1. CALL TO ORDER

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 3, November 12, 2008 [page 2]

3. CHANCELLOR’S REPORT

4. CONTINUING BUSINESS
   a. Proposal to Revise the Interdisciplinary Requirement - Second Reading [page 5]
      Presented by Brian Sutton

5. NEW BUSINESS
   b. UW-Green Bay Branding Committee. Presented by Lucy Arendt
   b. Requests for future business

6. PROVOST’S REPORT

7. UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE REPORT
   Presented by Steven Meyer, Chair

8. OPEN FORUM
   The Growth Agenda (Senators are asked to bring concerns and questions.)

9. ADJOURNMENT
MINUTES 2008-2009

UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 3
Wednesday, November 12, 2008
Phoenix Room C, University Union

Presiding Officer: Illene Noppe, Speaker of the Senate
Parliamentarian: Clifford Abbott, Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

PRESENT: Scott Ashmann (EDU), Lucy Arendt (BUA), Andrew Austin (SCD), Peter Breznay (ICS), Kathleen Burns (HUD), Matthew Dornbush (NAS), Susan Gallagher-LePak (NUR), Stefan Hall (HUS), Catherine Henze (HUS), Curt Heuer (AVD), Steve Kimball (EDU), James Loebl (BUA), John Lyon (NAS), Michael McIntire (NAS alternate), Randall Meder (AVD), Daniel Meinhardt (HUB), Steven Meyer (NAS-UC), Thomas Nesslein (URS), Illene Noppe (HUC-UC), Uwe Pott (HUB), Laura Riddle (AVD-UC), Ellen Rosewall (AVD), Jolanda Sallmann (SOCW), John Stoll (PEA), Brian Sutton (HUS-UC), David Ward (Interim Chancellor, ex officio), David Voelker (HUS), Dean VonDras (HUC-UC), Jill White (HUD)

NOT PRESENT: Tim Meyer (ICS), Meir Russ (BUA-UC), William Laatsch (interim Provost)

REPRESENTATIVES: Katrina Hrivnak (Academic Staff), Jamie Froh (Student Government)

GUESTS: Associate Provost Tim Sewall, Dean Scott Furlong, Dean Fritz Erickson, Associate Provost Jan Thornton, and Senior Executive Assistant to the Chancellor Scott Hildebrand, Paul Wikgren, Jessica LaPlante-Wikgren

1. Call to Order. With a quorum present, Speaker Noppe called the Senate to order at 3:30 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes of UW-Green Bay Faculty Senate Meeting No. 2, October 15, 2008. On a motion by Senator Riddle (second by Senator Sutton) the minutes were approved unanimously after correcting the opening time.

3. Chancellor's Report. Interim Chancellor Ward dealt with three topics:
   1) the Governor is now projecting a budgetary shortfall of about five billion, approximately 15% of the biennial state budget;
   2) the Student Government has proposed a revision to the campus smoking policy and the Chancellor will gather advice from legal counsel, Faculty Senate, Academic Staff Committee, and University Cabinet before he makes his decision on approving it; and
   3) Steve and Karen Swan are leaving the University and Dan Spielmann will be the interim replacement to lead the Advancement office.

He then stood for questions and received several: how will a permanent replacement for Steve Swan be found (largely up to the next chancellor); do we anticipate a hiring freeze (we’re in a hiring slowdown now, but there is no official freeze yet); what will be the impact on faculty hiring (probably little, but current searches should move as expeditiously as possible); is there planning for a budget deficit (yes, it has begun); will there be an enrollment reduction (enrollment is typically the last element to be cut).
4. Continuing Business

a. Proposal to Develop Faculty Senate Caucuses. Speaker Noppe introduced some revisions to a proposal discussed at the previous Senate meeting and Senator VonDras moved (Senator Riddle seconded) the proposal’s adoption as a tool for the Senate. The following discussion produced:

several arguments against the proposal (need for a change has not been demonstrated; criteria on when to use caucuses are not specific enough; the activities in caucusing could be accomplished currently without additional structure and perhaps more efficiently),

arguments for it (it might increase engagement in some issues, as an experiment it is worth a try, an additional tool for the Senate is useful even if it is not used all the time),

questions (will there be enough advance notice and information on an issue to make caucusing effective; shouldn’t the Senate, rather than the UC or with the UC, determine when to use a caucus),

and an observation (caucuses are typically used for partisan groups to advance arguments on an issue but randomly assigned membership will likely be more discussion than refinement of arguments).

The Senate **approved the proposal by a vote of 14 to 13 with one abstention.**

b. Proposal to Revise the Interdisciplinary Requirement - First Reading. Senator Sutton presented the proposal noting it had been revised from the version used for an Open Forum at the previous Senate meeting. He also mentions some other options that were not built into the current proposal: separating sections I and II; dropping section IA and just having section IB; exempting all double majors from the interdisciplinary requirement; and abolishing the distinction between interdisciplinary and disciplinary as a feature of programs and holding all program responsible for some degree of support for the mission of interdisciplinarity. The Speaker then invited discussion. It was not always clear whether senators were speaking for or against the proposal, but several themes did emerge from the discussion.

One was the legitimacy of the disciplinary/interdisciplinary distinction is the current program array. Some argued it made no sense; others were happy with it; and still others suggested it might be more problematic in some areas than in others. From this emerged a concern for how the University might change the status of a program in either direction.

A second theme was the very definition of interdisciplinarity. Some felt the need for a single definition; others wanted to admit multiple understandings; and others argued that the definition had to be relative to the academic area. There was also the idea that interdisciplinarity could be understood as driven by a problem rather than just an integration of any two or more disciplines.

A third theme concerned the value of the requirement for students. Here there were arguments that the students were saddled with a requirement that amounted to subsidizing certain areas or designed to motivate faculty behavior better motivated with alternative mechanisms such as interdisciplinary institutes or additional merit categories. Some senators also added comments about the value of expanding student choice. There were also arguments to the contrary that the requirement was primarily for students’ benefit or for students, faculty, and community equally.

A fourth theme was whether interdisciplinarity was better thought of as a feature of courses or programs. Here a few senators argued that following the writing emphasis model resulted in a rather thin and not terribly coherent approach. There was also a worry that the General Education Council, normally concerned more with breadth than depth, might not be the best reviewing body.

Finally there was a theme on the complexity of implementation. A few read the proposal as an increase in complexity for advising and that led to some interest in some of the options Senator Sutton had talked about that were not in the proposal. The Speaker ended the discussion at 4:45 to move on to other business.
5. New Business.
a. Memorial Resolution for Bruce LaPlante. Senator Breznay read the resolution prepared by Professor William Shay. The resolution will be added to the collection in the SOFAS Office.

At this point the Speaker entertained a **motion to extend the meeting**. Senator Austin moved (Senator Voelker seconded) to extend the meeting for 30 minutes. The motion **passed**.

b. Resolution on Granting of Degrees. This routine motion was made by Senator White (Senator Rosewall seconded) and **passed unanimously**.

c. Resolution to Support UW-Oshkosh’s Request of the Legislative Fiscal Bureau. UC Chair Meyer introduced this resolution. A faculty group at UW-Oshkosh is asking the Legislative Fiscal Bureau to produce a white paper on faculty salaries and also is asking for support from other faculty governance groups across the UW-System. Senator Pott moved the adoption of the resolution (Senator Austin seconded). Several senators spoke on the problems of lower salaries, particularly on searching to fill positions. One senator suggested the timing seemed bad, but others responded that this was simply a request for data, although it might be exactly the right time in the context of proposals for unionization. UC Chair Meyer pointed out that the intended audience for the white paper was probably more the legislature than the Regents. **The motion passed 20-0-1**.

d. Requests for future business. The Speaker invited items for future business but received none.

6. University Committee Report. UC Chair Meyer listed the issues the UC is currently discussing. In addition to the items on the Senate agenda today, he mentioned work with the Senate Budget and Planning Committee on a proposal to have a “seat at the table” of budgetary decision makers. He also mentioned the Growth Agenda and enrollment management as topics under discussion.

7. Adjournment. With business before the Senate concluded, the Speaker adjourned the meeting at 5:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Clifford Abbott, Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff
Proposal to Revise the Interdisciplinary Requirement

I. To graduate, students may satisfy the interdisciplinarity requirement in either of two ways:

A. By satisfying the current requirement of having either an interdisciplinary major or an interdisciplinary minor, or

B. By satisfying an interdisciplinarity-across-the-curriculum requirement, structured as follows:

- Students satisfying this requirement must take at least six courses designated as interdisciplinary (three upper-division, three lower-division). As is the case with the writing-emphasis requirement, the requirement of lower-division interdisciplinary classes may be waived for transfer students.
- For a course to receive the “interdisciplinary course” designation, it must receive approval for this designation from the General Education Council. The sponsoring area must submit to the GEC a form specifying how the course is problem-focused and interdisciplinary, along with a sample syllabus demonstrating the course’s commitment to a problem-focused, interdisciplinary approach.
- In order to gain GEC approval, courses should fit within one of the following categories:
  --Disciplinary courses informed by other disciplines (example: a literary theory course taught as an English class, with units on Psychological Criticism, Historical Criticism, Sociological/Marxist Criticism, Feminist Criticism, Cultural-Studies Criticism, etc.)
  --Courses that link disciplines (example: an Environmental Studies class dealing with the biology and chemistry of sustaining or restoring certain ecosystems)
  --Courses that cross disciplines (example: a course in Psychological Perspectives and Nursing Care in End of Life Issues)
  --Courses without a compelling basis in a traditional discipline (example: Introduction to Women’s Studies, if Women’s Studies isn’t viewed as a “traditional discipline”)
- All disciplines and interdisciplinary areas will be encouraged to offer courses satisfying the interdisciplinarity requirement, whether through creating new courses, modifying existing courses, or continuing to offer in their current form courses which already satisfy the aims of the requirement.
- As with the writing emphasis requirement, courses satisfying the interdisciplinary-course requirement may also count toward other general-education requirements and may count toward students’ majors or minors.
- Also as with writing-emphasis courses, courses satisfying the interdisciplinary-course requirement will be specified as such in the Timetable and the Catalog.
- We hope resources will be made available to allow for team teaching of certain interdisciplinary-requirement courses and to create grants or reassignments for new course development.
- We also hope that students will be encouraged to take a senior seminar as one of the courses satisfying either the interdisciplinary-course requirement or the interdisciplinary major or minor.

II. Programs seeking revision of their status from disciplinary to interdisciplinary, or vice versa, may present to the Academic Affairs Council their case for reclassification, and the AAC will either approve or reject the requested change.

Faculty Senate Continuing Business 4(a)
December 10, 2008
Creating a Task Force on Interdisciplinarity

Motion to have the University Committee appoint a Task Force

1) to investigate the status of interdisciplinarity in our curriculum,

2. to develop recommendations to support and/or further develop interdisciplinarity at UW-Green Bay, and

3) to report back to the Senate by May 2009.
Report of Academic Affairs Council to the Faculty Senate
Curricular Actions
November - December 2008

A proposal to create a minor in Interdisciplinary Studies was not approved.

A proposal to create a new minor in Arts Management and the discontinuation of a COA minor were approved.

A modification of the Humanistic Studies Culture Area of Emphasis was approved.

Modifications to the Design Arts major requirements were approved.

A modification to the existing minor requirements in Psychology by adding one course to the supporting courses (choice of PSYCH 300 or COMM SCI 301) was approved.

A modification of existing requirements in HUB by adding HUB 204 Anatomy and Physiology: lecture and lab for all Human Biology majors and minors was approved.

Modifications of existing major requirements in Social Work by adding HUM DEV 331 and 332 to Human Behavior options list, adding ANTRO 304 to Family options list, and adding SCD 251 Sustainable Development to a list of electives were approved.

New courses approved:
  DESIGN 431 Design Arts Studio III
  FNS 360 Women and Gender in First Nations Communities
  PHIL 401 Plato and Aristotle
  HUD 443 Spirituality and Development
  SOC WORK 737 Social Work and Crisis Intervention with Vulnerable Populations