

Approved 05/13/2008

**University Committee Meeting Minutes**  
**March 18, 2008**  
**Room 102, 432 N. Lake Street, Madison, WI**

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

Chair Burke called the meeting to order at 9:01 and certified compliance with the Open Meetings Law. Attending: Rob Burke, Dave Hart, Tom Evans (for Chapter 3 discussion), Chris Kniep, Lee Cunningham (for Greg Blonde), Melanie Miller (for Karen Nelson), David Nack, Robin Shepard, Ann Keim, Kate Wodyn.

**2. Approval of February 12, 2008 meeting minutes**

Hearing no changes; Burke considered the minutes approved.

**3. Provost/Vice Chancellor report**

Interim Vice Chancellor Robin Shepard began by stating that the budget repair bill is receiving a lot of discussion though no specific number has been tossed around for the UW share of that cut. The governor is still quite high on the Growth Agenda and that will be in our favor. The rumor at this particular time is a \$30 million cut to the UW. The chancellor's attention has been on the Bachelor's of Applied Arts and Sciences degree for the Colleges. This has received media coverage and Board of Regents attention and is moving through the appropriate channels and the entitlement to plan process. Greg Lampe has begun shaping that approach, so we can expect to hear a lot about that in the next six months. There is resistance from the technical colleges and some reaction from the four-year institutions. This would be a different mission for the Colleges and they will have to submit a change of mission if it is approved. Shepard continued that this is the time for DINs (Decision Item Narratives) although there is not a lot of hope given the budget situation. We are working on two, Adult Student Initiative II and Cooperative Extension has one in the economic development and public policy/conflict resolution arenas. This could be a way to bolster the CNRED presence across the state. UW Colleges and UW-Extension are hosting the Board of Regents meeting in April. Ann Keim is working on the program and there are several places on the agenda that will highlight what we do. David Wilson is moving forward with the Director of Entrepreneurship and Economic Development position. It will not be a vice chancellor position but an executive director position. Dates to keep in mind: a Wingspread Conference on "The Civic Mission of the Public University" in September; and the Outreach Scholarship Conference at Penn State Oct 7-9. Shepard added that Purdue and Kentucky will be coming into the outreach scholarship partnership. He recently attended a meeting of the vice chancellors of the partner institutions where they discussed expanding the organization, perhaps becoming a non-profit and publishing a journal.

**4. Chair report**

Burke referenced the letter from Al Crist (circulated via email) about the compensation advisory committee. UW System would like to know of any changes in our reps on that committee. Burke talked to Barb Larsen and since she is going off faculty senate this year she thought it might be best to appoint another member. Burke will suggest that Larsen attend the May 16 meeting since she will still be on faculty senate at that time and can report at the June meeting. Call for nominations for faculty hearings committee: Ray Schultz will send out the call when he returns from vacation.

**5. UW System Faculty Representatives Council report**

Karen Nelson sent a written report (circulated via email) in her absence. They are in process of editing the shared governance guidelines piece. Wodyn mentioned that Paula Huff has been appointed as the UW-Extension representative on the Council of UW Libraries (CUWL).

**6. Chapter 3 ad hoc committee report**

Tom Evans reported. He recapped the Jan 16 discussion about improving communication about the tenure process and some structural changes that could improve communication. This group will provide a report at the next Faculty senate meeting on April 25. Today he is sharing where they are

so far. There are three pieces that the committee agrees on; the 4<sup>th</sup> piece is still being worked on. (Distributed handouts). He went on to explain that in an organization as broadly distributed as ours it is easy for communication to be challenged. Energy has been dwindling regarding this process and a lot of misinformation has settled in. The committee has recommended re-establishing an annual orientation workshop primarily geared toward probationary faculty and then establish another annual workshop among SRP members, the Faculty Tenure Advisory Committee and academic department chairs to talk about what worked, what didn't and how do we make the process better. We need to make sure that these are annual events and faculty-led events, not administrative. The University Committee needs to have ownership of the process. If these are put in place, a lot of the misinformation can be addressed.

Changes to Article 5: this deals with the Faculty Tenure Advisory Committee (FTAC). Evans commented that he feels there is an incredible amount of misinformation out there about FTAC. Much of this stems from three negative recommendations last year that the dean overturned. Going back four years, 46 of 42 tenure candidates received positive recommendations and only one did not receive tenure because of programmatic changes. The recommended changes to Article 5 insures that the candidate receives written detailed rationale on the committee recommendations which are tied to the criteria.

Changes to Appendix IB: the committee looked at the criteria first. They are proposing to rewrite the criteria that so that scholarship is pulled out as separate and made part of the other 5 criteria. The assessment of scholarship has been kept pretty much intact.

Changes Appendix IIB: the committee is still working on this. They are thinking of putting in a section about how the portfolio contents relate back to the criteria and to eliminate confusion about some of the administrative documents. They would like to focus more on how the candidate would summarize their work rather than putting in lengthy documents that don't have much meaning outside their department.

Discussion—Keim suggested a regular review of this whole process. Evans said there is something in the policy about this but this has been somewhat lost. Cunningham said that the workshops in the past provided this review. Burke said there has been a suggestion to have a standing committee of the University Committee on tenure and scholarship with a specific charge that would embody these goals. Evans cautioned creating additional structure that could hamper communication; it would have to be staffed with people who are closest to the process (SRP, FTAC, etc). Miller commented that the committee's recommendations are outstanding and they are to be commended. In Article 5, Kniep suggested moving the proposed written rationale from 5.06(4) to (3) rather than just for reconsideration of negative advice. The written rationale should accompany either a positive or negative recommendation. Shepard asked if there is anything the provost's office should be aware of in all of this. Evans responded that the provost needs to be aware that the faculty are very concerned about this and communicate/provide the financial support for the workshops. Kniep emphasized the importance of mentors in being a part of this. Robin Shepard asked when would be an appropriate time to share this with the administrative team (district directors and program leaders) because they need to be in this loop. Evans said it's probably a little too early now but in a month or so after the Faculty Senate has looked at this it would be more timely. There was agreement to add language that mentoring groups, program leaders, district directors should all be invited to the workshop and emphasize the importance of them being there. Cunningham said that the Secretary of the Faculty also needs to have an active role as well as the University Committee.

**7. Article 4 –discussion about potential faculty governance units**

Burke has recruited Chris Kniep, Karen Nelson, Karen Hintz, Barb Larsen, Sue Pleskac to serve on an implementation committee. He has also talked to Peter Manley regarding academic department chair representation. He hopes to formally pull the committee together via Wisline in the next few weeks. Some initial thoughts by Burke would be to have each county be a faculty governance unit and perhaps have a statewide unit for specialists and the southeast part of the state. Kniep said there is confusion about whether a faculty member could be in more than one unit. Discussion ensued.

**8. Discussion of potential agenda items for co-located governance meeting on April 25**

One item will be the report from ad hoc committee on scholarship. Keim added that each governance

group will need to look at the institutional strategic plan and David Wilson has asked for a vote. Groups will get the plan in plenty of time to review before April 25. Cunningham commented that the faculty senate should review it and decide how to respond. Nack said we could discuss it in a joint session but the individual governance groups would decide how to respond to it. Kniep commented that this is an awareness, communication, and understanding thing rather than an approve/disapprove situation. Another agenda item will be the report on Article 4 implementation. Idea for joint session with Colleges - strategic planning. Cunningham asked about the status of the joint governance work group that was formed but has never met. Burke replied that Chancellor Wilson has said that he didn't see an opportunity for a joint governance model at this time and going ahead with the search for an Extension vice chancellor indicates two separate faculties.

**9. Meeting schedule for 2008-09**

Three drafts were circulated. Nack suggested meeting more with the Academic Staff Council (ASC) because of issues of joint concern. Burke agreed that the discussion at joint meetings is good. Nack supports the schedule with three joint meetings with ASC and just one co-located meeting with Colleges. There was consensus that it is more important to meet with the ASC. The University Committee's recommendation to Faculty Senate will be the 3-1 combination.

**10. Strategic plan update**

Ann Keim thanked the committee for their input (as above). She also mentioned that she will be in the Special Assistant to the Provost position another year and then will return to Cooperative Extension.

**11. Other issues**

Kniep asked if we are supposed to do anything with the IT document that was circulated. Burke said this was informational only.

**12. Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 11:22 a.m.

Recorded by Wodyn, 3-18-08.