

Approved 6-12-07

Academic Staff Council/University Committee Joint Meeting Minutes
May 16, 2007
The Pyle Center, 702 Langdon Street, Madison

1. Call to Order/Certification of Open Meeting Notice Compliance

Call to order by Maguire at 10:05 a.m.; certified compliance with Wisconsin Open Meetings Law. Academic Staff Council members present: Penny Ralston-Berg, John Fischer, Darlene Kramer, Heather Boyd, Michael Maguire, Nancy Coffey (phone) University Committee members present: Mark Kopecky (phone); Mary Gruenewald, Tom Hooyer, Karen Nelson, Rob Burke Others attending: David Wilson, Marv Van Kekerix, Ann Keim, Ray Schultz, Kate Wodyn

2. Approval of Minutes

Academic Staff Council—Kramer motioned to approve 4/11 minutes/seconded by Fischer. No discussion; motion carried. University Committee—Gruenewald motioned to approve 4/10 minutes/seconded by Kopecky; motion carried.

3. Chancellor/Vice Chancellor Report

Strategic planning process—Vice Chancellor Van Kekerix started with a discussion on the strategic planning process and distributed information taken from the UW – Madison strategic plan. He explained that this model is helpful for showing how various pieces relate to the overall strategic plan and how planning processes in divisions can be integrated.

Update on status of joint governance work group—Van Kekerix reported that this group has not met yet, but he wanted to talk about scheduling this for next year and is open to finding time when the governance groups from both institutions can meet in the same location, similar to this joint meeting. He has talked to Margaret Cleek and she felt this would be favored. The joint governance discussion will probably be more active as we move into next year. Van Kekerix asked for reactions to the idea of a joint governance meeting with Colleges. Maguire asked how frequent and Van Kekerix responded perhaps two meetings. He clarified that this would be different than the joint governance discussion – this would be an opportunity to discuss common issues and observe. Chancellor Wilson added it would be a great learning opportunity just to attend the others' meeting--see the meeting format, topics on the agenda, etc. Hooyer and Maguire commented on their attending the College's governance retreat last fall. Gruenewald commented that perhaps we should have a University Committee representative designated to attend the Colleges Senate meetings and vice versa. Wilson also mentioned some practical considerations for meeting together including the time commitment on the part of the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor to attend two sets of meetings. It would behoove us to bring ourselves together in a unified format on common issues, and he asked the group to consider this suggestion. Van Kekerix added that there is value in hearing the viewpoints from both institutions. Hooyer wondered if this is putting the cart before the horse since the work group charged to look at joint governance hasn't met yet. Van Kekerix replied that there are pieces of the meetings that are the same and these could be combined, but other business would be handled separately. Obvious things to be combined would be the chancellor's report, for example. He understood Hooyer's view but feels that the joint governance work group has a more technical conversation whereas having combined meetings is to increase understanding and break down barriers. Wilson added that when issues come before him and other Chancellors offer their campus stand, Wilson needs to articulate a point of view of faculty and staff across the two institutions. He feels that if you would take faculty tenure and scholarship out of the mix, it seems there is very little difference in how issues have been approached. He also said there is power in numbers, and we (Extension and Colleges combined) would be third, if not second, in numbers of faculty/staff in the UW System and how do we make that work for us. Van Kekerix also said on most of the issues coming from UW system there has not been much difference in how they have been approached, UWS 7 being a good example. Leave reporting could be another one.

Wilson reported on legislative visits he's been making; most legislators have been very receptive. He commented that when they hear about the Growth Agenda and the Adult Student Initiative (ASI) they have set aside some time to find out how things are in other states. Staffing update: CIO search—interviews are taking place this week. This is an important hire for us and Wilson encouraged participation in the search process by attending the public presentations. David Schejbal will join us officially July 1 as Dean of Continuing Education, Outreach and E-Learning. Wilson has also appointed a committee on co-location of UW Colleges and Extension offices. This needs a well-thought-through position, since this has come up 4-5 times and is on the minds of some county boards and county executives. It is an issue we will explore. The committee is co-chaired by Jim Perry (UW Fox Valley Dean) and Karen Hintz (Eastern District Cooperative Extension director). The committee will provide an official report by early fall. In the next issue of the Chancellor's communiqué, he'll talk about the shared vision and strategic planning process and the challenge upon us to remove all the barriers in making that happen. He will list 3 or 4 of our guiding principles and 3 or 4 strategic directions/goals which will be at the "cloud level". When the unit strategic plans are developed they will have these broad umbrellas and will be guided by that. The ASI is one example of how we want to move forward and erase some of the barriers that may be internal, such as the way we offer courses which is still in a very traditional semester model. We need to hear what the population we are serving is saying. The NOW initiative is looking at opportunities for UWC/Extension to open an outreach center in northern WI to serve the adult placebound population in a more aggressive and systematic way. Florence/Vilas counties, in particular, are looking for a UW presence in their area. He is also looking at two more outreach centers, in downtown Milwaukee and somewhere in Madison, in response to unmet needs. He feels a greater presence in Milwaukee can only be a positive thing for both UW Colleges and UW-Extension. Wilson next mentioned the UW-Madison IDEA project. This is in response to a lot of negative feedback that UW-Madison has received because of students not being able to get in. Madison is seeking to put in place some kind of initiative that will say to citizens, "This is how UW-Madison is serving all your needs." We need to be at the table to make sure this doesn't become another Extension statewide network. At the last Board of Regents meeting, there were two Academic Staff Regents Awards for Excellence. Wilson wants to be sure when we get notice of these awards, that we make sure we have nominees and to take all systemwide awards seriously. Gruenewald suggested putting this in the communiqué. He also is concerned that there is not much understanding of the extension mission in UW System academic affairs. Maguire also mentioned the whole idea of academic rigor and how to think outside the box when it comes those of us involved in real world work and overcoming the perception of that not having real rigor.
(reordering of agenda items, #4, #9, #7, #6, #5, #12, #8, #10, #11.)

4. Chair Reports

Schultz reported that Bill Mann has made arrangements for an Academic Staff Council (ASC) communication road trip Dodge, Brown, and Calumet (?) counties on 5/22 and extended an open invitation to attend. The purpose is to talk to county staff about ASC and get feedback on issues.

Burke (after circulating a photo of a 31" walleye he caught in a bass tournament last weekend) reported that Michael Childers attended the May 4 joint Faculty/Academic Staff Reps meeting. The committee put a lot of work into the response on shared governance procedures, but has not heard back how it went. Tom Hooyer will preside over the next Faculty Senate meeting.

5. Competition With the Private Sector Committee

Van Kekerix explained that each UW institution is required to have committee for issues in competition with private sector. Common issues are like, "is Lowell Hall in competition with private hotels?" This committee makes an assessment on the specific situation. The reason he is bringing it up now is he is anticipating an issue coming forward in the future. A representative from the academic staff and faculty is needed on the committee. **Maguire motioned to nominate John Fischer as the academic staff representative on the competition with private sector committee; Boyd seconded. No other nominations; motion carried. Gruenewald motioned to**

nominate Bill Ryan for this committee. Burke seconded; no other nominations. Motion carried. Marv will follow-up with Bill Ryan.

6. Scholarship Discussion

Schultz explained that the origin of this item was an email from Tom Hooyer asking for discussion about recent decisions regarding tenure candidates. Hooyer referenced Dean Klemme's email that said he would overturn the Faculty Tenure Advisory Committee's (FTAC) negative tenure recommendations. His concern is administration going against a committee recommendation. Schultz provided additional background. Of eleven faculty reviewed by the committee, three had a negative recommendation. The FTAC is advisory to the dean only. All eleven had been forwarded by their respective departments. Klemme had done an extensive review of each negative recommendation. His recommendation to the Chancellor was to forward their promotion. Vice Chancellor Van Kekerix also concurred with these recommendations. Hooyer's concern was that FTAC members felt they were ignored, and as faculty they are best suited for evaluating scholarship. Boyd said Klemme also talked about this at the Joint Council of Extension Professionals (JCEP) conference and there is a PowerPoint posted on his website. Wilson added that the message we don't want to send is that we're ignoring the faculty decision point. He is not a rubber stamp chancellor. When the decision reached his office he had similar concerns and he had several conversations with Rick Klemme and based on those conversations he supported the decision for promotion. It was not about ignoring the previous review process, but there were larger issues involved. The three individuals were voted on positively by their academic departments, but not by the FTAC. These decisions were not taken lightly. Conversations about scholarship in Cooperative Extension are taking place so everyone is on the same page. Perhaps faculty are being evaluated on standards they were not aware of. Van Kekerix added that there may not be solid alignment on the issue of scholarship because of the differing views between faculty, and this is the conversation that needs to take place. Hooyer wondered if we need to look at the policy. MVK says it is a policy issue in the sense that there may not be as much consensus around policy as we thought. Wilson wondered if the process is structurally flawed and questioned whether an institutional committee should be making an institutional assessment at a level above the deans and be advisory to the chancellor. This would preserve the independent review at each decision point. Gruenewald said this could be a learning opportunity and perhaps we should have a conversation around scholarship, similar to the engagement in controversy discussion. It was suggested to have this discussion at the June Faculty Senate meeting. Gruenewald supported putting this on the June agenda and with new governance year have a broader scholarship ad hoc committee. Ann Keim mentioned the Outreach Scholarship Conference, and as program chair she knows there are many similar discussions at other institutions. Many of us may be at the October conference and she suggested looking at the program to see what we can take from other institutions. Maguire also suggested that this be put on an ASC agenda and how the scholarship issue relates to academic staff.

7. Leave Reporting Recommendations

Maguire also attended the May 4 joint Faculty/Academic Staff Reps meeting. Maguire was impressed with Kevin Reilly's candor on this issue. This is rife with political ramifications. Schultz reminded that any recommendations on section I and II are due today. Burke expressed that the newer draft seems less punitive. Nelson expressed concerns about supervisors changing leave reports and the whole matter of professional time. Nelson would like clarification on the 10th of the month in 11.2.a. Maguire suggested he hears using more generic language in 11.2 to cover so many various situations. The 10th of month deadline is hard for county offices. Nelson and Kramer expressed there is problem with 11.2.d.; there needs to be communication with the employee first. Discussion seemed to revolve around that much of this really doesn't fit UW-Extension because of our statewide nature.

Motion by Maguire to forward statement (put down by Ray) to KPR today; seconded by Boyd. Motion carried. (see attached)

8. Academic Staff Council Awards for Excellence update

Boyd reported on nominations received (one for each category).

9. **Proposed [UW System] Shared Governance Principles and Guidelines**

Gruenewald commented that the readability is greatly improved in the 5/4/07 draft of shared governance principles and guidelines. Maguire reported what transpired on this at the 5/4 joint Faculty/Academic Staff Reps meeting. Ron Singer is the UW System point person for a working group of faculty and academic staff reps who will work on this issue. A working group to determine the shared governance principles and guidelines will be formed.

10. **Meeting Schedule for 2007-08**

There was agreement to continue with monthly meetings, including two joint ASC/UC meetings and two joint meetings with the UW Colleges Senate (perhaps October and January). This would require moving Faculty Senate meetings from Sept to Oct and Dec to Jan. Wodyn will work on a draft and distribute.

11. **Discussion of Institutional Issues and Opportunities Appropriate for Governance**

Nelson mentioned a need to orient new members to what the issues are and how to be more proactive, perhaps a retreat for the governance groups would accomplish this.

12. **Adjourn**

Motion to adjourn at 1:59.

Recorded by Wodyn, 5-16-07

16 May 2007

President Kevin Reilly
University of Wisconsin System
Van Hise Hall

[sent via email to kreilly@uwsa.edu]

Dear President Reilly,

The governance groups at the University of Wisconsin-Extension (Academic Staff Council and University Committee) have thoroughly reviewed the recommendations from the FBAC on Leave Reporting. While we agree in principle with the intentions of the recommendations, we find it difficult to approve the details.

In our review of the details, we found too many reasonable exceptions to the proposed policy changes for Extension to be able to apply them uniformly.

As you know, Extension is a statewide institution with 72 county offices, numerous other programmatic offices, and extensive use of professional time that often includes evenings and weekends.

We request that the University of Wisconsin-Extension be allowed to meet the spirit of the rules and recommendations but that we be allowed to develop the specifics for the implementation of these recommendations at the institutional level.

We will involve the Human Resources Department, governance groups, and the administration in the development of these implementation parameters. We will complete this process by 31 October 2007.

Thank you for your consideration.

Academic Staff Council
University Committee

Passed unanimously by joint resolution at the meeting of 16 May 2007

Copy: David Wilson
Marv Van Kekerix
David Prucha
Academic Staff Council
University Committee/Faculty Senate