

Annual Reports of University Elective and Appointive Committees 2007-2008 University of Wisconsin—Green Bay

FACULTY ELECTIVE COMMITTEES	2
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE.....	2
COMMITTEE OF SIX	7
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COUNCIL.....	9
PERSONNEL COUNCIL.....	15
GENERAL EDUCATION COUNCIL	17
GRADUATE FACULTY BOARD OF ADVISORS	21
COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND NOMINATIONS	23
COMMITTEE ON RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES	24
LIBRARY AND INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE.....	25
FACULTY APPOINTIVE STANDING COMMITTEES.....	26
ACADEMIC ACTIONS COMMITTEE	26
AWARDS & RECOGNITION COMMITTEE	27
HONORARY DOCTORATE COMMITTEE	28
INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS COMMITTEE	29
FACULTY SENATE COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET.....	30
SENATE LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE.....	32
COMMITTEES APPOINTED BY THE PROVOST	33
FIRST YEAR EXPERIENCE COMMITTEE	33
COMMITTEE ON INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES.....	35
INDIVIDUALIZED LEARNING COMMITTEE.....	37
INSTITUTIONAL ANIMAL CARE AND USE COMMITTEE	38
INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE.....	39
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD	40
INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL.....	44
INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION COUNCIL.....	50
RESEARCH COUNCIL.....	51
TECHNOLOGY COUNCIL.....	54
COMMITTEES APPOINTED BY THE CHANCELLOR.....	56
CHANCELLOR’S ADVISORY COUNCIL ON DIVERSITY	56
CHANCELLOR’S ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EQUALITY FOR WOMEN.....	58
ACADEMIC STAFF ELECTIVE AND APPOINTIVE COMMITTEES	59

FACULTY ELECTIVE COMMITTEES

University Committee

Annual Report 2007-2008

The University Committee (UC) of the 2007-2008 academic year was comprised of Professors Dean VonDras (Chair), Steven Meyer, Illene Noppe, Terry O’Grady, Laura Riddle, and Kevin Roeder. We met weekly for approximately two hours and discussed a wide variety of issues and concerns. Dan McIver, the Academic Staff Committee representative, and Ricky Staley, the Student Government representative, regularly joined the UC at these meetings. Throughout the year, Provost Hammersmith also met regularly with the UC for discussion and exchange of information. In his position as Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff, Professor Cliff Abbott also met with the committee to discuss topics of concern. In addition, throughout the year the UC met with various guests to discuss matters of importance. The specific topics and issues discussed by the UC, as well as topics and items taken up by the Senate and their outcomes, can be found in the minutes of the UC weekly meetings, and in the minutes of the Faculty Senate meetings at <http://www.uwgb.edu/sofas/>. Highlights of the activities of the Faculty Senate and the UC are noted below:

The Faculty Senate Passed the following:

Curricular Issues:

- New Major in Arts Management
- New Major in Design Arts

Resolutions:

- Faculty Resolution on the Granting of Fall and Spring Degrees
- Faculty Resolution on the Revised Policy on Student Feedback on Instruction
- Faculty Resolution in support of the 2009-2022 budget initiative “Advantage Wisconsin”
- Faculty Resolution in Support of Student Government Association U-Pass Program
- Memorial Resolution for Professor Emeriti Alice Goldsby
- Memorial Resolution for Professor Anne Kok

Code Changes:

- Code change effecting the recusal of members of the Committee of Six Full Professors and Personnel Council
- Code changes that, a) clarified the relationship of the Academic Affairs Council and General Education Council to the Faculty and the Faculty Senate; b) clarified that the intent of the term “recommendation” to mean “approved”; and, c) delineated an appeal process for decisions made by the Academic Affairs Council and the General Education Council.
- Code change delineating the responsibilities and duties of interdisciplinary unit chairpersons, indicating that the chairperson has leadership responsibilities to approve, schedule, and staff courses, subject to negotiation with other interdisciplinary units, relevant disciplines and programs.

Other:

- In closed session met to discuss the awarding of honorary degrees.
- Approved the slate of nominees for faculty elective committees.

Issues and Topics Presented to Senate with Action to be taken in 2008-2009:

- Issues regarding alignment and support for programs that bridge interdisciplinary units.
- Updating the Curriculum Planning and Procedures Guide.
- Revising and reforming Program Review procedures.

Senate Discussion Items – Action not required:

- Instituted a process for faculty administrator evaluations and gained the approval of the Chancellor to begin the evaluations in 2008-2009.
- Held a Faculty Forum during the Senate meeting on the topic of the validity of the CCQs as indices of teaching effectiveness.
- Held a Faculty Forum during the Senate meeting on the topic of possible alignment of disciplinary and other programs with interdisciplinary units.
- Held a Faculty Forum during the Senate meeting on the topic of academic excellence.
- Held a Faculty Forum during the Senate meeting on the topic of Program Reviews.

University Committee Discussion and Actions:

Committee and Personnel Issues:

- Discussed and revised the charges of the Faculty Senate Planning and Budgeting Committee.
- Endorsed the establishment and naming of faculty to the Executive Committee of the Global Studies Minor.
- Provided names for the interim-Chancellor and interim-Provost positions.
- Nominated faculty to serve on the new Chancellor search committee.
- Replacement nominations were provided for the Committee on Rights and Responsibilities and the Senate Appointed committees.
- Asked that the Unit Chairs and Deans meet with UC representatives in discussion of unit alignment and budget matters.
- Discussed code changes effecting, a) the Committee of Six Full Professors and Personnel Council; b) Academic Affairs Council and General Education Council; and, C) responsibilities and duties of interdisciplinary unit chairs.
- Discussed the use of Emeritus Faculty on Executive Committees.
- Created an Administrator Evaluation Committee to serve for one-year at the discretion of the UC to assist in implementing evaluation of administrators.

Salary, Workload, Campus Climate Issues:

- Discussed and provided response to System's inquiry concerning sick leave coverage.
- Continued to discuss with the Provost issues regarding internal (local campus) inequities in faculty salaries, and concerns for salary compression and inversion.
- Provided a recommendation to the Chancellor regarding the distribution of the Chancellor's 10% discretionary fund.
- Discussed payment for courses taught in the summer session and asked the Deans to address this issue.
- Discussed campus traffic safety and a report provided by Public Safety.
- Discussed and requested for a weekly common hour in the 14-week calendar.
- Discussed and suggested refinements in the employee tuition assistance policy.

Governance and Curricular Issues:

- Discussed and requested of the Provost the creation of an informational web site that makes the campus planning and budgeting more transparent.
- Discussed the advisability of providing a contextualized GPA on transcripts.
- Discussed alignment of major and minor programs with interdisciplinary units.
- Discussed possible ways to reform and revise Program Reviews.
- Discussed and suggested updating and revising the Curriculum Planning and Procedure Guide.
- Discussed the establishment of an Executive Committee for the Global Studies Minor.
- Discussed procedures and implementation of the timeline for administrator evaluations.
- Discussed and requested a reporting of students with low standing to program chairs.
- Discussed the use of clickers as a method of voting in the Senate.

Campus Wide Issues:

- Discussed procedures for faculty evaluation of administrators.
- Discussed student feedback of teaching and the CCQ instrument.
- Discussed and suggested a multifaceted approach to assessing teaching effectiveness.
- Most of the UC met with the Higher Education Commission during accreditation.
- Discussed the new MLLO initiative that focuses on mission level student learning.
- Discussed and commented on campus planning and budget issues.
- Discussed and suggested opportunities for professional training programs addressing sexual harassment, ethical behavior, cultural competency and diversity, etc.
- Discussed System efforts to formalize the role of Faculty and Staff Representatives.
- Discussed and endorsed the U-Pass initiative of the Student Government.
- Discussed and endorsed the initiatives of the library to provide greater access to e-journals.

Conclusion:

In closing, I would like to express my sincerest thanks to Steven Meyer, Illene Noppe, Terry O'Grady, Laura Riddle, and Kevin Roeder for their kind support and collegial discussion throughout the year. Our committee worked with a great spirit of cooperation, hoping to understand and address the important issues and challenges faced by our whole University community. I would also like to express my thanks to Professor Cliff Abbot for his guidance in all matters concerning code and senate rules, and to Pat Przybelski for her administrative assistance. It is important to note also, that throughout the year the Faculty Senate worked very conscientiously and ably to debate and find direction that led to resolution of the items and matters presented to them, and thus I would like to convey my thanks and great appreciation to each of them for their very judicious service.

Respectfully submitted,

Dean D. VonDras, Chair

Committee of Six

June 24, 2008

From: Larry Smith, Chair

Subject: **2007-08 Annual Report - Committee of Six Full Professors**

The members of the Committee of Six for the 2007-2008 academic year were Gregory Davis, Cheryl Grosso, Robert Howe, Judith Martin, Laura Riddle, and Larry Smith, Chair

During the year we considered one candidate for promotion to the rank of full professor, and forwarded our recommendation and evaluation to the Dean for Liberal Arts and Sciences. Unlike the two previous years there were no conflicts of overlapping memberships among committee members and the candidate for promotion so issues of recusal and replacement of committee members did not arise. But, as more post-first-generation faculty move through the tenure track such issues can be expected to return and should be more formally addressed.

Unrelated to previous activities of the C-6, a new mandate from the provost that the chair of the Committee serve as a voting member on selection committees for Named Professorships, issued early in 2008, raises some serious concerns.

Work load was of special concern this year because the success of the administration in funding Named Professorships resulted in reviews of candidates for an unprecedented five NPs this year and the only voting member on all five selection committees was the C-6 Chair. In fact it was not easy to find even one candidate for election to Chair the C-6 among the six elected members of the Committee this year and had it been known at the time of the election that this mandate was coming there would likely have been none. This issue must be addressed in the future, should probably be brought through faculty governance, and if the volume of activity in reviewing candidates for Named Professorships remains high reassignment should be considered.

Also of concern to both the Chair of the C-6 and several Named Professors who served on some of the Selection Committees was the fact that this mandate violates prior practice of having only Named Professors vote on recommendations for future NP appointments. Thus deliberations about this issue might consider having only members of the C-6 who are Named Professors serve in this capacity.

Finally, and we should all hope for the first and last time, there was regrettable ambiguity, or at least lack of emphasis, about different qualifications for some of the new Named Professorships and limited information about the wishes of the donors who make the Professorships possible. Since we now have Named Professorships that are open to tenured faculty, not just full professors, and since the number of Named Professorships is getting

rather large and expected to grow, more attention to detail is clearly needed. It is the chair's recommendation that these issues be forwarded to the University Committee, whose chair also serves on all NP selection committees, but as a non-voting convener, for clarification and recommendation.

The Committee of Six is a significant and important committee on our campus. Although its decisions are termed "advisory," committee members take their duties very seriously, give careful scrutiny to the files of candidates for promotion, and operate under the assumption that their recommendations will be taken seriously by administration. As long as its role is, and remains, only review and recommendation regarding candidates for promotion to the rank of full professor The Committee of Six's role is unambiguous and essential.

Academic Affairs Council

May 14, 2008

To: Cliff Abbott, Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

From: Mark Everingham, Academic Affairs Council chair

Re: **2007-2008 ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COUNCIL ANNUAL REPORT**

The 2007-08 Academic Affairs Council members are Jennifer Ham, Patricia Ragan, John Lyon, Lloyd Noppe, Mark Everingham, and Tim Sewall. The AAC, a cornerstone of faculty governance, had a highly productive year.

Approval of Course Master Forms for new courses and modifications to existing courses:

Theatre 221; 222; 321

Communication 366; 382

Social Work 395

Environmental Science 491

Music 181/381

Design 131

Political Science 499

History 337; 450

Human Biology 198

Interdisciplinary Studies 106; 400

English 290

Education 361

Approval of course discontinuations:

Art 371; 377

Approval of new programs:

Major in Arts Management

Major in Design Arts

Approval of modifications to existing programs:

Minor in Art

Minor in Theatre

Minor in Graphic Communications

Discontinuation of the International Studies Certificate:

The Academic Affairs Council considered a LAS Dean's request to discontinue the International Studies Certificate. The main rationale was the recent creation of a Global Studies minor program. Given the lack of faculty support for the continuation of the

certificate, and that courses offered currently under the certificate will not be affected, the AAC voted unanimously to recommend the discontinuation of the International Studies Certificate.

Program reviews completed:

Communication

History

Environmental Policy and Planning and Public Administration

Social Change and Development

Information Sciences

Chemistry

Environmental Science

Earth Science

New program proposals returned to initiators:

Bilingual/Bicultural Education Minor-The Academic Affairs Council received the Form C proposal for a Bilingual/Bicultural Education Minor. The proposal was incomplete. It proposes to use a number of courses from Humanistic Studies, but the HUS chair has not signed or commented on the proposal. The proposal also lacks the signature of the Dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences. The AAC must receive formal input from all relevant and interested parties before it takes action on any proposal. The chair of the initiating unit is responsible for sending a copy of the proposal to other impacted units. Therefore, the ACC returned the proposal via the SOFAS office and requested a completed Form Z with signatures and input from Humanistic Studies and the Dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences.

Interdisciplinary Studies Minor-The Academic Affairs Council reviewed the Form C and a number of issues and questions emerged that require more information.

1. Interdisciplinary Studies needs to request a formal evaluation and statement of support from Business Administration.
2. How are the learning outcomes of the new minor different from the learning outcomes of the University's General Education program?
3. How and why were the required supporting and upper level courses chosen? Are there other courses that could be included in these categories?
4. In the categories under Humanities, Natural Sciences, and Social Sciences, how are the course options different from the array of course options from which students could chose to fulfill General Education requirements in each of these same categories?
5. How and with whom would Interdisciplinary Studies consult about which faculty members will offer particular courses, as well as when and how, under the new minor?
6. Are communication and writing skills intended to demonstrate proficiency only in English? Could a student demonstrate proficiency in another language to satisfy the minor requirements?
7. Learning outcome I includes "humanities and fine arts", however only course options in Humanities are listed.

Other academic issues:

1. AAC proposal for a new University policy on special topics and variable content courses-

The Academic Affairs Council discussed the creation and the implementation of a new University policy governing the approval and the use of special topics and variable content courses. The AAC recommends that executive committees of all academic programs approve the offering of special topics and variable content courses with the same content only once every four academic years. Those academic programs wishing to offer the same special topics or variable content course more often than every four years must submit instead an independent Course Master Form to create a permanent course through the existing curricular approval process. The Academic Deans should inform in writing all program chairs about this new policy. The Deans and the Registrar should monitor the policy carefully on a semester-by-semester basis. The AAC would refer to this policy in a memo to the initiator and the relevant program chair each time the AAC approves a special topics or variable content course through the existing curricular approval process.

2. AAC request to include a signature line on the Course Master Form for disciplinary or other unit executive committee action-

Disciplinary programs and other units are not required to align formally with a single interdisciplinary budgetary unit. For the purpose of consistency and clarity on new course proposals, a signature line must be added to the CMF to indicate disciplinary program or other unit executive committee action. Accordingly, the interdisciplinary budgetary unit chair of the faculty member who initiates a new course proposal and the disciplinary program or other unit chair must sign the CMF once approvals of the respective executive committees are obtained.

3. Approval of the Global Studies Executive Committee-The Academic Affairs Council and the Personnel Council met jointly to review the Provost's proposal to form an Executive Committee to oversee the Global Studies Minor. The motions were 1) to recommend the establishment of a Global Studies Executive Committee; and, 2) to recommend the slate of faculty members, who expressed a commitment to the development of the Global Studies Minor program, and who were proposed by the Provost, to be members of the Executive Committee. These faculty members are David Coury (Humanistic Studies), Marcelo Cruz (Urban and Regional Studies), Mark Everingham (Social Change and Development), Kevin Fermanich (Natural and Applied Sciences), Ganga Nair (Natural and Applied Sciences), and Kevin Roeder (Social Work). Each motion passed unanimously. The Academic Affairs Council and the Personnel Council recognize that the membership of the Global Studies Executive Committee remains open to invitations to and requests from additional faculty members to participate in the minor program. Both Councils will appreciate your timely action to secure the required approvals from the Deans, the Faculty Senate, and the Chancellor.

4. Code change to section 54.03 A.1 of the Faculty Governance Handbook and the Curriculum Planning and Procedures Guide-New code language in section 54.03 A.1 on the Academic Affairs Council was passed by the Faculty Senate on November 17, 2007 and is in the Faculty Governance Handbook. Section 54.03 A.1 states:

Upon request of the appropriate Dean(s), the Academic Affairs Council shall approve or disapprove of all new programs or of modification to existing programs (majors and/or minors), and of all new credit courses or modifications to existing credit courses at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.

This language contradicts the Curriculum Planning and Procedures Guide approved by the University Committee and Faculty Senate in October 2006. The Guide contains a summary chart on page 5 indicating the academic action of the Academic Affairs Council is either “recommendation only” or “no action required”. The Academic Affairs Council requests modification to the Curriculum Planning and Procedures Guide to reflect that all academic actions listed in the summary chart require the approval of Academic Affairs Council according section 54.03 A.1.

5. The Academic Affairs Council reviewed a proposal **“Procedures for determining the curricular relationship between interdisciplinary units and academic programs” dated October 18, 2007**. The minutes of the AAC meeting on November 7, 2007 reflects the following conclusions:

The discussion begun last meeting regarding the current proposal for the alignment of majors and minors with budgetary units was renewed. Members of the AAC strongly expressed their aversion to the concept that budgetary units would have approval power over the actions taken by the executive committees of disciplinary majors or minors and interdisciplinary minors. This role being proposed for budgetary units was viewed as being in conflict with the duties identified in the faculty code that are designated to the chair and to the executive committee of the disciplinary programs. The AAC recognized the inconsistency between the faculty code, section 54.03 A. 5 and current practice. Currently, it is not possible for the chair of the AAC to perform the task outlined in this section of the faculty code. A possible solution to the problem would be to delete the last seven words from this section of the code.

The Academic Affairs Council shall annually provide the Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff, for inclusion in the Faculty Governance Handbook, a current list of: 1) Interdisciplinary Units and 2) approved academic programs (including majors, minors, emphases, graduate programs, and certificate programs) ~~and the Interdisciplinary Units responsible for them.~~

While this change in code would allow the AAC to perform this codified duty, it would not address the problems associated with having academic units trying to function without access to clerical support and S&E budgets.

The AAC also noted the University Committee’s deliberation on the same proposal as reflected in the UC minutes of October 31, 2007:

Proposal concerning "unit alignment." Originating from Associate Provost Sewall and circulated to Unit Chairs, this proposal suggests that programs (e.g., minors, certificate programs) that have no specific academic home be formally aligned with a "responsible interdisciplinary unit." The UC debated the advantages and disadvantages of doing so, as well as the benefits of keeping the current policy of curricular proposals based on negotiated agreements with units of faculty members involved with the particular curricular initiative. The UC determined that the "unit alignment" proposal does not embrace interdisciplinarity and that the disadvantages of institutionalizing a unit alignment far outweigh the advantages. Furthermore, it was hoped that future proposals for curricular matters would also be sent to the UC as a matter of standard protocol.

The Academic Affairs Council requests the code change to section 54.03 A.5 indicated above be placed on the formal agendas of the University Committee and the Faculty Senate for discussion and action prior to the end of the 2007-2008 academic year.

6. The Academic Affairs Council reviewed a draft proposal on **Academic Program Review Procedures**. The AAC applauds the efforts to reform the academic review process to make it a more efficient and focused on each unit's self-study of its ability to develop a high quality academic program. The AAC identified some questions and concerns about the proposal enumerated below. Associate Provost Sewall is aware of these points and, in some instances, already made changes to the document dated April 21, 2008. However, the AAC would like to bring them to the University Committee's attention prior to its meeting on May 7, 2008 and in advance of the Faculty Senate meeting on May 14, 2008.

1. Attachment C of the document on page 6: program continuation, conditional continuation, or discontinuation is mentioned. Is that normally part of the AAC review process (unless specifically requested) and should it be included here?
2. The AAC's role is discussed on page 3: What are the responsibilities of the AAC with regard to recommendations or suggestions about areas in need attention to improve the quality of the overall program and curriculum?
3. Step #7 of the Review Procedure: The AAC should be included on the list of those persons or bodies who receive a copy of the report prepared by the Dean.
4. Why have considerations of resource needs been eliminated from the program review procedures given program strengths and resources are interconnected?
5. Is it sufficient for programs to have the opportunity to get written feedback on their initiatives and needs from the AAC and deans, Provost only every 7 years?
6. What is the relationship between a Program Review and a Program Development Plan? Is there some way to combine these two documents to cut down on redundancy?

7. The use of the terms “interdisciplinary unit chair”, “disciplinary unit chair”, and “other unit chair”, instead of “unit chair”, throughout the document will avoid potential confusion about which groups of faculty are responsible for the preparation of information, the participation in the formal procedures, and the response to feedback from various sources. Interdisciplinary unit chairs, disciplinary unit chairs, and other unit chairs should inform their relevant faculties about program strengths and challenges that emerge from clear communication throughout the academic program review process.

8. Concerning paper flow: according to #3, the only part of the discussion to which the Senate would not have access is the dean’s response and recommendations for actions. Should the dean’s response about the program also be forwarded along with the other materials? #9 suggests that the Provost also provides a response which the Provost will send for posting on the SOFAS website. Should the Provost’s response also be sent to the relevant interdisciplinary unit chair, disciplinary unit chair, other unit chair, and dean? Granted they would have access to the website, but it would be easy to copy them directly.

9. How does each program evaluate the relationship between the University mission, its requirements and “UWGB as a whole”?

10. Will programs and the AAC be required to evaluate which and how many requirements are adequate and reasonable to produce a given major? How will the AAC or others be able to assess if requirements are sufficient or not? What might the criteria be for judging this aspect?

CC: Dean Von Dras, University Committee chair
Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

Personnel Council

University of Wisconsin

GREEN BAY

8-14-2008

To: Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

From: Jeff Entwistle, Chair Personnel Council 2007/2008

In Re: Personnel Council Annual Report 2007/2008

The Personnel Council had a very positive year sharing in the successes and promotions of five of our faculty colleagues on campus and conducted important discussions about the tenure review process as well in addition to typical council business.

- Tenure/Promotion Reviews were conducted for four Assistant Professors who had come to the end of their probationary tenure period. Those colleagues (and academic programs) were Assistant Professors Denise Bartell (Psychology and Human Development), Kristin Vespia (Psychology and Human Development), Scott Ashmann (Education), and Mark Kiehn (Education). In addition Assistant Professor Stefan Hall's Academic record (English and Humanistic Studies) was submitted for our consideration prior to official completion of his probationary period. I feel I can speak for every member of the Personnel Council and the replacements for recused members of the council when I say that it was an honor to celebrate in the commitment to excellence and a special commitment to their students that all of our tenure candidates displayed during the review process.
- The Council selected four colleague's names (from a list supplied to the council) to be placed on the ballot for the Committee on Committees and Nominations, which had two openings for a Social Science Representative and one At-Large Representative. The council unanimously agreed to the following election slate.

SS Rep Nominees

Laurel Phoenix
Regan Gurung

At-Large Rep Nominees

Rebecca Meacham (AH)
Bill Lepley (PS)

- The Council did also have discussions about the value and/or necessity of this particular council level of review since it seems that in most ways once the academic unit has made it's recommendation this council is incapable of doing anything other than agreeing with and passing on that unit recommendation to the Deans. Even in areas of combined service, which seemed like a particular interest of the personnel council perspective, different units have varying expectations about the nature and breadth of their faculty's service responsibilities so it is not something the Personnel Council can evaluate and assess any differently.

The final outcome of these discussions was that this Council does complete a very important function in helping to prepare the candidates for future promotion reviews. The council can and should recommend to both the tenure candidates and their respective academic units or representatives things they might consider revising or focusing on or even cutting back on to better prepare their candidates and their candidate's files for future promotion reviews.

General Education Council

To: University Committee

From: 2007-08 General Education Council Members: Greg Aldrete, Heidi Fencl, Catherine Henze, William Lepley, Debra Pearson (Chair), Georjeanna Wilson-Doenges, Associate Provost Tim Sewall (ex officio)

Subject: **Year-End Report of the General Education Council**

I. Actions on Individual Courses

During 2007-08 the GEC approved the following courses:

Courses approved for Writing Emphasis (WE) categorization:

- History 483X - The History of Russia (1700 to the present)
- Art 395 - Exhibition Development and Design
- Environmental Science 469 - Conservation Biology
- Human Biology 403 - Human Physiology Laboratory
- Human Biology 444 – Endocrinology
- Human Biology 422 – Immunology
- Biology 309 - Evolutionary Biology
- Psych 483X - Anger and Aggression Seminar
- History 337 - The Rise of Islamic Civilization to 1800
- Human Biology 198 – Death, Dying and Science (freshman seminar)
- English 290 - Literary Studies
- Environmental Science 283X – Weather and Climate Forecasting (freshman seminar)
- Social Change & Development 283X – Waging War, Waging Peace (freshman seminar)
- Human Development 198 – How we live: American cities and suburbs (freshman seminar)
- Communication 198X - Communicating effectively: Necessary tools for conflict management in everyday student life (freshman seminar)
- Urban & Regional Studies 283X, Jumpin' Java: Coffee cultures around the world (freshman seminar)
- Human Development 283X - Not Just for Children: The meaning of Play (freshman seminar)
- Spanish 465 - Special Topics

Courses approved for Social Sciences 1 (SS1) categorization:

- Urban & Regional Studies 283X - Jumpin' Java: Coffee cultures around the world
- Human Development 283X - Not Just for Children: The meaning of Play

Courses approved for Social Sciences 2 (SS2) categorization:

- Social Change & Development 283X – Waging War, Waging Peace
- Human Development 198 – How we live: American cities and suburbs
- Economics 307 – History of Economic Thought
- Communication 198X - Communicating effectively: Necessary tools for conflict management in everyday student life

Courses approved for Humanities 3 (H3) categorization:

- English Composition 105 - Expository Writing (the Provost did not approve this course request for H3 categorization)
- History 206 - History of U.S. 1865 to present (change from H2 to H3 categorization)
- History 205 - History of U.S. 1600-1865 (change from H2 to H3 categorization)
- History 380 - U.S. Women's History

Courses approved for Natural and Physical Sciences 1 (NPS1) categorization:

- Chem 355 - Chemistry in the World

Courses approved for Natural and Physical Sciences 2 (NPS2) categorization:

- Environmental Science 342 - Environmental Geology
- Human Biology 198 – Death, Dying and Science
- Environmental Science 283X – Weather and Climate Forecasting
- Environmental Science 283X - Radioactivity and the Environment

Courses approved for World Culture (WC) categorization:

- Nursing 492 - Global Aspects of Health Care
- Hist 337 - The Rise of Islamic Civilization to 1800
- Spanish 465 - Special Topics

Courses approved for Ethnic Studies (ES) categorization:

- FNS 360 - Women and Gender in First Nations Communities

II. Actions with Relatively Wide Applications

- The GEC Domain Committees were formally created at the very end of the 2006-07 academic year. During the first half of the 2007-08 year the GEC worked with unit and discipline chairs to recruit members for the GEC Domain Committees. It proved to be a bit difficult to get faculty to fill all the positions in these committees. The GEC charged the Domain Committees with reviewing the current state of General Education within their domain. Specifically, the Domain Committees were asked to review the syllabi of all their domain's gen ed courses to ascertain if they address the relevant domain-specific learning outcomes (see **appendix A** for the Domain Committee charge and forms). This review would

serve as a foundation for future Domain Committee work, including further discussion and possible revision of the general education curriculum. The Domain committees completed their review and reported back to the GEC by April 1, 2008 (see **Appendix B** for the Domain Committee reports). Briefly, the results indicated that a majority of gen ed course syllabi do implicitly or explicitly state the relevant gen ed learning outcomes. Yet, there was still an uncomfortably large number of faculty (new, existing and ad-hoc) who are unaware of the gen ed curriculum and its domain-specific learning outcomes. Given these findings, the GEC will charge the Domain Committees for the 08-09 year with developing, and implementing a specific plan for informing new, existing and ad-hoc instructors that they are teaching a Gen Ed course, what the relevant learning outcomes are, and encourage them to make clear to students the role of the course in fulfilling the learning outcomes as part of the student's general education. The timeline for accomplishing this is to have the Domain Committees develop the plan during the Fall of the 08-09 year and begin implementing it in the Spring semester of that year.

- During the 07-08 year a General Education Task Force was formed under the direction of the Provost's office. The GEC initially felt that it had inappropriately been left "out of the-loop" and had concerns that this initiative was not faculty-driven. However, after meetings with the Provost and the Task Force widespread agreement and support for the Task Force emerged (see **Appendix C** for the joint memorandum of understanding between the Task Force and the GEC). It is expected that in upcoming years the GEC and its Domain Committees will be working closely with the Task Force.
- Associate Provost Tim Sewall requested that the GEC help generate a General Education Program Report for the UW Board of Regents. Specifically, the GEC in its portion of the report addressed the UWGB philosophy of General Education, the goals of the program, its relationship to the UWGB mission and compiled an overview of the general education requirements and curriculum.
- GEC members met with the on-site reviewers from the Higher Learning Commission as part of UWGB's 10-year review for accreditation.
- The GEC helped oversee General Education embedded assessment in conjunction with Pam Gilson in the Provost's office. This process is still problematic in that a significant number of faculty asked to do embedded assessment in any given semester do not participate. The GEC intends for the Domain Committees to take on a more active role in this process this next academic year and this may improve compliance.

III. General Observations

This past year the GEC members worked effectively together and had a rather full agenda at each meeting, with meetings held every other week. Much of our time was occupied

with specific course approvals and this fact alone makes it a bit difficult for the GEC to tackle larger, long-term issues without seriously restructuring the amount of time the GEC meets. In fact, this is one reason why the GEC feels that the newly formed General Education Task Force is better positioned to attempt large-scale reform of General Education. The Task Force can devote all its time to that issue and its membership will serve for longer terms than the 3-year rotations that GEC members serve. With some trepidation, which is expected given the failures of previous general education reforms, the GEC is hopeful that the Task Force in conjunction with the GEC and its domain committees can incrementally win Faculty Senate approval and successfully reform UWGB's general education program. The formation of the GEC Domain Committees may be quite timely as this subcommittee gives one more level of faculty participation and consensus in the process of gen ed reform. Also, the Domain Committees are ideally set up to effectively implement and assess any future incremental changes in the general education program that the Task Force-GEC recommend.

Respectfully submitted,

Debra Pearson
Chair, General Education Council

APPENDIX A, B & C can be found in the SOFAS office files.

Graduate Faculty Board of Advisors

MEMORANDUM

TO: Clifford Abbott
Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

FROM: Fritz Erickson, Dean
College of Professional and Graduate Studies

DATE: April 24, 2008

SUBJECT: **ANNUAL SUMMARY, GRADUATE FACULTY BOARD OF ADVISORS 2007-2008**

The members of the 2007-2008 Graduate Faculty Board of Advisors were:

Fritz Erickson, Dean of Professional and Graduate Studies, Chair
Patricia Terry, Chair, Environmental Science and Policy
Timothy Kaufman, Chair, Applied Leadership
Meir Russ, Chair, Management
Edna Staerkel, UWO, MSW Coordinator
John Katers, Member-at-Large
Marilyn Sagrillo, Member-at-Large

Greg Davis served as the University Committee's liaison.

The Board held five meetings throughout the academic year.

The Board was unable to successfully recruit a student representative to serve as a member of the board.

The Board acted upon or reviewed the following policy or procedural items:

1. Discussed new procedures for processing graduate applications since the process had been successfully transitioned from the Admissions Office to the Office of Graduate Studies.
2. Approved an increase in the number of credits in which a graduate student could enroll per term from 9 to 15.
3. Approved a policy revision to the way in which transfer credits are recorded on the student's transcripts.
4. Endorsed a partnership between the Applied Leadership for Teaching and Learning Program and the Institute for Learning Partnership's Professional Development Certificate (PDC) where successful completion of the PDC could lead to transcripted elective credits in the Masters Program through the Credit for Prior Learning review process.

The Board acted on the following curricular matters:

1. Endorsed a proposal by the Graduate Faculty of the Applied Leadership to Teaching and Learning program to offer a Professional Project, along with a thesis, as a Culminating Activity.
2. Endorsed a program change and additional course requirement to the Masters of Social Work curriculum – SOC WORK 735; Research Consultation.

The Board also reviewed, discussed, and/or provided advice to the Dean of Professional and Graduate Studies on the following topics:

1. The group discussed growth potential within the current programs and identified four new potential programs. Based on these discussions, Dean Erickson put together a document that would be brought to the Provost for possible Growth Agenda funding.
2. The group discussed ways in which the Fox Valley Learning Center could be utilized by the Graduate Programs.

In summary, the Board functioned effectively, providing the procedural oversight of Graduate Programs and also advice to the Dean. The GFBA continues to work in a collaborative fashion to increase graduate enrollment and streamline the process for admitting students into graduate programs.

cc: Graduate Faculty Board of Advisors
Greg Davis, NAS, University Committee Liaison

Committee on Committees and Nominations

2007-2008 Year End Report

Submitted to the Secretary of the Faculty & Academic Staff

1. The Committee on Committees (CCN) met for a total of 7 times during academic year 2007-2008.
2. The CCN revised the Committee Preference Survey and established a mechanism so that the survey will be completely electronic for the 2008-2009 academic year.
3. The CCN submitted a slate of candidates for elected committees to the Faculty Senate and a slate of candidates for appointed committees to the Provost.
4. The CCN took up a proposal written by former SOFAS Ken Fleurant regarding the organization and reorganization of UW-Green Bay Committees. In tackling this proposal, the CCN accomplished the following:
 - Developed a CCN website which will hopefully go “live” during the 2008-2009 academic year.
 - Distributed a “Committee Chair Survey” that requested information about committee charges, membership, activities, mission statements, and issues and concerns. Input from these surveys will help in writing pages for each committee that will be on the CCN website. In addition, structural, communication, and procedural issues that reflect patterns across the committees will be identified and discussed in future CCN meetings.
5. The CCN wrote its own mission statement.
6. The CCN agreed that a more formal mechanism for committee formation must be instituted and a form, to be signed by both administration and faculty, was drafted.

In sum, the members of the CCN, Profs. Heidi Fencl, Jennifer Mokren, Kaoime Malloy, Judy Martin, and Illene Noppe (Chair) feel that we had a productive year. Continuing members will work toward completion of the pending projects during the coming academic year.

Respectfully submitted,

Illene C. Noppe, Chair

Committee on Rights and Responsibilities

TO: Chancellor Bruce Shepard

FROM: 2007-2008 Committee on Rights and Responsibilities Members: Andrew Austin; Cristina Ortiz; Tian-you Hu (Chair); John Lyon; Sagrillo Marilyn.

Date: May 15, 2008

RE: Committee on Rights and Responsibilities Annual Summary Report

During the 2007-2008 academic year, the Committee on Rights and Responsibilities reviewed one grievance. We complete the year with the following findings and suggestions:

The grievance was submitted by a member of the Professional Program in Education. It can be considered as a continuation of the multiple hearings between this member and the program spanning the previous two-year period.

By reading the emails/correspondences between the parties, the CRR felt that the tension between this member and other members in the Professional Program in Education has been lessened, but nonetheless continues to be a problem that should be resolved. The CRR normally handles the grievances and hence it can smooth some conflicts happening in the campus. On the other hand, it is an advisory committee. Therefore the CRR suggests that the administration and the University Committee to encourage the Professional Program in Education continue to improve their collegial relations and focus on producing highly qualified graduates from UW-Green Bay.

Library and Instructional Technology Committee

Annual Report, 2007-2008

Committee membership: Franklin Chen, Sarah Detweiler (secretary), Leanne Hansen (ex-officio), Mark Keihn, Andrew Kersten (chair), Kathy Pletcher (ex-officio), Todd Sanders, Andrew Speth,

This year we worked on three main initiatives. First, we completed the implementation of the student response system (aka., clickers). This has been a highly successful initiative. Last year, the LITC engaged in a major research project to gauge student and faculty interest, to understand how other campuses have adopted this technology, and to find the best way to bring it to UW-Green Bay. This last year we have moved from a pilot clicker project to a full-fledged clicker program on campus. The results in terms of faculty satisfaction and in terms of student engagement have been tremendous. The LITC members and the clicker sub-committee deserve a lot of credit for their hard work on this. The LITC has also been discussing other library and technology initiatives including: the new Cofrin Library web site; the new Cofrin Library learning commons; the upcoming faculty technology survey; podcasting; web2.0 technologies; and classroom management tools such as D2L. All these conversations and the related projects are ongoing and should be continued by the next LITC.

Submitted by:
Andrew E. Kersten, Chair

FACULTY APPOINTIVE STANDING COMMITTEES

Academic Actions Committee

Academic Actions Committee Report for 2007-2008

The Academic Actions Committee for 2007-2008 was comprised of: Atife Caglar (NS), Randall Meder (AH, Chair), Sarah Meredith (AH), Kristin Vespia (SS), Sandra Deadman (*ex officio* and therefore not voting), Darrel Renier (*ex officio* and therefore not voting), Michael Herrity (*ex officio*, and therefore not voting), Melanie Czypinski (student), Paul Gazdik (student) and Ryan Mach (student).

The Committee met three times during the 2007-08 academic year: August 27, 2007, January 18, 2008 and May 6, 2008.

At the August 27, 2007 meeting four student appeals were heard and Professor Meder was elected Chair for 2007-08.

At the January 18, 2008 meeting five student appeals were considered, and the 2009-10 Academic calendar was reviewed and approved. The status of the 2010-11 academic calendar was changed from “proposed” to “pending.”

At the May 6, 2008 meeting the committee discussed the student appeals process and the The Survey of Campus Committees.

At the June 17, 2008 meeting four student appeals were considered.

Respectfully submitted,
Randall Meder, Chair for 2007-08
June 17, 2008

Awards & Recognition Committee

Annual Report for 2007-08
July 14, 2008

Submitted by: Brian Sutton (chair), Woo Jeon, Steve Kimball, Karen Lacey, Emily Rogers, Jan Snyder, Linda Toonen, Jill White

1. During the 2007-08 school year, the Awards and Recognitions Committee solicited nominations for University of Wisconsin-Green Bay Founders' Association Awards, and eventually selected Founders' Association Awards winners for 2008 from among those nominated.
2. The committee also advised the administration regarding potential commencement speakers.
3. Partly because in some cases persons were nominated for Founders' Awards in one category for certain kinds of work, while other persons were nominated in a different category for extremely similar kinds of work, some committee members felt that next year's committee should consider creating more detailed written guidelines for criteria in the various award categories.
4. Some committee members also recommended that next year's committee, or next year's Honorary Degree Committee, should consider creating written guidelines to more clearly delineate the criteria for awarding honorary degrees from UWGB.

Honorary Doctorate Committee

Annual Report for 2007-08

July 14, 2008

Submitted by: Brian Sutton (chair), Woo Jeon, Steve Kimball, Karen Lacey, Linda Toonen, Jill White

1. During the 2007-08 school year, the Honorary Degree Committee recommended that the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay should offer an honorary doctorate to Dr. Verna Fowler, founder and current president of the College of the Menominee Nation. This recommendation was approved, and Dr. Fowler received an LL.D. (Doctor of Laws) during the Spring 2008 Commencement.
2. The committee also recommended that UWGB grant honorary doctorates to two other candidates during the 2008-09 school year. These recommendations were approved, and the two persons were contacted, but the candidates' names and responses have not yet been publically announced.
3. Some committee members recommended that next year's committee, or next year's Awards and Recognitions Committee, should consider creating written guidelines to more clearly delineate the criteria for awarding honorary degrees from UWGB.

Intercollegiate Athletics Committee

2007-08 ANNUAL REPORT

The IAC met on seven occasions during the 2007-08 academic year.

Committee members were: Professors Brecher, Feranich, Shay, T. Meyer (Chair); Academic Staff members K. Swan, DeLeeuw; Community Representative Chuck Askalakson; Athletic Director K. Bothof (ex-officio/non-voting); Faculty Athletic Rep. D. Ritch; Asst. Athletic Director J. Stangel.

Major topics and actions included the following:

- The IAC assisted in various facets of the NCAA Certification Review process, including the on-campus visit of the review committee.
- The IAC worked on the issues of gender equity, academic support services for student athletes, graduation rates for student athletes as compared to non-athlete students, and matters relating to the Academic Progress Rate (assessed for all D-1 sports, men's and women's, across all D-1 institutions).
- The IAC provided input on issues related to student athlete workouts following breaks while away from campus (and, subsequently, regular workouts, for many); several student athletes experienced problems with high stress/impact workouts following the Thanksgiving break; steps have been taken to ensure that this type of occurrence will not be repeated in the future.
- The IAC provided input on new coach selections for various men's and women's sports.
- The IAC approved post-season competition for various men's and women's sports.
- The IAC developed a well focused, specific, and accurate Mission Statement which was formally submitted to the University Committee.
- The IAC provided feedback and input on the IA budget.

The IAC continues to play a very useful role in our intercollegiate athletics program, providing advice and input, as well as developing and approving important policy matters affecting the entire campus.

Faculty Senate Committee on Planning and Budget

2007-2008 Report

The Faculty Senate Committee on Planning and Budget (FSCPBC) met regularly during the year to discuss issues related to budget allocation, budget planning, and budget priorities. More specifically, the FSCPBC was provided a charge for 2007-08 by the University Committee (UC) in a memo dated October 9, 2007. The primary items included in the charge from the UC are summarized below:

- 1) The FSPBC Chair as well as the Members of the FSPBC will serve as the Chair of the University Committee's Designee on the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay University Planning Committee.
- 2) The FSPBC is given the assignment to work with the Provost in disseminating information about budget processes to the entire UW-Green Bay faculty via a web-page.
- 3) The FSPBC is given the assignment to represent the Faculty Senate in discussing with the Chancellor, Provost, Deans and other administrative officers budgetary processes and related concerns.
- 4) The FSPBC is given the assignment to represent the Faculty Senate in understanding the impact of the proposed "Growth Initiative" on the broader general education programs.
- 5) The FSPBC is asked to provide a monthly progress report to the Faculty Senate regarding the assignments noted above.

Overall, the FSPBC attempted to meet the charge provided by the UC, but was not successful in all areas, most notably playing an active role during all stages of the budget process, which has been a concern of the FSPBC in previous years. Administrative Code provides additional details in this area beyond what was included in the charge from the UC, and is summarized below:

In fulfillment of the faculty codified responsibility (UWGB Chapter 50.04), the committee will be expected to play an active role during all stages of the University's budget-building process. The committee also will be available for consultation with the Chancellor, Provost/Vice Chancellor, Assistant Chancellor, Deans, and academic budgetary units involving emergency decisions and related issues.

In spite of ongoing discussions between the FSPBC and the UC, the greatest concern for the FSPBC continues to be the role and purpose of the committee. However, it remains unclear to the FSPBC where to intervene in the budget process and what level of activity from the

FSPBC would be acceptable to the Faculty Senate and Administration. The FSPBC Chair did participate on the University Planning Committee, although the University Planning Committee met very infrequently during the fall semester and all of the meetings for the spring semester were cancelled. Progress reports were also provided to the Faculty Senate several times throughout the year, which precipitated the additional discussion with the UC on the role of the FSPBC.

The entire FSPBC did meet with the Provost and Deans to discuss issues related to the dissemination of budget information to the faculty. Subsequently, a significant amount of information on the budget process, including several items requested by members of the FSPBC, was included on the Budget webpage. However, it should be noted that much of the information found on the website is policy related and does not provide significant budget details. In addition, some of the information was not provided in a timely fashion, particularly as related to salary increases associated with the Star Funds and Chancellor's Discretionary Funds that were distributed during the spring semester.

The FSBBC has not had a role in discussions related to the "Growth Initiative" to date. However, the FSPBC does hope to play a more prominent role in the Growth Initiative as it moves forward during future years.

John Katers, Chair

Senate Legislative Affairs Committee

June, 19 2008

From: Benjamin Brecher, Convener, Senate Legislative Affairs Committee

Subject: 2007-2008 Senate Legislative Committee Annual Summary Report

The Members of the Senate Legislative Committee were Benjamin Brecher, Kaoime Malloy, and Steve Meyer. After our first meeting we decided that the Faculty and Academic Staff Legislative Committees would meet together and separate as needed. The dates, times, and members present during these meetings are recorded in the minutes for the committee, which are available in the Office of the Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff.

The subjects discussed included:

- A review of the state Budget
- Budget lapse and the Growth Agenda
- Collective Bargaining
- Updating a private e-mail list
- Roundtable discussion with Senator David Hansen
- Spring Legislative forum
- Letter to Governor Doyle regarding budget
- Student independent study

The Senate Legislative Committee strives to keep the University community informed of developments in the Wisconsin State Legislature. This year with the Budget lapse, there were many developments. The committee worked on processing the developments and keeping the University community informed.

COMMITTEES APPOINTED BY THE PROVOST

First Year Experience Committee

September 3, 2008

To: Cliff Abbott, Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

From: Brenda Amenson-Hill and Steve Meyer, Co-Chairs, First Year Experience Committee

Re: Annual Summary Report (2007-08) of the First Year Experience Committee

The First Year Experience Committee met a couple times in 2007-08. There are several other committees working throughout the year to support FOCUS “First Year” initiatives on campus. Some of the groups include a Task Force focusing on First Year Seminars, a campus-wide FOCUS Logistics Planning Committee and an Ambassador Advisory Committee. All of the groups work on the big picture and fine details related to “First-Year” programming and services. The following includes a summary of main initiatives this year.

1. Assessment Data from FOCUS R&R (Registration and Resources). FOCUS R&R provides incoming freshmen and their parents/guardians an introduction to the university including: 1) the academic requirements of the university, 2) the resources available to students, 3) the academic expectations of students, and 4) a list of items the students need to accomplish today (register for courses, submit a declaration of major form). After this introduction, students get their ID photographs taken, learn the SIS computer system, meet with advisors, and plan their first semester course load. Parents learn the “nuts and bolts” of the university (bursar/financial aid, residence life/dining, health services, bookstore, etc.) through panel discussions. At the completion of R&R both students and parents complete a survey evaluating their R&R experience. During the First Year Experience Committee meeting, we discussed the 2007 survey results that indicated the students’ and parents’ level of satisfaction with the R&R program. The results were very positive and similar to previous years.

2. FOCUS Orientation 2007 Evaluation Results. Students’ move in day is the Thursday before classes start. On Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, FOCUS Orientation schedules a number of small group sessions, social activities, and one-hour seminars to assist the students’ transition to college life. Following these activities, the students completed a

“bubble sheet” evaluation. During the First Year Experience Committee meeting, we discussed the 2007 evaluation results which provided information on which areas we were doing well and which areas need to improve.

3. Student Ambassador Summary. There are 36 Student Ambassadors and 2 Student Ambassador Co-Directors. The Ambassadors work an average of 16 hours per month while the Ambassador Co-Directors work 10 hours per week during the academic year and 20 hours per week during the summer. The Student Ambassadors are vital to the success of the FOCUS program, but their role is not limited to FOCUS. They are also involved in Campus Preview Days, commencement, daily campus tours, and programs hosted by the Chancellor and Advancement Office. The number and types of activities in which ambassadors are used is continually increasing; for example, they assist with Campus Life Programming Task Forces, College Fairs, Majors Fair, just to name a few. While ambassadors are required to participate in training activities, they also are involved in numerous service projects as well. The ambassador program is fully funded by FOCUS.

4. Majors Fair in March. We had all of the academic areas participate in Majors Fair again this year. Over 250 students attended this event.

5. FOCUS Budget and Fees. The FOCUS budget is derived entirely by student fees. Freshmen students are charged \$200 each. This fee has not increased since the inception of the program.

6. Freshman Seminars (now called First Year Seminars). 2007 was the second year of the Freshman Seminar program. The first year consisted of 6 sections of general education courses (that normally were high enrollment courses) that were limited to enrollment of 25 students. The second year (2007), the Freshman Seminars expanded to a total of 13 sections, including: 2 sections of English Composition courses, 6 general education courses, and 5 interdisciplinary seminars (newly developed courses commonly referred to as “198” courses because that was the course number assigned to the new courses). A detailed evaluation of these freshmen seminar courses was undertaken and compared to a “control group” of regular general education courses. These data are still being evaluated.

7. Common Theme. It was decided that the university would have a Common Theme around which the students, faculty, staff, and the community to rally around in order to develop a sense of unity. A call for proposals was issued through the Office of LAS Dean Furlong. Since that time, Prof. Kim Neilsen’s “Waging War, Waging Peace” theme was selected. A Common Theme Committee was developed and a series of activities are being planned for the 2008-09 academic year.

Overall, this was another successful and productive year for FOCUS. We are fortunate to have great collaboration and participation across the campus on our “First-Year” initiatives.

Committee on Individuals with Disabilities

Summary of Activities for 2007-08

Members of the Committee on Individuals with Disabilities for the 2007-08 school year included Rebecca Meacham (faculty), Sherri Arendt (academic staff), Elaina Koltz (classified staff) and Andrei Varney (student). Assistant Director for Diversity and Employment Services Yarvelle Draper-King, Coordinator of Disability Services Lynn Niemi and Americans with Disabilities Act Compliance Coordinator Greg Smith served on this committee as ex-official members. Lynn Niemi and Greg Smith served as co-chairpersons.

The Committee on Individuals with Disabilities met officially two times this year as a full committee.

Areas the committee addressed this year were as followed”

- University Union Concerns – The committee met with Rick Warpinski, Director, to discuss the UU expansion, the barrier-free restrooms, access to dining services and products. Rick listened to our concerns and said he would address them.
- Issues with Accessibility with Campus Entrances – The committee reviewed several entrances on campus and identified areas of concerns. A memo was sent to the Provost and the copy of the memo is attached. We also met with Chris Hatfield to tour the sites with him and reviewed our concerns. He also provided information that upcoming remodels where they incorporate accessibility eliminates in the design.
- Other accessibility concerns brought to the committee’s attention this year that were discussed include: discussing need to develop a service animal policy; identifying gender neutral restroom in CL; campus voting issues; emergency phones and access; Residence Life needing check box on application; and snow removal and accessible paths.

The co-chairs of this committee feel that it has been doing valuable work and is worthwhile. We are ensuring individuals with disabilities have access to our campus and events held.

Committee on Individuals with Disabilities - attachment

Email to Provost Hammersmith and Chris Hatfield, Director of Facilities:

Provost Hammersmith and Chris Hatfield:

The Advisory Committee for Individuals with Disabilities has met several times this year to discuss accessibility issue on our campus. Attached is the recommendations for entrances that we had discussed with Chris this year. We want you to be aware of these issues as you continually plan for improvements to the facilities of our campus.

Others areas that the original memo does not address include the following:

- **Student Services front entrance** - The entrance in front of the Welcome Center does not have automatic door openers. We would recommend having them.
- **Emergency Phones** - The emergency phones on campus should all be fully accessible in reach and approach. In time of snow, the approaches to the phones need to be kept clear for wheelchair access.
- **Single Stall Restrooms** - There are several single stall restrooms (i.e. restrooms by the Garden Café in CL) that could be identified as “gender neutral” or “unisex” rather than being identified as Men or Women’s. This would allow for personal care attendants of the opposite sex to comfortable assist. Also, it would allow for two same sex people who need to use the accessible restrooms to do so at the same time.
- **Barrier Free Restroom in University Union** – The female restroom on the first floor of the UU that is identified as “barrier free” needs some modifications. We recommend that the door be reinstalled with an automatic door opener so females who need to use the accessible stall can have the appropriate privacy. Currently, you can see that stall when walking by.

If you have any questions related to our recommendations please contact the Co-Chairs, Greg Smith and Lynn Niemi. Thank you.

Individualized Learning Committee

Year End Report – 2007 – 2008

Chair: Kaoime E. Malloy

Members: Lucy Arendt, Pamela Gilson, Mark Kiehn, Lloyd Noppe, Song Hosung, Donna Ritch (ex- officio).

The individualized Learning Committee met twice during the 2007 – 2008 academic year, once to elect a chair and once to evaluate the Individualized Major proposal of Sam Eagan.

- During the first meeting, Prof. Malloy was elected to serve as chair and secretary for the committee. Also, the committee approved a requested course substitution for Sarah Preissner's previously approved Individualized Major in Arts Management.
- During the second meeting, Sam Eagan's proposal for a major in Women's Studies was discussed at length. The committee decided unanimously to not approve the proposal, but emphasized that it was not a rejection. We believed that Eagan did not need a different degree title in what was already a very strong major and minor package to meet her career goals. At this meeting, the committee also briefly discussed the upcoming survey from the CNN regarding committee structure.

Respectfully submitted,
Kaoime E. Malloy

Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee

2007/2008 Annual Report

In September Professor Meinhardt met with Professor Wolf's Ecology class to review the ethical use of animals in research.

The committee met only twice (minutes attached). In February the committee elected Daniel Meinhardt as chair, and approved a protocol submitted by Professors Meinhardt, Bauer-Dantoin, and Baker, entitled *Hormonal Control of Development in Xenopus laevis*. The committee discussed the processes of identifying "exempt" protocols and the handling of animal use in course labs (i.e., not research). Professor Austin volunteered to review federal codes for animal use to determine what we must do to be in compliance.

In May the committee heard a summary of federal codes from Professor Austin, and the committee voted unanimously to approve policy consistent with that code. These policies are recorded in the minutes. The committee considered a protocol by Professor Wolf entitled *Spatial Distribution of Red-backed Salamanders in the Cofrin Arboretum*. The protocol was approved on certain conditions (in the minutes). Professor Meinhardt followed up with Professor Wolf and, when assured the conditions were met, sent official approval to Professor Wolf.

After the May meeting Professor Meinhardt made minor revisions to the current Vertebrate Animal Use Protocol form to make it consistent with policy approved at the May meeting. Professor Meinhardt also designed a report/renewal form consistent with policy. Finally, Professor Meinhardt summarized the approved policies and distributed them by email to all faculty known to (or suspected of) using vertebrate animals.

Respectfully submitted 19 August 2008

Daniel Meinhardt
IACUC Chair
Assistant Professor
Human Biology

Institutional Assessment Committee

2007-08 Annual Report

The Institutional Assessment Committee continued the 2006-2007 agenda of exploring a new assessment system for the campus. The new assessment device was based on a system developed at Rutgers University. A poll was sent to faculty asking if they were willing to participate in testing the new methodology. The results were decidedly underwhelming. A large number of faculty respondents either did not want to participate or did not see any significant differences between the new system and the existing one.

Some of the responses to the survey were vehement and suggested that, to some faculty, no course evaluation system can be acceptable. Since evaluation is mandated at the State level, that approach is not an option. Among the complaints were that evaluations did not measure teaching performance adequately, that students were discriminatory in their responses (more hostile toward females) and that evaluations were frequently used inappropriately, or misused as a pretext to justify judgments made subjectively on other grounds.

Given the tepid response to the survey, the IAC decided it was not worthwhile to attempt to launch a new assessment system. The only significant business for the remainder of the year was a report by Heidi Fencel on the Higher Learning Commission's Assessment Academy.

It seems to this outgoing chair that:

1. Units jealously guard their right to conduct merit the way they see fit, and oppose any campus wide effort to mandate how evaluations are to be used.
2. However, there is also a widespread perception on the part of many faculty that numerical scores are overused if not actually abused.
3. Students are frequently not in a position to provide meaningful input on teaching quality.
4. Nevertheless, students do know when things are going well or poorly in the classroom.

A sensible approach would be to go on collecting assessments. They should be used for two principal purposes:

1. Documenting problems in the classroom: tardiness, absenteeism, lack of preparation, discrimination, harassment, and so on.
2. Documenting exceptional performance.

In the absence of either extreme, teaching should be presumed satisfactory and numerical scores should have minimal weight compared to factors like new course development, revision of materials, advising, and so on.

Steven I. Dutch, Chair
Professor, Natural and Applied Sciences

Institutional Review Board

Summary Report of the activities of the Institutional Review Board of the University of Wisconsin – Green Bay for the academic year 2007-2008

**Submitted by Dr. James C. Marker, Chair
July 25, 2008**

Proposals:

During the 2007-2008 academic year, the IRB met 8 times. The meetings were held on Tuesday mornings, and they generally lasted around 1.5 hours.

There were 70 proposals submitted to the IRB (see attached summary). Thirty-two were submitted in the Fall (07) and 38 in the Spring (08). Fifty of the proposals 50 were reviewed as "expedited" or "exempt" status by the IRB chair, and twenty proposals were reviewed as non-exempt/"full board" proposals by the entire IRB. One submitted proposals was deemed "non-research" and was not reviewed. There were two proposals that were submitted, but because of incomplete submission requirements, never acted on. Four proposals were withdrawn. As of this writing, one proposal awaits final approval contingent on the PI providing follow-up information as requested by the IRB.

The proposals came from three main sources: (1) UW-Green Bay faculty who were doing research with students; (2) students enrolled in the UW-Green Bay / UW – Oshkosh Masters in Social Work program (w/ Dr. Judy Martin as PI); and (3) graduate students in the Masters of Applied Leadership program here at UW-Green Bay. For the record, a significant number of the proposals dealt with pedagogical issues both at the K-12 and college level.

IRB training:

As the UW-Madison site IRB training is no longer available, considerable time was spent on finding a new source of IRB training. Fortunately, we found a very useful training site that is designed for the training and education of both IRB members and potential researchers. It is called [Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative \(CITI\)](#). The majority of the IRB members went through the training on this web site, and we will ask new members of the IRB to use the site for training. The training took around 2-3 hours depending on how much training a person wanted. We now refer investigators to use this training web site for their Human Subjects research certification.

Revising the UW-Green Bay IRB manual:

Considerable effort was made to bring the IRB “manual” up to date with the major changes in policy related to Human Subjects research and/or clarification of various sections of the manual. In particular, changes related to what constitutes “exempt” and “non-exempt” research was clarified, and the section dealing with course related

research was upgraded to clarify (1) what type of classroom research needs approval and (2) the process by which one gets such research approved. The revisions reflect many discussions that have occurred over the last 3 year.

Proposal Processing:

As chair of the IRB, I continued to use a technique I developed for other applications to streamline the process of dealing with proposals. This method has the advantage of being efficient, accurate, and professional. It also provides a detailed log of the proposals and relevant matters pertaining to them, e.g., any stipulations needed for approval. In brief, this technique involves entering the basic information from a proposal (PI, dates, etc) into an Excel spreadsheet which in turn is used as a data set to send e-mail messages via the Word "e-mail merge" program. The Word document is a "form letter" set up with basic IRB response language, but the language changes somewhat depending on the status of the proposal (which is coded in the spreadsheet). These e-mail messages provide an excellent record of the transaction and status of a proposal. As such, the final approval letter is sent to the Secretary of the Faculty and Tim Sewall as official record of the proposal being approved. I believe this process to be effectual as I have had numerous compliments on the fast turn-around in the approval process.

IRB Web Page revision:

As chair, I continued to upgrade the IRB web page. The emphasis for the revised web page was to help the user know where to start and what to do. I have heard several positive comments from faculty that the revised web page is more "user friendly" than it was in the past. There is still more to do, but at least faculty have a good sense of where to begin and/or what the overall process entails.

IRB Support – release and/or summer stipend:

For years, the work load of the IRB and, in particular, the Chair of the IRB has been a matter of concern! Having now experienced it FOR A SECOND YEAR, I concur with past IRB chairs that the workload is excessive! (It is fulfilling, but it is excessive!) The provost recently provided a memo outlining how staff would be used to alleviate some of the burden of this time consuming process.

I kept a detailed log (see copy) of my activities and time as chair over the 2007-2008 (including writing this report). As you can see, averaging my total time over 15 weeks, I spent nearly **4 hours per week** on IRB related matters. Keep in mind, this is with my efficient data- mail merge method of dealing with proposals. To put this in perspective, I spent nearly half a day per week over the entire academic year working on IRB matters. As a matter of comparison – how would that time commitment compare to the Chair of the UC who gets a release for her/his efforts?

The IRB response to this effort to support the IRB and chair is as follows: We appreciate the Provost's effort to respond to what has always been an excessive work effort for the chair of this committee. We are hopeful that it will, in fact, reduce the workload of the chair. However, we feel emphatic that this person must be fully integrated with the committee meaning they must be IRB trained and they must attend the meetings so they

understand the nuances of role of this committee and in particular the process involved in handling IRB proposals.

The following is directly from the minutes of our last meeting.

- A. Response from Provost to Marker memo of "IRB Matters"
 - 1. The Chair will respond to the Provost's offer of support staff beginning in Fall '08 as follows:
 - a. IRB appreciates the offer of support staff for the IRB.
 - b. In order to meet the goal of diminishing the Chairs workload the individual assigned as support staff must be fully trained in IRB policy and procedures. In addition, the support staff would perform the following duties:
 - i. Attend all IRB meetings and function as recording secretary for the group.
 - ii. Set meeting schedule for the academic year. Set meeting agendas in consultation with the Chair. Send out meeting notices as required.
 - iii. Handle all IRB correspondence including approval letters and annual update requests.
 - iv. Maintain and enter all information into IRB database.
 - v. Maintain IRB files
 - vi. Review all submitted proposals and make requests for missing items. (This will require very good working knowledge of IRB policies and procedures.)
 - vii. Forward exempt and expedited protocols to Chair for review and approval.
 - viii. Distribute copies full board protocols to IRB members before scheduled meetings.
 - ix. Maintain IRB web page.
 - c. IRB estimates support staff responsibilities will require a .25 FTE assignment.

While I appreciate that this added support may help alleviate some of the workload, I still argue that a reassignment is in order for the chair of this committee AND a modest summer stipend to review any proposals and/or handle any situations that come up during the summer (see below).

Summer support? With the current status of the IRB – reviewing proposals during the summer is only possible if (1) the proposal is expedited and (2) the IRB chair is agreeable to review it (outside of her/his contract). As such (and I know that this has happened), research can be impeded and/or postponed until after the summer which can be a problem for faculty and/or students, e.g., delayed graduation. For the summer of 2008 I had one “late” proposal that I agreed to review. I also have a proposal submitted but not reviewed. One faculty member asked about a review and when we would meet in the fall. In addition, this past summer I had a “concern” from a research subject brought to my attention. It was resolved easy enough, but because I was not under any contractual obligation, I could have NOT responded with the possibility of making the situation worse.

Please kindly consider the option of providing a reassignment for the chair of the IRB along with some type of summer support. The details could be negotiated somewhat with the faculty member involved, but clearly some type of release and/or compensation is appropriate for the excessive hours required as chair of the IRB.

Potential course in Human Subjects Training and Ethics of Research:

The IRB considered the (many) merits of having such a course. It would be a type of on-line course akin to the Lab Safety course currently offered. Among the merits are (more informed graduate and undergraduate students desiring to do research involving human subjects!

Educating the Campus Research Community – continues to be an important concern. I noted several research presentations (that involved human subjects) at the PKP research symposium that I KNOW did not have IRB approval. In the spirit of education and collegiality, I kindly reminded them of the importance of IRB approval.

The IRB members:

The members of this 2007-2008 IRB demonstrated extreme professionalism, commitment, and competence in carrying out the important charge of this body! We had a lot of work to do, and as a whole, the committee members were dedicated to the task. They came to meetings prepared, and they approached the task of reviewing proposals in a spirit of problem-solving and collegiality. They are to be commended for their efforts to facilitate the ethical treatment of human subjects participating in research conducted at UW-Green Bay!

Instructional Development Council

May 28, 2008

MEMORANDUM

TO: Cliff Abbott, Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

FROM: Dean D. VonDras, Chair, Instructional Development Council

SUBJECT: **2007-08 Instructional Development Council Annual Summary Report**

The Instructional Development Council met throughout the 2007-2008 academic year. Ongoing activities were advisory, awareness-oriented, and in support of student engagement and excellence in teaching. During the 2007-2008 academic year the IDC sponsored the following programs: Teaching Enhancement Grants, January Faculty Development Conference, Instructional Development Awards, Friday Discussions, the *IDC Newsletter*, and the new Recognition of Outstanding Scholarship in the Area of Teaching and Learning. The IDC also acts in an advisory role and supports the UW-Green Bay Sabbatical Leave Program as well as OPID initiatives of UW Teaching Fellows, and UW Teaching Scholars.

Advisory Activities:

- Recommended Ryan Martin to OPID for the WI Teaching Fellows Program.
- Reviewed six sabbatical applications and found all acceptable for award.

Awareness-building Activities:

- In the fall, the Awards Subcommittee of the Council voted to award Professor Theresa Adsit the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Award.
- In the spring, the Awards Subcommittee recommended the Summer/Fall 2008 Instructional Development Grant proposals of Atife Caglar-Clark, Jeff Entwistle, and David Voelker for funding.

- The Subcommittee on Teaching Enhancement Grants, in their reviews for both the Fall and Spring semesters, supported the proposals of Theresa Adsit, Denise Bartell, Kathleen Burns, Adolfo Garcia, Regan Gurung, Kevin Kain, and Kim Nielsen.
- The Chair of the Instructional Development Council, Dean D. VonDras, edited, published, and distributed the *IDC Newsletter* to teaching faculty and staff in the Fall 2007 and Spring 2008 semesters. The newsletter provided information about instruction-related activities on-campus as well as System and national conferences and activities. It also hoped to foster a professional exchange by included brief teaching and learning related articles composed by faculty. The articles by UW-Green Bay faculty that appeared in the Fall 2007 *IDC Newsletter* included the following:
 1. *“Significant Learning Goals that Lead to Deeper Understanding”* by D. D. VonDras
 2. *“Rethinking Critical Thinking”* by Patricia A. Terry
 3. *“Do I Still Want to Teach?”* By Carl Black and Steven Kimball
 4. *“Wikis and Blogs: On Incorporating New Technology into Coursework”* by Clifton Ganyard
 5. *“Emerging Technologies, Games, Learning”* by Andy Speth
 6. *“Against the Grain: the Dilemma of Fighting the Culture (or the Lack of It) in American Higher Education”* by Peter Breznay
 7. *“Seven Key Ways to Engage Learners”* by E. Nicole Meyer
 8. *“The Four Deadly Sins of File Organization or A Pretty Cover Doth Not Make for a Good Book, but a Pretty File Doth Make for a Smoother Promotion Review”* by Illene Noppe

The articles appearing in the Spring 2008 *IDC Newsletter* included the following:

1. *“Self-Assessment of Teaching Practice: A First-Step in Enhancing Student Learning”* by D. D.VonDras
2. *“Full Cycle Learning”* by Lucy A. Arendt
3. *“Improved Learning by Non-traditional Students in Mathematically Intensive Courses”* by Dale N. Buechler (UW-Platteville)

4. *“Teaching Intermediate Algebra Using Incremental Development and Review”* by Theresa Adsit
 5. *“Do They Understand?”* by David J. Voelker
 6. *“A Closer Look at How Students Study (and if it Matters)”* by Regan A. R. Gurung
 7. *“Inducing Student Appreciation of Intellectual and Ethical Development in Technology-Oriented Courses”* by Peter T. Breznay
- The IDC also maintained an up-to-date web site of development opportunities and IDC news.
 - The IDC offered and promoted the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Poster-Session during the January 2008 Faculty Development Conference.

Activities to Support Student Engagement and Excellence in Teaching:

- The IDC sponsored the brown-bag program entitled, *“Tenure and Post-Tenure Promotions: An Informal Discussion of the Ins and Outs of Professional File Preparation”* by Professor Illene Noppe, on September 26, 2007.
- The IDC sponsored the brown-bag program entitled, *“Innovations in Instructional Development”* on October 26, 2007. This program featured the work of the 2006-2007 Instructional Development Awardees:
 - Peter Breznay on *“Hands-on Teaching of Digital Electronics in a Comprehensive Liberal Arts College”*
 - Aeron Haynie on *“Teaching the Culture of Food”*
 - Uwe Pott on *“Scientific Inquiry in the Biology Lab”*
 - Jill White on *“Designing Introductory Courses for Engagement - Backwards”*
- The IDC sponsored the brown-bag program entitled, *“Critical Thinking and Interdisciplinarity”* by Council member David Voelker, on February 29, 2008.
- The IDC sponsored the brown-bag program entitled, *“Engaging Students – A Discussion on How to Effectively Integrate Clicker Technology in the Classroom”* by Andy Speth, Kim Baker, Adolfo Garcia, Leif Nelson, and Jennifer Zapf, on March 28, 2008.

- The IDC January Conference Subcommittee Co-Chairs Mimi Kubsch and Dean D. VonDras hosted the 12th Annual Faculty Development Conference entitled, *"How Students Learn: Lessons from the Arts, Sciences and Professions"* on January 17, 2008. This conference included colleagues from St. Norbert College, Bellin School of Nursing, as well as other UW System campuses. This day long conference was noted as having one of the highest attendance in recent years. The conference keynote speaker was Bill Cerbin (UW-LaCrosse) who presented a talk entitled, *"Exploring the Interplay Between How We Teach and How Our Students Learn"*. The distinguished luncheon speaker was Bill Laatsch who reflected on his teaching experiences. Other sessions included the following presentations:
 1. *"Teaching for Understanding: Helping Students make Connections"* by David Voelker.
 2. *"Student Grade Expectations and Ratings of Study Behaviors"* by Lee McCann (UW-Oshkosh).
 3. *"Increasing Classroom Discussion with Two Steps: Empirical Results and the How To"* by Leda Nath (UW-Whitewater).
 4. *"Impact of Diversity Course in Sciences on Students' Attitudes Toward Race"* by Angela Bauer-Dantoin.
 5. *"Full Cycle Learning: Applying Theory to Real World Organizations and Solving Their Problems"* by Lucy Arendt.
 6. *"Case Studies, Simulations, and Student Organizations as Integrative Learning Vehicles"* by Joy Pahl (St. Norbert College).
 7. *"Probing Student Misconceptions Regarding the Nature of Science"* by Tracy White (UW-Barron County).
 8. *"Critical and Logical Thinking; Integrating Lessons from Cognitive Science"* by Jerry Kapus (UW-Stout).
 9. *"Improved Learning by Nontraditional Students in Mathematically Intensive Courses"* by Dale N. Buechler (UW-Platteville).
 10. *"Shulman's Taxonomy of Pedago-Pathologies: Intellectual Land Mines of Teaching and Learning"* by Nancy Chick (UW-Barron County).
 11. *"The Practice of Creativity: Giving Students Tools to Think and Work More Creatively"* by Jennifer Mokren.

12. *"The Analogical Imagination: Aiming for Likeness Between Seemingly Disparate Realities"* by Father Jim Neilson (St. Norbert College).
13. *"The Use of Incremental Teaching and Review to Increase Retention and Understanding in Intermediate Algebra"* by Theresa Adsit.

There was also a poster session focusing on the scholarship of teaching and learning presented, and, overall, the conference evaluations were excellent.

Ongoing Interests:

- To continue to promote faculty exchanges and discussions through the Friday Discussions program.
- To promote a Peer-Review of Teaching for interested educators on campus.
- To promote post-tenure advancement through the "Promotion Tutors" program coordinated through the Secretary of the Faculty.
- Serve as the Advisory Board for the new Faculty Development Center.

Conclusion:

The Instructional Development Council plays an important role in emphasizing student engagement in learning, promoting reflection on and discussion of effective teaching methods, and in facilitating opportunities for professional development. The Council is recognized for its service of providing Instructional Development Awards and Teaching Enhancement Grants throughout the year. These are very important awards to the campus community and provide for a variety of professional development activities. In many ways the awards assist faculty in reflection about and refinement of teaching, as well as informational exchange with colleagues at regional, state, and national professional development conferences.

Serving as Advisory Board of the new Faculty Development Center, the Council looks forward to hosting the January 2009 Faculty Development Conference. The Council also looks forward to assisting the Faculty Development Center in its mission of offering and involving faculty in various professional development activities. As noted in the recent *IDC Newsletter*, faculty have been solicited to

submit scholarly essays about teaching and learning, and to participate in peer-review of classroom teaching, development of a teaching portfolios, and participation in a professional development learning-circles. The Council continues to be interested in facilitating these and other activities that not only provide new opportunities for professional growth, but also build inclusive, cooperative, and interdisciplinary connections among peers. The Council recognizes that the *IDC Newsletter* may change to reflect the programs and initiatives of the new Faculty Development Center, but hopes that this new center and its publication will continue to invite faculty to lead peer-discussions that explore various topics in teaching and learning.

International Education Council

Annual Report for 2007-2008

Membership included:

Kristin Aoki	Sue Keihn
Brent Blahnik	Anne Kok
Diana Borrero-Lowe	Russell Leary
Fritz Erickson	Riccardo Paterni
Kevin Fermanich	Timothy Sewall
Scott Furlong	Jill White
Shiyanke Goonetilleke	

Topics of Discussion

The International Education Council gathered infrequently throughout the 2007-2008 academic year to provide guidance on topics related to international education.

Discussion points included:

1. Development of an Office of International Education Mission Statement
2. Development of an Office of International Education Vision Statement
3. Development of Office of International Education Strategic Initiatives/Priorities
4. Discussion of International Admissions Review Procedures
5. Discussion of the Global Studies Certificate Program
6. Review and award of Faculty Site Visit Grants

Thanks to members of the International Education Council for their dedication, commitment, and work throughout the year.

Submitted by: Brent Blahnik, Chair of the International Education Council and Director of International Education.

Research Council

2007-08 Annual Report Craig Hanke, Chair

The UW-Green Bay Research Council met six times during the 2007-2008 academic year. Members of the council included: Greg Aldrete, Denise Bartell, Carol Emmons, Craig Hanke (Chair), Linda Tabers-Kwak, Mike Marinetti (ex-officio) and Lidia Nonn (ex-officio). The Research Council continued in its mission to support research and scholarly activity at UW-Green Bay. The primary responsibilities of this committee include solicitation and evaluation of institutional grant proposals including the Grants in Aid of Research (GIAR), Grants for Integrating Research and Teaching (GIRT) and the continued development of the Research Scholar program.

Grants in Aid of Research (GIAR)

Applications for Grants in Aid of Research awards were solicited in both fall and spring semesters. The purpose of these grants is to support faculty scholarship by providing funds for data collection, supplies and equipment. Grant funding may also be used for travel for the purpose of presenting research. The Research Council awarded five grants during the fall term and 23 grants during the spring term for a total of \$11,259. Names of the grant awardees are listed on the Research Council web page (<http://www.uwgb.edu/rc/grantrecipients.htm>).

Grants for Integrating Research and Teaching (GIRT)

Applications for Grants for Integrating Research and Teaching were solicited in the spring term. The goal of these grant awards is to provide funding for projects in which faculty and students work together on a scholarly project. The specific focus and evaluation criteria of the GIRT awards has been a subject of discussion for the past two years and this year the call was revised to clarify the purpose of these grants. Three applicants, Professors, Greg Aldrete, Peter Breznay and Julie Lukesh were awarded grants.

Research Scholar

Now in its second year, the Research Scholar program continues to provide opportunities for faculty research time. This program provides a single course release for a faculty member to pursue more ambitious and time-intensive research projects. The goal of the program is to provide the critical time necessary for faculty members to pursue more extensive research projects in hopes of expanding the research opportunities on our campus. The Research Council continues to receive exceptional proposals for this program. Three proposals were received in the fall term and Professor Kristy Deetz was selected as the Research Scholar. Professor Deetz received a course release during the spring term to complete her painting for the traveling art exhibition "Divas and Iron Chefs of Encaustic". Based on the exceptionally high quality of the proposals submitted in the spring term, and with the support of the Provost's office, the program was

expanded and three faculty members were selected as Research Scholars. Professor Scott Ashmann will prepare a National Science Foundation Grant Proposal with the Einstein Project. Professor Andrew Kersten will complete his biography of Clarence S. Darrow, and has already found a publisher. Professor Amy Wolf will develop a National Science Foundation Research Experience for Undergraduates proposal for an internationally networked study of temperate forest dynamics.

The Research Council felt strongly that all four of these Research Scholar projects provide excellent opportunities for UW-Green Bay scholarly activity to have national (and international) impact. The potential contributions of these projects in terms of additional research funding, opportunities for community interactions and recognition for the university make the continued development of this program very promising.

Faculty Research Exchange

The Eighth Annual UWGB Research Council Exchange was held on April 18, 2008. The goal of this program is to allow faculty to present and discuss their ongoing research with other members of the UW-Green Bay community. All faculty are encouraged and recent GIAR award recipients are required to submit brief descriptions of their current research. Prof. Russell Arent presented “Language, Culture and Understanding” and described the work he had carried out as the most recent Research Scholar. Although a wide variety of research descriptions were submitted, the Research Council continues to experiment with different dates, times and formats for this event in efforts to expand the number of faculty participants.

Future Directions

The Research Council continues to be an effective means of distributing small institutional grant awards and providing research support on the UW-Green Bay campus. The current set of grant opportunities appear to be popular and many faculty members make use of the available funding. With the expected growth and new faculty presence in the coming years, continued efforts should be made to publicize and clarify these grants.

The Research Scholar program continues to build momentum and, although still in its infancy, appears to be an excellent opportunity to make significant improvements in the research climate on our campus. After much discussion during the 2007-08 academic year, progress was made on clarifying the tight timelines for previous Research Scholar awards. New timelines have been developed to maximize flexibility for faculty applicants while still allowing adequate time for departments to plan for course releases. It is encouraging that the Research Scholar program has been used to support scholarly activity in many different departments.

It was decided that successive revisions of the call for Grants for Integrating Research and Teaching had resulted in confusion among potential grant applicants. This grant program had originally been designed to support collaborative research between faculty and students. A continuing discussion of the criteria for the Grants for Integrating Research and Teaching has led to a simpler, more direct call for proposals. It is likely

that this call will require further revision and clarification by next years Research Council. The revisions of the call move this grant back toward the original purpose, focused on faculty/student collaborative research. After extensive discussion, it was decided that projects focused on developing teaching pedagogies (funded by GIRT in some previous years) are outside the scope of the Research Council grants and would more appropriately be directed to other support. As a consequence of this clarification it may be useful for the Research Council and the Instructional Development Council to meet in the coming year in order to clearly identify their respective roles.

The 2007-08 Research Council members wish to thank the Offices of the Provost and Associate Provost for their continued support and guidance of the Research Scholar program. We also wish to thank the Institute for Research for their dedicated support of research opportunities across campus and for their great assistance of the Research Council.

Technology Council

2007/08 Annual Report

Kathy Pletcher, Chair, Technology Council

Purpose & Membership. The Technology Council is advisory to the Provost and responsible for developing and monitoring the campus technology plan and recommending technology policies. The Council is chaired by the Associate Provost of Information Services. Membership consists of representatives from each of the divisions, three faculty members, and one student. Members for 2007/08 were:

Academic Affairs – Tim Sewall
Advancement – Scott Hildebrand
Athletics – Dan McIver
Business & Finance – Sharon Dimmer
Faculty Representatives - Kaoime Malloy, Uwe Pott, Meir Russ,
Information Services – David Kieper
Liberal Arts & Sciences – Scott Furlong
Outreach & Extension - Jan Thornton
Professional & Graduate Studies - Fritz Erickson
Student Affairs – Sue Keihn
Student Representative - Shaun Raganyi
Chair – Kathy Pletcher

Activities for 2007/08

- Reviewed progress on the *IT 2007 Action* in October and March.
- Monitored the clicker (interactive response systems) pilot.
- Implemented use of GB-Share for Technology Council document management.
- Reviewed utilization data for all computer labs and approved *Academic Computer Lab Plan for 2008/09*, which included the following changes: added two new small labs in the Athletics Department and one PC to the Social Sciences project rooms; eliminated the GIS teaching lab and reallocated three computers to a GIS project room; reduced the number of computers in the language lab from eight to five. The 2008/09 plan includes 110 networked PCs in eight locations; 76 surplus PCs in 5 locations and 41 Macintosh computers in 7 locations. The total cost for the 2008/09 plan is \$85,000, which is funded from the Lab Mod Fund.
- Recommended to the CIO that the three year replacement cycle for computers be flexible in the case of computers that support lab science labs. The CIO agreed as long the computers can function effectively and be kept up-to-date with security software to ensure the campus network is safe.

- Sponsored Annual Technology Forum, May 1, which focused on Office 2007 rollout, the Web site redesign project, and a demonstration of clickers.
- Sponsored *ECAR Undergraduate Survey of Computer Technology*.
- Responded to the Committee on Committees survey regarding the work of the Technology Council.
- Revised the Information Security Policy and forwarded it to the Cabinet for action.
- Decided to defer a campus-wide survey of students and faculty/staff to fall 2008.

Value of the Council

The Technology Council members feel that the work of the Council is very important to the campus. The Council meets monthly during the fall and spring semesters and is very productive.

COMMITTEES APPOINTED BY THE CHANCELLOR

Chancellor's Advisory Council on Diversity

Year End Report, 2007-08

In 2007-08, the Chancellor's Advisory Council on Diversity focused its attention on workforce diversity issues. The Council did research on campus workforce diversity demographics and trends, conferred with representatives from Human Resources about the search and screen process and the campus affirmative action plan, and reviewed workforce diversity planning efforts at other UW campuses. The Council respectfully offers the following observations and recommendations.

1. Increase campus awareness of the importance of workforce diversity. Diversity in our workforce at all levels enriches our academic enterprise. As the student on our committee so eloquently explained, it also inspires and engages our students of color. To this end, we specifically recommend the following:
 - Improve division-head/hiring authority and accountability for outcomes with respect to diversity in hiring.
 - Invite minority students to meet with division heads and campus administrators to explain for themselves how the diversity of the faculty and staff affects their educational experience. The Council would welcome the opportunity to facilitate such a meeting or forum.

2. Move from reactive to proactive efforts to improve workforce diversity. Too often, the first consideration of a workforce diversity opportunity occurs when a vacancy is created. Improved planning and anticipation can create opportunities to increase the likelihood of hiring persons from diverse backgrounds. The Council recommends the following:
 - Improve succession planning and anticipated hires to predict hiring opportunities in advance, and take appropriate proactive steps in advance.
 - Recruit from within, where appropriate (consider internal postings, waivers, and developing existing talent).
 - Include academic staff and adjunct faculty/staff positions in planning efforts.

3. Improve the search and screen process. The search process has seen successive streamlining and improvement in recent years, and the Council recognizes and applauds that effort. However, there is room for continued improvement in order to bring forward diverse applicant and interview pools. The Council recommends the following:

- Hiring authorities and their designees must insist on active recruitment activities in “non-traditional” venues (distribution lists, community contacts, internal campus announcements of vacancies, informal networks, electronic social networks, etc.)
 - Job descriptions must be sufficiently expansive to attract a diverse candidate pool and not just seek to replace attrition with a “clone” of the person who vacated the position.
 - Seek ways to maximize returns on advertising expenses so that higher cost/higher profile advertising can be cost-effective. (post multiple positions, use fewer larger ads, etc)
 - Chart the “loss” of diversity through the entire search process: applicant pool, applicants meeting minimums, short list, interviewees, etc, to focus search process improvements.
 - Shorten the length of searches so that “hot prospects” are not lost to competing institutions.
 - Assure frequent communication with applicants, especially if searches are protracted or delayed.
4. Provide support for new hires. Attracting and hiring diverse employees is only half the equation. Keeping them is the other half. To that end, the Council recommends the following:
- Cultivate and reward informal support networks that faculty, staff, departments or governance groups are willing to develop.
 - Assure that all new academic staff are assigned mentors or “buddies” who have a vested interest in assuring the new staff person’s success. The academic staff would do well to model a successful program used by the classified staff.
 - Be as attentive and responsive as possible to social as well as formal (job) support needs of employees of diverse backgrounds.
5. Improve the collection and use of information. Exit interview information, surveys of current faculty and staff of color, and the broader use of existing information may inform efforts to improve workforce diversity at UW-Green Bay. Thus, the Council recommends the following:
- Collect and use exit interview information systematically and strategically.
 - Share an executive summary of the annual AA/EO Report, and use the report to leverage changes. Currently, this report, while containing the most accurate information about workforce diversity relative to national availability, is not used in any meaningful way to formulate campus goals or action plans.

The Council welcomes the opportunity to discuss these recommendations or any other matter regarding campus diversity with you at your convenience.

Respectfully submitted,
 Michael Stearney, Chair
 Chancellors Advisory Council on Diversity,

August 8, 2008

Chancellor's Advisory Council on Equality for Women

No report submitted for 07-08

**ACADEMIC STAFF ELECTIVE AND APPOINTIVE
COMMITTEES**

**Academic Staff Assembly Minutes and
Committee Reports for 2007-08 are available at:**

For April 2008

http://www.uwgb.edu/sofas/staffgov/Assembly/minutes_4_08.pdf

For November 2007

http://www.uwgb.edu/sofas/staffgov/Assembly/minutes_12_07.pdf