APPENDIX 1. INSTITUTIONAL INTEGRITY

Schedule of Team Meetings

Meeting 1  Sept. 13, 2007, 1–3 p.m.  Core Group 4246 Helen C. White
Meeting 2  Sept. 20, 2007, 1–3 p.m.  Core Group 4246 Helen C. White
Meeting 3  Sept. 27, 2007, 1–3 p.m.  Advisory Group 4246 Helen C. White
Meeting 4  Oct. 25, 2007, 1–3 p.m.  Core Group 4246 Helen C. White
Meeting 5  Nov. 15, 2007, 1–5 p.m.  Core Group 4246 Helen C. White
Meeting 6  Dec. 7, 2007, 1:30–3:30 p.m.  Core & Advisory Groups WAA Board Room
Meeting 7  Jan. 31, 2008  Core Group 4246 Helen C. White
Meeting 8  Feb. 21, 2008  Core Group 4246 Helen C. White

APPENDIX 2. BUILDING COMMUNITY

In this section we provide reports written by members of the Building Community team that illustrate campus resources or exemplars of community and inclusivity. Others highlight challenge areas and suggest possible solutions.

1. PEOPLE Program

Description prepared by Tom Browne

Pre-College Enrichment Opportunity Program for Learning Excellence (PEOPLE) is a precollege pipeline for students of color and low-income students, most of whom are the first in their families to potentially attend college. Their journey prepares them to apply, be successfully admitted and enrolled at the University of Wisconsin–Madison. PEOPLE accepts highly motivated students into a rigorous program to build study skills, explore and strengthen academic and career interests, and gain a positive experience on a world-class campus.

PEOPLE challenges motivated students by providing personal discovery, academic improvement and career exploration. Throughout the program, students demonstrate an increased understanding for college life and expectations as well as improved confidence in their academic abilities and preparation.

PEOPLE currently serves students in the Madison, Milwaukee, Racine, and Waukesha public school districts, and the Ho-Chunk, Menominee, and Lac Courte Oreilles, Lac du Flambeau and Bad River Nations Indian Nations. For Madison-area residents, the six-year program begins in the summer when students have completed the sixth grade and continues until the students have graduated from high school. All other PEOPLE locations accept students when they are in ninth grade. Priority for admission is given to students eligible for the free and reduced hot lunch program. Upon graduation from high school, students who are U.S. citizens or permanent residents, who have been admitted to UW–Madison and who complete the Bridge-to-College Program will be eligible for a tuition scholarship for up to five years.

The director of the PEOPLE Program is Jacqueline Dewalt, 608/262–7415, jadewalt@education.wisc.edu.

2. College of Letters and Science Honors Program

Prepared by Mary Czynszak-Lyne

Goal: Create an inclusive and welcoming environment for program staff and students through the development of “guiding principles” and “mission statement.”
The L&S Honors Program has gone through several transitions in recent years, including an organizational restructuring as well as various personnel changes. In addition, the program continues to grow in terms of student and faculty involvement, as well as sponsorship of new educational and co-curricular opportunities. In light of these changes, the staff recognized the need for an ongoing self-reflection that would identify who we are, where we want to go, and how to get there.

In January 2006, we held a five-hour staff retreat, facilitated by the Office of Quality Improvement (OQI), at which we identified the strengths of our office and our areas for improvement, and began to develop our guiding principles. Following the retreat, staff members collaborated to synthesize the information and drive it through several different iterations, including list-like documents and visual representations. We held a follow-up retreat in August 2006, again facilitated by OQI. At this second retreat, we further defined what “success” means for our office, established goals for the year, and drew up a list of action items. Among those items was the creation of an office mission statement. Staff members collaborated to draft this statement, which was finalized by staff and the Faculty Honors Committee in January and February 2007. In summer 2007, we began a strategic planning process in which we began to apply the guiding principles and mission statement into a performance evaluation process.

This entire process has improved staff collaboration, collectivity, and morale. We continue to strive to build horizontal working relations while recognizing the possibility of such relationships within the hierarchical structure of the university. The more publicly visible results are the L&S Honors Program guiding principles and mission statement, as well as the integration of these materials into our interviewing and training for new staff, and evaluations of continuing staff. Our new admissions process also reflects the work we have done around the guiding principles by focusing on selecting students based on qualitative markers of essay questions instead of the qualitative measures used in the past. In addition, we are developing a core honors course sequence that will engage honors students in the process that our staff has already begun working on.

The value of naming the problem. By collectively identifying and discussing the issues and circumstances that negatively affected office functioning, we were also able to reach consensus on what we needed to do to move forward and improve.
The importance of outside facilitation. Having an outside facilitator was crucial to our success because it allowed everyone to fully participate.

The necessity of having an individual or core group to keep the process moving forward. Without three or four individuals committed to seeing this process through, it would have fizzled long ago.

Keep the guiding principles and mission statement alive by integrating them into the office culture and reviewing annually at a retreat or mini-retreat in early fall. Students comprise the majority of our staff and, as a result, turnover is constant; each new staff member brings new qualities and perspectives to the program; our changing nature needs to be reflected in these documents. For the documents—and, more specifically, the commitments outlined in them—to be truly alive, we need to ensure that they are present in all aspects of our operations. This entails tailoring our public personae (Web site, publications, etc.) to be in line with the principles and mission.

Continue developing a strategic plan for the L&S Honors Program. This is particularly important for developing a performance evaluation that keeps the guiding principles in mind and in light of the program’s upcoming move to a new larger space in April 2009.

Contacts: Mary Czynszak-Lyne and Molly McGlone, 420 South Hall, 2055 Bascom Mall, mczynsza@wisc.edu, 608/262–2984

3. The First-Year Experience Seminar
Description prepared by Angela Byars-Winston

Counseling Psychology 125: Racial and Socioeconomic Perspectives on the First College Year is designed for first-semester freshmen, a population in need of small courses to facilitate the transition from high school to college-level academics. While this is not a freshman orientation course, the academic material is presented in a way that allows students to open up to each other and to instructors about their transition to college. It is well documented that small, academic freshman seminars are a critical part of a successful first year at a large university like UW–Madison and predict higher grade point averages and graduation rates. Through a small course like this, students are encouraged to engage in academic material, practice and hone critical thinking and communication skills, and enhance their appreciation of and sensitivity to diversity.

This one-credit course explores issues of race and class in higher education in the context of a student’s transition from high school to college. Students read the book A Hope in the Unseen by Rick Suskind, and closely examine the experience of Cedric, the main character, as he moves from a depressed high school in inner-city Washington, D.C., to the halls of Brown University. Through this exploration, students will think, write, and talk about how their own transition from high school to UW–Madison compares to Cedric’s. This compare-and-contrast exercise serves as a basis to explore the larger themes of the course including active learning, affirmative action, religion, and multiculturalism. Students are asked to write weekly papers, complete experiential assignments, and participate in a weekly intensive discussion section. The course culminates with a final paper asking students to closely examine one theme from the book in the context of their own transition from high school to UW–Madison. The course is designed to engage students in the academic experience early in their college career through intensive discussion with classmates and individual dialogue with instructors. Finally, the course is intended to create an appreciation for and sensitivity to diversity in a developmentally and educationally purposeful way.

The course is taught in a ten-week format in the fall and spring semesters. Each section enrolls a maximum of twelve students (approximately 100 students took the course in fall 2007). Instructors are selected for their ability to relate well to freshman students and for their understanding of the themes and learning goals of the course. Faculty, academic staff, and graduate students are eligible to serve as instructors. This seminar is coordinated by Wren Singer, director of Orientation and New Student Programs.

Description prepared by Jennifer Sheridan

The Women in Science & Engineering (WISE) Residential Learning Community provides an environment where women interested in science, technology, engineering, or math (STEM) can make strong academic and personal connections with students, staff, and faculty who share their interests. Participants benefit from having a small academic and social community within the setting of a large research university. WISE participants have the opportunity to develop mentoring relationships with faculty members, as well as upper-class, former WISE students who serve as peer mentors.

Initiated in 1995, WISE is one of UW–Madison’s founding residential learning communities, and it paved the way for much of what works so well for other residential communities within the university. Students in the WISE program:

- Attend a weekly seminar where they interact with their peers and faculty around intellectually stimulating topics.
- Take key foundation courses (e.g., chemistry, calculus) together.
- Enroll in WISE-designated sections in chemistry, math, and engineering.
- Meet with women faculty one-on-one in the first six weeks of the academic year, a best-practice identified by the National Academic Advising Association.
- Organize and participate in science and arts events such as cheesemaking, the science of chocolate, behind-the-scenes industry tours, and theater and concert performances.
- Travel to nearby cities to experience culture and science. Recent destinations have been Chicago, Milwaukee, and Minneapolis.
- Meet with area professionals, faculty and staff at workshops, lectures and roundtable dinners.
- Meet with their professors and instructors at the WISE professor dinner held each semester.
- Participate in science-oriented community service projects, including restoration of the lakeshore nature preserve on Lake Mendota, science outreach programs, and tutoring for local boys and girls clubs.

Evaluation of the program has shown that WISE women:

- Remained in their majors more often than other women in residence halls.
- Had higher GPAs (3.35 vs. 3.17) than other women in residence halls or freshman women as a whole.
- Earned significantly higher-than-average grades in both of the two-semester, gateway chemistry sequences.
- Earned significantly higher grades than a matched group of women science and engineering students from another dorm.
- Experience less isolation than other women in STEM.
- Are less likely than a control group of students to wish they attended a college/university other than UW–Madison.
- Consistently identify having study mates and feeling comfortable studying STEM as consequences of living in the dorm.
- Are less likely to binge drink.

WISE elements of success include:

- Small residential community, peers with similar interests, and designated sections of key foundation courses combat the isolation typically reported by women in STEM fields.
• Female teaching assistants, professional women speakers series, and women faculty dinners provide female role models in fields where professors are typically men.

• Residence hall–based study groups combat the chilly classroom climate reported by women undergraduates in STEM.

• A supportive, human-scale community and formal and informal academic support counteract the low self-confidence typical of underrepresented persons in the challenging STEM fields.

For more information about WISE, visit the Web site or contact Ann Haase-Kehl at ann.haase-kehl@housing.wisc.edu.

5. Women in Science & Engineering Leadership Institute

Description prepared by Jennifer Sheridan

The Women in Science & Engineering Leadership Institute (WISELI) is a research center housed in the College of Engineering. WISELI was initiated by a five-year, $3.75 million ADVANCE Institutional Transformation (IT) grant from the National Science Foundation, co-directed by Professors Molly Carnes and Jo Handelsman. The goal of the ADVANCE program, and of WISELI, is to promote the participation and advancement of women in academic science and engineering. Begun in 2002, WISELI has ended the five-year IT grant but continues to thrive, funded through an ADVANCE PAID (Partnerships for Adaptation, Implementation, and Dissemination) grant and from campus units such as the Office of the Provost, the College of Engineering, and the School of Medicine and Public Health. The current faculty co-directors of WISELI are Professors Molly Carnes and Amy Wendt.

The center structure of WISELI provides an effective and legitimate means of networking women faculty across departments; performing research and evaluation on programs and initiatives designed to improve the environment for women; administering new grant programs and workshops to promote gender equity; bringing in new grants relevant to improving gender equity on campus and at other universities; and monitoring of gender equity indicators for the UW–Madison campus overall. The main activities of WISELI include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop Series</th>
<th>Research &amp; Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Searching for Excellence &amp; Diversity, for faculty search committees</td>
<td>• Study of Faculty Worklife at UW–Madison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enhancing Departmental Climate: A Chair’s Role</td>
<td>• Ongoing data collection on the status of women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Running a Great Lab: Workshops for PIs</td>
<td>• Evaluation activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Exit interviews of departing faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dissemination Activities</th>
<th>Grant Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Brochures and publications</td>
<td>• Celebrating Women in Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Implementing Training for Search Committees workshops</td>
<td>&amp; Engineering Grant Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enhancing Department Climate mock workshop</td>
<td>• Vilas Life Cycle Professorship Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- • Celebrating Women in Science & Engineering Grant Program
- • Vilas Life Cycle Professorship Program
In its first five years, WISELI has identified some successful and not-so-successful strategies for transforming the environment of UW–Madison to be supportive of STEM women’s careers. The top 10 successful strategies include:

- Use of data and excellent research to reach faculty and administrators.
- Use of literature on unconscious biases and assumptions to approach the issue from a nonaccusatory angle.
- Use of active learning and peer teaching strategies to deliver our messages.
- Fearless intervention where required.
- Use of Web and video media to reach audiences.
- Including qualitative and quantitative social scientists on the ADVANCE team and using their research and findings to guide the process.
- Placing WISELI outside of campus administration (an independent unit); having PIs who are respected faculty and not administrators.
- Having strong, supportive administrative leadership.
- Having an external advisory team make recommendations for increased campus resources.
- Refrain from producing programs that are gender-specific.

WISELI’s least successful strategies include:

- Including too many leaders in a project’s onset.
- Employment track changes are not a way to increase the numbers of women faculty on a large scale.
- Including only faculty from one unit in a small-group workshop (especially climate).
- Allowing institutionalization to occur too soon.
- Expecting faculty to attend too many meetings.

For more information, visit the Web site or contact Jennifer Sheridan, Sheridan@ engr. wisc.edu.

6. CALS Leadership Programs

Description prepared by Tom Browne

The CALS Leadership Program grew out of the efforts of CALS undergraduate students. In 2003 the officers of the CALS Student Council requested that the college develop a leadership program for students. The first response from faculty and staff was a winter retreat in January 2004, sponsored by the Student Council and which involved participants nominated by student organizations. Since that time faculty and staff in the college, working with the Student Council, have developed a one-credit, fall-semester leadership seminar, developed a leadership certificate, sponsored winter leadership retreats, and obtained a USDA grant to train small groups of students to facilitate workshops on leadership topics for student organization meetings and classes.

This program is administered by Christina Klawitter (cklawitter@cals.wisc.edu), assistant dean, CALS Undergraduate Programs and Services, and John Klatt (jklatt@cals.wisc.edu), student services coordinator, Leadership Certificate, and USDA Training Grant program.5

The students who have participated in these programs have come away with a better sense of self, and have learned to critically analyze their strengths and weaknesses. This self-reflection helps them to become better and more engaged students, and to become more conscious of the need for social responsibility and making a commitment to impacting their various communities. This is achieved through the nine competencies required to obtain a Leadership Certificate, most specifically by competency #9, which requires students to perform a function or provide leadership to a program that in some way improves the community they are serving. But it is the self-reflection they
7. The Sconnie-Coastie Divide

Description prepared by Alec Carroll and Josh Monifi

**Problem.** There is a divide among the students on campus that is not based on race or ethnicity, but rather, geography. In order to understand this, some terms have to be defined.

A *sconnie* or *townie* is a person who is from Wisconsin or grew up near the state. A *coastie* is a student who is from one of the two coasts, New York, California, and sometimes Chicago. A student's origin should not classify him/her when coming to college, but unfortunately on this campus it has managed to create a rift between peers.

The foremost issue is money. Coastie students tend to come from middle- to upper-middle-class families that have the resources to pay out-of-state tuition to attend UW–Madison. Some in-state students harbor feelings of resentment and animosity toward out-of-state students for the perceived flaunting of wealth. Part of this stems from the fact that those who come here from the coast can afford to pay a higher price for college, most of the time right out of pocket. The stereotypical dress of many coasties serves to highlight the divide. The coastie “uniform” consists of UGG boots and expensive North Face winter jackets. Although this did not create the divide, it does exacerbate it to some degree by making it very public.

The option of living in either public or private residencies during the freshman year places this divide into a tangible context. Nearly all students in the private housing are from the coast, and most students in the public housing are from the Midwest. This has the important effect of creating separate social groups that pervade throughout the students' time in Madison. The people who meet each other in private housing stick together, as do those in the public housing, and participate in selective activities that prevent intermingling between the two groups. This lack of interaction creates a feeling of antipathy, which leads to unhealthy social competition and mean-spirited perceptions or stereotypes, albeit not always untrue, among the students. Coasties are seen as being arrogant, unfriendly, and ungrateful by coming to Wisconsin and failing to adopt much of the local culture by keeping to themselves. Likewise, the sconnies are perceived as being hostile, and the limited interaction that ensues leads to the generalization that Wisconsin people are all “hicks.”

This situation would not be detrimental if it did not also foster two separate and different cultures. The lax alcohol policy in the private residences (“if we can’t see it, then it’s fine”) creates a culture of rampant underage drinking. This is not to say that students in the public residences do not drink in their rooms, but the fact that they have stricter regulations suggests that the level of drinking would be lower.

Students in private residences also generally do not participate in many first-year programs, such as Wisconsin Welcome. Their numbers at the freshman barbecue and the chancellor's convocation are lower than those students living in public residences. Part of this stems from differences in advertising and proximity to campus of the two housing systems. Furthermore, students in private housing could view these events as outside of their community and something that they would not feel comfortable going to.

**Solution.** Since it is unethical to ban freshmen from choosing where they can live when they enter college, other proactive measures would have to be taken to bridge this gap between students.

- Strongly encourage all freshmen to attend at least one event during Wisconsin Welcome. This will get the students in the private dorms to identify with the greater university community early on. Create more interesting programs that people will want to attend and, at these events, promote interaction. Most people are mature enough when they arrive at college to introduce themselves and interact with other willing people. If there is a strong draw, some amount of success is guaranteed.
• Coordinate events between University Housing and the private residences. The university should work to increase awareness of campus events among students living in private residences. Perhaps the university could also encourage the fraternities and sororities to interact more with each other. As we understand it, some Greek houses have reputations for drawing either coasties or sconnies. If interaction was promoted, this might help to lessen the divide and have a beneficial ripple effect and promote more interaction and cooperation on campus. Sending more housing literature, or specifically welcoming coasties to live in university residences might be helpful, too.

8. Examples of Departments with Commitment to Inclusive Welcoming Climate

a. Counseling Psychology, School of Education

Description prepared by Lynet Uttal

The Department of Counseling Psychology is primarily a graduate department that emphasizes the integration of multiculturalism and diversity into counseling psychology and is committed to multiculturalism broadly defined in teaching, research, practice, and service. And it walks the talk. Students are selected because their research and applied interests reflect the department’s goal to prepare high quality scholars and practitioners to be effective leaders in an increasingly diverse world. The department has a Diversity Committee, and sponsors an annual Social Justice Conference and Diversity Dialogues, an initiative to address cultural awareness within the UW–Madison campus community. The department promotes a scientist-practitioner model of training that emphasizes the importance of conducting culture-centered and ethical psychological research among people from ethnic, linguistic and racial-ethnic backgrounds, and encourages the development of the abilities to apply culturally appropriate skills in clinical and other applied psychological practices and to employ organizational change processes to support culturally informed organizational policy development and practices.

b. Entomology, College of Agricultural and Life Sciences

Description prepared by Stephanie Eastwood

January 2008. Based on interviews with Ken Raffa, Walt Goodman, and Janet Deutsch, and on my experience as an entomology student and technician in Ken Raffa’s lab.

In 1983, UW–Madison’s Department of Entomology went through what Professor Ken Raffa called “a sexism trauma.” A female faculty member was denied tenure by a committee of her colleagues. She appealed the decision, which involved the entire faculty. The veteran professor who argued against her acceptance into the department used rhetoric that betrayed more than a little sexism. She won the appeal and was granted tenure, but stayed only a few years before moving on to the National Science Foundation. One professor who had tried to deny her tenure has since left the university.

The junior faculty member emerged from the crisis of the mid–1980s sharing a desire to help the department evolve. I asked the current department chair, Walt Goodman, why the entomology department has such a good climate. He said that that’s something the faculty themselves would like to understand better. “It seems like it just happens.” But without more explicit awareness of what they’ve been doing to keep this culture going, he is concerned that it could change with the next generation.

What follows are a few people’s reflections on things that contribute to the entomology department’s positive climate.

Walt acknowledged that the key to good climate is “getting faculty who are not only interested in the science but who have respect for their fellow people in the labs. We do science; but we are human. We have to fulfill the needs that humans have.”

Communication that keeps everyone included: Walt said that as chair, he wears out his shoes walking around asking people how things are going. He has people kick ideas around before they’re brought up formally to the full faculty. When people raise a
concern they don’t want to talk about in front of everyone, he takes it to every member one on one.

He consults with Professors Rick Lindroth and Sue Paskewitz like co-chairs, as they are in line for the rotating position. The former chair, Dave Hogg, is their insider with CALS.

Janet Deutsch worked for entomology as an IT maven and is now with the university’s Division of Business Services. She didn’t miss a beat offering specifics on what makes the department such a great workplace for classified staff—it’s the empowering leadership and genuinely friendly nature of department administrator Jim Butts. Jim makes sure staff are recognized for the contributions they make to the department. Janet emphasized how important that is. People need evidence that they are appreciated.

Janet described Jim Butts’s management goal as helping people move up, supporting their professional development and empowerment. Here’s one example of how he empowers workers: Jim suggested to Janet that she take OHR’s training in supervisory management, even though she wasn’t supervising anyone in her entomology position. Taking that course gave her the confidence to apply and obtain a position at a higher level. Janet asserts that all university staff should have the opportunity to take OHR’s supervisory management training. She said it’s very good. Imagine what a difference it would make if more nonsupervisory employees on campus were being as enlightened supervisors and started practicing skills managing conflicts, cultivating good climate, etc.

What We Can Take Forward. Good climate develops when managers treat coworkers as knowledgeable, intelligent sources of good ideas. Leaders figure out what each individual is good at and continuously find ways for everyone to give their best to the organization. People feel appreciated. There is good climate when people in every job category feel enfranchised to discuss their ideas and share their skills and creative works with people at all levels of the organization. Where this atmosphere of friendly, egalitarian, intellectual-social exchange is going on, there is a mighty potential for leadership development throughout the organization. What it takes is for managers to notice when people are tossing up ideas for innovations and improvements. S/he invites them to talk about it more seriously, asks, “What would it take to make this happen?” then mobilizes the resources they need to get it done. That’s an empowering workplace.

9. Athletic Department
Description prepared by Tim Taggart

The Division of Intercollegiate Athletics at the University of Wisconsin–Madison offers two programs designed to promote goals of this subcommittee. One program, the Diversity and Inclusion Program, is designed to connect the student athletes with the university at large, while the other program, Rolling Out the Red Carpet, is designed to acknowledge to the non-university community members their value and importance to the Athletic Department.

The goal of the Diversity and Inclusion Program is to increase the qualitative campus experience for minority student athletes. Student athletes will have an opportunity to interact with a diverse population of UW faculty members to foster mentor relationships. These relationships will provide an avenue for student athletes to discuss current issues and topics that relate to them as minorities on campus and more specifically as students in the Athletic Department. As part of the Diversity and Inclusion Program, students are encouraged to participate in a student-driven group, Student Athletes Equally Supporting Others (SAESO). SAESO was formed in an effort to develop peer-to-peer relationships among the student-athlete population. Through group discussion, community involvement, and social events, the participants of SAESO will advise and develop activities designed to improve the campus and community experience for minority student athletes. The Diversity and Inclusion Program will encourage all members to understand the importance of high academic achievements and ultimately increase the qualitative experience for ethnic-minority student athletes.

The Rolling Out the Red Carpet campaign was developed in 2004 to assure that community members, and the fans of the visiting teams felt welcomed and valued at Camp
Randall Stadium and other Athletic Department facilities. This nationally recognized program reaches out to fans across the street and across the nation. The theme of the campaign—Welcome to Our House: Making Game Day Great—is made possible by the effort of Athletic Department personnel, university groups, student organizations, and local businesses. Volunteers from these groups, known as Fan Ambassadors, are stationed to welcome guests, answer questions, and heighten the awareness of the importance of fan conduct when attending UW–Madison sporting events.

10. Summer Research Opportunities Program (SROP)

Description prepared by Tanya Cobb

The University of Wisconsin–Madison offers twelve summer research opportunities to undergraduate students. It is a unique chance for undergraduates to work closely with faculty mentors and graduate students in their major discipline. Students accepted into research programs are matched with faculty whose expertise and interests match their own. Students gain valuable skills for success in postgraduate studies and careers in their chosen field. Upon completing their summer research, students have the opportunity to present and receive reviews of their individual work.

My direct experience is with the Integrated Biological Sciences Summer Research Program. The Summer Research Program in Biology (SRP-Bio) was developed in 1990 in response to an institutional request to provide opportunities for qualified undergraduate students to do research with distinguished UW–Madison faculty in the biological sciences. It is funded primarily through a Research Experiences for Undergraduates site grant from the National Science Foundation, with matching support from the UW–Madison Graduate School. The program name changed to the Integrated Biological Sciences Summer Research Program (IBS-SRP) in 2006. Since the beginning, an average of 20 to 25 students have done research with faculty mentors each summer.

Our center’s (Laboratory of Molecular Biology) graduate program coordinator, Michelle Holland, administers the Cellular and Molecular Biology (CMB) cluster within this SRP.

In the IBS-SRP, students do independent research projects with faculty mentors for ten weeks in one of six research areas:

- Computational biology and biostatistics
- Neurobiology
- Cellular and molecular biology
- Plant development, breeding and genetics
- Environmental biology
- Bioenergy

These six disciplinary clusters are intellectually woven together at weekly meetings in an interdisciplinary learning community through evolutionary theory and the research process. In addition to meeting with the interdisciplinary group, students prepare research proposals, final papers, and oral presentations summarizing their work. Students also have the opportunity to explore UW–Madison and the city. This program is administered through the Center for Biology Education.

The program provides a stipend of $4,200, full support for travel, housing, health insurance (if needed), and a partial food allowance. Students have access to all campus libraries and facilities. There are no fees or tuition costs.

The IBS-SRP strongly targets underrepresented minority candidates, first-generation college candidates, low-income students, and students from small colleges without access to direct research experience. Because the CMB cluster has such a large number of applicants, we are able to select solely participants who fit one of the four targeted categories. Partnering with the IBS-SRP has allowed our graduate program (Program in Cellular and Molecular Biology-CMB) to make an increasing number of direct contacts with underrepresented students interested in graduate school in the biological sciences.
From our first year as a formal partner (2006), we have a student now matriculated into our graduate program (fall 2007). CMB program application numbers from underrepresented minority students appear to be increasing. Overall, the participating students indicated that the summer research program steered them toward graduate studies in the biological sciences at UW–Madison. We’re hopeful that these positive results so early on may indicate future success in increasing our pool of highly qualified minority and economically disadvantaged students for admission into the CMB program.

11. The Original Model of Creating a Collaborative Learning Environment

Prepared by Lillian Tong, with assistance from Chris Carlson-Dakes

Creating a Collaborative Learning Environment (CCLE) began in 1993 as the dissertation study of Katherine Sanders in Industrial Engineering. The program was designed for faculty/staff to learn about learning through working together collaboratively. It grew from a grassroots College of Engineering program to a campuswide program housed in the provost’s office in the course of ten years. One aim was to assist in building more healthy, diverse, and imaginative working communities across departments and colleges. In 2003, it was adapted to become part of the Delta Program with changes in both content and dynamics. Therefore, we will report on the original model of CCLE that focused on a campus climate of respect and collaboration.

Almost 200 faculty/staff from 80 departments in all four divisions participated in the original CCLE program. Most were from the biological sciences and physical sciences. Facilitators were trained to accommodate numbers and became a learning community, also. All participants took “Stage 1,” a two-semester, 1.5-hour-per-week program of learning about learning by introspection and discussion in a group of ten. Participants wrote reaction papers to the weekly readings and discussed their reactions. In addition, the group engaged in two consensus activities. The first was to individually, and then collectively, write a statement of their teaching vision (“What do you want students to know, be able to do, or wonder about when they leave the UW?”). The second was to individually and then collectively draw a diagram of how people learn. Through the effort of reaching consensus, growth occurred in awareness of individual differences, respect for different ways of learning, and skills in group process. The facilitator brought the group together, helped them develop ground rules, and increasingly throughout the year receded into the background as the group worked. The result was a feeling of ownership of the learning and a better understanding of leadership.

In “Stage 2,” participants who completed “Stage 1” could apply what they knew about learning in the Classroom Experimentation Team or other CCLE offerings. People could continue taking “Stage 2” offerings as long as they wished and often suggested topics. The structure of CCLE gave participants an initial transformative experience in collaboration where diversity clearly emerged as an asset and skills were developed in group membership and leadership. Diversity was a strong emphasis in the readings as well as the CCLE-wide activities held several times a year.

“I expected to have some sort of discomfort with the different kinds of people in the group with the very different teaching that they did, and I in comparison to them. I thought that was going to be more of a handicap than it was. I think actually that turned out to be a strength . . . it caused me to look at my teaching in a way that I wouldn’t have.” First-year participant, 2000

“CCLE has the most supportive interactions and I’ve met the most progressive thinking people. It’s like a haven where I can actually explore these things in a safe place with people. It’s a very good essential place because without that, none of [my rejuvenation about teaching] would have happened.” Third-year participant, 1996

This model was adapted to create a program in “Creating a Collaborative Research Environment,” sponsored initially by the Provost’s office. The format lends itself to adaptation for any university activity.
12. Brief Descriptions of Example Programs

a. Women Faculty Mentoring Program

Description prepared by Lindsey Stoddard-Cameron

The Women Faculty Mentoring Program was founded in 1989 by an assistant professor, Robin Douthitt, (now dean of the School of Human Ecology and professor of consumer science). Soon thereafter, it was adopted into the Office of the Provost. Today, the Women Faculty Mentoring Program is directed by Wendy Crone (associate professor of engineering physics) in consultation with a faculty advisory committee of ten members. The program is supported by the Office of the Provost and housed within the Office of the Secretary of the Faculty. Laurie Beth Clark (vice provost for faculty and staff programs, and professor of art) is the Office of the Provost’s liaison to the program. Lindsey Stoddard-Cameron (coordinator of new faculty services) is the Office of the Secretary of the Faculty’s contact and the program coordinator.

The Women Faculty Mentoring Program welcomes new women faculty to campus and seeks to support and retain women assistant professors throughout the tenure process. Women appointed with tenure are invited to participate in year-long orientation matches. Women assistant professors are paired for the duration of the tenure process. All matches are extra-departmental: mentees are matched with tenured colleagues who share similar professional and personal interests but are removed from the promotion and tenure process. Participation in the Women Faculty Mentoring Program does not obviate the department’s responsibility to assign a guidance committee or mentor for each assistant professor; rather, it offers additional information and resources that build upon the work of departmental mentoring relationships. Currently, the program supports 107 mentoring pairs. Approximately 45 percent of women assistant professors are mentored through the program, and nearly 30 percent of all women faculty are actively involved.

In addition to individual mentoring relationships, the Women Faculty Mentoring Program supports a number of peer mentoring groups—informal networks intended to foster collegiality, promote learning, spark new ideas for research, and help women find their way throughout the university. The oldest, “Gooey Chocolate Cake,” is a group of women faculty in the physical sciences, initially established by Denice Denton. The newest are “New Moms” groups in the arts and humanities, biological sciences, physical sciences, and social studies—with a “Single Moms” group forming in spring 2008.

The program sponsors several events each year, including a mentoring luncheon to welcome prospective members, an annual reception celebrating the accomplishments of newly promoted and tenured women, and a conversation series promoting dialogue on topics of special interest to women faculty.

b. Academic Staff Mentoring Program

Description prepared by Lindsey Stoddard-Cameron

The Academic Staff Mentoring Program was established in 1997 through the efforts of Jean Buehlmann (instructional program manager III emerita, physics), Char Tortorice (director emerita, Testing and Evaluation Services), and other respected members of the academic staff. Today, the program is directed by a six-person steering committee chaired by Lori Devine (program manager, Recreational Sports). The program is supported by Colleen McCabe (secretary of the academic staff) and housed in the Office of the Secretary of the Academic Staff.

The Academic Staff Mentoring Program is designed to help both new and continuing academic staff professionals meet individual professional development goals. The program supports networking across disciplinary and departmental boundaries, offers opportunities to learn new skills and grow professionally, and promotes participation in academic staff governance. Mentoring pairs are matched in the spring semester, participate in a formal orientation workshop in April, and are invited to attend two additional workshops during the following academic year. Mentoring relationships may be brief or last a full year, depending on specific goals articulated by each mentoring pair. At the end of the year, mentors and mentees may end their relationship or continue working together.
informally. Currently, 35 mentoring pairs are active in the Academic Staff Mentoring Program. Since 1997, more than 400 pairs have participated in the program.

c. University Committee on GLBT Issues
Description prepared by Tom Armbrecht

The University Committee on GLBT Issues, comprised of students, faculty and staff appointees, is the university’s shared governance committee charged with fostering lesbian, gay, and bisexual (LGB) scholarship and considering concerns about services for and equity toward LGB students, faculty and staff. The director of the LGBT Campus Center is an ex-officio member of the committee, and the committee serves as the de facto advisory board to the LGBT Campus Center. Initially named the University Committee on LGB Issues, the T was added in 2002. During the 2007–08 academic year, the committee was headed by Professor Jeanne Boydston (boydston@facstaff.wisc.edu, 608/263–0647) of the Department of History.

This group’s agenda is very much in line with the Building Community team because it actively works to promote LGBT concerns and to improve the atmosphere related to issues of sexuality and gender for all members of the UW–Madison community. A 2004 report to the Faculty Senate gives a concrete idea of the issues on which the group has worked and the types of problems it continues to address.

d. University Learning Communities
Description prepared by Lynet Uttal

Seeking Educational Equity and Diversity by the Experienced Doers (SEEDED)

SEEDED is a monthly discussion group in which faculty, academic staff, and classified staff participants explore projects they are working on or issues that come up around campus that affect campus climate and diversity initiatives. The group thinks together, drawing from both the textbook of them “selves” as well as textbooks on their “shelves,” to understand what went wrong, to identify innovative and tested strategies to do better in the future, and to provide a respectful learning community for deepening knowledge and honing skills for developing effective practices—practices that will collectively move the university forward to design and develop authentically inclusive working, learning, teaching environments. The participants are experienced and actively working on initiatives and projects to promote a more inclusive and empowering environment on the UW–Madison campus.

f. Student Personnel Association

The Student Personnel Association (SPA) on the UW–Madison campus, established in 1956, exists to create cross-campus connections among people who work with students to support, enhance and reinforce the learning mission of the University of Wisconsin–Madison in their lives. As both a state institution and a huge, decentralized educational organization, UW–Madison must function with a strictly defined structure. SPA works informally, alongside that structure, to bring people across campus who work with students together socially, intellectually, for campuswide affirmation and recognition, for personal professional development, for development of our profession, and to support the learning mission of UW–Madison.

g. The UW–Madison School For Workers

The School for Workers is the labor education department of the UW–Extension, Continuing Education, Outreach and E-Learning. Our mission is to educate workers and others about issues of concern in the workplace. Yearly we offer hundreds of programs to thousands of union representatives, officers, members, and employer representatives. Our classes and programs cover a wide variety of employment-related subjects, in formats including one-hour presentations, evening community classes, on-campus Madison institutes, customized on-site classes, and ongoing labor-management and union facilitations. Our faculty also conducts applied research and offers technical assistance services to our clients.
If you are interested in arranging a class, please contact the education coordinator of your local union, central labor council or regional labor body. The education coordinator should contact: Carol Graham, 608/262–4496, carol.graham@uwex.edu.

h. The Teaching Assistants Association (TAA)

Description prepared by Stephanie Eastwood, taa@taa-Madison.org, 608/256–4375

The TAA is a democratically run labor union through which UW–Madison graduate students negotiate wages, benefits, and other terms of their employment as TAs and project assistants.

- Bargaining collectively as a large, united group gives grad students the power to have their needs met as workers. Having a legally binding contract makes individual graduate students more powerful in their relationships with supervising faculty and staff; when questions arise, they can refer to it or consult the union.
- Every semester, there are grad students who call the union seeking advice and support when someone in their workplace on this campus is treating them in a way that makes them feel diminished, misused, or disrespected. When this happens to you, whatever your situation, a TAA advocate will listen to your story and take it seriously. You are likely to hear that, contrary to what you've been encouraged to feel in the workplace, “It's not you. You're not crazy.” Or “You're not the only person who has voiced this complaint.” Since the role of the union is not to rescue people but rather to support each other’s empowerment, the advocate will ask you what you want to happen, as together you discuss a variety of options and perhaps start formulating an action plan.
- Active TAA members learn how to conduct meetings according to Parliamentary Procedure, a structure for deliberative decisionmaking by a group, so that for every proposal made, every person has a turn to speak his/her mind before the group votes.
- Involvement in the TAA as a steward, organizer, officer, or contract enforcer immerses grad students in a very practical empowerment education that is essential preparation for leadership in any organization.
- While strikingly different from academic work, involvement with the TAA’s warmly welcoming, earnest, witty, quirky, passionate scholars, scientists, and mathematicians is a refreshingly multi-disciplinari-lingual adventure in bridging our diverse theoretical worldviews with praxis.

Contact contract-enforcement staffer Claiborne Hill to discuss members’ workplace climate concerns and her empowerment philosophy and approach.

i. Employee Assistance Office

Description prepared by Stephanie Eastwood, 263–2987 (Contact Kathleen Holt)

Most people who come to the Employee Assistance Office (EAO) have tried unsuccessfully to resolve a situation in their personal or work life, and are looking for additional options or resources. Employee Assistance Office services are available to all faculty, staff, limited term employees, project employees and their immediate family members or significant others. The EAO provides a variety of services including problem consultation/assessment with individuals and groups, information about community resources, educational programs, and appropriate referrals of individuals in need of help. It also assists deans, department chairs, directors, managers, supervisors, and/or union representatives to respond more appropriately to employees who evidence deteriorating or unacceptable job performance or employment problems caused by personal, work-related, behavioral or medical reasons.
Resources on Community Building and Assessment

Initiatives
- Academic Staff Mentoring Program
- CIRTL Diversity Resources
- Creating Community
- Cultural and Linguistic Services, OHRD
- Domestic Partner Benefits
- Dual-Career Couple Assistance Program
- Faculty Exit Interviews
- Faculty Strategic Hiring Initiative
- Learning Communities
- New Employee Orientation, OHRD
- Office for Equity and Diversity Programs
- Ombuds Office
- PEOPLE program
- Plan 2008 Campus Diversity Forums
- SEEDED: Seeking Educational Equity and Diversity for Experienced Doers
- Sexual Harassment Information Project
- Think/Respect campaign
- Vilas Life Cycle Professorships
- WISELI (Climate Workshops for Dept, Chairs; Search Training Workshops; Life Cycle Grants Program)
- Women Faculty Mentoring Program

General/Operational
- Committee on Women in the University
- Campus Childcare and Family Resources, Office of
- Campus Mission Statement
- Diversity Oversight Committee
- Equity and Diversity, Office for and Committees
- General Education Requirements
- Graduate Assistant Equity workshops
- Human Resource Development, Office of
- International Student Services
- LGBT Student Services
- Multicultural Student Services
- New Employee Orientation
- Vice Provost for Diversity & Climate

Policies/Reports
- Transfer Student Experience Executive Summary (May 2004)
- Domestic Partner Benefits and Employee Benefit Programs
- Stopping the Tenure Clock
- Faculty Salary Equity Review Policy
• Involvement of Non-Tenure Track Clinical Staff in Shared Governance 4– Report (2005)
• Health Professions Programs Task Force Report (2005)
• Mandatory Sexual Assault Reporting & Sexual Harassment Information
• Military Service Policy
• Plan 2008 Campus Diversity Plan
• Religious Observances: Conflict with Classwork

APPENDIX 3. GLOBAL CITIZENS

Schedule of Team Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting 1</td>
<td>Oct. 5, 2007</td>
<td>1:30–3:30 p.m.</td>
<td>187 Bascom Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting 2</td>
<td>Oct. 19, 2007</td>
<td>3–6 p.m.</td>
<td>260 Bascom Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting 3</td>
<td>Nov. 9, 2007</td>
<td>2:30–5:30 p.m.</td>
<td>8417 Social Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting 4</td>
<td>Nov. 30, 2007</td>
<td>2:30–5:30 p.m.</td>
<td>8417 Social Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting 5</td>
<td>Jan. 24, 2008</td>
<td>1-4:30 p.m.</td>
<td>21 North Park Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting 5</td>
<td>Jan. 25, 2008</td>
<td>8:30 a.m.–Noon</td>
<td>21 North Park Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting 6</td>
<td>Feb. 24, 2008</td>
<td>1–5 p.m.</td>
<td>226 Pyle Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting 7</td>
<td>Mar. 27, 2008</td>
<td>1–3 p.m.</td>
<td>WAA Board Room</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX 4. DISCOVERY AND LEARNING

Schedule of Team Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting 1</td>
<td>Nov. 19, 2007</td>
<td>3–5 p.m.</td>
<td>8417 Social Science Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting 2</td>
<td>Nov. 28, 2007</td>
<td>3–5 p.m.</td>
<td>1820 Van Hise Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting 3</td>
<td>Dec. 17, 2007</td>
<td>3–5 p.m.</td>
<td>260 Bascom Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting 4</td>
<td>Jan. 8, 2008</td>
<td>10 a.m.–Noon</td>
<td>260 Bascom Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting 5</td>
<td>Jan. 30, 2008</td>
<td>3–5 p.m.</td>
<td>260 Bascom Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting 6</td>
<td>Feb. 25, 2008</td>
<td>3:30–5:30 p.m.</td>
<td>206 Ingraham Hall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX 5. GLOBAL AGENDA

### TABLE 1: TRENDS IN ACADEMIC YEAR TUITION AND REQUIRED FEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tuition &amp; Fees</th>
<th>97–98</th>
<th>98–99</th>
<th>99–00</th>
<th>00–01</th>
<th>01–02</th>
<th>02–03</th>
<th>03–04</th>
<th>04–05</th>
<th>05–06</th>
<th>06–07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>3,242</td>
<td>3,408</td>
<td>3,738</td>
<td>3,791</td>
<td>4,089</td>
<td>4,426</td>
<td>5,139</td>
<td>5,866</td>
<td>6,284</td>
<td>6,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident</td>
<td>10,986</td>
<td>11,588</td>
<td>13,052</td>
<td>14,189</td>
<td>5,976</td>
<td>18,426</td>
<td>19,139</td>
<td>19,866</td>
<td>20,284</td>
<td>20,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>4,692</td>
<td>4,928</td>
<td>5,406</td>
<td>5,887</td>
<td>6,361</td>
<td>6,880</td>
<td>7,593</td>
<td>8,320</td>
<td>8,738</td>
<td>9,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident</td>
<td>14,395</td>
<td>15,190</td>
<td>17,110</td>
<td>18,597</td>
<td>20,500</td>
<td>22,150</td>
<td>22,863</td>
<td>23,590</td>
<td>24,008</td>
<td>24,454</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data Digest, http://www.greatu.wisc.edu/resources/

### TABLE 2

#### Average 2006-07 Stipends for Graduate Assistants

For Half-time Appointments at Public AAU Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Teaching Assistants</th>
<th>Research Assistants</th>
<th>Other Graduate Assistants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>$19,052</td>
<td>$20,781</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>$16,783</td>
<td>$17,484</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>$16,663</td>
<td>$16,412</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>$15,889</td>
<td>$16,238</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>$15,741</td>
<td>$15,116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>$15,705</td>
<td>$17,286</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>$15,698</td>
<td>$17,091</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>$15,660</td>
<td>$16,022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>$15,053</td>
<td>$17,746</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>$15,024</td>
<td>$14,713</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>$14,997</td>
<td>$16,314</td>
<td>$11,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>$14,890</td>
<td>$19,214</td>
<td>$14,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>$14,486</td>
<td>$15,969</td>
<td>$13,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>$14,323</td>
<td>$16,060</td>
<td>$13,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>$14,261</td>
<td>$11,430</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>$14,244</td>
<td>$15,926</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>$14,070</td>
<td>$14,528</td>
<td>$12,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>$14,067</td>
<td>$17,118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>$13,813</td>
<td>$21,050</td>
<td>$14,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>$13,521</td>
<td>$14,174</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>$13,514</td>
<td>$12,065</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>$13,316</td>
<td>$14,426</td>
<td>$12,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW-Madison</td>
<td>$13,282</td>
<td>$15,120</td>
<td>$13,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>$13,119</td>
<td>$14,335</td>
<td>$10,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>$12,547</td>
<td>$13,121</td>
<td>$11,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>$12,244</td>
<td>$13,041</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>$11,858</td>
<td>$14,952</td>
<td>$10,925</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: All average stipends are for graduate assistants on the basis of half-time appointments (0.50 FTE) for an academic year (9-month or 10-month) contract. The following public universities are included: Purdue, SUNY Stony Brook, Maryland, Oregon, Florida, Michigan St, San Diego, SUNY Buffalo, Pittsburgh, Indiana, Irvine, Kansas, Minnesota, Ohio State, Santa Barbara, Colorado, Davis, Wisconsin, Texas A&M, Berkeley, Michigan, Illinois, Rutgers, Washington, Iowa, Nebraska, and UCLA.
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**APPENDIX 6. FIGURE 1 AND TABLE 4**

Number of UW-Madison Research & Project Assistants Supported from Federal Funds

![Graph showing the number of students supported from federal funds over time.](#)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>October Payroll</th>
<th>Project Asst</th>
<th>Research Asst</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>1,291</td>
<td>1,463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>1,215</td>
<td>1,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>1,246</td>
<td>1,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>1,077</td>
<td>1,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>1,049</td>
<td>1,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>1,071</td>
<td>1,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>1,162</td>
<td>1,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>1,202</td>
<td>1,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>1,249</td>
<td>1,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>1,357</td>
<td>1,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>1,503</td>
<td>1,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>1,568</td>
<td>1,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>1,604</td>
<td>1,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>1,533</td>
<td>1,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>1,466</td>
<td>1,681</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX 7. GLOBAL AGENDA

Schedule of Team Meetings
Meeting 1  Dec. 1, 2007  9:30 a.m.–1:30 p.m.  5120 Grainger Hall
Meeting 2  Dec. 8, 2007  9:30 a.m.–1:30 p.m.  5120 Grainger Hall
Meeting 3  Feb. 9, 2008  8:30–11:30 a.m.  5120 Grainger Hall

APPENDIX 8. PUBLIC UNIVERSITY

WISCONSIN CONSTITUENCIES, AND THE WORK WE DO WITH THEM

Early on, members of the Team understood the importance of identifying UW–Madison’s key constituencies in Wisconsin, and the work in which members of the university community and those constituencies were engaged, both within the state of Wisconsin and beyond. In order to be truly accessible, and to harness the intellectual capacity of the university for the benefit of the state so that the UW–Madison could be seen as a solution to some of the state’s, and the globe’s, most pressing needs, we recognize that we need to be more closely aligned with those constituencies, to understand what they see as the most significant issues facing the state and the world, and to find better ways in which to engage those constituencies’ intellectual and civic energies and interests.

The work we do with these constituencies falls under the three broad categories of intellectual work generally associated with higher education—teaching, research, and engagement (typically, and erroneously, to our minds, called ‘service’). While the constituencies identified by the Team are not the only ones with which the UW–Madison community can and should be engaged, they are prominent and have great potential for increasing the public impact of the university. Below we will identify those constituencies (i), provide examples of the work we do with those constituencies (ii), and explain some of the principal public issues of concern for those constituencies (iii). The recommendations in Section III of this report come directly from a consideration of how we can work best to become mutually engaged with these constituencies in the best spirit of the Wisconsin Idea.

Students

(i.) Included in this constituency are any individuals who wish to learn at the UW–Madison, whether or not currently enrolled at the UW–Madison. This includes traditional students, namely those undergraduate and graduate students who reside and learn on campus and who are working towards a degree. It also includes non-traditional students, a much broader group who are actively participating or wish to be participating in learning activities. We also recognized that students will receive critical support from people beyond the UW–Madison, and that support will often tie those people with the university through the student. Among those who so contribute to the UW–Madison educational mission are parents and families of students; other Wisconsin teachers in higher education, including those in the UW-System, two- and four-year colleges, and the technical college system; and K-12 teachers. All of these individuals and institutions provide a pathway for and prepare students for their work at UW–Madison.

(ii) The nature of the public work that we currently engage in with this constituency includes providing opportunities for learning through research. The public research through which we engage students must clearly address issues of concern to students, including but not limited to improving access to the university, increasing the diversity of the campus community, addressing the issue of poverty, addressing issues of differing learning styles among the wide variety and ability of students on and off the campus, social issues (such as binge drinking, etc.), and issues of residential learning. As for engagement, it is important to provide a broad array of service learning, community-based research, internships, practica and other opportunities for students, so that they can engage—while they are here at the University—with members of the communities in which they reside before they leave, increasing the chances that they will take their experience in serving the public to be part of their work after they go on to careers and jobs once they graduate. The university also has the potential to provide ‘job retraining,’
and—perhaps most important—to make clear to students that learning is not simply vocational preparation, but that a fully-engaged life of the mind is enjoyable and fosters connections to the cultural, artistic, and civic life of the community.

Included under the heading of ‘teaching/learning,’ it’s important to clearly consider a wide variety of learning experiences (the charge of Team 2) and to seriously consider expanding learning, research, and engagement opportunities for students who may not reside in Madison or on the UW–Madison campus, but who wish to connect with the community of students and scholars who do.

(iii) Two key public issues of the Student constituency are access and how the state benefits from student work. With respect to access, traditional students must have access to a UW–Madison education regardless of income, race, background, or disability. As different reports make clear, fewer students from lower income families are applying to UW–Madison for traditional educations, and those that do apply and are accepted have greater financial need and are incurring greater debt over their undergraduate careers. “Over the past decade,” for example, “the percentage of low-income students on this [Madison] campus (small to begin with) has fallen sharply. In the class entering in 2002, fewer than 7 per cent came from families earning $28,000 or less (the lowest quintile) while more than 34 per cent came from families earning $87,000 or more (the highest quintile).” This trend has in turn led to the phenomenon of “gapping”—i.e. “for a growing number of students, admission to the land grant university comes with a cost of attendance (COA) that exceeds all sources of financial aid (grants, loans, work study, family contribution, etc.)”—something we haven’t seen at UW–Madison before.

On the second issue, the people of the state don’t recognize the extent to which graduate students are a vital part of a world-class university dedicated to teaching and research. Graduate students bring new energy and creative ideas into our classrooms and laboratories that spark learning and innovation in education and research. They work with and teach our undergraduates, and are a rich dimension enhancing education at research universities. Graduate students are also vital in the creation of an intellectual and physical infrastructure that address the most significant problems of our times. Graduate students become intellectual, civic, and entrepreneurial leaders in the state, reversing the “brain drain” of concerns to so many citizens. Despite their importance and value, graduate students are seldom recognized by the people of Wisconsin as a critical facet of their great public research university (see Wright et al. 2007).

Communities and People

(i) The diversity of UW–Madison’s engagement with communities parallels the diversity of the forms of communities as a constituency. Communities can be demographic and geographical: they range from self-identified ethnic communities to stakeholders in agricultural or veterinary technology to socioeconomic or geographic groups with particularly tenuous access to information. In all of these various ways, however, a community represents a group of people with common issues, a common experience, and potentially a common engagement with UW–Madison.

Obviously, communities comprise people. However, in this constituency we also recognize that individuals engage with the UW–Madison in ways independent of their community associations. And often this distinction is blurry.

(ii) Some areas of the university, including Extension, Health Sciences, the School of Business, and various science and engineering groups, enter into public relationships that are significant not only on the level of sharing information and methodologies with a larger learning community, but also on the level of private sector business relationships and economic development. Key examples of this type of activity are the research agreement between UW–Madison and GE Medical (which has so far resulted in nearly 100 patent applications), a partnership between Nursing and the Gunderson Clinic to educate more nurses, and the development of medical clinics throughout the state in partnership with Gunderson, Aurora and Marshfield clinics among others. The UW–Madison Arts community enhances public awareness of the university’s talent through high profile performances with large audiences or via presentations in K-12 schools, and draws alumni and other philanthropic support. The Athletic Department plays a major role in creating a “brand identity” for the university and in mobilizing
public support; its events, which qualify as outreach activities, are now, through television and marketing contracts, helping to support non-athletic areas of the educational mission. The Humanities contribute extensively to educational outreach, as does the School of Education; both also focus on the educational development of the individual that forms the base of the “people” category of our constituency. The School of Education serves a direct pipeline through which intelligent students from the state and beyond become the next generation of teachers for the state’s students, and so while there may be few direct financial benefits for the university in this form of publicity, it contributes to the welfare of the state in tangible ways. The Arts and Humanities also draw diverse groups into intellectual partnerships with the university, in the form of co-sponsored programs with and donor support to the university. Recognition of these different modalities and stakes of community involvement is crucial to fostering systemic and sustained UW–Madison community work. In other words, as we chart the local, regional, and global communities we serve, we also need to chart the UW–Madison communities that provide these services, and why and how they operate.

Public work to communities can be defined as the sharing and expansion of expertise, methods, and products. The efficiency of university public work to communities depends on our ability to understand individual and group needs. Knowledge theory research documents that when you disseminate information, a considerable segment of the population may receive it, but there will always be other segments that do not receive it. How can the university make information available to an individual who needs it? How do people signal their need? The internet era challenges the university to systematize and publicize its community work in new ways.

(iii) The problem of sustainability is paramount, since community-based partnerships must be grounded in thoughtful, equitable, and long-term interaction. The UW–Madison cannot simply parachute in, and then leave, which often happens as part of our grant-and semester-based culture (once funding or the semester ends we pack up and go). This means that a community-based project is an entity that must become a part of the community and then remain integral to community deliberations and decision making. The question is how one accomplishes this as a university. How do we have an ongoing presence in a community?

We also have found that often communities are engaging with different parts of the university at the same time. Too often neither the university staff nor the community is aware of it. There is a crying need for alignment in university engagement, primarily for higher impact but also for resource efficiency.

Alignment and sustained interaction are easy to seek but not easy to find. The UW–Madison and the public have much to learn in order to achieve these goals. The Communities and People subteam would like to undertake assessment of engagement and needs in two communities, with specific recommendations of Ashland and South Madison. Ashland is a well-organized community with established relationships to the university, representing traditional Wisconsin identities through agricultural work and other long-established local practices. South Madison represents an acute challenge for the dissemination of university expertise and methods, and a transitional or evolving Wisconsin identity. They would use these two communities to explore existing and needed collaboration, and then perhaps use them as prototypes of how the university might do coherent and sustained engagement. Such an assessment might promote integrated thinking by the community—theirs and ours.

Policy Makers

(i) As considered here, this constituency comprises the individuals and bodies that are responsible for formulating civic, state and national policy, and by dint of their connection to the people of the state and the nation—they are, in many cases, the representatives of the people, elected or appointed to positions of political authority—understand the issues in the state and the nation that require solutions, solutions that we in the university community can be called upon to help provide. This group includes but is not limited to state legislators (many of whom we talked to in creating this report), other members of the state administration including but not limited to the governor, members of the legislative council, agency heads, and budgetary officers; and other key
officials such as county executives, mayors of Wisconsin’s major cities and those responsible for administering other civic units (towns, cities, villages).

(ii) The work that we do with these key constituents includes the creation of the state—and the university system—budget, through the Joint Finance Committee and the Fiscal Bureau; the Audit Committee and the Audit Bureau on program and financial matters; the Building Commission for campus structures; higher education policies with the committees on Higher Education; and service and research that members of the university community do in concert with the legislature, Legislative Council and Executive Branch agencies. Current examples include a series of annual Family Impact Seminars attended by legislators and staff that provide objective research and expertise on the impact of pending legislation on families, or the current Evidence Based Medicine meetings involving the university, legislators, Legislative Council and state agencies. In this work, it is often unstated but taken for granted that the university is just another state agency, according to at least one of those legislators we interviewed. When interviewed, a number of state legislators either did not know or were misinformed as to just what members of the university do that is of benefit to the public, which suggests that there is very little agreement at the ends of State Street as to just what the university does.

Nearly all state legislators interviewed referenced the Wisconsin Idea in our conversations. It was always implied, however, and sometimes explicitly stated, that the UW–Madison was the most important educational/intellectual institution with which the policy makers and their constituents interacted in the state.

(iii) These key public issues from the perspective of policy makers are drawn almost entirely from our interviews with five state legislators from across the political spectrum as well as from the experience and knowledge of members of the working group, and so should be recognized as limited. Perhaps the most striking outcome of our interviews was finding that the lens through which legislators looked at UW–Madison was almost solely as an educational institution, not a research institution. In addition, to the extent that research was mentioned, it was largely in the context of an “economic engine.” Of course, both education and economic impact are high priorities for the university. But we were struck that there was very little sense that the intellectual capacity of UW–Madison could be engaged with the needs of the people of the state, or that the research and knowledge-base of the university was a valuable state resource available to them or the state. The role of humanities was particularly underappreciated, even as a function of shaping educated citizens for the state or nation, though one legislator warned we would lose our soul without them. The academic excellence of UW–Madison was taken as a given, even by critics of the university. All stated a certain pride in this excellence, but often were not clear about how it occurred or was sustained. In truth, neither the faculty nor the legislators understood well the other’s world, a disconnect that must be repaired.

Access to that academic excellence was frequently mentioned, both in terms of students’ ability to gain admission to the UW–Madison, and in terms of those who were admitted being able to afford the cost.

Finally, trust and transparency were issues of concern, with members of the legislature saying that they often feel the university was not responsive to its questions, and that the answers that were provided were ‘spun.’ Indeed, several legislators questioned whether even academic knowledge provided by the university could be trusted to be unbiased. There is a significant concern that integrity at the university is not as emphasized as it should be in matters of public trust. Restoring trust will be essential for enhanced engagement with the public. Trust building needs to be ongoing. And the trust building needs to go both ways—the university community better trusting the legislature and the legislature better trusting the university.

Private Sector

(i) As a constituency, the private sector includes not just established companies but also new and emerging start-up and spin-off companies, as well as for-profit entities in sectors such as agriculture and health care. There are probably hundreds of thousands of these for-profit private sector entities in Wisconsin, from large corporations like Johnson Controls or Kraft/Oscar Mayer to large and small family farms to one or two person
startups run by entrepreneurs. In fact, more than 30,000 new for-profit business entities register with the Wisconsin Department of Financial Institutions each year. Importantly, the private sector includes not only the owners and executive officers in the private sector, but also the workforce vital for their economic success.

(ii) Generally speaking, the university provides resources and expertise to the private sector in five different ways. A primary role of a university is of course to educate students for today’s and tomorrow’s workforce. More than 9,000 students graduate from UW–Madison each year, the majority of which enter the workforce. In addition, many students participate in internships, co-ops and other activities with companies while they are in school; almost one half of seniors reported having participated in some type of “field work” (defined as internships, co-ops, practicum, etc.) in the 2005–06 Undergraduate Survey. There are more than 20 different career offices/contacts around campus that assist employers in identifying, interviewing and hiring our students.

Second, the university is a place for continuing professional credit and noncredit education, not just for full time students but for individuals interested in life-long learning opportunities that will help them in their careers and beyond. For example, the School of Business offers courses, certificate series and custom programs at all levels, and a general executive education program that has consistently been ranked among the world’s best by the London Financial Times. The College of Engineering is the largest continuing engineering education program in the country, offering more than 300 short courses annually in all aspects of engineering, as well as on-site and distance-learning degrees geared toward professionals. The School of Medicine and Public Health’s professional education operation serves nearly 75,000 health care professionals via a wide range of activities, including providing on-line access to Grand Rounds and other professional opportunities. All told, UW’s health sciences schools (medicine, nursing and pharmacy) reach nearly 90,000 professionals each year. The College of Agricultural and Life Sciences presents internationally recognized programs in farm management, the dairy industry and food-industry research. Its Food Safety Lab also provides valuable services to state industries by testing and analyzing processing and packaging applications for safety. The School of Veterinary Medicine offers continuing education to Wisconsin veterinarians.

Third, faculty and staff at UW–Madison are known for the breadth and depth of their expertise. They rank in the top tiers nationally for awards, honors and membership in professional societies. For this reason they are frequently sought by the private sector to provide insight and knowledge into the challenges that these entities face. Faculty and staff engage in everything from providing short briefings and presentations to long-term consulting. In addition, many (particularly larger) private sector entities turn to university researchers for research collaborations; in 2005–06 these entities provided more than $40 million to university researchers to conduct research of interest to the companies.

Fourth, UW–Madison offers more than 200 research centers, institutes and consortia that foster networking and collaboration with industry partners. Private sector entities that participate in these centers and consortia benefit through seeing work in progress, helping set research directions, and interacting with faculty and students. They also benefit from University-Industry networking, access to interns and opportunities that are available for collaborative research.

Finally, the Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation (WARF) is a national model for technology transfer from the university to the private sector. WARF’s mission is to support scientific research at the University of Wisconsin–Madison by moving inventions arising from the university’s laboratories to the marketplace for the benefit of the university, the inventors and society. It ranks in the top 10 nationally in the number of patents awarded each year and in royalties generated from those patents. WARF offers more than 1,000 UW–Madison generated technologies for licensing by the private sector.

(iii) Given these activities, reaching out and being a resource to the private sector has and will continue to be an important part of the Wisconsin Idea and of being a great public research university. The lessons learned from the practical application in a private sector setting of the education and research conducted at the university helps inform
us about the role and direction of the university in the future. UW–Madison is widely viewed by its peer institutions as a leader in how it interacts with the private sector and for its role in regional economic development. Every UW–Madison school and college, and many centers and institutes, are involved in outreach to the private sector and most are increasing their levels of activity every year. The campus has a wide range of programs and services aimed at serving and supporting the private sector, especially in Wisconsin.

But while there is a great deal of opportunity for the private sector to engage the university and take advantage of the expertise and resources that exist, much of the private sector—as well as most policymakers—are largely unaware of those opportunities and the amount of interaction that already occurs. Finally, a growing number of faculty, staff and students at UW–Madison are interested in pursuing entrepreneurial activities, generally the formation of a company based on a technology or idea they have developed. A significant number of start-up and spin-off companies have been formed out of UW–Madison, most within the last 10 years. Support and assistance from a variety of university programs and activities (including the Business School, University Research Park, WARF, the Office of Corporate Relations and others) has contributed to the growing interest in entrepreneurship on campus. However, there is likely more that the campus can and should be doing to help facilitate the development of these new entities, many of which will provide employment opportunities for our students, research collaborations and further growth of the state’s economy.

APPENDIX 9. PUBLIC UNIVERSITY

Schedule of Team Meetings

Meeting 1: Oct. 12, 2007 2–4 p.m. 187 Bascom Hall
Meeting 2: Nov. 1, 2007 2–4 p.m. Memorial Union
Meeting 3: Nov. 16, 2007 2–4 p.m. 206 Ingraham Hall
Meeting 4: Nov. 29, 2007 2–4 p.m. 3270 Grainger Hall
Meeting 5: Dec. 14, 2007 2–4 p.m. 206 Ingraham Hall
Meeting 6: Jan. 17, 2008 2–4 p.m. 206 Ingraham Hall
Meeting 7: Jan. 31, 2008 2–4 p.m. 206 Ingraham Hall
Meeting 8: Feb. 22, 2008 1–3 p.m. 336 Ingraham Hall
Meeting 9: Feb. 28, 2008 1–5 p.m. 112 Pyle Center