

>> I am told we have a quorum, so I'm going to call the meeting to order. Thank you all for coming. And ask everyone to rise for the reading of memorial resolution. Let me recognize Professor Thomas Purnell [assumed spelling], excuse me, Thomas Purnell to present the memorial resolution for Professor Emeritus James G. Nelson.

>> James G. Nelson graduated from the University of Kentucky with a B.A. in education in 1952. Before he became a scholar of worldwide fame, Jim served in the Air Force for six years. He completed his doctoral degree at Columbia University in 1961. In his distinguished career, Jim studied the publishers of the 1890's including those who printed the work of Oscar Wilde. His studies focused on conflicts among publishers, authors, editors and printers. [Inaudible] marketing and even price of paper, typesetting and binding. Jim won the Chancellor's Distinguished Teaching Award in 1964.

>> Thank you very much. You may all be seated. It's good to have only a single memorial resolution. We've had far too many in recent meetings. I have just a couple updates that I want to give everyone about things happening around the university. Let me start with two personnel announcements. The first, and I'm looking to see if Charlie is here. Is he? Not yet? Well, I'm going to announce him anyway. We have appointed a new permanent vice chancellor for university relations, and even if he isn't here, you should all know him because he's been around the university for the last 20 years. Charlie Hoslett [assumed spelling] brings a wealth of connections in the state and knowledge about the state. He has directed corporate and both government affairs and really knows the political and business leaders in Wisconsin. I did not necessarily start in on this search saying that I was going to hire the internal candidate. But it became clear, I think, that Charlie's wealth of knowledge about this state is really something we need at this moment in time and his vision for where this unit can go, about how we deepen some of our communications and marketing efforts and continue to make progress in legislative affairs front was very compelling. I am delighted to announce Charlie's appointment. And if you don't know him, maybe he'll be here later. Second appointment I'm going to announce is as many of you know Darrell Bizelle [assumed spelling] we all applauded for last week. He had his last official day on Friday. And we have our interim vice chancellor for finance administration here. Mike Layman [assumed spelling], will you stand up so everyone can see who you are? Thank you, Mike, for coming.

[Applause]

Those of you who read the press announcement know that Mike has had a very distinguished career in Silicon Valley providing both financial and management leadership to a variety of major tech firms. And in addition to that, he has over the last 20 years been a very loyal and faithful badger. He has served on a number of advisory committees. He's currently serving on the board of the UW Foundation. He's just been a great member of our community, and I am just delighted that he's willing to go above and beyond and actually come back and work here for the next four to five months. The search committee looking for a permanent replacement is impaneled. The job is posted. If you know of people either in this area or outside the area at other universities who you think might be a good vice chancellor for finance administration, now is the time to tell them to look up the job description to apply because we're looking for great people. And we have a two month posting for this. So it will probably be May and early June that we'll be interviewing people and hopefully making a good choice. So that's where that is. On to faculty news, David Pagliarini, Director of Metabolism at the Morgridge Institute for Research and associate professor of biochemistry here at UW has received the U.S. government's highest honor for scientists in the early stages of their careers. President Barack Obama announced that Pagliarini is among the 105 recipients nationally of the presidential early career award for scientists and engineers, which is an impressive honor and congratulations to him and to the biochemistry department. I also wanted to call your attention to the announcement of our distinguished teaching award winners coming from across the university. I love this award ceremony and invite you all to come at 5 o'clock on March 16 to the Fluno Center. This is supported in part by the Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation as well as the office of the secretary of the faculty. And this is just a great group of people who represent the university wonderfully in many, many ways. So the 12 this year are great and if they're among your colleagues, please pass along our congratulations. We also have three University of Wisconsin Madison professors in the order of sort of younger people who've been named Sloan Research Fellowships, which are also given to promising young scholars at early stages of their career. And this year this includes Etien Grande [assumed spelling], the assistant professor of chemistry, Ori Rosenberg [assumed spelling], assistant professor of neuroscience and Lu Wang [assumed spelling], assistant professor mathematics. So all good news, and I'm sure all of you could add your own list of awards amongst your own colleagues. But it's always good to see UW faculty recognized

for the many things that they do. On the faculty front, let me [inaudible] comment on faculty retention, and I could not remember if we talked about this at the last meeting or not. But even if we did, it bears repeating because there are always new people in the room. As you all know, we were hit with quite a wave of outside offers that came in much earlier than I've ever seen August and September, largely the result of some of the negative publicity we got around budgets and tenure last year. Many of those offers have now closed. There are a small number that are opening but actually we're getting fewer offers in January, February and March than we usually do. They all -- many of them seem to have come in earlier. Of those that have closed, which I say is quite a large number, our current retention rate stands at 85 percent. And that is a wonderful number. It's above our average retention rate on the typical year and it is a sign that a lot of faculty have chosen to remain here at UW when given a choice. I might also say it's a sign of the excellent work of our deans and our department chairs and the provost and the vice chancellor of research and the fact that we made a real commitment to put resources into this because this is the university and retaining our top faculty is absolutely necessary to being who and what we are. So that 85 percent number is particularly good news and I have to say better than I would have dared to hope if you'd ask me last August. So all good. Moving from that front into the legislative session, the state legislature has almost finished their work for this particular session, which is always a two year session. The state assembly is done. The state Senate has one more day in the middle of March. While this hasn't always been the best legislative session for the university given budget cuts, changes to tenure and shared governance, there are a couple of things that have gone right in this session. I want to remind people that we were the only unit anywhere in the system to get money for a building. We got \$86 million in bonding for a needed addition to and renovation to the chemistry building, and that is moving forward as fast as the state allows it to move forward. We very recently got legislation that allows cows to sell and trade agriculture research land, which is very important given the magnitude of land that they own and their need to trade things out. Had they not been able to do that anytime they would sell land, the proceeds would go back to the state, and they couldn't use it to buy new land and usually they're always in the midst of land swaps. So this is really good news. Now here's one that will make your eyes glaze over, but I have to say some of us have worked on this for a long time, and it's really important. We got the ability to do what we've been doing for the last 20 years, which don't ask why, which is to continue to use parking revenues to fund our other transportation, bus service, safe walk programs. That legislation basically saves us \$2.5 million per year that we would have had to put into these because there'd been a ruling saying we can't cross use parking revenues for anything except parking. So that piece of legislation which took a ridiculous amount of time and effort on the part of the leadership of this university and our legislative affairs passed just last week and was signed by the government. Equally important is what did not pass the legislature this session. Bills that would have restricted the use of fetal tissue and cell lines and research and bills that would have allowed people to carry concealed weapons on campus and in the classroom. And I want to thank both our government affairs teams and all the other people who have been involved with the legislature, particularly profs and for the work that they and many of you have done in advocating for our behalf on part of the university as we finish up this legislative session. So thank you all. So good work. Update on where all of the policies around tenure and post tenure review stand. The regents in their meeting on Thursday are going to be voting. I believe their policies on tenure and layoffs and on post tenure review so the region wide policies should be in place at the end of this board of regents meeting. I have then been told and hasn't happened yet, but I really do believe this will happen is that their April meeting, our proposed policy on tenure and layoffs will be the first policy they take up, put through the education committee and approve by the regents. And it does look like our policy is broadly consistent with the [inaudible] policy they're going to adopt in April. So I believe that those things are moving forward, and so it will leave us with tenure policies that as I said before are very close to those of our peers. We -- I've been in San Francisco and in California the last four days. And we had a number of good meetings, but I particularly want to tell you about the campaign event we had in San Francisco. We had these series of campaign events around the country. And Saturday night was our San Francisco event. I think we had more than 300 alums there. And it was a wonderfully diverse crowd. Everything for the tech industry and engineers to nurses and some writers and mass communication people. I just talked with literally I think hundreds of people that night. And the degree of enthusiasm for the university and support of it and for our campaign is palpable there. As you know, we announced a \$3.2 billion campaign last October. We've been working on this for awhile. We never announce this until you're well into it. And we are almost halfway to our goal at this point which is really good news. And those are important additional revenues that supplement and provide a margin of excellence on a lot of things that we cannot use our state institution dollars for. So we're having our next campaign event next month in Chicago and then our last one of this sort is going to be in Minneapolis in June. So if any of you want to be in either Chicago or Minneapolis at either of those events, let myself or someone in the foundation know and we'll find a place for you. Lastly, I want to say a couple of things about diversity conversations because our campus like every campus is having a whole lot of conversations about issues of diversity and particularly about issues of race on

campus. We have a very active group of students that are concerned with these issues as I say does every campus. And as you all know, you live in Wisconsin, this is a disproportionately white state. It's a disproportionately white community. We are never at a time in our lifetimes going to look like California or Florida or Texas where the majority of high school graduates are non-white, are Latino, African American, Asian American, mixed race of one form or another. So this is one we just have to work on, and I know there are many people in this room who've been working on this issue for many years, and I think we've had some real successes when we talk about the numbers, which I'm not going to go into right now. But we are -- the fact that over the last several years we have this very large committee headed by Ruth that established a strategic plan for the next eight years called a framework for diversity and that was a group of both faculty, staff, students and community members has given us, I think, a leg up on many other campuses because we were already in the midst of thinking strategically about what do we need to do new and different over the next eight to ten years? And we're launching from that towards a variety of different issues. We had a great campus conversation two weeks ago. About 400 people primarily undergraduates, but a lot of other people from the community as well all came together and I've been blogging on this issue recently so you're more than welcome to go and read that if you want to see numbers and want to hear more about that particular event and at least my impressions of it. I do want to let you know that we're very much engaged in these conversations. We're talking, for instance, about doing some things for new students as they come on campus that are a little more explicit about inclusiveness and behavior in community for new freshmen and for new transfers coming on campus and we're in the midst of putting together a climate survey across campus. It will be slightly different for students versus staff versus faculty. But we really need to know where we need to focus some of our efforts. And I think the climate survey is going to give us some of that information. We've never done that before. It's going to be very helpful thinking about how we move forward and then there are a dozen other things we can talk about in terms of faculty and student and staff recruitment. Those of you who want to know more, we've got a lot of things active and don't hesitate to come up and ask about it. Secondly, on a very closely related topic, let me talk a little bit about hate and bias incidents which happen on this campus far too often whether it's a racial slur yelled out on Saturday night by people walking along Langden Street or a sexualist slur yelled out at young women as they walk through our campus or you may have heard of the recent incident of swastikas that were posted on the door in Selery [assumed spelling] Hall. We have a very detailed protocol for addressing these incidents and to the extent there is some good things that have come out of some recent incidents, it's that we've had an opportunity to advertise the fact we want people to report these things when they happen. We want to know what's happening when we have the information that will let us take action and respond. We will take that action, and we have a dedicated group of people in student life in housing across a number of offices that are really working on these issues. And a community of this size and this scope and this age range and everything else, some of this will always be happening. But we can do better, and we couldn't have less of this than we do right now. So that's one that we're also working on. And if you experience anything or see things, I hope you will speak up and help report things as well as support those who may be experiencing this because part of the problem is those who experience this often there's no one else who comes up to them and says that was terrible. That shouldn't have happened, right? They're sort of on their own. And if we're going to be successful at this, it can't be just African American students who speak out. It has to be white students as well. It can't just be the women who speak up. It has to be the men as well. It can't just be our Jewish students. It has to be non-Jewish students. This is not just a student issue I will note. So that's one that I encourage you also to join some of those conversations if you have the information. That is all I have to say, and I believe that Beth has nothing to announce. I will tell you just to give a warning. I have to be on a conference call at 5 o'clock. So if we are still going at that time, I'm going to leave about five of five and the provost will take over. And if provost has to go because she has people coming to her house to dinner, Beth will take over. But we don't have that long an agenda, and I'm hopeful that we might be out of here before then. Are there any questions for myself or for the university committee?

>> [Inaudible] 48. I have one question. The faculty reps and a number of other faculty groups adopted a statement about requests for amendments to the tenure policies at the system level. And I wondered whether you were supporting those on behalf of our institution?

>> I appreciate that question. I am not signing onto that explicitly, and I will tell you in part I had a lot of conversations with some other folks about this as well as some other chancellors. And I guess I feel pretty strongly that as the chancellor here, I need to represent the views of this institution and it's needs. And I'm a little reluctant to sign a statement that talks about what should happen at other institutions as well. So that's one of the main reasons why I chose not to sign onto that. I can promise you that I have been supporting some of those issues in person and on the phone

with a number of regents and people at the system level. But I haven't formally put my name on that document. I think that didn't feel completely appropriate to me. Other questions or issues that anyone wants to raise? Has Charlie come in? Someone told me he has. Where are you, Charlie? I'm not seeing you. Charlie Hoslet, our new vice chancellor for university relations.

[Inaudible]

If there are no other questions or concerns, I'm going to ask you to turn to the minutes, which are in your agenda on pages two and three. Are there any additions or corrections to the minutes of February 1? If not, I'm going to approve the minutes as they are distributed, and they are done. Let me then recognize Professor Beth Marvin [assumed spelling] who's going to present an update to the biannual report on Senate districts and apportionment, and we're going to have to vote to accept the revised report when she's done.

>> Thank you, chancellor. So as specified in faculty policies and procedures chapter two, every other year the office of the secretary of the faculty reviews the apportionment of the faculty into Senate districts. Last month, you accepted this report and today I'm asking that you approve the following update as written in your agenda. The Center for Jewish Studies and the Department of Linguistics will join German, Nordic and Slavik in faculty district 59 retiring districts 80 and 81.

>> Are there any questions or comments on that one change? You all saw this document last time. If there are none, I'm going to call for a vote. I do not need a second on this. Call for a vote to accept the amended report. All those in favor, indicate by saying I.

>> I.

>> Any opposed? Nay? All right. It is accepted. Let me then recognize Professor Carl Broman who's going to present a university library committee resolution for Senate endorsement.

>> Thank you. I move that the faculty Senate endorse the university library committee resolution in support of an open access policy for the University of Wisconsin Madison.

>> Is there a second to this motion? All right.

>> A number of universities around the country have adopted open access policies including MIT, Harvard, University of California, University of Minnesota. Currently, faculty authors own copyright of their scholarly work. The way that these open access policies work is that the authors would grant the university a nonexclusive right to distribute their scholarly articles. Authors would retain copyright ownership and the policy would not affect what journals an author wanted to publish in. The key thing is that the right granted to the university would perceive copyright transfer to a publisher so that the university could continue to distribute faculty scholarly work, journal articles in particular, on behalf of the author. Authors could request a waiver for a particular article and such a waiver would be automatically granted. Because so many universities have adopted open access policies like this, publishers are well aware of them. Some publishers do require authors to seek these waivers. But the numbers of waivers have been surprisingly small. University of California has a web page that lists requested waivers and numbers and maybe smaller than I would have expected, and it is largely nature publishing group, AAAS and PNAS. These open access policies don't require faculty to do anything. But we would hope that faculty would provide library staff with electronic preprints of their articles for inclusion in the university archives. Mine's at UW. An open access policy for the university is in keeping with the Wisconsin idea and will help ensure the accessibility of our scholarly work. The present motion is not to approve a specific policy but is simply to endorse a resolution from the university library committee in favor of such a policy. So this is a sort of endorsement of an endorsement of an idea of a policy.

>> And presumably we will put together a working group to draft the policy if this were passed by the Senate today. Why don't you stay here, and I'll call for comments and questions, discussion.

>> Surely, there's one person who would comment. Yes?

>> Tom Purnell [assumed spelling]. I'm in district 85. So I'm an editor of a small journal. My question is what would happen [inaudible]. It's not open access right now. What happens if [inaudible]. Second question is why is this not an [inaudible] policy [inaudible]? What would you do, what punishment will happen to me if I don't do this? Will I [inaudible] fired?

>> First, regarding you as a publisher of a small journal, what would you do? You could ask that authors of works that you wish to publish, you could ask that they waive the policy for those particular articles.

>> So Duke Press publishes the journal. So my question actually might be maybe you probably already know from UW Press, does UW Press [inaudible]?

>> I'm not aware of UW Press having any problems.

>> Have you asked them?

>> I've not yet asked them, no.

>> It might be worth it in case they have any journals that the editors [inaudible] themselves were actually more concerned like about my [inaudible] Duke Press because I have a very good relationship with them. It's not open access. They're willing to put articles up in certain time periods on the web [inaudible] website free, but they also do want to keep things closed. So the question is [inaudible] conflicts with my position as the editor of that type of journal [inaudible] as university policy.

>> The policy as -- the policy we have in mind would try to avoid getting in the way of the needs of small publishers or large publishers for that matter. What we really want to do is be able to capture the work that's all the other work. There are publishers that don't mind having preprints of articles appear in repositories, university repositories. We would like to see that we can at least be able to capture those. I think the main reason for an opt in is that you can then -- it -- for the benefit of faculty in a way that they don't have to be thinking about this all the time. They can go -- if the policy -- if such a policy were in place when they signed copyright away to a publisher, this has preceded that and so they can go back to those articles and make them available in the repository later as they wish.

>> Is there -- one of the other things is just from a funding model for the journals. I know in their requirements [inaudible] there's [inaudible] 12 month period. Part of the question is how is this going to -- what is this going to [inaudible] for journals down the road? Are we simply going to have one large [inaudible] journal [inaudible]?

>> I really don't know. I think that is to the benefit of both scholars and those interested in reading their work that it be made available easily, and I think this move towards making preprints available open access in repositories is generally a good thing. The way in which publishers will continue to keep going if everything ends up in a wide repository that's easy to access I'm not sure, but I mean, definitely the publishing industry small and big need to figure that out.

>> The other thing is the repository sounds a lot like [inaudible]. These other types of search tools. You don't need a new search tool [inaudible]. You wouldn't need new [inaudible].

>> I agree. I mean, this is really about the right of the university to archive our scholarly work and make it available. How a reader would find the work is a separate [inaudible].

>> I'm Matt Allen [assumed spelling], engineering physics. One or two questions. So you're saying that you want to only suggest that preprints be put in this repository, not the actual printed paper? Because if you --

>> That's right. I mean, largely because the copyright of what copy editors do and the typesetting, who owns copyright of those final changes is not terribly clear. I think the policies that most universities have are completely silent on this point of what version of the article ends up in a university repository?

>> Okay because when I read the thing, and I didn't have lots of time to look at it, it wasn't all clear to me that this only applied to preprints because for example, if we want to put the actual printed document in, then the author has to look at either paying an open access fee, which for example I looked up a journal that I published with we're looking at about \$3,000 per paper with Elsevier. And -- or they can sign a waiver, and I think after a year you might be able to get access to doing that. But basically the way the thing is written now it sounds like every single paper I write I will now have to also turn in a form with the university asking for a waiver or pay \$3,000. So the other comment I just wanted to make is that it -- the way it's written now, it doesn't give me the impression that you've really done a lot of homework. For example, it's okay to say yes, it would be wonderful if all research was free and available to everyone. Publishers do perform a service that they need to be paid for, and there's a big conversation going on about how much they should be paid for that and are open access journals as good as standard journals and all of that? And I didn't really see any links to some good opinion pieces or any kind of summary of what the state of the art is there. And I spent a few hours looking at that, but it's a huge issue. And I'm not really comfortable signing off on this when it doesn't even acknowledge all these issues.

>> Krista Olsen [assumed spelling], district 55. I also think there may be disciplinary differences. And I'm informing this in part with advice from Jonathan Senchen [assumed spelling] who knows a lot more about this than I do. That journals and publishers in the humanities are not in great position to allow to support this. Even the idea of a preprint is not something that a lot of us have. So this would be putting in the final version that I sent to the journal which is full of typos or isn't the final version. I'm concerned that maybe also disciplinary differences haven't been accounted for in terms of the size of journals, the nonprofit nature of journals. I like open access in theory. I want to make sure that the needs of different kinds of disciplines have been accounted for before signing onto something.

>> Judith Erston [assumed spelling], district 48. So a comment with respect to those of us who receive funding through NIH already deposit all our papers because of the Pubmed requirements and those are the final versions of the paper but not in the edited form. In other words, it's in the form that is accepted by the journal, and that's a straight forward thing to submit those papers. I feel in general that open access is desirable, although there are issues with respect to the profitability of publishers. But the fact of the matter is most of our research is funded in many cases by public agencies and therefore it seems appropriate to be available to the public.

>> Jordan Zwack [assumed spelling], district 55. I just wanted to echo this concern about disciplinary differences and to add one other thing to what Krista has already said which is that for example, I'm in a book field. I'm in the humanities. In order to get my book published, I probably have to publish one or two articles from the book to show that there's interest then to publish the book. I'm a junior faculty member. I'm concerned about how that requesting waivers or adding that language to the contract about being allowed to publish in the repository might slow things down with journal publishing. But more importantly, I know that when I contacted a press about publishing my book, they said, "Where has this already been published including open access dissertation?" And I think that if I hadn't been able to say that my book was significantly different then the dissertation available through open access that they would not have accepted my book. So I would ask that you consider things like that as well.

>> Mark Etsel [assumed spelling], district 11. I move that we table this motion until the next faculty Senate meeting to allow further discussion.

>> I need a second for a motion to table, and I believe there is no discussion. There is discussion. Would anyone want to discuss the motion to table? If not, we will vote on the motion to table this until the next meeting, and I assume it's the implication you want the committee to work on it further or you simply want people to come back better prepared for a discussion? All right, we will simply delay the discussion until the April faculty Senate meeting. Any discussion of that tabling motion only?

>> [Inaudible], district 51. I second because there is a strong sentiment that [inaudible] expressed by many other Senators that we need to acknowledge that we have some bias. We know [inaudible] libraries are a part of us and the publishers are for profit organizations, that some of them have reputation, and it put is in some bias position, and we need to recognize that the for profit publishing industry is essential for our survival. If we undermine and undercut the profitability and push them out of the market, we are undermining our future in terms of the ability to publish really our work. So this is not entirely addressing the motion, and that's the reason for the amendment, for the motion to table.

>> Anyone else want to speak to the motion to table? If not, all those in favor of tabling this for a discussion at the April faculty Senate indicate by saying I.

>> I.

>> Any opposed? I think the motion carries. So we will take this to the April meeting. It is incumbent upon all of you to take this back to your colleagues and come back with conversation so we can hold a further discussion. Thank you very much [inaudible] your committee has done, and we'll continue this. Let me recognize Professor Michael Kissik [assumed spelling] who's going to present a new proposed policy on children in the workplace.

>> Hello. So I hope you've had a chance to look at it in the documents for the meeting today. Let me just run through a couple of the main points. Before I do that, I'm going to be asking for --

>> Let me move [inaudible].

>> All right. I'd like to make a motion to endorse this policy.

>> And I should say that this is a motion to endorse. Faculty Senate cannot actually put in place an HR policy. It would be a recommendation to the university to adopt this policy as an HR policy. Is there a second? Second? All right.

>> I was just going to introduce and then motion. Okay. If you read the rationale, it says the UW Madison is a family friendly workplace, supports work life balance by providing appropriate flexibilities for employees. So this is about employees bringing children, not some special university event that has children as a part of it. And it's not about daycare. It's actually also not about lactation rights, which are covered in a federal policy and that women have a federal right to have access to a baby for breastfeeding. That's separate. This links to it. What this is about is people actually like me -- I like to bring my son in for a couple of hours a few times a year just to see how Dad spends his day at work. So I'd like to have that flexibility. It doesn't seem to disturb anybody and so this policy wants to cover situations like that. Also situations where maybe you're coming back from the dentist and there is this strange awkward period of time, but somebody needs to get something done. You just have the kid tag along with you. Again, if nobody is upset by it, why not allow it? We actually don't have a campus wide policy right now. There are policies within schools or divisions perhaps, but this would be a campus wide policy, and it is based off a template that system gave us. But if you look through it, there's a couple of key words, and I actually surveyed the faculty in my department as to how they felt about it. I realized that I like freedom as much as possible. And if a rule is not there and everything's going fine, my personal bias is well, why make a rule? But we have to make this rule. And so I wanted some guidance on what will be the average faculty view on some of these things? And the average faculty view in my department was there should be some stuff which is left with local control. Definitions like the word brief or extended and regular. Those kinds of things I think can be defined locally. Clearly, there's some places where children are just not going to be a good idea. There's dangerous facilities, stuff like that. The faculty in my department wanted a more global policy covering anything related to safety. But if it's not related to safety, it's not related to disruptions, then there should be some give and take depending on the local environment. So that's what this tries to do. This is made possible by the fact that if you look on the next page there are responsibilities for the employee and for management. Employee needs to understand, needs to supervise, needs to accept a lot of responsibility, needs to refrain from bringing the child with an illness. Management needs to determine the hazards, consider the health of all the employees, consider the extent to which the child's presence poses a risk of a breach of confidentiality. There's HIPAA regulations and so forth. Clearly, there's places where kids would not be appropriate. And addressing any issues related to whether the employee can continue their work duties or disrupt other employees. However, it doesn't say that management is encouraged to disallow under any circumstances. So if you read the rationale, there's a sense that maybe management should try to allow as much as possible. So that's the flavor of it, and as we've been talking about it with different groups and gotten different ideas about defining this, give an example for that, a lot of times we're hearing conflicting viewpoints. I feel like this policy is so far meeting with approval from everybody, and it seems to hold this position of equal tension among different views so I think it's actually pretty good. It links to a bunch of other stuff. It's got boiler plate stuff about insurance and it's got definitions of high risk areas. I guess that's about it. I guess I'd like to open it up for discussion then.

>> Questions?

>> Hi. My name's Bridget Builder [assumed spelling]. I'm from district 51. I'm wondering if you could just elaborate on the portions or this that you say are encouraging of bringing children and how this is a family friendly document. I read this as a much more discouraging document and so as somebody who is currently with child, I'm looking for the specific places that you're talking about here, and I'm just not seeing something. Could you point out to the specific parts of this?

>> Love to. Yeah. I relate to you. And I think it's encouraging because it doesn't say the employee has to ask permission beforehand. It doesn't say there needs to be a waiver signed. There's a whole lot of things like that which could create actually a lot of overhead and create more problems that's not there. But at the same time, I just don't think it would have been possible to get approval for anything much looser than this. I mean, I was as strong a voice as I could possibly be for freedom here. But I just -- there's a lot of other viewpoints. And even within the faculty, there's other viewpoints. I couldn't just say my view is what I'm going to represent. I wanted to represent what I thought would be an average of all of your views. And I did the best I could by surveying my department. So --

[Inaudible]

To some extent, it's what's not being said. Yes.

>> I would read the statement here, which is under rationale [inaudible]. The whole point is try to provide appropriate flexibility for employees who may want or need to bring a child or children to the workplace for brief visits [inaudible] situational convenience or family emergencies, which I actually take is an encouraging tone [inaudible].

>> I mean, there were also -- yeah, and there were other views related to equity. Not all employees are going to be able to experience the freedoms that maybe faculty might have more of. On the other hand, I think if you're higher up than [inaudible] provost or chancellor I think you might have less flexibility as well. So considering it all, I don't know how much better we could have made it. If you also look, it says you're not supposed to bring a child in lieu of extended or regular child care, but it doesn't really say what that means. And we resist a lot of attempts to try to describe what do you mean by regular or extended? How about just leave it at that? Let local situations work themselves out.

>> [Inaudible] Goldberg, district 71. Michael, I'm glad to see this. I think it's a welcome development. My question is was there any consideration of including an appeals process so that it documents that management has the authority to disavow? What if you happen to be working in a unit or department where management is not being very reasonable?

>> That's a good question. I'm glad Patrick's here from HR. I think there are already appeals procedures in place for things like this. But I think here's the expert.

>> Sure. That's a great question. I'm Patrick Sheehan [assumed spelling]. I'm with the office of human resources. That was something we discussed a significant amount within the group as well as with others who were involved with this policy and under supporting tools, there's [inaudible] faculty policies and procedures, the grievances section is identified and that is really the formal process that can be utilized, although in our discussions, we really feel that it's best that this be something that would be best discussed with the supervisor or manager, department chair, whoever is making that decision so that there's an understanding of what the different viewpoints may be.

>> Lisa Everett, district 67 physics. I wanted to make a comment that I didn't -- I also when I first read it thought it seemed a little discouraging. And I appreciate what you said about it could have been much more discouraging. But I also wanted to comment that one thing that I think maybe comes to my attention is that we talk about serving the faculty, but I'm wondering are we serving the staff? For example, if you have an infant, it's extraordinarily difficult to get into daycare that are near by here. The wait list are years. And so suppose you're in a situation where you really don't have that many options? In fact, I think the ones which are covered by city financial aid in particular and that are within a bus distance, there's almost none. And I happen to know almost every one of them have wait lists that are on the order of -- their kids got to be like four or five before they get into them. And so I was -- yeah, for the infant, or you have to sign up somehow years before you ever realize you're ever going to have a child. So sign up everyone right now. But I

guess the reason why I'm bringing this up is that to me what was discouraging then was the sort of you're not allowed to have under any circumstances. But suppose we have somebody that literally cannot afford to do anything else and there's a baby, and is that something that locally can be handled or not?

>> Well, yeah. I've got several replies to that. Well, the first is I was just a faculty representative. There was general staff and academic staff representatives as well as representatives from other groups as well. With regard -- like I say -- with regards to breastfeeding, there already needs to be access on a regular basis. So I'm not sure every department does this well, and I think we need to start thinking about that and maybe develop a better policy for that. That's that one. As far as the child care thing, it's just not going to fly to bring your kid to work all the time. There's just too many people that don't want that to happen at all levels. But there were voices saying well maybe we food service workers for example can never bring our kid into our workplace so nobody should. And I really just think that's driving the equity thing too far off the edge. And so -- but on the other hand, you have to respect it to some degree so we can't just have any policy we want without any restrictions. So it was a really hard balance. Yeah, I guess that's all I have to say right now. But I really tried to be a voice for your concerns actually.

>> The first time I've come up -- this is I think a really important issue actually. Kathy Marler [assumed spelling], district 69. I've had two kids. I brought my children, and I have an office. I was able to bring them into my office, and I brought them even to faculty meetings. They were fine. They were well behaved. I would not have been able to do that during the first six months. It would have been -- if I had to bring them to -- I just wouldn't have been able to come into work. And I just really think you have to think about this really seriously because it's going to have a large impact on women at this university.

>> Well, so your point is that you should or shouldn't?

>> Should be flexible.

>> There should be flexibility.

>> Yes. I had that flexibility. I appreciate it greatly. It made a huge difference.

>> Right now there's no campus wide policy, and things are working. So one method that I saw was to let's try to keep it as much as possible like it is now. And I think this is pretty much.

>> So this would be to keep it as it is now?

>> Yeah, because there's already some policies at division or school level that are there that are similar to this. Is there something about it you don't like?

>> It was the point that was brought up before about women who are coming in who are pregnant or they're going to be having small children. They want to be able to bring their kids in over an extended period of time, especially during those first six months. And as long as it's not disturbing the people next to you and it's an agreement with your colleague, then I think that should be permitted.

>> Well, this is the way I look at it. Extended and regular are not strictly defined, and there's no examples given for that. If nobody's being disturbed and management's okay with it, it'd be very hard to have a policy that says yes, you're allowed to do that. But some other employees can't at all. So I -- I mean, the equity argument does hold some weight. But like I say, you can have a different definition of extended or regular from one place to another.

>> Okay. So that flexibility would be retained, and it would still be impossible for all those people [inaudible] to have that ability as long as it's not --

>> I don't know. We did the best we could to retain it. There were a lot of voices trying to get us to define all of those things. We just kept trying to hold this position in the middle. But a policy had to be created. So --

>> I disagree with [inaudible]. I think it's [inaudible].

>> Well, how would you like it to be different?

>> I would like to have that flexibility or maybe there's [inaudible] in a different area where the child would be less disturbing or some flexibility [inaudible].

>> I think this gives flexibility. This gives flexibility. It doesn't take that away. If -- I mean, it doesn't say you can't do that.

>> Then the voices that you're saying where there are people who are disagreeing, where is that in this policy? Where have their views been accommodated?

>> Well, the rationale for the template said -- the rationale for the template said the workplace is not ordinarily a place for children. So we X'd that. So there were a lot of things like that. The tone of it was completely changed to a welcoming place for children.

>> My reading was that similar to a couple of others where after reading it, it didn't seem that welcoming.

>> There's just a lot of people that don't want the disturbance of a child around. They have rights too. And so I have to listen to those concerns as well. And it was coming from all different angles. Actually, when I was talking to the faculty in my department, I had a hard time predicting what that person's view would be. It didn't seem to even fall along gender lines. It didn't fall along political lines. It seemed to be a rather honest difference of opinion about how much people want to work around children. And I have to respect all of these views. So I tried to handle it that way.

>> Yeah. Chad Allen Goldberg [assumed spelling], district 71. Michael, I appreciate the work that you and others have done on this document. Like colleagues who spoke, I'd like to see the maximum flexibility possible. And this exchange just now, one concern occurred to me. You said that at the moment there's no campus wide policy. There's lots of variation across units or departments. Maybe I'm -- and I probably am -- vastly overestimating the degree of flexibility that exists at present. But is there possibility that having a campus wide policy, a campus wide policy might be worse or less flexible than some departments. That's to say are there some places in the university that have very flexible policies that are actually better than the campus wide policy? Is that a danger that you considered or that you talked about?

>> It is a danger I considered. But on the other hand, there had to be a campus wide policy because of an audit. And actually it comes -- it doesn't come from the state coming down on us so much like so many other things. It's my understanding this comes out of the Penn State scandal. And there are audits all over the country related to this.

>> So this campus wide policy that was adopted, this would trump those sort of local policies within certain departments or units that might provide at present more flexibility. Am I understanding right?

>> My hope and people in the committee can tell you it was difficult because I wanted there to be so much flexibility. I really was difficult.

>> I know that.

>> For that view. You know me. But I think this does the best that it can because it doesn't define what the manager is. The manager could be the dean. It could be the professor in charge of a little group. You know what? If you try to over define that, then you're making it less flexible. So we tried to keep those terms as they were. Less is more.

>> Andrea Rupar [assumed spelling]. I don't know my district number but rehabilitation psychology and special education. I just wondered -- you talked about talking to people in your own department and maybe informally or anecdotally getting information about people's opinions about the policy. I was wondering if there's been any systematic effort to determine campus wide opinion on how workplace flexibility works for people with children?

>> With regards to this policy, I wanted to survey all of you. But there's actually open meetings laws related to this. I can't just do that outside of the formal meeting. It was dumb for me to ask. But department was something I had freedom to do. But there were other people and their voices in on this too. Like I said, the staff representatives, people from other --

>> Be potentially like campus wide survey or something that could be distributed to find out -- take the temperature of how people feel like the policies are working for them right now?

>> I believe that [inaudible], and I'm going to look [inaudible] a regular workplace survey that includes some questions about -- not asking specifically about children but about sort of some of these work life balance. Is that right? And I don't know what that showed.

>> Yeah, so the equity inclusion and diversity survey surveys things -- this really falls under the inclusivity so if you feel that as a parent, as a father, a mother, would you feel that your workplace allows you to balance your work life? Do you feel welcomed in the workplace that addresses questions like that? And these sorts of issues? And so -- I mean, there's some -- a couple of points I wanted to make about this policy that it does refer to things such as workplace flexibility and as well as office of child care and family resources which has a number of different child care opportunities that are available to staff members on campus. And additionally, I think a big part that I think Michael would be supportive of is that we discussed at a great deal is the fact that some people may know that their supervisor supports this and allows this, that bringing a child in the workplace, brief visit, is something that's allowable in their workplace whereas many other employees never conceived of this. It's not something they're aware of, not something they knew was available to them. And so that's a large portion of this policy is just making all employees aware this is something that exists, and here are the guidelines and the parameters. But as far as policies that exist on campus that are more flexible than this that would be made subordinate to this and then would be restricted, to our knowledge, I think those don't exist. There's not something on campus that we think currently conflicts with this policy. It just has not been an area that's been formally addressed in any fashion before this.

[Inaudible]

>> Comment. I just -- I guess I would suggest maybe trying to formally obtain that information to find out what are the local policies across campus. My department has been very flexible with me bringing my children to work. But I know colleagues haven't had the same experience.

>> You might have something to lose doing that. I mean, I'm just a warning, less is more.

>> [Inaudible] district 74 statistics. I think if you're going to have any campus wide policies, they should be limited to [inaudible] -- they should be limited to issues of safety and disturbing your colleagues.

>> Well, that's what this is.

>> Disturbing your colleagues [inaudible] emergencies.

>> Those are the three things.

>> We have to recognize that they're different classes of people in this university. Members of this Senate are all tenure or tenure track faculty and probably all of us have a private room where we can shut the door. As far as I know, there are colleagues in my department that bring small children in and nobody is the wiser, provided the children are well behaved and they're not out of their -- and they're not running around. In our working group, which I'm moderator, I encourage people to bring their kids in as soon as they're old enough to not scream and yell, and they can be brought into the conference room without bothering other people. The last time it happened somebody brought in their play pen and their kid got up and started walking around the play pen while the guy was giving a talk. Everybody had a great amount of fun with this. But this is really restricted to us privileged people who have rooms of our own that we can close the door and not bother anybody else. So I hope we don't disturb that or make it very bureaucratic.

>> Well, I've seen secretaries bring their kids in. It's fine. I've seen a lot of students bring their kids in and their babies in, and it's fine. I don't feel the need to create laws when we don't -- rules -- when it's not needed. So I -- that's how I went into it. But on the other hand, I was not the only voice.

>> I got one more [inaudible].

>> Brett Larget [assumed spelling], department 47, department of [inaudible]. I'm also a member of the university committee on women. From the university committee on women we did see a version of this document ahead of time. I know that other people were sharing it with other groups on campus. Our first read of it was something that we thought did read more restrictively than we wanted. I actually believe that some of the comments that we made -- there's places where the language actually did change. And in the spirit of the document, it really is setting up saying if you're someone who wants to bring your child in, these are the things you ought to be aware of. And if you're a manager who's in charge of this, probably ought to let it go unless it's causing a problem in one of these areas. And I think it's -- the vagueness is something that is good and can be locally defined and hopefully where things are going well, it will -- it was looked at by broad groups on campus including the committee on women.

>> Yeah. It seems to be satisfying everybody. Will it satisfy you all? I guess we should call a vote, huh, to endorse it?

>> I see no one waiting to talk so I think we are ready to vote, which voids voting on calling the questions. If you are all ready to endorse this policy or not, if you are ready to endorse, please signify by saying I.

>> I.

>> All of those opposed? Nay? Motion carries, and the policy is endorsed. And we will send it forward to human resources for them to act further. Thank you very much and thanks [inaudible]. I know your committee did a lot of work on this one. Let me recognize Professor [inaudible] who's going to present modifications to the membership and functions of the committee on women in the university.

>> I move approval of the changes to FPNP chapter 6.56 presented in your agenda materials.

>> Are there any questions or issues on these changes? Do you want to say anything about them?

>> They're evidently all very just straight forward cleaning up things from statutes and [inaudible]. If not, if we're ready to vote, all of those in favor of the changes to the membership and functions description of the committee on women in the university, indicate by saying I.

>> I.

>> Any opposed? All right. In that case, I recognize Professor [inaudible] who is going to present FPP changes relating to the university research council. This is a first reading so there will be no vote, but there will be discussion.

>> So you have in your materials a first draft of language that incorporates university research council into FPNP. Current URC was appointed to assist VCRGE office in implementing the new organizational structure. This inaugural group worked with the VCRGE who in turn worked with the UC to create the document you have in front of you. I'd like to highlight a few elements and then invite your input. Based on the faculty document that split the grade school, a report from the working group and discussions with others across campus, we propose a hybrid model for populating the committee where half the faculty members would be elected from slates prepared by the divisional committees and half of the faculty would be appointed by the university committee. We feel this hybrid model takes advantage of the benefits of different modes of selection. I welcome your input.

>> Is there discussion or questions on the proposed language here for the URC? Judith.

>> So Judith First [assumed spelling] in district 48 and member on the committee on committees. The committee on committees thanks you for having some of the members elected. We felt that that was a very important component of

the process, and I assume that that means elected by all faculty. Is that correct?

>> Mike Sessman [assumed spelling], biochemistry department and biotechnology center. Yeah. I applaud this. It's obviously required because of the reorganization, and I just have a couple of points. I was wondering what your thoughts on this were. I applaud the word -- there's a difference between the word advise or approval. Advising is one thing. Requiring approval is another. And I was looking for that because approval gives more meat to faculty governments. Advising is kind of you can advise but whether or not that's abided by -- and there's pluses and minuses on both words in each situation. And I did notice that in here there was the word approval required in the center section, which I applaud actually as a center director, I like the lack of confusion on how they're reviewed. I was part of the committee that decided the review process. I think that's good. But I didn't see the word approval in the other aspects. For example, where a lot of the money is being disbursed in section A -- in section 1 -- B1B. Talking about allocations and flexible resources. If one added there provides advice and approval, that would change that function of the committee substantially I think. And the same thing goes to the annual request to the [inaudible] board of trustees. If one added provides advice and approval to the section B13 instead of advising and counsel. Now, there's pluses and minuses on there. On the one hand, you want to give VCRGE flexibility to make decisions that may not be approved by a committee. On the other hand, as a professor wanting faculty governance at all levels, you might want that. So I was just wondering if the committee or whoever wrote this document could provide some advice on how the word approval versus advise was inserted at various places?

>> That's a very good question. We followed the policies that were brought forward. So if you go back to when the graduate faculty executive committee was the advisory group to the graduate school which included the functions of the vice chancellor research as well as the graduate school, it was advisory except for the section on centers. So we're actually following the model of the prior governance group as we move forward into the split of the VCRGE and the grad school. And so we felt that actually this committee would take over the responsibilities of the [inaudible] allocations advisory committee which was prior chapter 6 committee, and that's been folded into this group. And it was advisory.

>> Do you want to add anything?

>> Sure. Allen Goldberg, district 71. Question, what is the advantage of having some of the members appointed by the university committee? Why not just have everybody elected? That would be more democratic.

>> This is something we actually struggled with a lot in the university committee. And when I reached out and talked to people that are on the existing committee and other people on campus, quite honestly we want to make sure that the committee has the best researchers on campus populating it, people who really focus on research, are outstanding in their discipline and there's concern that those kind of folks wouldn't run for election. These are typically not people who do a lot of service. They're just working on their scholarship. So the committee was worried. Other people I've talked with are worried. I talked to some really research stars who said, "Oh, I'd never run for election. No way. But if someone asked me to, I might do it." So that was -- it was sort of born out of that concern.

>> If I may ask a followup question -- so couldn't -- so I understand the problem -- couldn't the problem be resolved simply by having university committee instead of appointing people, speaking to colleagues and asking them saying look, we'd really like you to run and won't you do it? Having a personal appeal.

>> Yeah. They said they really would not want to run for an election. They'd be embarrassed if they didn't get elected. They just don't want to do it. They don't want that kind of public thing. They just want to do their scholarship.

>> I think you're absolutely right. I agree with you on that. It used to be something called the principle -- I'm sorry?

[Inaudible]

My name?

>> Just [inaudible].

>> Oh, Mike Sesman [assumed spelling]. Okay. Yeah. There used to be a principle investigator's committee which represented the interests of all the researchers that write grants and bring it all in. And I'm viewing this as the replacement for that. And I totally agree with you that many of those people are too busy writing grants and stuff to run for election. So --

>> Are there any other questions or comments on this proposal? This is a first reading so this will come back to you next month for a vote. And if there are suggested revisions and changes, that's obviously something you should all feed into the UC because they have the ability to make changes before bringing a final document next month. All right? I'm going to move on to the next item. Professor [inaudible] is going to present a proposal for a new shared governance budget committee for a first reading.

>> So you have in your materials a first draft of language creating a shared governance budget advisory committee. For years, the former VCFA felt that it would be useful to have a shared governance group of individuals who are well versed in budget matters to serve as a sounding board for the administration on campus wide fiscal issues. So the document you have before you includes feedback from faculty, academic staff, university staff and students. But it also includes many specific functions that the former VCFA saw as required to meet his specific needs. And these he discussed with the UC over a number of meetings. And they're now contained in that document. I welcome your input on this.

>> Hi. Irwin Goldman, district 13. Beth, you mentioned in your opening comments that this was [inaudible], the former vice chancellor for finance administration's wish, and I applaud him for that. I think it's terrific to have a budget committee, but it sounded very specific to his -- what he hoped to have for his -- the kind of information he needed given that Darrell is unfortunately not with us anymore here.

>> Sounds pretty dire.

>> Although he's still alive. It's a very sad thing that he's not with us. I wonder if it makes sense to have a consultation with our new interim person in that role. Maybe take this back to the university committee for more consultation so that -- to the degree that this was for Darrell and the kind of information Darrell wanted, we could at least make sure that it's more appropriate for what we need going forward. So I would -- one recommendation I would have then is that this would be -- the university committee would take this up, discuss it with the faculty and with others, bring it back in April and we could still vote in May on this if you wanted to do it. But it would give a chance to more thoroughly I guess discuss it among the community.

>> So is that a moved table to the next month I take it?

>> I can make that as a motion, and we can move to table, bring it back in April for further discussion.

>> Is there a second to the motion to table? Second here. Is there discussion on the motion to table? If not, let's take a vote on the tabling motion. All in favor of tabling this going back for some discussion with new personnel who are in place and bringing it back in April indicate by saying I.

>> I.

>> Any opposed? Motion carries. All right. That is tabled, and we have only one other item. And Professor [inaudible] will again come forward to present a draft statement on shared governance for first reading.

>> I feel like I'm at mass here. Up and down and up and down. So you have in your materials a first draft of language reaffirming the importance of shared governance on this campus. Some months ago, the chancellor asked the shared governance chairs to develop a statement reiterating UW Madison's commitment to shared governance. [Inaudible], ASM and the UC each reviewed the chair's draft resulting in the draft you have before you. The academic staff assembly, the university staff congress and the students are also discussing this document this month. I welcome your input on the document.

>> This is a document for discussion, not vote. Is there any discussion or comments on the document that anyone wants to make? I will consider that an endorsement of the document in that case. And it will move forward. And we'll see if the other shared governance groups agree, and we will then all have this in a final arrangement. We're at the end of the agenda. And it's a quarter of five, and we don't even have to shift chairs up here. So thank you all very much for coming, and we'll see you all in April. The meeting is adjourned.