

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
June 12, 2007
The Pyle Center – Madison, WI

1. Call to order/certification of Open Meeting Notice Compliance

Vice-chair Tom Hooyer call the meeting to order at 1:09 and certified compliance with the open meetings law. Senators attending: Tom Hooyer, Marie Witzel, Dave Hart, Karen Nelson, Gail Huycke, Judy Knudsen, Mahlon Peterson, Luane Meyer, Kathy Hetzel, Art Lersch, Katy Forsythe, Pam Hobson, Michael Childers, David Nack, Barb Larson, Mary Gruenewald, Annie Jones. Others in attendance: David Wilson, Marv Van Kekerix, Ray Schultz, Ann Keim, David Prucha, Kate Wodyn.

2. Approval of minutes of March 13, 2007

Hearing no comments or concerns; the March 13 minutes stand approved as distributed.

3. Chancellor/Vice Chancellor Report

4. Vice Chancellor Van Kekerix started with an Adult Student Initiative (ASI) update. Three statewide advising coordinators are in place, seeking to make connections with adult populations including through county extension offices and college campuses. Another piece is an effort to reach out to students who have been enrolled at the campuses but discontinued their enrollment. We are working with pilot institutions to contact those students (11,500 names) and to help them complete an educational goal (funded by COBE grant—with continued funding expected). We are also encouraging institutions to develop more online degree programs and other course formats (like 5-week courses, hybrid, etc.). Funding is also being sought to increase the advising capacity and identifying high need areas and going to institutions to see if they can develop a response. Personnel actions: Marsha Henfer has been named new CIO. The Director of Entrepreneurship and Economic Development search has been launched. Director of Broadcasting and Media Innovations finalist interviews are taking place this week. David Schejbal will be in place on July 1 as Dean of Continuing Education, Outreach and E-Learning. David Mathieu has been named UW Colleges Associate Vice Chancellor for Student Services and Enrollment Management. With Margaret Cleek retiring, Greg Lampe will move into interim provost position; Lisa Seale will move into Associate Vice Chancellor position on an interim basis (Greg Lampe's position). David Prucha also mentioned that the search and screen committee for the legislative liaison position (Spec Asst to Chancellor) is meeting later this week.

Chancellor Wilson continued with a Board of Regents (BOR) meeting report. Mark Bradley was elected as new president of the BOR. Wilson has extended an invitation to Bradley to be convocation speaker at UW-Fond Du Lac and he has accepted (late August). At the Board meeting, Chancellor Santiago continued to crystallize the vision of UW-Milwaukee as primarily a research institution on one side and access on the other. Regarding access he is talking about a multi-campus (West Allis, Wauwatosa, Downtown – Wauwatosa would be research campus). That presentation received good endorsement from the Board. UW-Milwaukee is no longer talking about a campus in Waukesha but is still talking about enhanced programming there at the UW-Waukesha campus. The Board also heard a dynamic presentation by Dennis Jones on higher education and the future of Wisconsin (http://www.uwex.uwc.edu/chancellor/documents/Dennis_Jones.ppt). The data shows that it is important that we address the needs of the adult population in the state, therefore ASI is cornerstone initiative for UW Colleges and UW-Extension. Growth areas likely are Madison, western part of state and the Kenosha area. Jones also indicated the color of the population will begin to change with the white population expected to decrease Latino and Black populations increasing, particularly in Kenosha area. Eighty percent of people of color is concentrated in eight counties. Occupations with the most growth will be health care, teacher education, IT, engineering. Wisconsin is one of few states where a high school graduate is more likely to be employed than either an associate or baccalaureate degree holder. Compared to rest of country, Wisconsin high school graduates are overpaid and baccalaureate holders underpaid. This is the result of the manufacturing foundation of the state. Wilson next commented on his legislative visits; the ASI has resonated with every single

legislator he has met with. The UW Budget has passed the legislative Joint Committee on Finance. In addition to the ASI, Wilson is currently exploring whether to have a Colleges presence in Madison and an enhanced Colleges and Extension presence in Milwaukee to serve needs not currently being met.

Wilson has also put together a committee to explore co-location issues in counties where there is both a campus and an Extension office. The charge is to explore the pros and cons and present a recommendation. Karen Hintz and Jim Perry are co-chairs. Wilson continues to visit the counties—close to 50 now. He has been asked to give presentations directly to county boards in Rock, Washington and Marathon counties. Lersch attended the Marathon county meeting and thought it went very well. Briefly, in strategic planning, Wilson will be outlining 4-5 strategic priorities to drive the unit strategic plans. Most likely, these will be things we've heard before, but will be at the macro level and will give units maximum flexibility in incorporating these priorities into their strategic plan. Marv Van Kekerix is point person on strategic planning.

Lastly, we will be hosting the BOR meeting in April 2008 in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of Pyle Center. A planning committee has been formed; Teri Venker, Lisa Seale, Bill Mann, Ann Keim. We need to think about what face, theme, etc we want the Regents to see.

5. **Chair Remarks** – none.

6. **System Faculty Representatives Council Report**

Childers attended the May 4 Faculty Reps meeting. He mentioned that the shared governance principles and guidelines document is still in limbo -- “received” but the Faculty Reps group continues to act as the interface between UW System and governance groups. There was also back and forth on UWS 7 and how that was handled, and whether the Faculty Reps as a body “waters down” the position of the governance groups. This is something to continue to monitor. Nelson mentioned that we were the only governance group that officially responded to the draft. UW System has designated Ron Singer as the person with the skill set to determine what issues should engage the governance groups. Also, since individual Regents are assigned to become more familiar with a particular institution we should make sure we interface with our “regent” and this should help the process. Wilson noted that our assigned regents are Danae Davis and one of the student regents. Hooyer wondered if we should restate our position in the form of a letter. Childers felt that we have outlined our position quite specifically with the response Burke submitted. The Faculty Reps group is in flux, many are on 9-month appointments and no redraft of the document has been distributed. When new membership is set, it would be beneficial to resend the response. Nelson said she would bring it to the Faculty Reps retreat in August. Hooyer recommended that this be on the September agenda.

7. **Approval of 2007-08 meeting schedule**

Item #10 will address the joint meetings with Colleges Senate. This item is to approve the dates. Nack recapped the University Committee discussion that there would be a plenary session for items of joint interest/information with breakouts for each group to conduct their own business. This would provide an opportunity to interact with Colleges on issues of common interest. Hooyer commented that he felt his attendance at a Colleges governance retreat last fall was beneficial. **Lersch motioned to approve the 2007-08 governance meeting schedule as distributed; seconded by Nack. Motion carried.**

8. **Update on UW System response to leave reporting**

(Reference documents distributed with agenda.) David Prucha referenced the June 1, 2007 response from UW System to the Legislature on the Legislative Audit Bureau report on Personnel Policies and Practices. The response on leave usage includes redoubling our efforts to make things clear to staff, make the form more user-friendly, understanding what the parameters and reporting requirements are and come up with some standard deadlines for submission of leave reports. The next part of the response involves the need to improve the whole concept. For example, with leave reporting, the assumption is that this fits a standard 40-hour work week on a campus and this certainly doesn't fit us. A discussion paper on alternative work week (dated 5/23/07) by Al Crist attempts to articulate this. Unfortunately, he feels there is the assumption that we underreport. Discussion ensued. Wilson suggested doing a study on the number of hours per week that Extension and Colleges faculty

and staff work – as an education and public relations piece. David Prucha will look into a previous study to see if there is a tool available to do this. Prucha mentioned that we are making progress on electronic distribution of leave statements as well as an electronic signature mechanism for sending them back. Hooyer asked where we want to go with this. David Prucha will forward the referenced 5/23 discussion paper from Al Crist that expands on these conceptual problems. The response to Al Crist on section III of the improvements in leave reporting recommendations is due October 31 (reference document: University of Wisconsin System Improvements in Leave Reporting Recommendations of the UW System President's Fringe Benefits Advisory Committee April 4, 2007). **Nelson moved to form a committee to respond to section III of the leave reporting recommendations; Knudsen seconded. David Prucha willing to be involved. Karen Nelson, Barb Larson and Art Lersch willing to serve on this committee. Gruenewald suggested committee should be broadened to include Academic Staff Council members. Report to be given at joint Academic Staff Council/University Committee meeting on August 8. This committee will provide an assessment of what such a policy change means for our institution specifically in regard to section III of the April 4, 2007 Recommendations of Fringe Benefits Advisory Committee. Motion carried.**

9. Update on UWS 7

New policy has been approved effective June 1, 2007. There is no corresponding UWEX Chapter 7, Dismissal of Faculty in Special Cases. If there is no UWEX policy, the System policy is default. Nack stated his feeling is that he is reluctant to write a policy that he doesn't agree with. Consensus was to let this lie and take no action.

10. Status Report – Joint Governance Work Group

Van Kekerix reported that this group has not met at this point. Projecting into the future, there is some continuity in the membership of this group (Burke and Hosler will continue as chairs of their respective governance groups), and we are now prepared to bring this group together. The new meeting schedule provides two opportunities to meet in the same location as the UW Colleges governance group (Jan and Apr 2008) and we could include a report from this work group. There is also some discussion about a joint forum on scholarship and this group could explore this. Peterson felt this proposal makes sense, being able to see the reactions of both groups at the same time. Lersch also felt this gives them additional time. Van Kekerix viewed this as support.

11. Possible Shared Vision Statement and Tagline

Handout from Teri Venker distributed. One of the activities of the senior staff leadership retreat in April was to develop a shared vision statement and tagline. Faculty Senate was one of the groups this was to be shared with for feedback. This has been an iterative process. So far, the most attention has been on #3 and 4 of the vision statements and #9 and 10 of the taglines. The is not intended to take the place of other taglines in use, such as in the divisions, but for the purpose of providing visual indicators of how we are coming together as an integrated institution. Wilson added that he was asked to make a presentation at the University Continuing Education Association conference in Vancouver in April and there is a lot of national attention/excitement about our integration process. The first question after Wilson's presentation was, "What is going to be the name of your new institution?" Wilson replied that he is not ready to go there yet in the foreseeable future, but to communicate what binds us together. Maximum access is the shared vision, but we need to come up with a statement that expresses that. Wilson emphasized that we are not bound to the statements on the distributed document. He encouraged sharing this with colleagues and give feedback to Teri (timeline by mid-summer). Van Kekerix is interested in initial reactions. Childers' preference is for #2 vision statement because it mentions the Wisconsin Idea. For a tagline, he likes Access to Learning. Impact for Life. Jones felt just the word "access" is weaker than "maximum access"--in other words, we're going to do everything we can. Other comments: Dislikes "learning options". #3 vision statement seems awkward; #4 is better. #4 better understood by target audiences. Likes #2—expanding boundaries is good but use some other words instead of "boundaries of the state." On behalf of "learning options", she likes that because people want to have options. Wilson said to think of it in terms of "how are we going to present to the world what our institutions do well?" Other suggestions: University without walls. Learning--here, there and

everywhere. Gruenewald repeated what she articulated at the University Committee meeting. She would like to see us get to the point where the scientific knowledge of the UW is used to solve community problems. When she thinks of vision she thinks of the ideal end state – for what do we strive? Positive community change is the umbrella under which she works. Working with individuals and communities and bringing them together for the public good. Civic engagement, public issues involvement might be other terms for this. She thinks we are so far ahead of other states because of our strong partnership with counties to have all four program areas represented. Wouldn't it be great if other states could get to the point of a vision of positive community change? Our ideal end state is solving community problems. Wilson responded that what she is getting at is what will be in our strategic plans. What we are trying to do here is to simply communicate what UW Colleges and Extension are at the core.

12. **How can University Committee and Faculty Senate be more proactive on emerging governance issues?**

It has been discussed in previous University Committee meetings about being more proactive in identifying and addressing issues. A retreat setting for accomplishing this has also been suggested. Lersch asked what some of the conversation has been about and Hooyer mentioned that the scholarship issue is one example. Larson added this would include what the appropriate issues are for Faculty Senate to address, as well as doing a better job of orienting new members. Gruenewald felt a brainstorming session could bring up issues to address. Lersch commented that part of the discussion should be how we can be more proactive when something comes up that we have to react to. Peterson said he does not see much reporting from University Committee members to senators. Hooyer replied he sees the University Committee serving a winnowing and sifting process on issues. Huycke feels this gets to the communication issue. Hart felt choosing one or two proactive issues would be manageable. Wilson added that he would like to be able to feel that the senators are representing the faculty voice; he has heard comments that this is not always the case. When issues come into the Chancellor's office, we cannot always take 7-8 months to come to a decision. It would be helpful if he could come to a Faculty Senate meeting and feel that he is engaging in conversation that represents hundreds more. It was suggested to have everything posted on a website, rather than emailing, with notification when they are posted. Hooyer, Wodyn and Burke will work on posting things on the website and coming up with a standard procedure for notification. Hooyer said he will collect issues.

13. **Scholarship – reviewing systems and operations**

Gruenewald mentioned this was a topic of conversation at the May 16 University Committee (UC) meeting, stemming from a recent decision by the Cooperative Extension Dean to overturn Faculty Tenure Advisory Committee (FTAC) negative recommendations for promotion. In the UC conversation, both the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor indicated they were consulted by Dean Klemme on this issue and they concurred with his recommendation. The UC talked about how, in a larger sense, this could be a learning opportunity to increase our awareness and understanding of scholarship on a greater level. Another possible facet could be the Outreach Scholarship Conference and Gruenewald mentioned the tenure orientation workshops that Ray Schultz conducts. The UC thought this could be something for an ad hoc committee to work on. Hooyer said another part of the conversation was, "Is this a policy issue that needs to be addressed?" Huycke said the vice chairs in her department would like to have the policies looked at because they feel there is some room for improving them, both Appendix IB and IIB. Forsythe added that she feels this goes beyond scholarship as well for rank change. Nack made a general comment that you will always have interpretive issues. **Huycke moved to establish a committee to review Articles of Faculty Governance Appendix IB and IIB and their relation to UWEX Chapter 3. Seconded by Larson.** Discussion ensued about how the scholarship piece fits into this. Wilson wondered if it would be productive to have at the first joint meeting with the Colleges Senate a presentation on scholarship, how it is practiced in Extension, and examples from the Colleges. Wilson felt a discussion on process would also be beneficial. For example, if FTAC is meant to be an institution-wide committee, is it in the right place? The Cooperative Extension Dean could have an advisory committee for those candidates within Cooperative Extension. The FTAC could then be advisory to the chancellor. This would preserve integrity at every level of the review process. For example, if FTAC is not in concert

with the dean, they could invite the dean into their meeting to explain his/her position and this would be taken into consideration before forwarding it on. (Motion by Gruenewald to extend meeting by 10 minutes; seconded; carried). Looking at Chapter 3 will get into the process. Peterson suggested that the committee have representatives from each department. **Larson amended the motion that each academic department appoint a representative to this committee; Knudsen seconded. Amendment passed. Peterson amended to have this committee report to the Faculty Senate at the September meeting; Jones seconded. Discussion. Amendment passed.** (Back to main motion). **Motion carried unanimously.**

Marv Van Kekerix distributed certificates to those members of the University Committee and Faculty Senate whose terms are ending June 30 and expressed appreciation for the important work they have done.

14. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 5:16 p.m.

Recorded by Wodyn, 6-12-07