

Approved 2-14-07

University Committee Meeting Minutes
January 9, 2007
The Pyle Center and via WisLine
702 Langdon Street, Madison, WI

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

Chair Burke called the meeting to order at 9:11 and certified compliance with the Wisconsin Open Meetings Law. University Committee members present: Rob Burke, Tom Schmitz (for Karen Nelson), Judy Knudsen (for Mary Gruenewald), Tom Hooyer, David Nack, Mark Kopecky (by phone). Others present: Donna Doll-Yogerst, Ray Schultz, Marv Van Kekerix, Kate Wodyn.

2. Approval of Minutes of December 20, 2006

Hearing no suggestions for changes Burke considered them approved.

3. Chancellor/Vice Chancellor Remarks

Van Kekerix said the primary piece of his report is the visioning themes and these will be discussed with the academic department chairs later in the meeting. He did point out that what took place yesterday was an internal town hall meeting and on January 11 there will be an external town hall meeting with the Boards of Visitors from both institutions. In ongoing activities, Marv is attending all of the WACEC winter meetings. He is giving a general update in terms of administrative integration, the visioning process, the Board of Regents (BOR) budget and in particular the Adult Student Initiative component that focuses on Extension and Colleges. He added that we probably won't hear more about the budget until after the governor presents his own budget in February. Through the WACEC group there will be a lobbying effort in Madison in March or April. He opened up the discussion for questions. Donna Doll-Yogerst asked if there has been any feedback from county partners on pay plan; Van Kekerix responded that he has not heard any. The BOR request is a 5.23% increase in each year of the biennium. Schmitz asked what role county educators might have in the Adult Student Initiative. Van Kekerix responded it probably is a little too early to tell. Academic advising is fairly complex and requires special knowledge. His feeling is that at the county level it is much more likely to be who to contact to get the specifics, or to coordinate meetings where perhaps the advisor would come to the county. He does not think it would be reasonable that the advising itself would be done by the county staff. Van Kekerix continued that the bigger role has to do with raising the aspiration level of potential students. That influence usually takes place in the middle grades and can be simple things such as visiting a college campus, working with parents so they include college in their financing plans, etc. Discussion ensued. Pay plan also came up and whether the chancellor will take 10% off the top. Van Kekerix said the conversation about this with David Wilson has not taken place yet. There was also the question as to whether there is the option to do things differently between Colleges and Extension, since there is one chancellor over both (each institution will have their own distribution plan). Schmitz also brought up two other issues that have come across his desk; e-portfolios and planning academic programs (entitlement to plan requests). The latter was sent in error to department chairs. Regarding the e-portfolio, Van Kekerix said a conversation in IT took place because these are used extensively in UW Colleges. He asked the deans/directors for a response and this was forwarded to academic department chairs. There seemed to be a feeling that it would be reasonable to explore this, but there are obvious challenges. It would be interesting to see what Colleges does. Discussion ensued over the assessment component.

4. Welcome Academic Dept. Chairs and Discussion/Action on Faculty Input to the Shared Visioning Themes Presented on January 8, 2007

Academic department chairs attending: Dan Wilson, Madeline Gotkowitz, Tom Schmitz, Donna Doll-Yogerst, Randy Knapp (phone). Burke explained that this portion of the meeting is to have some sort of organized discussion on the David Wilson presentation yesterday. Dan Wilson referenced the Cooperative Extension Administrative Committee (CEAC) document (handout) and he felt the Chancellor captured all the points in this document and did a good job of reviewing all the data he

received. He also felt that the Chancellor got the point that when programming in response to local needs you will have many themes. Schmitz added that he also spent a lot of time reviewing the documents, was glad the chancellor included the work that CEAC did, but it seems he is going to use the IDEAS (I=Innovation; D-Diversity; E=Economic Development; A=Access; S=Stewardship) concept as a way to get to these themes. He feels the themes the way they are right now (15) are not saleable. Dan Wilson said he has one issue with IDEAS – he feels that economic development does not fit with the others. Perhaps there is another word for “E” that would fit more of the programmatic ideas. Discussion ensued about a broad vs. narrow definition of economic development as well as the System emphasis on economic development. Wilson also asked whether the Chancellor will present a shared vision between UWEX and UWC or shared themes? Van Kekerix responded that he really doesn’t have much sense as to what will happen on Feb 7, but probably there will be some collapsing of themes and some relationship with the IDEAS acronym. Chancellor Wilson is still seeking input, so some may depend on what he hears in the meantime. Knapp commented that he still can’t see the “big picture” yet. Burke added that the themes are a list of things we already do, where does the vision come in? Wilson thinks there is a mix-up of terminology; themes vs. vision. Nack commented that UWEX is a federation of loosely connected units that are fairly autonomous. Gotkowitz commented that the themes are consistent with our activities and ambitions but we don’t yet see an expression of shared vision that embraces the missions of both UWEX and UWC. Dan Wilson commented that developing a shared vision is a process and is built on all units coming to a consensus on what the target for the future is. Picking up on the thought that UWEX is a confederation, Van Kekerix said that the UWEX mission statement is an umbrella mission and the divisions have their own missions. This is a complex structure administratively and we have continually struggled with a single vision or mission vs. multiple ones. This is not a problem in the Colleges because of their single focus and this has been an obstacle in trying to understand one another. Wilson said that maybe “access” is the vision rather than a theme. Schmitz feels that access, agility and collaboration are all part of the vision. Van Kekerix added that the collaboration piece also fits across all the divisions, not just Cooperative Extension. Wilson also said that “affordability” also cuts across all. What creates the umbrella, versus ways to get there.

The group agreed on two ways to communicate the ACCESS shared vision:

Option 1: Use ACCESS for vision acronym. A=affordability, C=collaboration and innovation, C=community and diversity, E=economic development; S=statewide sharing of University resources (the WI Idea), S=stewardship

Option 2: ACCESS through IDEAS and change A to affordability & agility. There was discussion about whether affordability means cheap, and program revenue requirements. Schmitz asked whether this as a shared vision really provides enough of a goal for us to shoot for?

Burke said he would be willing to summarize the discussion today including the acronyms and suggested having a face-to-face discussion with the Chancellor. Wilson also suggested a quick communication before the Board of Visitors town hall meeting on Jan 11 to let the Chancellor know that we feel he captured well the input he received, and to expect more detailed input within a week. Burke will send the “quick email” about the dialogue today to Chancellor Wilson also asking him when would be a good time to meet with a few of the individuals.

5. Chair Remarks

Burke had nothing to add. The joint governance work group has not yet met. The provosts will take the lead on scheduling the first meeting.

6. System Faculty Reps Report

No report was available.

7. Discussion of Institutional Issues and Opportunities Appropriate for Faculty Governance

The matter of county dept. head elections/selections came up and whether this should be considered at some point. There is much divergence of practice between counties.

Dan Wilson provided some background about the issue that Mahlon Peterson brought up at the last faculty senate meeting about a white paper on regionalization. He explained that there is a block of four counties in the Western district where there is no CRD presence and the paper was an attempt to address program coverage. CEAC also has a program coverage committee which has outlined a number of options, including regionalization, but it also has a listing of pros and cons and there are not many pros in that option. Both documents are internal dialogue pieces only.

Wilson thanked Burke for inviting dept. chairs to this meeting and said the dialogue was excellent.

8. **Adjourn**

Motion to adjourn by Nack; Hooyer seconded. Meeting adjourned at 1:16.

Recorded by Wodyn, 1-9-07.