AGENDA
UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 3
Wednesday, 16 November 2005, 3:00 p.m.
Phoenix Room C, University Union

Presiding Officer: Gregory Davis, Speaker
Parliamentarian: Professor Kenneth J. Fleurant

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 2,
   OCTOBER 19, 2005 [page 2 attached]

3. CHANCELLOR’S REPORT

4. CONTINUING BUSINESS
   a. Code Change to Chapter 6 (2nd reading) - [page 6 attached]

5. NEW BUSINESS
   a. Resolution on the Granting of Degrees [page 7 attached]
   b. Report from the Senate Committee on Planning and Budget - Presented by Joy Benson, Chair
   c. Discussion of Future Directions for General Education [page 8 attached]
   d. Requests for Future Senate Business

6. PROVOST’S REPORT

7. UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE REPORT
   Presented by Sally Dresdow, Chair

8. ADJOURNMENT
Presiding Office: Gregory Davis (NAS-UC), Speaker
Parliamentarian: Kenneth J. Fleurant, Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

PRESENT: Scott Ashman (ED), Forrest Baulieu (ICS-UC), Joy Benson (BUA), Peter Breznay (ICS), Francis Carleton (URS), Gregory Davis (NAS-UC), Sally Dresdow (BUA-UC), Scott Furlong (PEA-UC), Clifton Ganyard (HUS), Alison Gates (COA), Victoria Goff (ICS), Cheryl Grosso (COA), Sue Hammersmith (Provost, ex officio), Derek Jeffreys (HUS), Mark Kiehn (EDU), Michael Kraft (PEA), Mimi Kubsch (NUR), Daniel Meinhardt (HUB), Steven Meyer (alternate for John Katers, NAS), Terence O’Grady (COA-UC), Debra Pearson (HUB), Tara Reed (NAS), Meir Russ (BUA), Bruce Shepard (Chancellor, ex officio), Christine Style (COA-UC), Brian Sutton (HUS), Rebecca Tout (COA), Kristin Vespia (HUD), David Voelker (HUS), Michael Zorn (NAS).

NOT PRESENT: Harvey Kaye (SCD), Judith Martin (SOCW)

REPRESENTATIVES: Lucy Arendt (Academic Staff Representative), Adam Warpinski (Student Government Association Representative).

GUESTS: Clifford Abbott (ICS), Dean Fritz Erickson, Anthony Galt (SCD), Associate Dean Regan Gurung, Scott Hildebrand (University Communications), Interim Dean Fergus Hughes, Erik Mims (student senate), Associate Provost Timothy Sewall, Shae Sortwell (student senate), Associate Provost Jan Thornton.

1. Call to Order. With a quorum present, Speaker Davis called the Senate to order at 3:05 p.m. The speaker noted that Steven Meyer is seated as an alternate for Senator Katers (NAS).

2. Approval of Minutes of UW-Green Bay Faculty Senate Meeting No. 1, September 14, 2005. The minutes were approved without change by voice vote.

3. Chancellor’s Report. Chancellor Shepard reported on the following issues:

   1. Campus growth agenda: A common question has been “How can we talk of growth when we are so under funded and stressed?” The reason we are seriously under funded is precisely that we did grow without prerequisite resources. That will not happen again. Access must be access to quality. It is entirely possible the funding required to grow will not be available in the current economic environment, but, if growth is to happen, it will not be without an organized community effort of those in our region of the state who would like to see us succeed. Those voices are being heard more and more frequently. We will continue to labor to create the political pressures that will work in our favor. Even if, at best, there is a 50-50 chance of this happening, it is worth taking the chance.

   2. Heating and Cooling. We can expect between a 30 and 50 percent increase in heating and cooling costs, which translates to an increase of between a quarter and half million dollars. Those funds are not budgeted anyplace. Analysis is underway of reducing temperatures this winter and other cost-saving measures such as consolidating evening classes in one building.

   3. The Weidner Center has been operating at a loss for the past four years and the profits accumulated in the “hay day” of Broadway musicals are about depleted. Projected losses cannot be allowed to materialize since there are no funds in the budget to cover them. The community has a sense of ownership and we hope to take...
advantage of that by forming a task force composed of influential community partners to help us consider how the Weidner Center should be run in the future.

3. The recent false reports of assaults on campus were handled very professionally by campus staff and are examples of an increase in the number of mentally stressed and unstable students. The number of attempted suicides has risen significantly. This is a national phenomenon and of considerable concern to us.

Senator Breznay asked how growth strategies are being planned. Should huge majors like Business, Education or Human Biology be allowed to grow further to the detriment of small majors, putting us at risk for becoming a monoculture? Do we want a campus where 90 percent are in a few majors? The Chancellor responded that it is important to protect programs in order to remain a comprehensive university. However, he believes that the idea that we are in control of higher education is off the mark. Students will decide where they want to go. The decision of which programs will grow is in the hands of faculty and students. But we are getting too far ahead of ourselves since we need funding first. We will decide which programs to maintain and grow, but we don’t decide where students go. Senator Voelker commented that a recent Press-Gazette article on growth strategy mentioned new buildings but not new faculty and staff. The Chancellor pointed out that a 20 million dollar bottom line budget increase would effectively double instructional dollars.


a. Curriculum Approval Procedures. Presented by UC Chair Dresdow who explained changes in the new version of the chart of approval procedures discussed last month: the UC and Faculty Senate are now a single entity since the UC doesn’t act to approve curricular change on its own. Areas mentioned in code have been indicated with shading. One decision that the Senate needs to make is whether it wants to review requests for new minors within existing academic units. Code only stipulates that new “freestanding” minors need receive Senate approval. The chart does not represent the exact order of approval. The UC suggests creating a handbook on curriculum rather than attempting to fit everything into code. The Senate would, as faculty representatives, maintain and modify that text. Another question in need of an answer is whether new areas of emphasis within interdisciplinary programs should come before the Senate or, at least, before the Academic Affairs Council. Discussion and questions followed:

Senator Grosso asked how minor changes to courses are handled now. Chair Dresdow said there is no common understanding of what constitutes a minor change and this may be something for the Senate to consider. Senator Davis said we have been letting units decide if the change is minor and Deans have been approving those requests on their own. The Provost recommended a more specific name than “interdisciplinary program.” Chairperson Dresdow agreed that it is the interdisciplinary “executive committee” and not a “program” that makes curricular decisions. She also noted that disciplinary unit approval is assumed in interdisciplinary unit approval. The Provost questions whether requiring articulation agreement approval at every level is necessary or a good use of Senate time. Regarding what logically needs faculty approval, the Provost said that what is on a transcript needs faculty oversight. That would include majors, minors and degrees, for example, but not necessarily arrangements for offering courses (such as distance education). The manner of implementation of approved programs should not need to occupy faculty time in the curricular approval process. Senator Carleton said we should trust decisions on minors to the interdisciplinary units and that we should not have to micromanage at that level. Senator Grosso asked whether permission from System to plan a new major includes minors as well. UC Chair Dresdow said there is no good answer, but that it would seem to include the whole package. Senator Grosso said she would like to see minors for approved programs handled at the unit level. There was additional sentiment expressed for this.

Senator Davis asked for opinions on the place in the approval process of adding or eliminating areas of emphasis within approved majors. Some discussion followed about whether areas of emphasis are listed on transcripts. Several opined that that is not the case. Areas of emphasis are tracked by the Registrar’s software to assure that requirements are met but do not appear on transcripts. The Chancellor believes that a lot of
headaches can be avoided in the curricular approval process if interdepartmental communication is expected and is documented before proposals get to approval levels beyond curricular units.

5. New Business.
   a. Code change to Chapter 6 (first reading) regarding complaints and grievances. UC Chair Dresdow noted that the UC proposal to add language to this chapter stems from a perceived ambiguity in our code concerning what is considered to be a complaint. They feel the sentence “Any complaint against a faculty member substantial enough to imply prosecution under the provisions of UWS 6.01 or UWGB 6, including those for which the level of intended penalty is the placement of a letter of reprimand in the faculty member's personnel file, must be adjudicated according to the procedures outlined below” would take care of that ambiguity. She has spoken to faculty representatives from other campuses regarding their complaints and grievance process, and what the UC is proposing is compatible with what those campuses have done. In response to the Chair’s explanation, the Chancellor clarified that chancellors are not required to send complaints they receive automatically to the Committee on Rights and Responsibilities. That is one option open to them in System code for handling complaints. The Chair agreed with that interpretation. There was no further discussion.

   b. Discussion of adding a grade of C/D. In response to questions about the historical reasons for our current grade scheme, UC Chair Dresdow explained that research of our records shows that our grade system was based on UW Madison’s. Other proposals were discussed in the mid-1980s including one that also included a D/F grade. The UC checked with Registrar Herrity who said that adding a C/D grade would not be expensive or problematic. The student senate has not yet been asked for input and that will need to be done prior to taking any action. Various positions from mildly in favor to strongly opposed were voiced, including: the intermediate grade is logical, practical and fair. The C/D seems pointless; if you don’t make a C, you should get a D. (But what, then, is the logic of A/B and B/C?) Several felt the addition of a C/D would raise grades and others felt that it would lower grades overall and help with grade inflation. Having the option of a C/D might motivate “D students” to try a little harder. Faculty who don’t like C/D grades wouldn’t be obliged to give them.

   c. Requests for Future Senate Business. There were none.

6. Provost’s Report. Provost Hammersmith previously distributed a written report (attached) and added the following comments: The search committee for the Dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences has met with Professor Donna Ritch as chairperson. Questions about the search should be addressed to the chair to avoid problems created by multiple sources of information. The committee hopes it will be possible to schedule interviews with finalists before February 1. She called attention to a social justice symposium co-sponsored by the Oneida Nation, UWGB and SNC. Senator Davis asked whether the “Diversity Initiative” in the written report is to be defined as diversity across the university or within units as well. He also asked whether it will be possible for all units to take advantage of opportunities in hiring as part of the initiative. The Chancellor responded that it made great sense to him to build in opportunities for unit hiring based on opportunity to increase diversity. With regard to the first question, the Chancellor said that distinction has not yet surfaced beyond the recognition that something needs to be done to correct the great lack of diversity that pervades all parts of our campus.

7. University Committee Report. Presented by UC Chair Dresdow. The UC has begun discussing the instructive findings along gender and other lines of the HERI survey recently administered on campus. Senators are encouraged to look at those findings as the topic may well come up in a future Senate forum. The General Education Council will be meeting with the UC to consider ways to move along initiatives in that area.
8. **Open Forum:** Proposal for Founder’s Degree. This proposal written by Professor Abbott was previously discussed by the Senate. Senator Meyer reported that NAS did not understand how this would differ from the individualized major we already have and that his program is also concerned that 120 hours of 100 level courses (which is possible in the proposal) could cast a shadow of doubt on other UWGB degrees. On the positive side, they also believe that 60 hours of chemistry and 60 hours of earth science could create a very marketable person. Senator Jeffreys believes that the proposal is “a terrible idea.” We shouldn’t see innovation for its own sake or experiment with students unless the experiment is solid. This proposal assumes that eighteen-year-old students are wise enough to know what they need in their education, and he does not believe that to be the case. Our responsibility is to give them a basis on which to make decisions at the upper levels of study. The proposal is a “cafeteria style” approach to freedom and a prescription for avoiding challenges to prejudice and uncomfortable academic levels. A degree without requirements is not acceptable. Senator O’Grady believes the proposal wouldn’t get by System administration, but that it sparks other valuable ideas for encouraging academic exploration that might be feasible, such as not requiring a minor or finding other ways to allow and encourage students to explore. The ideas merit discussion but in a somewhat different context than in the proposal under discussion.

Senator Vespia also believes in encouragement to explore, however this proposal creates too many problems. It would undermine general education. How could we tell some students they need to take courses to broaden themselves while we tell others they do not? The proposal also contradicts our interdisciplinary educational philosophy since an interdisciplinary minor or major would no longer be required. Senator Grosso has the utmost respect for Professor Abbott but is “horrified” by the proposal. Her colleagues in COA do not approve of the proposal. Senator Baulieu is not convinced by such arguments against the proposal. Students who wish faculty guidance in planning their curriculum will continue to have faculty sanctioned degrees available to them. He is more sympathetic to the question whether students are mature enough to decide whether it is important that their degree carry the sanction of an approved major. That is a question in need of discussion. He is, on the other hand, concerned by the proposed title that makes it sound more grandiose than it is.

Additional concerns included: students too weak to take a major might end up in this catch-all program. Some units will bear the brunt and have large numbers of unprepared students. This degree will not be understood in the context of degrees offered across the country. College education does not equate time spent in class.

Professor Abbott congratulated the Senate for the serious discussion of the proposal and especially for wanting to follow up on the value of exploration for students and for considering the question of the value of a degree and what is necessary to preserve the integrity of a degree.

9. **Adjournment.** The Speaker called for a motion to adjourn, which was made and approved at 4:50 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Kenneth Fleurant, Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff
PROPOSED CODE CHANGE TO
UWGB CHAPTER 6
COMPLAINTS AND GRIEVANCES

The proposal is to add the language in bold face between the brackets. Wording changes from first reading are underlined.

UWGB 6.01 Complaints.

Complaints are allegations by the administration, students, faculty members, academic staff members, classified staff members, or members of the public concerning conduct by a faculty member which violates university rules or which adversely affects the faculty member’s performance of his/her obligation to the university, but which are not serious enough to warrant dismissal under UWGB Chapter 4. [Any complaint against a faculty member substantial enough to bring about action under the provisions of UWS 6.01 or UWGB 6, including those for which the level of intended penalty is the placement of a letter of reprimand in the faculty member’s personnel file, must be adjudicated according to the procedures outlined below.]
RECOMMENDATION ON THE GRANTING OF DEGREES

(Implemented as a Faculty Senate Document #89-6, March 21, 1990--action to be taken in advance of each commencement exercise and in the following language--dated as appropriate):

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate of the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay, on behalf of the Faculty, recommends to the Chancellor and the Vice Chancellor of the University that the students certified by the Registrar of the University as having completed the requirements of their respective programs be granted their degrees at the fall 2005 Commencement.
FUTURE DIRECTION FOR GENERAL EDUCATION DISCUSSION

Representatives from the General Education Committee met with the University Committee to discuss ideas for changes that might be made to General Education. The University Committee members have continued to talk about this and found that on November 20, 2002, the Faculty Senate adopted a reaffirmation about General Education at the University of Wisconsin Green Bay. Below is the reaffirmation statement that passed.

“…reaffirmation of UWGB’s distinctive academic plan characterized by an interdisciplinary approach to problem solving grounded in the breadth of the liberal arts and sciences.”

The discussion we would like to have in the Senate on Wednesday, November 16, 2006, would center on two issues:

1. Do we still affirm the position taken by the Faculty Senate in 2002?

2. What are the practical implications of such a position? How can we help give direction to the General Education Council in their work with the General Education curriculum?
Welcome Back Update/Faculty Senate Report

October 19, 2005

Submitted by Sue K. Hammersmith, Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
University of Wisconsin-Green Bay

I. CHANCELLOR’S DIVERSITY INITIATIVE

Recently the American Intercultural Center (AIC) was provided bridge funding to enable that unit to hire two qualified minority advisors. The AIC had two vacant advisor positions. One of those positions was being searched, while the second position was to remain vacant this year as part of our one-time budget reductions in 2005-06. The search in progress yielded two outstanding minority candidates, one Southeast Asian and one African-American. Aided by “bridge funding” from the Chancellor, the AIC was authorized to extend offers to both candidates, and both have accepted.

Of course, we expect the AIC to be diverse. The challenge is to achieve more diversity on the faculty side as well. The Chancellor’s Diversity Initiative encourages academic units to be creative in looking ahead toward opportunities to hire faculty who belong to one of the underrepresented ethnic or racial groups (as defined by DOE and UW System), even if that requires additional funding or making an additional hire before another vacancy becomes available. Search committees, interdisciplinary units, and deans are encouraged to be on the alert for and take advantage of such opportunities when they arise and are consistent with the needs of the academic program.

A more detailed statement of this initiative will be circulated to the campus community soon.

II. SEARCH FOR DEAN OF LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCES

The Dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences Search and Screen Committee has been formed as outlined in UWGB’s “Search and Screen Procedures for Administrative Appointments.” The following individuals—nominated by the University Committee, Academic Staff Committee, or Associated Student Government, respectively—have agreed to serve on that committee:

Cliff Abbott (Information and Computing Science)
Greg Aldrete (Humanistic Studies)
Brent Blahnik (Office of International Education)
Sheila Carter (Student Life)
Tim Kaufman (Education)
Bob Kranzusch (Student Representative)
Donna Ritch (Human Biology)
Georjeanna Wilson-Doenges (Urban and Regional Studies)

Dr. Lori Weyers will serve as the Community Representative on this committee. The campus community will be kept informed throughout the process, which I hope can be concluded early in the Spring semester.
III. INTERNATIONAL VISITING SCHOLARS PROGRAM

The International Visiting Scholars Program is hosting Professor Robin Palmer, from Rhodes University in South Africa, from October 17 to November 27. Dr. Palmer studies the indigenous peoples of South Africa and issues related to land usage, land rights, and environmental protection. He will participate in a number of events at UWGB, St. Norbert College, Oneida Reservation, and in the Green Bay community. Dr. Palmer’s sponsors during his visit are Troy Abel (Public and Environmental Affairs) and Mark Everingham (Social Change and Development).

Faculty, staff, and the public are invited to welcome Dr. Palmer at a reception to be held Thursday, October 27, 5:30-7:00 PM, at the UWGB Downtown Learning Center in Washington Commons. Also on October 27, the International Visiting Scholars Program will sponsor a “Bridges to the World” benefit from 7:30-9:30 pm at Oxford’s Café, 217 N. Washington, in Green Bay. The evening will include a South African perspective on democracy, South African wine tasting, dinner, and entertainment by the John Salerno Jazz Trio. For tickets ($50 each), contact Brent Blahnik at extension 2889.

IV. WHOSE LAND IS IT? CONFERENCE

The third International Social Justice Symposium is scheduled for November 14th and 15th. Internationally known scholars from the United States, Latin America, and South Africa will discuss the “many faces” of land claims and indigenous struggles to enhance understanding of the dispossession of indigenous peoples from their ancestral lands.

This year’s symposium is a collaborative effort by UWGB, St. Norbert College, and the Oneida Nation of Wisconsin. Sessions will be held on the Oneida Reservation and the UWGB campus. All sessions are free and open to the public. Pre-registration is encouraged. Additional information or registration may be found at http://www.uwgb.edu/outreach/events/socialjustice.

V. TRANSFER AGREEMENTS

UWGB and the College of Menominee Nation (CMN) have signed articulation agreements to facilitate the transfer of CMN graduates into our baccalaureate programs in business administration, education, and social work. A fourth agreement with CMN is being developed for the computer science program.

UWGB also has been working with Northeast Wisconsin Technical College (NWTC) to articulate the ideal program of study for students who enter NWTC with the intention of transferring into UWGB. The result is a 30-credit General Education Certificate consisting entirely of NWTC coursework that our faculty have determined will transfer into UWGB and count toward specific UWGB general education curriculum requirements. Currently, 21% of the new students entering NWTC say, on their first-year survey, that they intend to transfer to UWGB. Governor Doyle is expected to be on hand for the “signing ceremony” for this certificate, to be held November 7.

UWGB and UW-Oshkosh have applied for UW grant funding to facilitate development of an AAS-to-BAS degree completion program. Under this initiative, UWGB’s adult degree program, Interdisciplinary Studies major, would provide liberal learning as a complement to technical education. A proposal will be developed for consideration through our regular curriculum approval process. The program, if approved, would be self-supporting so as not to divert resources from other academic programs.
VI. AWARDS

Two of our UWGB colleagues were recently singled out for State-wide awards. Deb Anderson, UWGB archivist and coordinator of our Area Research Center, was selected to receive the 2005 Governor’s Award for Archival Advocacy. Sandy Deadman, Director of Academic Advising, received the 2005 WACADA Outstanding Achievement Award.

I am well aware of the behind-the-scenes work that both Deb Anderson and Sandy Deadman do to support our faculty, students, and academic programs. I was delighted to see them receive these awards and the professional recognition they represent.