

*Draft distributed – not yet approved*

**UW-Extension Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes  
March 13, 2007  
The Pyle Center – Madison, WI**

**1. Call to Order/certification of Open Meeting Notice Compliance**

Chair Burke called the meeting to order at 1:12 p.m. and certified compliance with the open meetings law. Senators present: Rob Burke, Mary Gruenewald, Tom Hooyer, Mark Kopecky, Gail Huycke, Barb Larson, Greg Blonde, David Nack, Michael Childers, Art Lersch, Judy Knudsen, Luane Meyer, Mahlon Peterson, Marie Witzel, Kathy Hetzel, Melanie Miller (for Pamela Hobson), Katy Forsythe, Karen Nelson, David Hart. Guest: Pat Malone. Others present: Marv Van Kekerix, Ray Schultz, Kate Wodyn.

**2. Approval of Minutes of December 12, 2006**

Hearing no comments, Burke considered them approved.

**3. Vice Chancellor Report**

*Board of Regents update*—Vice Chancellor Marv Van Kekerix reported on the March Regents meeting. Chancellor Wilson presented the Commission on Enhancing the Mission of the UW Colleges report. Van Kekerix outlined some of the recommendations from that report. The main themes are access and affordability. Another hot item has been the proposed UW-Milwaukee and UW-Waukesha merger. A study looked at three options; a new 4-year institution in that location, a merger (two models) of the two institutions, and the university center concept. A fiscal analysis was done and the first two options would cost approximately 20 million and the University Center about 6 million so a merger seems to be off the table. The Board authorized the Chippewa Valley Technical College to grant a liberal arts degree but made changes so that 1/3 of the courses would have to be taken from a UW institution. This is viewed as a potential threat to UW Colleges in terms of duplication and mission creep. Nack also commented on “mission abandonment” and the move by technical colleges away from teaching the skilled trades and there have been articles in national media about this. They have also stopped sponsoring School for Workers classes. He would like to see some of these issues raised before the BOR. Discussion ensued.

*Shared Vision*—presented by Wilson on Feb 7 and centered on maximum access. Van Kekerix touched on some of the highlights. The next steps are looking at some of the strategic planning components and trying to identify some themes that have broader applications. This is still taking shape.

*Administrative integration*—copies were distributed of the email dated 3/2 from David Wilson on senior leadership and the two accompanying organizational charts. Van Kekerix briefly ran through the charts. One major change from the previous is draft is that HR now reports directly to chancellor. Most of the integration work is in administrative areas which are in the center of the chart. All senior leadership team members have responsibilities across both institutions. One change not reflected is that there is now a special assistant to the Vice Chancellor, Ann Keim, whose main function is to identify programmatic collaborations and administer the Program Innovation Fund.

*Personnel changes* - Rick Klemme has been appointed interim dean of Cooperative Extension. A new dean has been hired for Continuing Education, Outreach and E-Learning, David Schejbal, effective July 1. The search for the Director of Broadcasting and Media Innovations is just being announced. The Chief Information Officer search is underway. We may also be launching a search for the Entrepreneurship and Economic Development (formerly Business and Mfg) Director in the near future. Margaret Cleek is retiring effective July 5 and Greg Lampe will be moving into that position in the interim.

The joint governance work group has not met yet.

**4. Chair Remarks**

Burke reported that the University Committee and academic department chairs met with David Wilson in January and shared some input into the visioning process. What came out in February was pretty much in line with what they shared; the input was well received and had impact in the final presentation. This was also the case when the University Committee expressed concern over the HR

director not reporting directly to the Chancellor. Burke made an appeal for volunteers for the faculty tenure orientation workshops. At these workshops there will be a panel representing SRP and Faculty Tenure Advisory Committee (FTAC) perspectives and members are needed. Blonde suggested recruiting from current committees because perspectives change over time.

5. **System Faculty Reps Report**

Nelson explained what this group is. Some items currently being discussed are recruitment/retention and collective bargaining—both of which are in the governor's budget. Another issue that comes up frequently is domestic partner benefits. There has been an incredible amount of email traffic on the technical college credit transfer issue, and the implications for faculty. Handout—UW System and the Board of Regents would like to identify a group to seek input from on issues since the faculty reps are not a governance group. A draft dated 1/25/07 outlines a group that UWS/BOR could come to for feedback. Rebecca Martin (UW System Interim VP for Academic Affairs) in turn has drafted a questionnaire about coming up with some guidelines for this group. **Nelson thinks we should take a close look at this and motioned for creation of a small committee to look into this and provide guidance to Rob Burke who will be attending the 3/30 Faculty Reps meeting.** Motion seconded by Nack. Nack commented that when he went to some of the UWS 7 meetings he felt that some of the faculty reps did not represent their respective campus governance groups. He also thinks that most of the feedback the BOR received from the governance groups was ignored. He feels anything that broadens the scope of the faculty reps diminishes the scope of the individual governance groups. Hooyer suggested developing a written position statement. **Motion carried unanimously to form a committee.** Members: Rob Burke, Art Lersch, Michael Childers, David Hart (Ray Schultz will staff the committee).

6. **CEAC, CNRED and Western District discussion on CRD program coverage in Western District**

This issue was raised at the last faculty senate meeting with concern that this promoted regionalization. The two papers were distributed in advance of the meeting and Pat Malone was in attendance for this discussion. She started by saying that no one in her district would ever promote regionalization. What makes Cooperative Extension so strong is the local county presence. This paper was to help fix the black hole in coverage in CNRED in the western district where there are 14 counties but less than 6 CRD educators and two basin educators. At the same time, the department wanted to look at a new teaching model for less experienced agents and for new specialists to get a feel for what county educators work on. This developed into a broader debate on CRD programming. Pat took the lead in drafting the white paper with the goal of stimulating discussion. Malone characterized this as a delicate balance: show counties without a CRD presence what they are missing but to make sure no staff member jeopardized their home base and county identity. A lot of this is happening already. The viewpoint of Blewett's paper was to rebuild CRD capacity in the western district. Hooyer commented that he sees scholarship as key in this issue and how can we act as a group of faculty in promoting scholarship? Peterson feels the big issue in this is communication -- we need to be open about communication and this seemed to come through the back door. Blonde expressed that providing the coverage to your neighbor without cost is a slippery slope (why buy cow when you get milk free). He also backed up what Peterson said about lack of governance input in this issue. Forsythe said we should be aware of unintended consequences of looking at this model and having counties use it to cut funding. Malone agreed it is a delicate balancing act. Further discussion -- Gruenewald felt there are two issues on the table: 1) communication. 2) the ideal of having all four program areas represented in every county – that is maximum access. Regarding the second issue, how can we move toward that ideal and the capacity to address any and every issue that comes up? Van Kekerix asked Peterson what would have been the best way to hear about this issue. Peterson replied at the district-level and after that, probably through the academic departments. Ideally, he expressed that it should come to the faculty senate from the provost. Huycke expressed that it seems less communication is coming from CEAC, perhaps since academic dept chairs were added to the membership. We may have added one communication link but closed another. Burke added that he and Marv will work together on the communication issue.

**7. Discussion of policies and procedures for selecting county extension office department heads (Article 4)**

Burke was approached by some who have concern that practice is out of line with policy when it comes to selection of county department heads. Handouts: Burke's simplification of article 4 and definition of terms used in articles 1-6 (the link to Article 4 policy was in an email sent prior to the meeting). According to Article 4, UWEX Articles of Faculty Governance, the administrative unit chair must be faculty (see Rob's handout) and allows for the possibility for a county extension office to have two positions, the administrative unit chair and a county department head. The policy about the administrative unit does not use term "department head." Peterson expressed concern that the county also has expectations and wants to have a say in this. This policy only speaks "university-ease". Kopecky commented that the department chair could be someone other than faculty and separate from the administrative unit chair. Miller suggested putting a group together, with different constituents at the table, to educate others and think about changing the policy. This has been attempted in the past but never got very far. Peterson suggested open communication and have the county, the other major partner, involved. **Motion by Peterson to form a committee to look at Article 4 and include a member of the Faculty Senate, Academic Staff Council, and university and county administration.** Seconded by Knudsen. Kopecky feels this policy is very narrow and pertains only to roles as faculty and not operational roles in the office. Peterson feels this is an elitist document and doesn't recognize the county or the mindset of today. Miller suggested getting one perspective first before having an effective conversation with the county partner. **Peterson accepted as friendly amendment, and Knudsen agreed, to exclude the county until we have a coherent stand.** Kopecky further suggested to have it just between faculty and university administration, excluding academic staff, since this is a faculty policy. There was agreement for the committee to consist of a representative from each academic department for faculty and administrative representatives from Cooperative Extension and General Educational Administration (GEA) (2). Blonde said he would agree with this only if the minutes reflected that the formation of the committee without academic staff in no way diminishes the value of academic staff. If, after the committee is formed, they want to bring in academic staff they would have the prerogative to do so. Peterson was in agreement only if this is communicated directly to academic staff. In some counties, academic staff have become equal voters and may outnumber the faculty in a county. Peterson said he would withdraw original motion if academic staff were not included. **Kopecky proposed formal amendment to structure the committee with 7 faculty (one from each department), 1 administrator from Cooperative Extension, 1 administrator from GEA, and as soon as committee has developed a recommendation to share it with academic staff and the county partner and seek their input. Blonde seconded. Amendment carried. Motion carried.**

**8. Shared Vision discussion**

No further discussion.

**9. Updates from Senate Ad Hoc Committees: Scholarship**

Kopecky reported that the committee has not met and very little feedback has been received. Huycke said the paper should start with an opening statement defining what it is. The purpose of the document is to explain the role of faculty to county partners and interested parties. There was discussion at the University Committee meeting to make scholarship more a part of our discussions and educate others about how important it is (like diversity). Kopecky asked for reactions. He is hoping we can adopt this draft and encourage the departments to use this with their own current examples of scholarship. He feels this is something we all need to espouse and make a commitment to keep it current. Nack commented not to restrict the definition of scholarship to just action-oriented to leave the door open to all forms of scholarship. In terms of impact measurement, add some flexibility because there may be times when impact can't be measured. Hart suggested making the title more active. **Motion by Kopecky to accept document with suggested changes; blonde 2<sup>nd</sup>. Motion carried. Blonde motioned to forward document to the academic departments with the recommendation to gather and keep current examples of scholarship; Kopecky 2<sup>nd</sup>. Discussion. Motion carried.**

10. **Library Access for Faculty**

Schultz said he understands Steenbock Library is sending information out to all faculty and academic staff in Cooperative Extension about electronic access.

11. **UPG 15 revisions from Academic Staff Council**

This policy deals with title progression for academic staff. The question is whether it is a matter of faculty concern over a proposed change in the title progression committee (4 members) from a "faculty member" to "program or service-unit representative". Broadcasting does not have faculty, and Continuing Education, Outreach & E-Learning has very few. The intent is to have someone on the committee with subject area expertise who can comment on the quality of the academic staff member's work. System Legal felt faculty should be made aware of this change. Discussion. Nack motioned to table and adjourn; no second. **Blond motioned to approved the revision as long as it doesn't exclude faculty; Huycke seconded. Motion carried.**

12. **Discussion of institutional issues and opportunities appropriate for faculty governance**

Huycke said that it would be helpful to receive the meeting minutes within two weeks of the meeting. Kopecky commented that the news clips emails miss a lot of noteworthy things.

13. **Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 4:58.

Recorded by Wodyn, 3-13-07