

Draft distributed – not yet approved

**University Committee Meeting Minutes
February 12, 2008
432 N. Lake Street – Madison, WI**

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

Chair Burke called the meeting to order at 1:10 p.m. and certified compliance with the open meetings law. On phone: Rob Burke, Chris Kniep, Greg Blonde. In 523: David Nack, David Hart, Karen Nelson, Robin Shepard, Ann Keim, Ray Schultz, Kate Wodyn. Burke welcomed Robin Shepard. Introductions were made.

2. Approval of minutes of December 11, 2007 meeting

Hearing no changes to minutes of 12/11 considered them approved.

3. Provost/Vice Chancellor report

Interim Provost and Vice Chancellor Robin Shepard started by saying he has been the CNRED program leader for the last 5 years; prior to that he was a longtime faculty member at the Environmental Resources Center. His tenure home is in the life sciences communications department at UW-Madison. For many years, he has been the point person for water/natural resources issues for Cooperative Extension. He is serving in the interim vice chancellor role for approximately 6 months. He has been in WI for 19 years; prior to that he was a broadcast news reporter for 11 years. Has worked a lot with continuing education and understands SBDC and entrepreneurial issues as well. In the 6 months he's hoping to keep the information flowing. In terms of his report, since he's been a week on the job, it will be fairly short. The anticipated state budget shortfall has triggered a number of things, including restrictions on new hires and travel. There will require more consultation with deans/directors, budget staff and the provost on these matters. The Adult Student Initiative is something we'll continue to nurture. Greg Lampe will be taking the lead on this. The Program Innovation Fund call for proposals has gone out with a due date of May 1. Shepard attended the Board of Regents meeting last week and distributed a Growth Agenda Action Steps document. He directed attention to items 9 & 10. Rob Burke will be chairing the vice chancellor search and screen committee. Chancellor Wilson hopes to have a permanent replacement named by August or September. Rob added that he has talked with David Prucha who will also have an instrumental role. The first meeting of the search and screen committee is scheduled for Feb 26. Rob asked about the status of the additional 1.5% pay increase. Nelson said that no definite action has been taken, although there does not seem to be much hope that it would be for more than just faculty. It seems this has been caught up in the budget shortfall. Ann made a clarification on the email from Ray Schultz regarding input on the strategic plan by Feb 22. This was intended for the UW Colleges Senate for their input; we'll have better clarification at the March meeting and will receive a more up-to-date version of the plan. Shepard concluded by saying that Marv Van Kekerix set a really high standard for this position and he is hoping to maintain the positive relationship he had with this group and is looking forward to the next 6 months.

4. Chair Report

Rob Burke said his items will be covered later on the agenda.

5. Faculty Reps Council report

Karen Nelson reported that she attended the Regents dinner last week. At the Faculty Reps meeting, the difficulty with recruitment and retention was again discussed. There is a dearth of qualified applicants for positions and they would like to do a quantifiable report about losing good faculty. Do we need to look at that from the Extension perspective? Schultz mentioned a report that Sharon Klawitter presented to the Cooperative Extension Administrative Committee in January. Nelson continued that Rebecca Martin commented that people are getting confused with Advantage Wisconsin, The Growth Agenda, and the strategic plans at the institutional level. The Presidents Fellows program will likely be put on hold because of

budget issues. Vicki Washington shared an inclusive excellence document (handout) and faculty governance input is invited. Rob will email it around to people. The Reps also talked about the Regents reframing some meetings to focus on policy issues. The collective bargaining proposal is still working its way through legislative committee but is not expected to pass. UW System is taking a neutral stance. The next Faculty Reps meeting is Feb 29. Nack said we should talk a look at the pay issue; he expects we're not different from other institutions in System. Anecdotal evidence seems to support this (Nack and Hart mentioned searches in their units). There was interest in seeing Sharon Klawitter's document. Further discussion ensued.

6. **Approval of Faculty Tenure Advisory Committee vacancies/appointments**

Departmental recommendations have been made to fill two vacancies on the Faculty Tenure Advisory Committee: Corliss Olson for Labor Education and Chuck Prissel for Youth Development. Motion by Nack to confirm these appointments; Blonde seconded: Motion carried.

7. **Academic Department Elections Update**

Community Resource Development: more competition this year than in years past, Burke pleased to see that interest.

Youth Development: Nelson hasn't seen a ballot yet, but there will be replacements.

Ag/Agbusiness: Blonde has also not seen a ballot yet; assuming no news is good news.

Environmental Sciences: Hart reported he doesn't anticipate issues; has reminded chair of elections.

Labor Education: Nack reported no elections yet.

Family Development: Chris Kniep said a ballot will be going out this week.

8. **Chapter #3 ad hoc committee report**

Schultz reported that this group has met once since the January meeting, primarily focusing on communication issues. Two types of workshops were discussed. The first is the faculty tenure orientation workshop that would continue yearly and be faculty-run. The University Committee (UC) would have oversight and recruit faculty to be presenters. A second communication workshop would be a forum for discussion purposes focusing on Appendix 1B and 11B. This would be conducted yearly, under the auspices of the UC, and be faculty-led and faculty-run. Rob Burke commented he feels this is a good approach to take. The ad hoc committee is continuing to meet and may have a more detailed report for the March UC meeting, but especially for the April Faculty Senate meeting. No workshop dates have been determined at this point. Nack and Hart emphasized the need for an annual orientation workshop. Blonde suggested asking the committee to come up with a recommended approach and timeline. Nack suggested doing this in the fall. There was agreement that SRP and FTAC members need to be involved in planning the curriculum. Kniep commented that one reason why the UC has been recommended for the leadership of these workshops is to avoid having them be from just a departmental perspective. Blonde expressed concern that the UC is too disconnected and could create more confusion. Nack commented that the UC role is to oversee the workshops not conduct them. Blonde expressed having a forum sooner rather than later (perhaps yet this spring or summer) would be preferable. Nack would like to request the committee give us times and places for 2008, and confirm the order of the orientation workshop and forum. Schultz said he thinks the committee is thinking of orientation first and forum second. UC members agreed to have Schultz communicate this to the committee. There was discussion on which months might be good, but no consensus. Shepard asked if the ad hoc committee might want to consider forming a curriculum committee or if the UC might want to do it. Blonde suggested members from each SRP committee and FTAC are the ones who need to be communicating in order for this to be effective. Schultz requested that each UC member go to their respective department and have this conversation and get feedback by Feb 25; he will share that with the ad hoc committee on Feb 27. Nelson wondered if there should be a standing committee formed with UC and SRP/FTAC members so that there is continuity in this. Shepard suggested the UC

make a recommendation to the Faculty Senate as to how this committee be made up and there seemed to be agreement with this. Members liked the idea of letting the ad hoc committee finish their work and come up with some recommendations at the April Faculty Senate meeting.

9. Article 4: discussion of what is ahead

Schultz outlined that the recommendation is for University Committee to be the keeper of the list of faculty governance units. The units could be county, units such as School for Workers or the Geological Survey, or program areas. The discussion that has to take place with the academic departments is how they want to structure the faculty governance units to deal with the two primary things: 1) faculty personnel issues and 2) faculty development. Nelson said we need to direct the academic departments to come up with the list. Discussion ensued. Burke suggested forming an ad hoc committee to think through some of this so we have a proposal. Chris Kniep and Karen are willing to be on this committee. It was suggested to have a district director on this committee and also approach the academic department chairs about how this committee be formed. Members were asked to consult with their academic department chairs and bring back recommendations to the next meeting. It was also suggested to go back to the original ad hoc committee to see if any members would like to be on this new group. The group will be formed and charged at the March 18 meeting.

10. Co-located governance meetings

a) Report on Jan 16 lunch discussions: Ann Keim started by sharing a summary of the notes from the lunch discussion tables at the Jan 16 co-located meeting. Ann also sat in on the Colleges Senate meeting and commented on how different they are. Their senate includes faculty, academic staff and classified staff, and is led by administrators. She suggested that at the April co-located meeting some of us sit in on one of their meetings. At the lunch, people were clustered loosely by interest, asked various questions, and their feedback collected. She hopes this is helpful in planning the next meeting. This feedback has also been shared with Colleges.

b) Member thoughts and impressions: Greg Blonde commented that the tenure/promotion panel was enlightening. Blonde feels there is potential for collaboration with their service component of faculty tenure/promotion. Regarding the Chancellor's presentation, he expressed it was as good as he has heard about the administrative integration.

c) Topics for next meeting: Blonde suggested a future topic might be examples of public service for their tenure/promotion. He also mentioned the combined annual report and wondered if this could be highlighted to gain a better understanding of each other. Another idea is the Cooperative Extension program planning process. Karen Nelson also mentioned inviting newly elected governance members to the April 25 co-located meeting, since there is not another one scheduled. Blonde further suggested an item on the Growth Agenda, reviewing the 10 points and how they relate to each of the institutions and where there might be overlap. Karen mentioned perhaps inviting some System Administration folks. Burke recommended to Robin to keep the same planning committee for the April 25 meeting. Burke said he'd like to invite the Colleges to talk more about their service component and invite them to suggest a topic to us. Blonde also mentioned field research.

d) Planning committee: members recommended keeping the same committee that planned the Jan 16 meeting.

e) Logistics: Burke suggested a 1/2 hour meeting for the University Committee before the Faculty Senate meeting.

11. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

Recorded by Wodyn, 2-12-08.