

Approved 05/16/2007

**University Committee Meeting Minutes**  
**April 10, 2007**  
**432 North Lake Street, Madison, WI and via teleconference**

**Call to order/certification of Open Meeting Notice Compliance**

Called to order 1:06 p.m. by chair Rob Burke who certified open meeting compliance. Members present: Burke and Kopecky on phone; Hooyer, Nelson, Gruenewald. Others attending: Schultz, Keim, Wodyn.

**Approval of the Minutes of 13 March 2007 University Committee Meeting**

The minutes of the 13 March 2007 meeting of the University Committee were reviewed. Hearing no objections they were considered approved.

**Chancellor/Vice Chancellor Remarks (Van Kekerix)**

Marv was not able to attend and expressed his regrets. There were no remarks.

**Chair Remarks**

There is a compensation compression committee for Coop. Yvonne requested a representative. Dave Hart from DES will be a representative.

Rob included remarks about the Faculty Reps meeting he attended. There was discussion of colleague coverage and sabbatical pay leave issues. Collective bargaining was discussed. Having the right is good – what we get into is different. There were academic staff concerned about de-coupling faculty and academic staff. WTCS transfer policy was discussed. President Reilly doesn't like it when shared governance slows things down. This was part of a discussion about the quality of transfer credits from WTCS.

Criminal background checks were discussed. Hotter issues for other campuses - Not much of an issue for UWEX. There was concern about who would conduct the background checks.

Academic Affairs Planning – UWS will be the “driver” for this. There was some concern about this.

Bob Jokish (sp?) and Ron Singer were at the meeting and shared ideas about how UWS Academic Affairs needs to interact more with all campuses and faculty.

Concern was expressed about degree creep and mission creep across WTCS, Colleges, and Comprehensives etc. There seems to be a lack of planning and vision and leadership from UWS about the creep.

Al Crist talked about collective bargaining, and partner benefits. He said there are some partner benefits UWS can pursue on their own if they are willing to pay.

He said faculty can be involved in the criminal background checks. There was a discussion about the Shared Governance issues discussed by the System Faculty Representatives Group and the draft of that group's thoughts was distributed leading to an involved discussion.

Rob will attend the May 4 System Faculty Representatives Group meeting.

*(Above recorded by Ray Schultz)*

Discussion on shared governance principles and guidance draft. The committee recommended at the faculty senate meeting has not met yet. Nelson thinks this issue will be forwarded to President Reilly soon. The next faculty reps meeting is May 4. Burke will get the committee members together (Lersch,

Childers and Hart). Nelson felt it better for our position to be included sooner rather than later (reference shared governance guidelines draft – April 3 2007). Hooyer asked if this draft should be shared with all faculty, along with a position statement that the committee comes up with. The committee needs to meet and have some discussion before May 4. Gruenewald says the draft document is hard to read and it would be helpful to have some background and history. Burke feels that the purpose behind this is that the Board of Regents (BOR) wants some way to communicate at the beginning of issues to get ideas on how to involve faculty in these issues. Gruenewald wondered if we really want another group or can President Reilly and the BOR use the existing bodies. Nelson thinks the issue is that it takes such a long time to go through the individual governance groups. She feels this would be a group they could go to as a sounding board, find out what the pitfalls are, and who should be at the table, etc. This would be a starting place.

#### **Article 4 committee progress**

Ray Schultz has four members recommended for this committee: David Nack (Labor Ed); Gail Huycke (CRD); Dave Hart (Env Sci); Ann Keim (admin rep). Cooperative Extension administration, Youth Development, Family Development and Ag/Agbusiness have not yet responded. As soon as all are named, Ray will share information and facilitate setting up a meeting. Mary Gruenewald and Mark Kopecky encouraged to follow-up on their department's recommendation.

#### **Leave Reporting recommendations: discussion for input**

Ray Schultz referenced the 3/16 email from President Reilly on recommendation for improvements in leave reporting. Nelson commented that using vacation in lieu of sick leave is of interest to her. Timeline for feedback is May 16. Gruenewald said just having an example for how to complete the form would be sufficient, and you shouldn't have to put in place a policy to address this (referenced part II in recommendations document). Schultz said he talked to David Prucha in regard to part II, which is an attempt to put some teeth into the policy because apparently there are many not reporting their leave in a timely fashion. Nelson commented that the 2- and 4-year campuses are viewing this in a completely different way than in Extension. Schultz commented that the Legislative Audit Bureau is operating under assumptions (as far as work day) that are not valid in many situations. Burke commented he thinks the revised form (to hour-by-hour reporting) looks fine. The colleague coverage item is not of concern to Extension. Hooyer doesn't see an issue with the hourly basis for reporting; seemed to consensus around this. Regarding a supervisors ability to change a report II.2(d.), Nelson expressed concern that she doesn't always know what others in her office are working. Discussion ensued. Gruenewald felt it would be helpful to find out how much of a problem this is in our own organization. II.2(a) & (d) are issues; clarification is needed on II.2(e). Hooyer suggested that one of us write up a response (regarding the punitive items) to what we see as issues and have senators look at it and respond before 5/16. Hooyer emphasized the need to be specific. Burke said he could write the general statement; the specifics will require getting others involved and this is time-consuming. For efficiency, Hooyer suggested circulating something among University Committee members first, then take it to Faculty Senate.

#### **Discussion of institutional issues and opportunities appropriate for faculty governance**

Follow-up is needed on the shared governance guidelines, article 4 and leave reporting.

Nelson commented that we are much more reactive than proactive when it comes to faculty governance and suggested that perhaps with the new membership year coming up we should have a conversation about seeking issues to address more proactively. Hooyer suggested that perhaps having a faculty retreat to explore issues would be helpful and to come up with a game plan. This will be an agenda item for the joint meeting with Academic Staff Council in May as well as a discussion item at the June Faculty Senate meeting.

Motion to adjourn by Kopecky; meeting adjourned at 2:25 p.m.

Recorded by Wodyn, 4-10-07