MINUTES

EDUCATION COMMITTEE, BOARD OF REGENTS
University of Wisconsin-Madison
Madison, Wisconsin
March 9, 2006

Regent Davis convened the meeting of the Education Committee at 12:50 p.m. Regents Davis, Axtell, Bradley, Semenas, and Spector were present.

1.   Approval of the minutes of the February 9, 2006, meetings of the
         Education Committee

                 I.1.a.: It was moved by Regent Axtell, seconded by Regent Bradley, that the minutes
                 of the February 9, 2006, meetings of the Education Committee be approved.

                 The resolution PASSED unanimously.

2.   Appointment to the Oversight and Advisory Committee of the Wisconsin Partnership Fund for
         a Healthy Future

                 The Committee began the meeting by taking action on the appointment of June Martin Perry to the UW School of Medicine and Public Health Oversight and Advisory Committee of the Wisconsin Partnership Fund for a Healthy Future. The item was moved up on the agenda to accommodate Regent Emeritus Boyle's schedule. As the Board's liaison to the Oversight and Advisory Committee, Regent Emeritus Patrick Boyle joined the Education Committee to provide background on the Wisconsin Partnership Fund and describe the process by which the nomination of Ms. Perry was forwarded to the Board for approval. When Blue Cross & Blue Shield converted to a for-profit company, he explained, it gave $300 million each to the UW School of Medicine and Public Health and to the Medical College of Wisconsin as proceeds from the sale of its stock. The Oversight and Advisory Committee (OAC) was created to oversee the use of funds allocated for public health, as stipulated by the Wisconsin Insurance Commissioner's Order upon transfer of the Blue Cross & Blue Shield money. The Insurance Commissioner's Order also stipulated the composition of the OAC, and how new members should be chosen.

                 Regent Emeritus Boyle assured the Committee that the OAC engaged in an exemplary and rigorous selection process through which to fill the urban community member slot for which June Martin Perry was being nominated. He praised the choice of Ms. Perry as someone with many impressive accomplishments in the public health arena in Milwaukee, and who would contribute positively to the OAC.   He further informed the Committee that the OAC had allocated about $34 million in grants over the last two years to fund university-community partnerships across the state. The Committee commended the work of the OAC and the choice of Ms. Perry.

                 I.1.c.: It was moved by Regent Axtell, seconded by Regent Semenas, that
                 the Board of Regents approves the appointment of June Martin Perry to the UW
                 School of Medicine and Public Health Oversight and Advisory Committee to fill
                 the unexpired term of a public member, which ends in October, 2008.

                 The resolution PASSED unanimously.

3.   Program Authorizations

a.   Second Reading of the Master of Science in Agroecology, UW-Madison

Recalling how impressed the Education Committee had been by the Master of Science in Agroecology at UW-Madison upon its first reading in February, members quickly took action on the program. They also noted that this would be the last program approved under the old system of two mandatory readings for each new academic program proposed.

I.1.b.(1): It was moved by Regent Spector, seconded by Regent Semenas, that upon recommendation of the Chancellor of the University of Wisconsin-Madison and the President of the University of Wisconsin System, the Chancellor be authorized to implement the M.S. in Agroecology.

The resolution PASSED unanimously.

b.   First Reading of the Bachelor of Science in Information and Communication Technologies, UW-Stout

c.   First Reading of the Master of Science in Information and Communication Technologies, UW-Stout

Before hearing from UW-Stout, Regent Bradley asked whether the UW System was increasing on a net basis the number of academic programs in its array. Senior Vice President Marrett responded that, in fact, the number of programs was stable over time. While new programs are brought before the Regents, those that do not receive entitlement or are disbanded are not. Because there have been no new resources for academic programs in recent years, new programs can only be funded through reallocation of existing funds. Regent Bradley explained that he asked the question out of concern for the public perception that there is a proliferation of new programs throughout the UW System. The Board, he added, should address this perception and make clear to the public that there is no such proliferation.

Senior Vice President Marrett reminded the Committee that, several years ago, the UW System enacted a moratorium on new programs in the face of uncertainty regarding proposed budget cuts. The moratorium was lifted as soon as the budget was adopted to enable institutions to continue to respond to student and state needs. She assured the Committee that she would report back to the Board on the overall numbers and substance of program array. Normally, the Board would hear this in the Annual Program Planning and Review Report presented each September but the Committee agreed that it would like some clarity before then. In response to a question from Regent Spector, Senior Vice President Marrett explained that the Board has authority over the System's entire program array, as well as an important role in ensuring the substance and quality of these programs. In periods of constrained resources, it is difficult to meet the state's emerging needs and maintain at the same time a stable array.

UW-Stout Interim Provost Julie Furst-Bowe then introduced the B.S. in Information and Communication Technologies, a program that she said would reinforce the special mission of UW-Stout and leverage its strengths and resources. UW-Stout Professor Len Bogner added that the program was designed to meet the needs of working adults through distance education, that it was one of a number of articulation agreements developed in the last few years by UW-Stout, and that it had received start-up funding through a grant from the Committee on Baccalaureate Education (COBE) funding.

Regent Axtell asked why the Bachelor of Science was being developed at the same time as the Master of Science program, observing that usually the B.S. degree would come first and a master's level degree would come somewhat later, once the former program had developed a cohort of graduates. UW-Stout Professor Steve Schlough described the two programs as conceived under the same information technology umbrella, but responded that the B.S. program was not a feeder to the M.S. program and that, in fact, they would be serving entirely different groups of students, with different needs. Regent Davis expressed some confusion that the two programs were not linked, especially given that they were both reviewed by the same external reviewers. Regent Spector stated that he did not intend to be negative but that he found less substance and rigor in the program executive summaries than he usually found, questioning in particular the vagueness of the description of the two programs' alignment with UW-Stout's mission. Professor Bogner responded that the B.S. program was designed to meet the transfer needs of students from the Wisconsin Technical College System (WTCS). Provost Furst-Bowe added that Stout was building on what the Technical Colleges provided to students. Stout was well-positioned to broaden the technical skills of WTCS students, to provide the General Education courses needed to provide baccalaureate degrees to WTCS students with Associates' Degrees.

These responses generated a host of questions and comments by Education Committee members. Regent Spector asked what courses, specifically, would be provided to the B.S.-enrolled students to give them a real major in Information and Communication Technologies. Regent Bradley questioned whether these courses would cohere into a suitable baccalaureate degree. Provost Furst-Bowe replied that this would be the third such degree-completion program offered by UW-Stout, and that it would be marketed off-campus and not to UW-Stout students who had begun on campus as freshmen. Regent Semenas followed with a line of questioning concerning the kinds of internship programs that both the B.S. and the M.S. programs said they would offer. Regent Axtell asked for greater clarity on how Information and Communication Technologies differed from other, related disciplines like Computer Science or Information Technology, and what kinds of jobs graduates of the B.S. and the M.S. programs would be able to get. He also asked for additional information on the practice of per-credit tuition that would fund the two programs under consideration. Provost Furst-Bowe responded that the students would fund the entire program. Regent Bradley asked whether the students' WTCS credits would transfer, citing the external reviewers' questions about this and noting that, if they did not, the UW System would be blamed. Provost Furst-Bowe replied that UW-Stout led the System in accepting WTCS credits and that this would not be a problem.

Regent Davis expressed her concern about both programs, and posed the question as to whether or not the Board should approve them. Regent Bradley expressed his continuing concerns about the quality of the programs. Regent Davis asked for more information on the program's intentions to address diversity. In response to a question from Regent Axtell, Ed Meachen, Associate Vice President of Learning & Information Technology, described for the Committee the employment needs both the B.S. and the M.S. programs would meet, such as the information technology needs of the banking and accounting industries.

Citing the need for due diligence, and despite the newly approved expedited process for approving new programs, Regent Davis suggested to Committee members that they defer approval of the B.S. program until they received additional information that would allay the multiple concerns raised. In response to a question from Regent Spector, Professor Bogner said that a deferral would disrupt their proposed timetable for offering the program to students. Regent Bradley asked Senior Vice President Marrett to explain why the program had come forward with UW System's recommendation. She responded that System's role is to bring programs forward for discussion by the

Regents and help the Board make quality assessments. Regent Spector noted that while he felt he understood the need for the two programs, he would move to defer them and hence give UW-Stout and UW System time to work out responses to the questions raised by Regents. Regent Semenas seconded the motion. Professor Schlough presented a few additional points on the M.S. program and concluded by asking what else the Regents needed in order to act on the two programs. Senior Vice President Marrett and Regent Davis summarized that the Regents were asking for collaboration between Stout and System to address the questions raised by Regents, in particular concerning the lack of clarity on how graduates of the B.S. and the M.S. programs would meet the societal need for information and communication technology graduates.

The Committee agreed unanimously to defer action on both the B.S. and the M.S. programs in Information and Communication Technologies.

4.   Revised Faculty Personnel Rules

a. UW-Green Bay

Regent Davis alerted Committee members to the revised executive summary in their folders, which clarified the proposed rule change from UW-Green Bay. The change specifies the role played by the Chancellor in the process by which complaints against faculty members proceed on campus. Regent Spector asked why the campus proposed to involve the Chancellor immediately in disciplinary procedures which might more logically involve a simple reprimand from a dean. Provost Sue Hammersmith explained that the proposed change came from the faculty and was approved by the Green Bay Faculty Senate. Provost Hammersmith agreed that it was unusual to involve the Chancellor at such an early point in the complaint process but noted that the Chancellor agreed to bring it forward because the Faculty Senate requested that he do so.

In response to a question from Regent Davis, System General Counsel Pat Brady said that if the Committee did not approve the rule change, it would not be allowed to go forward on the campus, adding that such an action would be unprecedented. In response to a question from Regent Spector, Senior Vice President Marrett responded that the rule change did have UW System's recommendation out of respect for shared governance and the UW-Green Bay Faculty Senate. Regent Axtell observed that this example of a faculty personnel rule change explains why such actions should not be delegated to the President, despite past inquiries by the Committee over whether such agenda items needed Board action. Regent Davis stated her intention to approve the rule change, despite the fact that she did not approve of it. Regent Semenas stated that he would be opposing the rule change.

> I.1.d.(1): It was moved by Regent Axtell, seconded by Regent Bradley, that, upon recommendation of the Chancellor of the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay and the President of the University of Wisconsin System, the Board of Regents approves the amendments to the UW-Green Bay Faculty Personnel Rules.
>
> The resolution PASSED,with Regent Semenas voting no.

b.   UW-Oshkosh

> I.1.d.(2): It was moved by Regent Bradley, seconded by Regent Axtell, that, upon recommendation of the Chancellor of the University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh and the President of the University of Wisconsin System, the Board of Regents approves the amendments to the UW-Oshkosh Faculty Personnel Rules.

The resolution PASSED unanimously.

5.   Recommendations for UW System Policy on the Role of Resident Assistants in Residence Halls

The Committee next undertook discussion on the UW System policy on the role of Resident Assistants (RAs) in residence halls, recommended to the Board by President Reilly. Assistant Vice President Larry Rubin reviewed for the Committee the background leading to the development of the recommended policy. He reminded the Committee that a resident assistant's room functions as both an office and a campus home, and that RAs are considered "on call" almost anytime they are in their room or assigned residence hall. The need for a policy on the RA role developed from a Resident Assistant at UW-Eau Claire who was informed he could not lead Bible study in his room. The student responded by bringing suit against UW-Eau Claire and the Board of Regents, with the support of a national advocacy group concerned with possible abridgement of the student's First Amendment rights. In the wake of a hearing held by Representative Rob Kreibich, President Reilly convened the working group to develop a systemwide policy defining the parameters of the RA role.

Assistant Vice President Rubin informed the Committee that most UW campuses had previously allowed such meetings to be led by RAs in their rooms; only UW-Eau Claire and UW-Madison did not, out of concern for the impact on students under the RA's supervision who did not share his/her religious beliefs. As the Working Group met to draft a policy, it was helped in its deliberations by over 500 web-postings received from members of the public on the appropriate role of the RA. The resulting policy, explained Mr. Rubin, is intended to balance the responsibilities that resident assistants have as university employees, with the opportunities offered to them on campus as students themselves. Certain principles were followed, including the fact that RAs are responsible for creating an open, inclusive, and supportive environment for residents. The policy under consideration by the Committee would permit RAs to conduct meetings anywhere on campus, including in their rooms, to the same extent as other students. However, noted Mr. Rubin, the policy was clear in stating that RAs could not use their positions to pressure or coerce residents to attend or participate in meetings.

Regent Spector requested a change to the proposed policy language and a revised version was passed out to the Committee with a slightly different last sentence of the policy stating that RAs "may not use their positions to pressure, coerce, or inappropriately influence student residents to attend or participate." The Committee agreed that while the language change was relatively minor (changing the position of the modifier "inappropriately"), the alteration was important in signifying that no kind of coercion or pressure is appropriate. The Committee discussed several additional points, including the fact that campuses would be required to include information about the policy when training new RAs. Michael Viney, Assistant Chancellor for Student Affairs at UW-Platteville, elaborated on how this training would be provided. The Committee made clear its expectation that each campus would develop a written process through which students could complain if they believed the policy was being violated.

The Committee expressed its appreciation to President Reilly, Larry Rubin, and the other members of the Working Group for their thoughtfulness and professionalism in developing the policy. The Committee voted to approve the amendment made by Regent Spector to Resolution I.1.e., and then voted to approve the revised resolution.

I.1.e. Revised: It was moved by Regent Spector, seconded by Regent Semenas that,

upon recommendation of the President of the University of Wisconsin System, the Board of Regents approves the following policy on the Role of Resident Assistants in Residence Halls:

Resident Assistants (RAs) are expected to work with student residents to create an open, inclusive, and supportive residential community. At the same time, because RAs are students themselves, they are encouraged to participate in campus activities and organizations. As such, RAs may participate in, organize, and lead any meetings or other activities, within their rooms, floors or residence halls, or anywhere else on campus, to the same extent as other students. However, they may not use their positions to pressure, coerce, or inappropriately influence student residents to attend or participate.

The resolution PASSED unanimously.

6.   Initial Report of the UW System Waukesha Study

        The Committee then heard the initial report of the UW System Waukesha Study. Senior Executive Vice President Don Mash introduced several guests from Waukesha County, including County Executive Daniel Vrakas and his Chief of Staff Allison Bussler, as well as Bronson Haase, Chair, Margaret Farrow, President, and Carla Rutley, Executive Director, all from the Waukesha County Action Network (WCAN). Noting that President Reilly had charged him to conduct the study and to convene a steering group, Dr. Mash also recognized the group's original members, including Regent Spector, Margaret Cleek, Interim Chancellor at the time to the UW Colleges, UW-Milwaukee Chancellor Carlos Santiago, Jane Crisler, Interim Dean at the time at UW-Waukesha. Other members have subsequently joined, including Marv Van Kekerix, Interim Chancellor of the UW Colleges/UW-Extension, Provost Rita Cheng from UW-Milwaukee, and Patrick Schmidt, the new Dean at UW-Waukesha.

        Dr. Mash presented the initial findings from the Steering Group's study of the higher education needs, expectations, and opportunities in the Waukesha and greater Milwaukee areas. The UW System, he noted, wants to offer more degree programs, as well as research and job opportunities to the state. The Steering Group has been consulting broadly with Waukesha-area leaders to study the region's educational and economic development needs. Dr. Mash identified four goals on which the UW might work with its County partners, and which would serve the area: (1) providing gateway programs to the baccalaureate degree; (2) providing noncredit education and training; (3) expanding bachelor's degree offerings; and (4) expanding graduate study opportunities. Dr. Mash said that although there had been discussion by some parties of a merger between UW-Waukesha and UW-Milwaukee, the Steering Group deliberately put that idea aside for the time being. Instead, the Group has worked to engage as many higher education partners as possible from the region, and to focus on developing the enormous intellectual property that exists in Waukesha County. He mentioned that a "research center of excellence" was being discussed, although funding for such a center remains a big challenge.

        The Committee then heard from two Waukesha area leaders: County Executive Dan Vrakas and Bronson Haase from the Waukesha County Action Network. Mr. Vrakas described the growth of Waukesha County and its value to the state, along with its high demand for education, research and training in areas like science, technology, engineering, sales, and nursing. He called on the Board to consider the merger of UW-Waukesha and UW-Milwaukee, citing as motivation the state and the County's need for more baccalaureate degree-holders, as well as the funding burden faced by his

County in its financial support of UW-Waukesha. Mr. Haase introduced the Waukesha County Action Network as a private sector, civic organization that made broad public policy recommendations to improve the County. Their top priority for Waukesha County is public higher education. Citing the competition of for-profit higher educational institutions in the County and the needs of the County's business community, WCAN recommended to the Board that UW-Waukesha become a four-year university and that the UW System establish a business-research park in Waukesha County. He requested that the Board take action in June to include these recommendations in the UW System's next biennial budget request.

Regent Semenas asked Mr. Haase whether WCAN was asking for a merger between UW-Waukesha and UW-Milwaukee, or for UW-Waukesha to be converted to a four-year institution. Mr. Vrakas expressed his belief that a merger had the potential to save money for both the UW System and Waukesha County. Regent Semenas observed that a merger would hurt Waukesha students who would have to pay more tuition to attend a four-year university. Regent Axtell recalled that, back in the 1980s, there was discussion of an Interstate 94 research corridor. There was nothing to prevent WCAN or Waukesha County, he added, from developing a research park independently of UW-Milwaukee or the UW System. If high-end jobs existed in the County, baccalaureate degree-holders would be attracted to and stay in that area.

The Committee expressed its appreciation to the Steering Group assigned to study this challenging topic, emphasizing their remarkably collaborative process. The Committee was informed that conversations and collaboration would continue, and the Board could look forward to a final report at some point in the future.

7.   Authorization to Recruit: Chancellor, UW-La Crosse

> I.1.g.: It was moved by Regent Axtell, seconded by Regent Semenas, that the President of the University of Wisconsin System be authorized to recruit for a Chancellor of the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse, at a salary within the Board of Regents salary range for university senior executive salary group three.
>
> The resolution PASSED unanimously.

8.   Report of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

        a.   The Use of Technology to Increase Student Access

Senior Vice President Marrett began her report by recognizing Regent Burmaster's receipt the next day of the Senator Paul Simon Award for Outstanding Advocacy for World Languages and International Studies. She then introduced Ed Meachen, Associate Vice President for Learning and Information Technology, to discuss the topic "The Use of Technology to Increase Student Access." Mr. Meachen outlined the growth of the UW System's world-class technology infrastructure to support alternative methods for delivering instruction, and described how that infrastructure enhanced both student access and success. The UW System, he observed, has made a huge investment in technology and he elaborated on its potential to achieve many of the goals of President Reilly's Growth Agenda. Both traditional-age and adult learners are digitally minded and web-connected; they expect and demand technology as a means of enhancing their learning. Technology, moreover, is remaking the way higher education can be delivered. The UW System has been proactive in implementing this transformation through budget initiatives and grant programs. A brief video montage was show demonstrating how online technologies are transforming teaching and learning in the UW System.

Mr. Meachen introduced Provost Rita Cheng and Andrew Petto, Lecturer in the Department of Biology, who described an "early warning system" at UW-Milwaukee that identifies at-risk students through the university's course management system. This innovative use of technology integrates classroom instruction with advising and other student support services in order to improve the performance and retention of at-risk freshmen. Second-year retention rates have been low at UW-Milwaukee and the "early warning system" addresses those numbers with a student-friendly, early intervention program designed to identify students in large courses who do not understand the material. Provost Cheng concluded that where a paper system did not work, the web-based system is producing dramatic results in identifying and serving the needs of at-risk students. In response to a question from Regent Davis, Mr. Petto explained that student contact with their instructors was increased greatly through technology, although the consequence for teachers is that they have to spend a huge amount of time responding to their students online.

Mr. Meachen concluded by indicating that every UW institution has exemplary programs using technology to transform teaching and learning. He asked the Committee to request that, as plans for President Reilly's Growth Agenda were pursued, UW System information technology leaders be included at the table because they have much to contribute to this agenda. The Committee agreed that it would do so and thanked Mr. Meachen, Provost Cheng and Mr. Petto for their presentation.

     b.   <u>Status Report on the Process for Shared Governance Input to the Regent Committee on Faculty and Academic Staff Discipline</u>

Regent Spector described the input being gathered from shared governance groups around the System on the proposed UW System Chapter 7, developed by the Regent Committee on Faculty and Academic Staff Discipline. Invited to meet with several governance groups, including the UW System Faculty Representatives and the UW-Madison Faculty Senate, he found participation in their meetings helpful and informative. He added that the comments and input received from these groups would play a valuable role in helping the Regent Committee make its final policy recommendations. Senior Vice President Marrett expressed her appreciation to Regent Spector for his willingness to listen and his attentiveness to the input being received.

Resolutions I.1.b.(1), I.1.c., I.1.d.(1), I.1.d.(2), I.1.e. Revised, and I.1.g. were referred as consent agenda items to the full session of the Board of Regents at its Friday, March 10, 2006, meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.