

AGENDA

UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 1

Wednesday, September 14, 2016

1965 Room, 3:00 p.m.

Presiding Officer: Patricia Terry, Speaker

Parliamentarian: Steve Meyer

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 9, April 27, 2016 [page 2] and APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 10, May 11, 2016 [page 7]

3. CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

4. CONTINUING BUSINESS (No continuing business)

5. NEW BUSINESS

a. Election of Speaker of the Senate for 2016-17

b. Election of the Deputy Speaker of the Senate for 2016-17

c. Post-Tenure Review Policy (first reading) [page 10]
Presented by David Voelker, UC Chair

d. Authorization to plan MS in Athletic Training (first reading) [page 15]
Presented by Amanda Nelson, Associate Professor (HUB) and Associate Dean (CST)

e. Appointment of Director of Student Success and Engagement as ex officio member of the General Education Council
Presented by Clif Ganyard, Associate Provost

f. Request for future business

6. PROVOST'S REPORT

7. OTHER REPORTS

a. University Committee Summary for 2015-16 - Presented by David Voelker
(http://www.uwgb.edu/sofas/actions/reports/reports/reports_15-16.pdf)

b. University Committee Report – Presented by UC Chair David Voelker

c. Faculty Representative Report – Presented by Christine Vandenhouten

d. Academic Staff Report – Presented by Eric Craver

e. University Staff Report – Presented by Amanda Wildenberg [page 25]

f. Student Government Report - Presented by Nikolas Austin

8. ADJOURNMENT

[draft]

MINUTES 2015-2016
UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 9

Wednesday, April 27, 2016
Alumni Rooms, University Union

Presiding Officer: Patricia Terry, Speaker of the Senate
Parliamentarian: Steve Meyer, Secretary of the Faculty and Staff

PRESENT: Greg Aldrete (HUS), Andrew Austin (DJS-UC), Gaurav Bansal (BUA), Ankur Chattopadhyay (ICS), Ryan Currier (NAS), Toni Damkoehler (AND), Greg Davis (Provost, *ex officio*), Doreen Higgins (SOCW), Harvey Kaye (DJS), John Lyon (NAS-UC), Kaoime Malloy (THEATRE), Christopher Martin (alternate-HUS), Ryan Martin (HUD), Michael McIntire (NAS), Gary Miller (Chancellor, *ex officio*), Paul Mueller (HUB), Steve Muzatko (alternate-BUS), Tom Nesselin (URS), Uwe Pott (HUB), Courtney Sherman (MUS), Christine Smith (HUD), Alison Stehlik (AND), Christine Style (AND-UC), Brian Sutton (HUS), Patricia Terry (NAS-UC), Brenda Tyczkowski (NURS), Christine Vandenhouten (NUR-UC), David Voelker (HUS-UC), Elizabeth Wheat (PEA), and Amy Wolf (NAS)

NOT PRESENT: Bryan Carr (ICS), Mark Kiehn (EDU), Arthur Lacey (EDU),

REPRESENTATIVES: Katrina Hrivnak (Academic Staff), Jan Snyder (University Staff), Nicholas Austin (SGA)

GUESTS: Dick Anderson (Budget Director, Business and Finance), Matt Dornbush (Assistant Vice Chancellor of Professional Development and Director, Graduate Studies), Scott Furlong (Dean, LAS), Clifton Ganyard (Assoc. Provost), Paula Ganyard (Director, Cofrin Library), Ronald Pfeiffer (Associate Chancellor and Chief of Staff), Christina Trombley (Assoc. Vice Chancellor), and Sheryl Van Gruensven (Vice Chancellor for Business and Finance)

1. CALL TO ORDER.

With a wink and a nod (and a mention that a quorum had been met), Speaker Terry called the meeting to order at precisely 3:00 p.m.

2 APPROVAL OF MINUTES for Faculty Senate Meeting No. 8, March 30, 2016.

Resounding silence was heard when Speaker Terry requested comments or revisions to the minutes. Thus, a virtual thumbs-up was provided by automatic consent and the minutes approved.

3. CHANCELLOR'S REPORT.

Chancellor Miller began his report with the most important announcement of the semester, Chartwells will replace A'viands as the campus food vendor starting in August. There will be some construction disruption because Chartwells will use an all-you-can-eat food model in place of the retail food service model that is currently used. Friday, April 29, UWGB will have completed the first round of discussions with the ten northeastern Wisconsin legislators, including some of the senior leadership in the house. This is a budget year, so these discussions

will continue. At commencement ceremonies on Saturday, May 14, an honorary doctorate will be awarded to Lou LeCalsey. The soon-to-be Dr. LeCalsey will also deliver the commencement address. Chancellor Miller made senate aware of concerns voiced by underrepresented groups regarding certain aspects of their culture at the institution. The Chancellor encouraged faculty to look for opportunities to visit these students and listen to their concerns, especially those related to what happens in classrooms.

The Chancellor then provided the Faculty Senate with an overview of the information he presented to the Board of Regents when they met here April 7-8 and to the Council of Trustees when they met April 19. The information presented by the Chancellor focused on two issues: 1) UWGB is an urban environment and we need to embrace our local urban diversity (this should be viewed as an excellent opportunity for growth), and 2) the \$2.4M that was removed from the budget of July 15 was a legislated budget cut (funding eliminated by the state government), while the \$2M that is being removed from the budget this year is an expenditure reduction (it's money that is still here, but is money that we have to pay ourselves to get through our enrollment shortfall – therefore, it is (hopefully) a temporary decrease in spending until enrollment recovers). Based on comments received, the Regents got the message and they understand that UWGB is different from the other regional comprehensive universities and we therefore need to be treated differently with regard to resource allocation, decisions regarding program mix, etc. While the Regents were in Green Bay for the meeting, a planned visit to Lambeau Field was hosted by Packers' President Mark Murphy, a Council of Trustees member, who took this opportunity to (twice) tell the Regents that “you must support this university if we (the Packers) are to survive.”

Following his remarks, Chancellor Miller thanked UC Chair John Lyon and Speaker of the Senate Patricia Terry for their service to the University and Faculty Senate by presenting them with a token of appreciation. At this time, the Faculty Senate burst out into applause that had the walls shaking.

4. OLD BUSINESS.

a. Code Change on 53.12 Graduate Program (second reading)

UC Chair Lyon stepped up to once again introduce this change to code regarding the membership, responsibilities, and appointment process for those faculty joining the Graduate Faculty. **A motion to approve the change in code was made by Senator Lyon, seconded by Senator Bansal.** On the condition that a graduate student's committee member found an employment opportunity elsewhere prior to the graduate student finishing their degree, **Senator Bansal moved to amend the original motion made by Senator Lyon (seconded by Senator Vandenhouten)**, specifically adding this sentence to the end of 53.12(A)1: “Graduate faculty who leave UWGB for other employment opportunities may retain their graduate faculty status (non-voting except for graduate committee service) for an additional year from the end of their formal employment with UWGB; additional extensions may be granted by the Director of Graduate Studies following a formal request from the relevant program executive committee.” **The amendment passed 26-2-0.** Following a point of clarification regarding the purpose of this last sentence made by Director of Graduate Studies, Prof. Matt Dornbush, the question was called and **the motion carried 27-1-0.**

b. UW–Green Bay Teaching and Workload Policy

With a bounce in his step (which could only be carried out by an exiting UC Chair) John Lyon once again returned to the lectern to present the Teaching and Workload Policy that was drafted by UC and will eventually be forwarded to UW System. Work on this policy began when Chancellor Miller received a letter from UW System President Ray Cross dated September 16, 2015 informing him that UW-Green Bay will be required to implement a 24 credit teaching load. President Cross also requested that the faculty come forward with a proposal including a time frame, description of campus policies, and other necessary elements to make UW-Green Bay consistent with the other regional comprehensive campuses. The UC has been working on the presented policy since September. Lyon pointed out the policy that has been developed “is as inclusive of all scenarios as possible.” A question arose regarding why a maximum of 14 credits taught per semester was specified; this was a protection for the individual faculty member and it allowed for variations (e.g., laboratories or credit values for their courses) in some programs. **Senator Voelker moved to endorse the policy, seconded by Senator Sutton.** The senate was amiable to the policy and so with no further discussion **the motion was approved 27-0-1.**

5. NEW BUSINESS.

a. Request for future business.

Speaker Terry’s request for new business was met with silence. Dutifully, she reminded Senators they should feel free to visit with or email their nearest University Committee member at any time or simply bring it up at the next Faculty Senate meeting.

Although not considered future business, Senator Kaye informed the senate of new business occurring in Madison. Specifically, the UW-Madison Faculty Senate was entertaining a motion to vote no confidence in UW System President Ray Cross and the UW Board of Regents. Senator Kaye wondered whether the UW-Green Bay UC had looked into that event and had considered our addressing the matter. Senator Austin added that it is not just Madison considering the vote of no confidence, but also UW-Milwaukee and UW-Whitewater, and other UW universities are actively considering following suit. If the UW-Green Bay Faculty Senate were to convene an emergency session to consider such a vote, SOFAS Meyer strongly encouraged every senator to discuss this issue with the constituents in their respective units to gauge the level of support in deciding how they might vote.

b. Closed Session.

Senator Austin moved to suspend the rules, thus allowing the senate to move into closed session pursuant to Wis. Stat. sec. 19.85 to discuss a personnel issue not included on the agenda; the motion was seconded by Senator C. Martin. The motion carried 28-0-0.

Following the business conducted during closed session, the senate reconvened in open session to hear reports from the Provost et al.

6. PROVOST’S REPORT

Expressions of gratitude was the theme of Provost Davis’s address to the senate. On the heels of the Board of Regents meeting held at UW-Green Bay early in the month, Provost Davis thanked all those who represented the university in such fine fashion. Of particular note was the

Academic Excellence Symposium which was held concurrently with the Regent meeting, providing an opportunity for the Regents to see firsthand some of the wonderful scholarly/creative work in which our students are involved. Provost Davis also thanked those faculty/staff who supported the students who presented their work at the Posters in the Rotunda the following week. Appreciation was also extended to Prof. Ryan Martin for his impactful presentation before the Council of Trustees detailing the tremendous work being conducted in Psychology/Human Development. Provost Davis next extended his deep appreciation to UC Chair John Lyon and Speaker of the Senate Patricia Terry for their continued leadership, as well as all of the individuals who served on the UC and all the senators.

Provost Davis mentioned the UC's continuing work on the Post-Tenure Review Policy is incredibly important to the university and the faculty. To meet the Board of Regents November deadline, the policy will have to go before the faculty senate for a first reading in September. This means the UC will need to complete their work on this document over the summer.

Provost Davis updated the senate on the search-and-screen process for the two remaining Dean positions. A candidate for the Dean of the College of Health, Education, and Social Welfare will be on campus tomorrow (4/28/16), and the next week the first candidate for the Dean of the School of Business will be on campus to interview.

Finally, Provost Davis informed the senate of potential changes related to the UW System's choice of learning management system (i.e., D2L). System is looking at adopting a different learning management system called "CANVAS," which UW-Madison is strongly supporting. At the last Provosts meeting, concern was raised that if Madison makes a choice, it pretty much forces the comprehensives to make the same choice. Next Fall semester, all campuses will be asked to submit an RFP specifying what their institution desires from a learning management system. Our own Caroline Boswell is a member of the committee looking at CANVAS and if there are specific questions, she may well be able to answer them. While the contract with D2L is coming to its conclusion, it will likely be extended two more years. If there is a decision to change to a different learning management system there would be a one or two year overlap between the two systems to facilitate transition.

In addressing the loneliness of his 8th floor office, the Provost extended an invitation to all to stop by any time during the summer to pay him a visit (although no mention of milk and cookies was made).

7. OTHER REPORTS

a. University Committee Report. The Regents' approval of the three Regent Policy Documents (RPD) has kept the UC busy, particularly RPD 20-9 "Periodic Post-Tenure Review in Support of Tenured Faculty Development" and RPD 20-24 "Procedures Relating to Financial Emergency or Program Discontinuance Requiring Faculty Layoff and Termination." In a letter from President Cross dated April 16, 2016, he stated RPD 20-24 did not require each UW institution to develop a faculty layoff policy, we could just use the Regent policy. So there is no urgency to take action on RPD 20-24. However, RPD 20-9 requires each university to report back to the Board of Regents within nine months of their March 10, 2016 meeting at which RPD 20-9 was approved

regarding what our institution's post-tenure review policy will be. The Regents published RPD policy is fairly explicit regarding how the post-tenure review should be conducted. The UC has been working on UWGB version of the policy for three weeks trying to understand a way to implement the policy in a way that is meaningful for faculty development. For faculty who are underperforming, a mechanism for remediation is embedded in the policy. Part of the development of this policy will include asking every unit on campus to identify what it means to have a faculty member working at a level of performance that "meets expectation." It is the UC's desire that whatever policy is developed will not infringe on personal academic freedoms of the individual faculty member. The developed policy needs to be about faculty development, not a five-year re-tenure process. A first reading of this policy will be presented as new business at the September Faculty Senate meeting.

And with that, UC Chair Lyon thanked everyone for their help this year and, with a gleam in his eye, joyfully reminded everyone that this was his last senate meeting. Upon hearing that, the senate spontaneously broke out into thunderous applause.

b. Faculty Representative Report. Christine Vandenhouten reported that the next (and last) faculty representative meeting is May 6. With the recent events there has been a flurry of email between the various representatives centered on the Regent policies and the rumored vote of no confidence.

c. Academic Staff Report. ASC Vice Chair Katrina Hrivnak reported that the agenda for the Academic Staff Assembly has been sent out.

d. University Staff Report. USC Chair Jan Snyder reported that the elections are now complete and the new terms will start in July.

e. Student Government Report. Newly elected SGA President Nikolas Austin reported that he presided over his first SGA meeting this past Monday.

8. ADJOURNMENT at 4:38 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Steve Meyer, Secretary of the Faculty and Staff

[draft]

MINUTES 2015-2016
UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 10

Wednesday, May 11, 2016
Phoenix Room C, University Union

Presiding Officer: Patricia Terry, Speaker of the Senate
Parliamentarian: Steve Meyer, Secretary of the Faculty and Staff

PRESENT: Andrew Austin (DJS-UC), Gaurav Bansal (BUA), Bryan Carr (ICS), Ryan Currier (NAS), Toni Damkoehler (AND), Hernan Fernandez-Meardi (alternate-HUS), Doreen Higgins (SOCW), Harvey Kaye (DJS), Arthur Lacey (EDU), Jim Loebel (BUA), Kaoime Malloy (TND), Christopher Martin (alternate-HUS), Ryan Martin (HUD), Michael McIntire (NAS), Gary Miller (Chancellor, ex officio), Paul Mueller (HUB), Uwe Pott (HUB), Courtney Sherman (MUS), Christine Smith (HUD), Christine Style (AND-UC), Brian Sutton (HUS), Patricia Terry (NAS-UC), Brenda Tyczkowski (NUR), Christine Vandenhouten (NUR-UC), David Voelker (HUS-UC), Elizabeth Wheat (PEA), and Amy Wolf (NAS)

NOT PRESENT: Ankur Chattopadhyay (ICS), Mark Kiehn (EDU), John Lyon (NAS-UC), Tom Nessler (URS), and Alison Stehlik (AND)

REPRESENTATIVES: Katrina Hrivnak (Academic Staff Rep), Amanda Wildenberg (University Staff Rep), and Nikolas Austin (Student Government Association)

GUESTS: Scott Furlong (Dean, LAS), Clifton Ganyard (Associate Provost), Sue Mattison (Dean, PS), and many others (too numerous to list here)

1. CALL TO ORDER.

With a quorum in place, Speaker Terry called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m. She thanked everyone for attending this special meeting of the Faculty Senate, especially during finals week, and then welcomed Senator Austin to present the lone item on the day's agenda.

2. NEW BUSINESS

a. Resolution on actions by UW System and Board of Regents

Before reading the resolution into record, Senator Austin updated the Faculty Senate on the status of similar resolutions being considered by campuses across the UW System. UW-Madison began the movement, overwhelmingly passing their resolution, authored by Prof. Chad Goldberg, on Monday, May 2, 2016. Resolutions based on Goldberg's language were considered at UW-River Falls, UW-La Crosse, and UW-Milwaukee on Wednesday, May 4; Thursday, May 5; and Tuesday, May 10, respectively. Those resolutions passed via unanimous or nearly unanimous votes.

Following the reading of the resolution, Speaker Terry asked the senate for a motion to take action on the resolution. **Senator Sutton moved acceptance of the resolution, with a second by Senator Loebel.** The floor was then opened for discussion on the motion. Chancellor Miller began discussion on the resolution by stating that he has deep respect for the group, that he fully supports the faculty's right to take this vote, that he understands the need to show solidarity with colleagues across the System, and that protest is part of the democratic process. However, he

wanted to let the Faculty Senate know that he will take a public position of disagreement with the resolution. His wish is that the Faculty Senate would take a different approach, one that he believes could achieve similar ends (i.e., committing to evidence-based action, constructive dialogue, and an appreciation for the full range of views). The Chancellor mentioned that he needs to engage legislators, trustees, and business community members on the university's behalf. Supporting this resolution would make it impossible for him to engage these individuals.

Senator Sutton moved to amend the resolution by deleting the fourth “Whereas” statement which begins “Whereas UW-Green Bay Chancellor Miller, in two memos...”, **the motion was seconded by Senator Voelker**. Senator Sutton suggested that it is not rhetorically wise to include as one of our reasons the support of Chancellor Miller since he has publicly stated that he opposes this resolution. Additionally, it seems unfair to the Chancellor to use him as a supporting argument and thus, perhaps, compromise his working relationship with his constituents. In rebuttal, Senator Austin stated that although Chancellor Miller has expressed his opposition to the resolution as a whole, he is not in opposition to the “Whereas” statement in question. Previous meetings with the Chancellor reaffirmed his commitment to the standards that were articulated in the fourth “Whereas” statement in the resolution. Various senators spoke both in favor of and opposed to the removal of the statement, but in the end **the amendment to the resolution failed (9-17-0)**.

Senator Tyczkowski introduced a motion to move to a paper ballot instead of a voice vote, Senator Carr seconded the motion. When a senator asked for a reason for using a paper ballot on this vote, the reason given was that untenured faculty felt it would be in their best interest to proceed with a paper ballot. With no other discussion on this motion, **the amendment to the resolution failed (8-18-0)**.

Ever the English Composition professor, **Senator Sutton moved to amend the resolution** by requesting several minor grammatical corrections (diminish access instead of diminishes, limit support instead of limits, and diminish outreach and services instead of diminishes) in the third “Whereas” statement; **the motion was seconded by Senator Mueller**. No discussion ensued and **the motion carried (26-0-0)**.

At this point, there were no other amendments to the resolution, however, several senators expressed their personal opinions and the opinions of their collective units. There were also several faculty and a student in attendance who expressed their views after being recognized by Speaker Terry. Those views (some brief and some extended) are included below.

- We need to adopt this resolution to send a message regarding how we are being treated.
- We now have a Chancellor “possessed of energy and ideas” who, unfortunately, has had to confront not only budget cuts, declining enrollments, and a governorship which questions the imperative of higher education, but also a Governor and Board of Regents who are openly hostile to public higher education. Because of this, it is imperative that we do not remain silent on this issue. Let’s not forget that in the recent past, in an effort to restructure the System, the Governor attempted to expunge “the search for truth” that is central to the Wisconsin Idea that is at the heart of the UW mission. We have a Board of Regents that is so politicized, one has to wonder if they even believe in higher education. We have a System President who, in his own words, fails to appreciate the

fundamental and essential role of tenure in academic freedom. The Governor and his appointees have no faith, trust, and confidence in us; as a consequence, we have no faith, trust, and confidence in them.

- This resolution is not a simple protest regarding changes in tenure policy, it is a much more comprehensive protest about what has been happening in the UW System. Tenure is just one small, but important, piece of this protest. Tenure is a means to an end, and that end is academic freedom, which is important to a high quality education in a democratic society.
- We have an administration (state and university level) that does not support faculty, staff, and students. In an email from Ray Cross to a Regent (source: *Capital Times*), he stated “I think faculty are hurting their argument that they should not be laid off when they are no longer needed in a discipline (i.e., program discontinuance), claiming tenure should protect them in that situation. That is a union argument, not a tenure argument. When the trains kept breaking for years after they were no longer needed, it was for the same reason, a job for life even when that job is no longer necessary.” This quote shows that even President Cross is misinterpreting and distorting the meaning and purpose of tenure. And if the UW System President cannot adequately express the meaning and purpose of tenure, how can we possibly expect those in political office (who want to do away with tenure) to understand its meaning and purpose. The System President should be speaking on behalf of and in support of all of us, faculty, staff, and students.
- (Student perspective) “It’s interesting that we trust doctors to treat ailments, we trust lawyers to try cases, and there’s no other profession where you have to prove yourself over and over again. And I think it’s about time that professors and teachers are trusted to do their job. They went through hard work and proved themselves day after day.”

At this point, the question was called, **the motion passed (24-1-1)**, and the senate burst into applause.

3. ADJOURNMENT at 3:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Steve Meyer, Secretary of the Faculty and Staff

Guidelines for Periodic Post-Tenure Review in Support of Tenured Faculty Development

This policy has been created in pursuance of Regent Policy Document 20-9: Periodic Post-Tenure Review in Support of Tenured Faculty Development (adopted 3/10/2016).

I. DEFINITIONS

1. For the purposes of this document, the following definitions are used:
 - a. “Annual review” refers to the review of each faculty member that is carried out annually, as per the UWGB annual review policy.
 - b. “Merit review” refers to the periodic review of a faculty member, carried out by their unit, for the purposes of determining a merit score for compensation increases, when available.
 - c. “Post-tenure review” refers to the review of a tenured faculty member every five years, starting with the fifth academic year following the awarding of tenure.
 - d. “Unit” refers to the primary budgetary unit to which a given faculty member belongs, viz., the unit that holds the budgetary line for the given faculty position.

II. PURPOSE AND PRINCIPLES

1. Post-tenure review shall be a formative process with the goal of continuing to develop and support, to the fullest extent possible, the talents and aspirations of each faculty member. The review shall not infringe on existing faculty rights and protections, including those of academic freedom, as defined by the University of Wisconsin–Green Bay Faculty Handbook. The review shall not be construed as a re-tenuring process.
2. The University should have an appropriately funded faculty development program that is available to all faculty members to support their professional development at any time during their careers. Evaluation of professional development and scholarly and creative activities should take into consideration the available resources and support (e.g, a freeze on travel or a lack of funds for travel or research, etc.).
3. These guidelines are intended to provide a framework and basic procedures for post-tenure review. Each unit is responsible for generating more specific policies, evaluation criteria, etc., consistent with the basic guidelines articulated herein.

III. PROCEDURES

1. Post-tenure review is a separate and distinct process from annual and merit reviews conducted by a unit. However, the post-tenure review process fulfills the annual review requirement for the year in which it is carried out, and, at the discretion of the unit, a review for merit may happen at the same meeting as the post-

- tenure review. Moreover, a faculty member seeking promotion to full professor may use review and evaluation for promotion to meet the requirements for post-tenure review. The substitution is permissible only when promotion is sought in the same year as, or sooner than, the faculty member's scheduled post-tenure review. An individual receiving a positive recommendation for promotion consideration will be awarded a "meets expectations" status for the post-tenure review and will not be required to undergo another post-tenure review for five years. If the individual receives a negative recommendation for promotion consideration, the executive committee will subsequently vote on the post-tenure review determination as specified in Section III.9 below.
2. Post-tenure review shall be performed every fifth year after the year of the faculty member's promotion to tenure. The review may be deferred only with the approval of the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, for unusual circumstances such as when it may coincide with a sabbatical, other approved leave, promotion review, announced retirement, or an appointment to a full-time administrative position. In such cases, the Provost will specify the new review cycle that applies to the faculty member. As a general rule, a faculty member who assumes a full-time administrative position should have a new five-year review schedule begin upon resumption of normal faculty duties.
 3. The review shall be based upon the faculty member's current activities and the performance of the faculty member since their last post-tenure review, or since gaining tenure (for faculty who are having their first post-tenure review). The updated personnel file of the faculty member shall be used for the documentation of appropriate activities. This file shall contain the following materials, in addition to any other materials required by the relevant unit's policy: updated curriculum vita, Professional Activity Reports for the period under review, a summary of student evaluation data for the period under review, annual and merit review memos from the period under review, and a one-page statement addressing the three areas of evaluation (see below).
 4. The outcome of the post-tenure review should be consistent with the evaluations of materials from annual and merit reviews from the same time period while taking into consideration materials from any unreviewed period.
 5. Faculty shall have at least three-month's notice of the intent of a unit to perform their post-tenure review. However, failure to meet this notice deadline does not obviate the requirement to conduct and participate in the review.
 6. Each unit shall develop criteria by which they will evaluate their tenured faculty. The criteria should be based upon the professional obligations of the faculty of the unit. The criteria should: allow for the effective evaluation of the tenured faculty member's performance; be consistent with the mission and expectations of the university and the faculty member's college and unit; and be sufficiently flexible to permit shifts in professional emphasis. All criteria must fall within the following three categories: teaching; scholarly and creative activities; and university and community service. Minimal standards include:
 - a. Teaching: Faculty consistently meet all of their classes and hold appropriate office hours (or maintain equivalent engagement with students for online courses); they continually reflect on their teaching and respond to

constructive feedback; and they update their course content and pedagogy as appropriate, in light of scholarly and pedagogical developments in their fields.

- b. Scholarly and Creative Activities: Faculty maintain familiarity with recent developments in their disciplinary field(s) and maintain scholarly or creative engagement, whether through attending conferences, publishing, or otherwise participating in scholarly or creative communities or dialogues.
 - c. Departmental, Institutional, and Community Service: Faculty contribute to departmental, college, university, professional group, and community life through participation in committees, panels, forums, projects, etc. While regular participation is expected at the unit and departmental level, contributions to other groups will vary over time, and major commitments in one area (*e.g.*, serving as a committee chair) may compensate for fewer contributions in other areas (*e.g.*, community-level service).
7. Post-tenure reviews will usually occur during the first half of the spring semester. Supporting documentation to be considered during the review should be available to the review committee at least one week before the scheduled review.
 8. The review shall be conducted by the executive committee of the unit, or by a review committee agreed upon by the executive committee, employing procedures to be determined by the unit.
 9. Based upon the materials submitted for review, the review committee should consider whether the faculty member under review has discharged conscientiously and with professional competence the duties appropriately associated with the faculty member's position and then find the member to either meet expectations or not, as follows:
 - a. Meets expectations. This category is awarded to those tenured faculty members whose performance reflects the expected level of accomplishment in all three categories over the previous five years.
 - b. Does not meet expectations. This designation should be given to those tenured faculty members whose performance in one or more of the three categories reflects a level of accomplishment below the expected level and which requires correction. All reviews resulting in "does not meet expectations," unless overturned upon further review, will result in a remediation plan as described below.
 10. For faculty members who receive the "meets expectation" award:
 - a. The review committee shall produce a written report for each faculty member reviewed. The report should address how the university can support the professional development goals of the faculty member being reviewed. The reviewed faculty member shall be given access to the report and shall have the opportunity to provide a written response to the report. The report and any responses to the report shall be provided to the faculty member, their unit chair, Dean, and the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.
 11. For faculty members who receive the "does not meet expectations" designation:

- a. The review committee shall produce a written report identifying the deficiencies identified in the record that require remediation before a “meets expectations” award can be given. Said report shall specify which of the three categories (teaching, scholarship and creative activity, and/or university and community service) needs improvement for the faculty member to be recognized as meeting expectations. The faculty member will be given the opportunity to provide the review committee with a written statement addressing the findings of the review committee. (The faculty member’s response shall be submitted within thirty days, unless an extension is granted by the Dean.) The report, along with any statements by the faculty member under review, shall be forwarded to their unit chair and Dean.
- b. The Dean, upon the examination of the faculty member’s post-tenure review documentation, the report of the review committee, and any statements from the faculty member under review addressing the findings of the review committee, must either concur with or dissent from the findings of the review committee and forward the case to the Chancellor (or the Chancellor’s designee) for consideration.
- c. The Chancellor (or designee) may, upon review of the case, inform the faculty member that a finding of “meets expectation” has been awarded to the faculty member or may identify which deficiencies identified in the review committee report must be addressed in a remediation plan.
- d. Upon the request by the Chancellor (or designee) to develop a remediation plan, the faculty member, in consultation with their Dean, will develop a plan to address the deficiencies identified by the Chancellor (or designee).
 - i. The primary focus of the remediation plan shall be developmental and to provide the faculty member with appropriate support from the unit, department, or Dean as applicable.
 - ii. The plan will contain one or more specific measureable achievements for each deficiency identified by the chancellor or designee. The plan will specify what array of achievements will constitute the completion of the plan and shall specify the possible sanctions should it be determined that the faculty member has not met the remediation plan expectations, following the policy outlined in UWGB 6.01 (for possible disciplinary action) or UWGB Chapter 4 (for possible dismissal).
 - iii. The timeline for the completion of the plan should not be more than three consecutive semesters (not including summer terms) starting at the beginning of the semester after the chancellor or designee has requested a remediation plan. In remediation plans related to a performance shortfall in research, where more than three academic semesters may be necessary to correct identified deficiencies, an extension of one academic semester shall be permitted only with the approval of the Chancellor, which shall trigger a notification of that extension to the UW System Administration Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs.

- iv. The faculty member is advised to consult with the Secretary of the Faculty and Staff (SOFAS) throughout the remediation period.
 - v. The faculty member may submit to the Dean evidence of the completion of the remediation plan at any time during the timeline of the remediation plan. Upon review of this material and in consultation with the faculty member and the faculty member's executive committee, the Dean may:
 - 1. deem the remediation plan to be completed and restore the faculty member to a status of "meets expectations."
 - 2. deem the evidence to be insufficient to constitute the completion of the remediation plan and provide the faculty member with specific reasons for this determination.
 - vi. If the remediation plan is not completed to the satisfaction of the Dean by the end of its timeline, the Dean may file a complaint against the faculty member to the Chancellor regarding the faculty member's failure to meet the expectations of their employment. Upon review of the complaint, the Chancellor shall determine whether sanctions are necessary and, if so, shall impose the appropriate sanctions specified in the remediation plan (see 11.d.ii), in compliance with UWGB 6.01 (for disciplinary action) or UWGB Chapter 4 (for dismissal).
12. A full written record of each faculty member's post-tenure review shall be provided to the Dean and Chancellor (or designee). Information and documentation relating to the review shall be maintained by the Dean and disclosed only at the discretion, or with the explicit consent, of the faculty member, unless required by business necessity or by law.
13. Each unit chair is required to report annually to the Dean and Chancellor (or designee) that all post-tenure reviews for tenured faculty in their annual cycle have been completed. The Chancellor (or designee) has responsibility for ensuring the reviews are completed on schedule.
14. The reviews conducted and remediation plans developed in accordance with this policy are not subjected to the grievance process set forth in Chapter UWS 6.02, Wis. Admin. Code.

**REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION TO IMPLEMENT AN
ENTRY-LEVEL MASTER'S IN ATHLETIC TRAINING PROGRAM AT UW-GREEN**

BAY PREPARED BY UW-GREEN BAY

ABSTRACT

The University of Wisconsin-Green Bay proposes to establish an entry-level Master of Science in Athletic Training (MSAT) degree with a five year (3+2) option in the Department of Human Biology. The MSAT program is designed to satisfy all of the requirements specified by the Commission on Accreditation of Athletic Training Education (CAATE), as well as the graduation requirements for UW-Green Bay. Upon the completion of this proposed program, students will be eligible to sit for the National Athletic Trainers' Association (NATA) Board of Certification Exam. The projected entry-level MSAT with a five year (3+2) option will provide a unique opportunity for UW-Green Bay students to obtain credentials as a certified athletic trainer in northeast Wisconsin. The professional graduate program will require 73 credits, which includes 14 credits of clinical practicum and six credits of research methods in preparation of a capstone project or thesis. The program will enhance both graduate and undergraduate research opportunities, strengthen community partnerships, support UW-Green Bay's Division 1 athletic program, and retain alumni from the UW system who are seeking careers as certified athletic trainers.

PROGRAM IDENTIFICATION

Institution Name

University of Wisconsin – Green Bay

Title of Proposed Program

Athletic Training

Degree/major Designation

Master of Science

Mode of Delivery

Instruction of lectures and labs will be face-to-face and clinical/practicum rotations will occur at UW-Green Bay and in the surrounding Northeast Wisconsin communities.

Single Institution or Collaboration

Single Institution

Projected Enrollment by Year Five

The table below represents enrollment and graduation projections for cohort students entering the program over the first five years of program implementation. The numbers are based on an assumed 90% retention rate from year one to year two of the program. By the end of the fifth year, we expect that 60 students will have enrolled in the program and 44 students will have graduated.

	1st Year	2nd Year	3rd Year	4th Year	5th Year
New Students Admitted	12	12	12	12	12
Continuing Students	0	10.8	10.8	10.8	10.8
Total Enrollment	12	22.8	22.8	22.8	22.8
Graduating Students	0	12	10.8	10.8	10.8

Tuition Structure

The MSAT degree will consist of 73 credits. Coursework is separated into four categories: crosslisted courses, didactic courses, clinical courses, and research/thesis courses. Cross-listed courses (20 credits; e.g., Kinesiology, Psychology of Sport and Injury) will be funded from general purpose revenue (GPR). Didactic courses (39 credits; e.g., Therapeutic Modalities, Athletic Training Administration), clinical courses (14 credits; e.g., Clinical Practicum), and research/thesis (6 credits; Research Methods) will be funded from tuition generated by the program.

Students enrolled in the MSAT program will pay standard per credit graduate tuition rates (\$424.47/cr. for in-state students) per existing UW-Green Bay policies. However, due to the high programmatic credit load typical of MSAT professional graduate programs (e.g., 73 credits), student will pay on a per credit basis, and thus will not be eligible for existing tuition plateaus designed for traditional graduate programs (e.g., 30 credits). Nevertheless, student segregated fees will following existing UW-Green Bay policies; MSAT students will not carry a larger burden of student segregated fees.

Department or Functional Equivalent

Department of Human Biology

College, School, or Functional Equivalent

College of Science and Technology

Proposed Date of Implementation

Pending approval by the UW System and the Board of Regents, the first class for the degree will be offered in Summer 2018.

INTRODUCTION

Rationale and Relation to Mission/Strategic Plan

UW-Green Bay's mission is based on a commitment to provide a problem-focused educational experience that enhances critical thinking skills to address complex issues. The proposed plan for an entry-level MSAT is consistent with that mission in that it will enable students to address problems using knowledge gained through clinical rotations, practicum experiences, didactic education, and research inquiry. This proposed program also aligns with UW-Green Bay's strategic plan, which emphasizes enrollment growth (particularly through graduate programs), promoting opportunities for innovation, establishing distinctive partnerships within the community, and highlighting academic programs focused on healthcare.

According to CAATE, "Athletic trainers are health care professionals who collaborate with physicians to provide preventative services, emergency care, clinical diagnosis, therapeutic intervention, and rehabilitation of injuries and medical conditions." Clearly, such a program will enhance collaboration and cooperation with health based institutions within the Green Bay community and Northeast Wisconsin region. The Green Bay community is unique in that it offers a wealth of opportunities for students to gain clinical experiences. As well as partnering with a number of high quality medical institutions (i.e., Prevea Health, Bellin Health, Aurora Health Care), Green Bay is a "sports-rich community" and rotation opportunities will include professional (i.e., Green Bay Packers, Green Bay Blizzard), minor league (i.e., Green Bay Bullfrogs, Green Bay Gamblers, Appleton Timber Rattlers), collegiate (i.e., D1 UW-Green Bay, D3 St. Norbert College, D3 Lawrence University), and/or high school practicum sites. In fact, UW-Green Bay has received letters of support from a number of the aforementioned organizations. Students enrolled in the program will receive exposure to multiple levels of competition and network with more than 30 medical professionals in the area.

In addition to developing significant relationships with community partners, a program of this nature will strengthen relationships between academics, athletics, and student populations on the UW-Green

Bay campus. An entry-level MSAT complements the Human Biology undergraduate degree, particularly emphasizes in Health Science and Exercise Science. Human Biology is currently the second largest major on campus (spring 2016 enrollment: 421 students). Students at UW-Green Bay, in particular, will have an (new) option for career development in an emerging area of the health care profession.

Need as Suggested by Current Student Demand and Market Demand

UW-Green Bay's Department of Human Biology surveyed Human Biology declared majors during the spring 2016 term to gain student perspective on the need for the MSAT program, to gauge personal interest in enrolling in this program at UW-Green Bay, and to determine the perceived value of this program to UW-Green Bay and the Northeast Wisconsin region. The Human Biology major includes four areas of emphasis: Exercise Science, Nutritional Science, Health Science, and General. Students who pursue a master's in athletic training after completing a B.S. in Human Biology typically graduate with an Exercise Science emphasis. The survey (N=79) indicated that 51.9% of all Human Biology majors and 73.1% of Human Biology majors with an Exercise Science emphasis have a personal interest in a MSAT program at UW-Green Bay. Over 92% of the respondents believe there is a need for the MSAT program at UW-Green Bay and 94.9% believe that this program would enhance the image of UW-Green Bay and is important to the Northeast Wisconsin region. The addition of the MSAT program at UW-Green Bay will enable current Human Biology students to continue their studies via the 3+2 option, while simultaneously recruiting students regionally and nationally.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the job outlook for athletic trainers across the nation is anticipated to grow by as much as 21.3% from 2014-2024, which is much faster than the average for all occupations.¹ There is a projected 18% increase in the number of athletic training jobs in Wisconsin from 2012-2022. Similarly, Wisconsin Department of Workforce Development's 2012-2022 projections indicate a 14.83% increase in health care occupations throughout the state.²

Currently, only 24.5% of athletic trainers (aged 25-44) have attained a master's degree or doctoral degree. The NATA has recently changed the mandatory athletic training degree level to a master's degree. Baccalaureate programs may not admit, enroll, or matriculate students into the athletic training programs after the start of the fall 2022 semester. After that point, athletic training candidates must possess a master's in athletic training to sit for the NATABOC exam and practice as a certified athletic trainer.

¹ U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2015). *Occupational Outlook Handbook. Healthcare, Athletic Trainers*. Retrieved from <http://www.bls.gov/ooh/healthcare/athletic-trainers.htm#tab-6>

² State of Wisconsin Department of Workforce Development. (2014). *Labor Market Information*. Retrieved from <http://wisconsinjobcenter.org/labormarketinfo/>

Emerging Knowledge and Emerging Directions

Athletic trainers have traditionally been employed in athletic settings, including professional sports, universities/colleges, and high schools. However, the field of athletic training has evolved, and now requires certified athletic trainers to develop the skills and knowledge to treat clients and patients in a variety of settings beyond the athletic field/court (e.g., performing arts, military, law enforcement, government, hospitals, clinics, industry, etc.). Athletic training professionals have progressively become an extension of other health domains (e.g., understand how to measure and fit medical equipment prescribed by physicians). The National Athletic Trainers' Association has recognized this new direction in employment opportunities and created a committee specifically focused on emerging practices in the profession (the Clinical and Emerging Practices Athletic Trainers' Committee).

The proposed MSAT program will embrace this new direction and provide experiences that integrate student athletic trainers in nontraditional settings (e.g., AT Field Experience). For example, the AT Field Experience would include an opportunity to attend a fire and rescue training session with a

local fire department. Graduates of the MSAT program will understand the concepts of professional practice and develop the knowledge and skills necessary to contribute to the field in this diverse capacity.

DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM

An entry-level MSAT is designed for graduates of a baccalaureate program with a degree in a related field (i.e., Human Biology, Kinesiology, Exercise Science) who would like to pursue the profession of athletic training. Students pursuing the proposed 3+2 MSAT degree would complete undergraduate core/athletic training courses during the first 3 ½ years of the program and would complete graduate core/elective courses during the last 1 ½ years of the program. Students who complete a baccalaureate program at UW-Green Bay, or at another institution, and pursue UW-Green Bay's entry-level MSAT would complete the graduate program in 2 years.

Graduate athletic training programs follow the constructs of most professional health care programs, which include a didactic classroom curriculum and a variety of clinical experiences (approximately 750 contact hours). Based on accreditation standards, this program necessitates that UW-Green Bay will partner with the community to provide traditional clinical rotations. Required clinical experiences include exposure to treatment and care of injuries related to sports activities of both genders and contact/noncontact athletics (i.e., high school settings, equipment intensive, upper vs. lower extremity focus, etc.). Additional clinical rotations, including orthopedics (i.e., surgical observation, rehabilitation, primary care sports medicine) and general medicine (i.e., family practice, urgent care), would also be a requirement of the program. Students will complete a master's thesis or capstone project under the direction of a faculty member in the Department of Human Biology with opportunities to collaborate with faculty from other disciplines (e.g., psychology). Following the completion of this program, students would be eligible to sit for the Board of Certification exam and enter the profession of athletic training.

Institutional Program Array

UW-Green Bay currently provides pre-professional prerequisite courses necessary to enroll in the proposed MSAT program. Required pre-athletic training coursework is drawn from biology, psychology, mathematics, physics, chemistry, anatomy, and physiology. Typically, UW-Green Bay students complete a B.S. in human biology and apply to entry-level master's programs out of state to obtain their credentials to practice as a certified athletic trainer. This program aims to retain NE Wisconsin students in NE Wisconsin.

Other Programs in the University of Wisconsin System

There are currently six accredited undergraduate programs in "good standing" in the University of Wisconsin System, including: UW-Eau Claire, UW-LaCrosse, UW-Madison, UW-Milwaukee, UW-Oshkosh, and UW-Stevens Point. These programs are designed for soon-to-be high school graduates who plan to complete a four-year baccalaureate degree. To be clear, this is not the type of program suggested in this proposal. It is our contention that UW-Green Bay is well suited to accept well trained undergraduates interested in pursuing a master's degree and athletic training certification concurrently.

There are currently two other Masters in Athletic Training programs offered in the state of Wisconsin, UW- Milwaukee (degree change pending) and Concordia University (active, in good standing). Furthermore, the NATA Board of Directors and the Commissioners of the CAATE recently announced a major decision to establish the professional degree in athletic training at the master's level as of 2022. With that being said, it is anticipated that all UW-System undergraduate programs will be transitioning to a MSAT as the requirement is phased in over the next several years. While offering strong programs for other regions of the state, the existing degree programs do not meet the needs of many students in northeastern Wisconsin, which is also home to a high concentration of high caliber athletic organizations.

Collaborative Nature of Program

While classroom and laboratory instruction in the MSAT program will be delivered from a single institution, a number of academic programs (i.e., human biology, nursing, psychology, graduate studies) and non-academic programs (i.e., athletics, student advising, financial aid) at UW-Green Bay will collaborate to fulfill the student learning outcomes for the accredited program. Furthermore, the Department of Human Biology and the Department of Natural and Applied Sciences house the necessary facilities and equipment to conduct research for master's theses and/or a capstone project. It is also anticipated that many of the graduate students enrolled in the proposed MSAT program would receive teaching assistantships to instruct lower-level labs within the human biology undergraduate degree (i.e., Anatomy & Physiology Lab). Teaching Assistants provide an important and cost-effective means of delivering high-quality instruction in introductory science laboratories, yet UW-Green Bay remains under-developed in this resource. UW-Green Bay's Division 1 athletic program and Prevea Health (the organization currently contracted for athletic training support at UW-Green Bay) enthusiastically support the current proposal. As indicated previously in this document, it is expected that the MSAT program will establish several community partnerships with various organizations (i.e., Green Bay Packers, Green Bay Blizzard, Green Bay Gamblers) to fulfill clinical rotations.

Delivery

The MSAT didactic courses (lectures and labs) will be taught in a traditional face-to-face format on the UW-Green Bay campus. The clinical courses (AT Practicum I-IV and AT Field Experience) will be taught at medical institutions and athletic facilities in the surrounding community, as organized by the clinical coordinator and under the direction of identified preceptors. The MSAT program will require oversight and instruction by certified athletic trainers, including: a program director, a clinical coordinator, one full-time faculty, and additional adjunct clinical instructors.

Diversity

UW-Green Bay is dedicated to finding ways to expand the diversity of their campus community. UW-Green Bay faculty and staff have engaged in several strategic initiatives to recruit a more diverse study body and offer diverse experiences and perspectives throughout a student's undergraduate program. The American Intercultural Center (AIC) and the Center for Advancement of Teaching and Learning (CATL) offer resources and services that promote academic success and personal growth of multicultural students. The College of Science and Technology, in collaboration with the AIC and CATL, is committed to fostering diverse experiences for students in the MSAT program.

The proposed MSAT program will serve a diverse student body who will be recruited regionally and nationally, including nontraditional students. The 3+2 program option has potential to create streamlined transfer paths and articulation agreements with Wisconsin Technical Colleges (e.g., NWTC's Physical Therapist Assistant – Associate Degree) and the two-year UW Colleges, which will serve a more diverse student population.

Upon admission into the program, students will be exposed to diverse settings across the region through clinical rotations integrated within the curriculum. Students will participate in diverse clinical rotations in various corporate and academic settings.

Student Learning Outcomes

The National Athletic Trainers' Association published a thorough document entitled *5th edition of the NATA Athletic Training Education Competencies*¹ (<http://caate.net/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/5th-Edition-Competencies.pdf>), which provides detailed student learning outcomes for accredited athletic training programs. The competencies outlined in the document are the minimum requirements for a student's professional education. In addition to classroom and laboratory instruction, students will fulfill these competencies through clinical rotations and integrated research experiences.

As determined by CAATE (and included in the *5th edition of the NATA Athletic Training Education Competencies*), an athletic trainer must demonstrate the knowledge and skills within the following content areas:

- Evidence-Based Practice
- Prevention and Health Promotion
 - General Prevention Principles
 - Prevention Strategies and Procedures
 - Protective Equipment and Prophylactic Procedures
 - Fitness/Wellness
 - General Nutrition Concepts
 - Weight Management and Body Composition
 - Disordered Eating and Eating Disorders
 - Performance Enhancing and Recreational Supplements and Drugs
- Clinical Examination and Diagnosis
 - Systems and Regions
 - Musculoskeletal
 - Integumentary
 - Neurological
 - Cardiovascular
 - Endocrine
 - Pulmonary
 - Gastrointestinal
 - Hepatobiliary
 - Immune
 - Renal and Urogenital
 - Face, including Maxillofacial Region and Mouth
 - Eye, Ear, Nose, and Throat
- Acute Care of Injury and Illness
 - Planning
 - Examination
 - Immediate Emergent Management
 - Immediate Musculoskeletal Management
 - Transportation
 - Education
- Therapeutic Interventions
 - Physical Rehabilitation and Therapeutic Modalities
 - Therapeutic Medications
- Psychosocial Strategies and Referral
 - Theoretical Background
 - Psychosocial Strategies
 - Mental Health and Referral
- Healthcare Administration
- Professional Development and Responsibility
- Clinical Integrated Proficiencies
 - Prevention and Health Promotion
 - Clinical Assessment and Diagnosis/Acute Care/Therapeutic Intervention
 - Psychosocial Strategies and Referral
 - Healthcare Administration

In addition to the above competencies, the *5th edition of the NATA Athletic Training Education Competencies* states that the following foundational behaviors of professional practice should be incorporated into accredited athletic training programs:

- Primacy of the Patient
- Team Approach to Practice

- Legal Practice
- Ethical Practice
- Advancing Knowledge
- Cultural Competence
- Professionalism

¹ National Athletic Trainers' Association. (2014). *Athletic Training Education Competencies*. Retrieved from <http://caate.net/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/5th-Edition-Competencies.pdf>

Assessment of Objectives

The program director and clinical coordinator will have the responsibility for the assessment of student learning. The program director will assign specific learning goals to each course that are designed to address core competencies as outlined in the *5th edition of the NATA Athletic Training Education Competencies*. Student learning outcomes will be assessed directly and indirectly throughout the two-year program. A more detailed assessment plan will be created by the program director and clinical coordinator as the courses are implemented during the first two years of program development.

Program Curriculum

After the obtaining a baccalaureate degree and completing the prerequisite courses listed below, the MSAT will consist of 73 credits. The credit load includes 14 credits of clinical practicum and six credits of research methods in preparation of a capstone project or thesis.

Prerequisite Coursework (34 hours)	Hours/Course
One semester biology w/ lab	4
Two semesters of chemistry w/ lab	8
One semester of physics w/ lab	4
Two semesters anatomy and physiology or equivalent w/ lab	8
Exercise Physiology	3
Introduction to Psychology	3
Statistics	4
Medical Terminology (credit or non-credit course)	
Required Graduate Courses (73 hours)	Hours/Course
<i>Summer 1</i>	
Gross Anatomy (cross-listed)	4
Principles in Athletic Training (cross-listed)	3
<i>Fall 1</i>	
Orthopedic Assessment - Lower Extremity and Spine	4
Psychology of Sport and Injury (cross-listed)	3
Therapeutic Modalities	3
Kinesiology/Biomechanics (cross-listed)	4
AT Clinical Practicum I	3

<i>Spring 1</i>	
Orthopedic Assessment - Upper Extremity, Trunk, and Head	4
Bioenergetics of Athletic Performance (cross-listed)	4
Evaluation and Management - Emergent Conditions	2
Healthcare Information Technology (cross-listed)	2
Rehabilitation in AT I	4
AT Clinical Practicum II	3
<i>Summer 2</i>	
Research Methods I	1
AT Field Experience	2
<i>Fall 2</i>	
Diagnostic Imaging and Lab Studies	2
Athletic Training Administration	3
Rehabilitation in AT II	3
Research Methods II	2
AT Clinical Practicum III	4
<i>Spring 2</i>	
Nutritional and Pharmacological Interventions	2
Seminar in AT	3
Research Methods III	3
AT Clinical Practicum IV	4
BOC Prep	1

Projected Time to Degree

Students who apply to the MSAT program with a baccalaureate degree (and having already met the prerequisite courses) will complete the degree in two full years (including summers). UW-Green Bay undergraduate students who have fulfilled the prerequisite courses and enroll in the 3+2 track will be able to complete both a B.S. in Human Biology and M.S. in Athletic Training in five years. Students will be required to take courses in sequence and must enter the program the summer term. The master's thesis or capstone project must be completed in the final semester.

Program Review Process

UW-Green Bay's Graduate Academic Affairs Council (GAAC) is charged with oversight of all graduate programs on campus, including review and approval of all credit courses and all academic programs at the graduate level. The MSAT program will be formally reviewed on a seven-year cycle by the department, the college program review committee, the Dean of the College of Science and Technology, and the GACC. The Graduate Academic Affairs Council forwards all recommendations and decisions to the Faculty Senate, and provides advice regarding issues of graduate level education policy and implementation.

In addition, the program must submit an annual report (and additional progress reports if requested) to

CAATE, which includes changes to program, personnel, and fiscal matters. Initial CAATE accreditation of the program requires a five-year review, including a self-study, peer review, and site visit. Continuing accreditation may be granted by CAATE for a maximum of ten years. The College of Science and Technology and the Department of Human Biology will manage the resources to ensure that funds are available to invest in the program as needed.

Accreditation

The program will need to be approved through the Higher Learning Commission. In order for students to practice in the field, they must graduate from a CAATE accredited program and pass the National Athletic Trainers' Association Board of Certification Exam. For this reason, the entry-level MSAT program will seek accreditation through the Commission on Accreditation of Athletic Education (CAATE)¹.

¹ Commission on Accreditation of Athletic Training. (2015). *Pursuing and Maintaining Accreditation of Professional Programs in Athletic Training*. Retrieved from <http://caate.net/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/Pursuing-and-Maintaining-Accreditation-Professional-Final-1.pdf>

University of Wisconsin - Green Bay						
Cost and Revenue Projections For Newly Proposed Program						
	Items	Projections				
		2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
		Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
I	Enrollment (New Student) Headcount	12	12	12	12	12
	Enrollment (Continuing Student) Headcount	0	10.8	10.8	10.8	10.8
	Enrollment (New Student) FTE	12	12	12	12	12
	Enrollment (Continuing Student) FTE	0	10.8	10.8	10.8	10.8
II	Total New Credit Hours (# new sections x credits per section)	23	30	0	0	0
	Existing Credit Hours	20	46	79	79	79
III	FTE of New Faculty/Instructional Staff	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	FTE of Current Fac/IAS	0.4	2.85	2.85	2.85	2.85
	FTE of New Admin Staff	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	FTE Current Admin Staff	0	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25
IV	New Revenues					
	<i>From Tuition (new credit hours x FTE)</i>	\$187,958	\$364,263	\$371,549	\$378,950	\$386,559
	<i>From Fees</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	<i>Program Revenue - Grants</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	<i>Program Revenue - Other</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	<i>Reallocation</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	Total New Revenue	\$187,958	\$364,263	\$371,549	\$378,950	\$386,559
V	New Expenses					
	Salaries plus Fringes					
	<i>Faculty/Instructional Staff</i>	\$102,097	\$179,000	\$181,202	\$183,458	\$185,770
	<i>Other Staff</i>	\$55,426	\$74,506	\$75,996	\$77,516	\$79,066
	Other Expenses					
	<i>Facilities</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	<i>Equipment</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	<i>Other:NATA membership, Accred., Prof. Dev., etc</i>	\$6,668	\$11,561	\$11,561	\$11,561	\$11,561
	Total Expenses	\$164,191	\$265,067	\$268,759	\$272,535	\$276,397
VI	Net Revenue	\$23,767	\$99,196	\$102,790	\$106,415	\$110,162
Narrative: Explanation of the Numbers and Other Ongoing Commitments that will Benefit the Proposed Program						
I. Enrollment assumes admitting an annual cohort of 12 full-time students with 90% retention rates into year 2.						
II. We are proposing 53 new graduate SCH, with the remainig SCH (46) pulled from cross-listed courses available in our large undergraduate Human Biology Program, thus benefitting both programs and providing limited elective options.						
III. We propose adding a Director (50% teaching/50% admin) and a Clinical Coordinator (50% teaching/50% admin) in yr 1. We have also budgeted 25% time for general admin support (also starting yr 1), primarily to support the clinical interns. Additional instruction will occur in summer, via existing faculty, and through use of practicing Athletic Trainers.						
IV. Tuition rates are standard, but we request students pay per credit for all credits. Professional MSAT programs have high SCH (73 for this program), thus traditional graduate student credit load does not apply, nor work financially.						
V. We included membership and accreditation expenses for NATA, as well as faculty and staff professional development dollars.						
<i>a</i> - Number of students enrolled						
<i>b</i> - To be based on 12 credits at the undergraduate level and 7 credits at the graduate level						
<i>c</i> - Number of faculty/instructional staff providing significant teaching and advising for the program						
<i>d</i> - Number of other staff providing significant services for the program						
Provost's Signature:				Date:		

**University Staff Committee Update for Faculty Senate Meeting
September 14, 2016**

- All committee positions filled, and first USC monthly meeting was held August 18.
- Draft proposal to request emeritus status for university staff similar to that of academic staff was sent to all university staff employees for review and feedback. USC will discuss survey results before moving forward with request.
- New website launched in August (<http://www.uwgb.edu/univstaffgov/>), with ongoing developments in progress.
- Annual [University Staff Fall Conference](#) to be held October 28 at Tundra Lodge; other UW campus colleagues invited, as well as those from NWTC.
- Will continue with our toner recycling program, which contributes to UWGB's environmental protection efforts while providing supplemental professional development funds.