. (See other business/concerns – under #10.)
6. Process for Submitting Promotion Materials for Professor

Discussion was held on how the Faculty Tenure review process worked out with some of the candidates submitting their paperwork electronically. It saves on printing and mailing costs. There was some concern that when items are sent as attachments, some items might be lost. Scanning the original would be one option.

Different methods were discussed. Department members could post their document to a site. Include a check list of what is sent out. Recommend using mostly PDF files. We discussed if it

should be password protected. Perhaps there could be a share point where that is password protected. Information could also be printed on one DVD so it is all found in one location. We discussed the challenge that some cannot open all attachments such as TV spots and other supporting materials may not read the same on all equipment.

The Primary and Secondary readers still got a hard copy. It was recommended we do more investigating and see what was done in the Department of Agriculture and Department of Youth Development Professor process. We discussed potential discussion with Bill Haffman, Ted Bay and/or Bob Cropp to ask them to share the highlights, cautions and lessons learned from electronic submissions.

7. Discussion/Review of Department and Program Area Meetings at All-Staff Conference. The committee discussed the Department and Program Area meetings held and the 2010 All-Staff Conference. Specific areas covered included:

- There is limited understanding of governance and how it fits together.
- Agent/Educators have different understanding of how faculty governance works.
- There are concerns about the commitment and the future of extension and where the funding will come from.
- There are some challenges with the faculty role with grant funded programs
- We seem to be “bogged down” but not sure if it is in the bigger vision or the process.
- People are not aware of all the faculty documents that are available to them.
- We heard questions about faculty members that have salaries on soft money, what it means to be tenured and how that impacts with academic staff annual renewals.

We also heard that there are concerns about commitment and the future of extension and where the future funding will come from. It was recommended that we invite Greg Hutchins to our meeting at the JCEP conference.

1. Educate our selves
2. Know what information to share with others
3. There is a need for an organizational chart that defines who/how we interact
4. Historical perspective is important and we have core principles that were covered in the table discussions.

We discussed issues of ½ time WNEP/ ½ time Department roles and how that has an effect on the department. We also discussed program teams and the faculty impact on issues.

The status of faculty was also discussed, how to help others understand the value of faculty status and how they can get involved. Who do you surround yourself with professionally? The culture of the department needs to look at trust and understanding. We have some academic challenges, opportunities and the need to balance it all together.

JCEP is a starting point but we may need to do a webinar.

Suggestions for JCEP /Department Meeting possibly Tuesday afternoon.

Greg Hutchins Keynote – talk to the Department of Family Development and then have a panel discussion. We discussed if ½ a day would be enough time. We would need to really find ways to address the value of being a faculty member. WNEP issues need to be kept separate.

Value of faculty

What is faculty Status?

Elements

Standards

Distinguish the academic staff and tenure track

- 1) Beyond relationship with WNEP impact on our work
- 2) A look at the total program
- 3) Differences in the work we do
- 4) Relationships with partners

Realize that WNEP affects the entire office, relationships are important.

Action: Chris Kniep said she would ask Greg Hutchins if he is available to be a keynote at our department meeting.

- 8) Future of the Department of Family Development Faculty Appointments and Family Living Programs
* Joan LeFebvre has compiled an extensive listing of our discussion points that are included at the end of the minutes. (see page 6)

Laurie Boyce has asked our program area to evaluate the structure of our work teams. The team will meet in January and there will be a meeting of the Team Chairs/Co-chairs in February.

Structure of Family Living:

It was suggested that we are too broad. We need to be based on research. We would also like to see more specialists involved with teams and help the teams be better coordinated. One example is the multiple health teams that we have. Are we subject based or client based?

In our larger groups we need to look at the concepts of evaluation, decision making, time allocation, resource management and resiliency. We also need to expand our base and strategy so that we ensure that the skills have a process such as Strategic Planning, Conflict Management, Community Building, Capacity Building, Leadership development, Outcomes, Evaluation, and Process Thinking.

We need to rebuild capacity to see the big picture. We need to identify and recognize the trends and build relevant partnerships to be ready with our scholarly work in the communities.

Perhaps we need to limit the team membership and have representation from the various districts/geographic regions of the state.

9. Future meeting date(s)

There are no candidates for promotion in 2011.

Request information from Bob Cropp how the Department of Ag/Ag Business changed their document submission process, lessons learned, etc.

It was suggested we have a meeting early in February via Wisline to meet and prepare for the JCEP/Department meeting. Suggested agenda items were:

- a.) JCEP
- b.) Ag Electronic submissions
- c.) Youth Development electronic submissions
- d.) Resource Engine Plan
- e.) Future workshops: "Thinking about Writing for Professor?"
- f.) Other Items

January 28 is one option. Another date suggested was February 18.

10. Other Business/concerns (for discussion only)

- a. Do we have a voice in administrative decisions with interim positions? The concern is rank at hire and it was recommended we check with Donna.
- b. The request for mentor assignment was brought back to the group. Mentors for Professor candidates do not have the same type of appointment and/or responsibilities as mentors and mentor teams for untenured faculty. The committee discussed that candidates should complete at least one Tenured Faculty Review process before applying for rank change to Professor. The TFR process would then suggest the next steps involved in achieving a promotion. Nothing precludes a faculty member from personally requesting support from department colleagues.
- c. We discussed if we should have a meeting with all professors to discuss or debrief on the past/ future mentors and how to assist with the process.
- d. Need to discuss how we can strengthen our department and program area.

11. Adjourn:

Marma McIntee moved to adjourn seconded by Faye Malek. Meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Karen Dickrell, Secretary

Input for work team restructuring from Professor Committee

October 29, 2010

I recorded the extemporaneous comments as they were shared. The committee did not necessarily have consensus regarding specific comments. Comments are shared to add to the discussion. (Joan LeFebvre)

- The current team structure has too many teams. If a person is looking for research on which to base a program, there are too many places to go to get the full picture.
- We need more specialists to participate in the teams. Compared to Agriculture, we do not have enough specialist assistance.
- Teams are disjointed; they don't work together of programming. For example, there are 2-4 teams that have a health component yet the connections between the teams are difficult and limited. It seems we have created "silos" making it difficult for teams to communicate with each other.
- Some of the teams might logically cross program areas. Are there some teams that are "multi-disciplinary" and could be cross-programming teams?
- We assume we are working on diversity. Is this consciously happening? Current team structure does not necessarily connect to some other missions/mandates we have within extension.
- It's a challenge to have Specialists work on county issues as they may have academic interests/expertise that does not "fit" with county concerns.
- We need incentives for Specialists to do extension work. Extension work is often back burner work unless specialist is 100% extension. Could some specialist funding be held back to connect university professors to meet county issues? Don't eliminate specialists—balance support as our needs evolve and change.
- At the Family Living conference, the idea of round tables with Specialists should be expanded to have Specialists present what they are doing—going beyond dialog to research presentations.
- Some teams are subject matter-based, others client-based or focused on process.
- Cross-discipline teams such as justice and conflict teams are examples of some of the new structure we may need in the future. Examples might be finance and health.
- Teams should focus on scholarship and research rather than activities.
- We need more thoughtful evaluation of team efforts. A report of 200 families exercising together is not nearly as impactful as showing families are making choices for healthier living.
- Resiliency is a big picture concept across all areas.
- Where can we combine FL teams with other program areas? Look at the knowledge base. Work across program areas will add strength.
- We need county staff who are versatile and have skills (strategic planning, leadership development, conflict management, organizational development, systems thinking, etc.) that will be in demand into the future. Our team structure needs to help us be able to take programming to a different level. Being able to work across program areas will add strength to Family Living positions.
- Rebuild our capacity to see the big picture, identify trends, build relevant partnerships, and be ready with scholarship.
- We have faculty and academic staff on teams. Sometimes that mix may be challenging when academic staff roles are defined and confined (limited). Limitations of academic staff may hamper team work.