Governance Retreat – August 29, 1-3pm, Tamarack Room

**Goal:** to develop an outline for the “future look” of shared governance at UWEC.

1:00-1:05  Opening remarks and ground rules discussed, Senate Chair Harrison
1:05-1:14  Round 1 – Be seated at the first Table listed in the assigned order.
1:14-1:15  Shift to next assigned table
1:15-1:24  Round 2 – Discuss the topic at your assigned table.
1:24-1:25  Shift.
1:25-1:34  Round 3 – Discuss the topic at your assigned table.
1:34-1:35  Shift.
1:35-1:44  Round 4 – Discuss the topic at your assigned table.
1:44-1:45  Shift.
1:45-1:54  Round 5 – Discuss the topic at your assigned table.
1:54-2:00  BREAK – Hosts create summary notes.
2:00-2:10  DOT TIME – Use the RED dots to indicate the key ideas on the wall that you DO NOT support. Use the GREEN dots to indicate the key ideas on the wall that you DO support.
2:10-2:50  **Dr. Scott Lester**, Director of the Center for Leadership and Professor in Management and Marketing will lead the group in forming consensus around the “future look” of shared governance at UWEC based on the previous conversations.

Be sure to speak up if you have a differing opinion.
Now is the time to share your ideas!

2:50-2:55  Closing remarks

(For your convenience, the questions for today’s discussion are listed on the back.)
Table Questions

1. Think about committee meetings.
   a. What are the characteristics of an effective and efficient meeting?
   b. What should be the expectations for the chair before the meeting, during the meeting, and after the meeting in order for the meeting to be considered effective and efficient?
   c. What should be the expectations for the members before the meeting, during the meeting, and after the meeting in order for the meeting to be considered effective and efficient?

2. Think about committee membership.
   a. What characteristics are displayed by someone you would consider an “excellent” committee member?
   b. What is the best way to obtain members with those characteristics for a committee?
   c. What criteria should define membership? (representation, classification, senator, etc.)

3. Think about the topics that were discussed in Senate over the last two years.
   (honorary degrees, mission, voting rights, authorized absences, new prefixes, new emphasis, speaking turns, suspending degrees, merging committees and committee memberships, creating new departments, creating new degrees, academic policy criteria, course overviews, post-tenure review, Constitution and Bylaw changes, Senate officers/reps, administrative advisory committees, Instructional Academic Staff appointments, credit bearing certificates, new international exchange programs, study abroad programs, university-wide committee name changes, tobacco free campus, salary plans, relationship of senate to student senate, administrator search procedures, promotion notification, online/hybrid/web courses, WI Idea, etc.)
   a. What areas absolutely must be brought before a larger senate by committees to provide an adequate governance voice of faculty and academic staff in the decision-making process?
   b. What areas could be handled solely by smaller focused committees with the authority to make governance decisions on behalf of faculty and academic staff (provided that those decisions would be published and adequate time provided for response)?
   c. What areas could be delegated to administration with reports to campus?

4. Think about the time spent in Senate last year given that over 60 people, on average, attended each two-hour Senate meeting and how you learn about what happens in those meetings.
   a. How can we streamline our meetings without sacrificing effectiveness to be able to invest time savings elsewhere?
   b. What parts of the meeting should be retained or changes? Are there viable alternatives to physical meetings?
   c. How can we document the work of the committees in meeting their charge and responsibilities and communicate that work clearly to departments and units if we streamline?

5. Think about those serving on and chairing effective committees.
   a. How should committee members’ work be valued?
   b. Should members be held accountable/evaluated for their level of work? How? By whom?
   c. Should chairs of university-wide committees receive some type of compensation? If so, what?
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