

## AGENDA

### **UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 1**

Wednesday, 13 September 2006, 3:00 p.m.

Phoenix Room C, University Union

Presiding Officer: Christine Style, Speaker

Parliamentarian: Professor Clifford F. Abbott

#### **1. CALL TO ORDER**

#### **2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 8, May 10, 2006** [page 2]

#### **3. INTRODUCTION OF SENATORS**

#### **4. CHANCELLOR'S REPORT**

#### **5. CONTINUING BUSINESS**

- a. Discussion on Proposed Code Change to UWGB 3.09.2 (2<sup>nd</sup> reading) [page 8];
- b. Curriculum Planning and Procedures Guide [available as a 75 page pdf file at [http://www.uwgb.edu/sofas/facGov/facsenate/agendas/Curriculum\\_Guide9-15-06.pdf](http://www.uwgb.edu/sofas/facGov/facsenate/agendas/Curriculum_Guide9-15-06.pdf)];  
Presented by Timothy Sewall, Associate Provost for Academic Affairs
- c. First Nations Major [page 9];
- d. Discussion of General Education Council Proposal for Domain Committees (2<sup>nd</sup> reading) [page 27]
- e. Discussion of General Education Council's General Education Plans (2<sup>nd</sup> reading) [page 30]

#### **6. NEW BUSINESS**

- a. Election of Deputy Speaker for 2006-07
- b. Resolution for Board of Regents on UWS 7 [page 33] . Go to pgs 486-495 of pdf file <http://www.uwsa.edu/bor/agenda/2006/june.pdf> for an introductory memo that discusses some changes from the original and then the resolution itself.
- c. Requests for Future Senate Business

#### **7. PROVOST'S REPORT** [page 34]

#### **8. 2005-06 UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT** [page 36] Presented by Sally Dresdow, 2005-06 University Committee Chair

#### **9. UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE REPORT** Presented by Scott Furlong, Chair

#### **10. MOVE INTO CLOSED SESSION** pursuant to Wis. Statutes, Sec 19.85 (1)(f) for discussion of an Honorary Degree

#### **11. ADJOURNMENT**

MINUTES 2005-2006  
**UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 8**  
Wednesday, May 10, 2006  
Niagara Rooms AB, University Union

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), Cheryl Grosso (COA), Sue Hammersmith (Provost, *ex officio*), Derek Jeffreys (HUS), John Katers, NAS, Harvey Kaye (SCD), Mark Kiehn (EDU), Michael Kraft (PEA), Mimi Kubsch (NUR), Kaoime Malloy (alternate for Rebecca Tout, COA), Daniel Meinhardt (HUB), 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), Kristin Vespia (HUD), David Voelker (HUS), Michael Zorn (NAS).

NOT PRESENT: Victoria Goff (ICS), Judith Martin (SOCW).

REPRESENTATIVES: Lucy Arendt (Academic Staff Committee), Eric Mims (Student Government Association).

GUESTS: Dean Fritz Erickson, Rosemary Christensen (HUS), David Coury (HUS), Associate Dean Regan Gurung, Virginia Dell (University Communications), Interim Dean Fergus Hughes, Peter Kellogg (HUS), Nathan Petrashek (SGA), Lisa Poupart (HUS), Trista Seubert (SGA), Associate Provost Timothy Sewall.

**1. Call to Order.** With a quorum present, Speaker Davis called the Senate to order at 3:04 p.m.

**2. Approval of Minutes of UW-Green Bay Faculty Senate Meeting No. 7, April 19, 2006.**

The minutes were approved by voice vote.

**3. Chancellor's Report.**

Chancellor Shepard began by thanking, on behalf of the Senate University Committee, chairperson Sally Dresdow and Senate Speaker Greg Davis, presenting them with a small token of appreciation for their dedicated service in 2005-2006. He then reported on the following issues:

a. Wendell Berry, nominee for an honorary doctorate, declined our offer due to failing health. We have contacted a second nominee and have identified a third.

b. The "Taxpayer Protection Act" (TABOR) was defeated in the Senate following considerable community opposition.

c. The UW System submitted a proposal for a System-wide growth agenda but the Regents were not convinced that giving each campus the same small share of the pie is the way to proceed. Our campus growth agenda continues to make headway, and the next hurdle is to get it on the governor's budget agenda.

#### 4. Continuing Business.

a. Discussion of General Education Council Proposal for Domain Committees. Presented by Sally Dresdow. This item and the next return from last month's agenda since time ran out before they could be completed. The purpose of today's discussion is to give advice to the GEC and to get a sense of where current senators stand on these issues. Senator Voelker asked whether the domain committees would ever meet together. Probably not, according to Senator Sutton, since matters broader than an individual domain would remain the responsibility of the GEC. Senator Kaye noted two corrections on page 8 of the agenda regarding domain representation: First Nations Studies should be listed in the Humanities, and History should be listed in both Humanities and Social Sciences. Senator Kubsch noted that Nursing is missing from the list; she would like the program to have the opportunity to be represented on a domain committee. Senator Sutton clarified that "Assigned by Area of Specialization" is not a domain. Rather, faculty in areas under that heading could be assigned to a domain according to their academic specialization or approach to their subject. The same principle could be used, he suggested, in determining domains for historians and others whose discipline falls under more than one domain. Senator Grosso asked that COA be added to paragraph (a) page 7. That will be done. Senator Kaye pointed out, and the Provost confirmed, that two of the areas listed—International Studies and Physical Education—are not currently faculty groups.

Senator Furlong reported the UC's concerns about creating additional committee assignments. He also asked that thought be given to the pros and cons of assigning people to domains based on their interdisciplinary program as opposed to their disciplines. Senator Kaye would like it to be clear that there is nothing to prevent faculty in one domain from proposing courses in another. He would also like the proposal to explain more clearly how professional programs fit into general education. Senator Pearson said the GEC anticipates that the domain committee assignment would likely be limited to 2 or 3 meetings per year. She believes that having domains could facilitate courses in one domain proposed by faculty associated with another. Kaye would like to avoid attempts such as one made under the Perkins/Cohen administration to inflexibly assign disciplines to interdisciplinary areas. The proposal being considered needs to make clear that flexibility is being preserved in this regard. Provost Hammersmith said it is important to remember that courses belong to units and not to individuals who propose them and that faculty are associated with their resident unit. Kaye agreed and suggests that domains would, consequently, be better organized around personnel bodies (budgetary units) rather than curricular ones. Representation on domain committees should come from budgetary units and page 8 should be a list of those units.

b. Discussion of the General Education Council's Proposal of Four Alternative Plans for General Education. Senator Kaye asked why 3,9,9 and 10-12 credits were proposed. Senator Sutton said it was simply a reflection of the current situation. Senator Grosso asked for clarification since Plan 1 does not seem to call for GEC approval. That is because plan 1 is the distribution model and students would take any course in the requisite areas. There would be no need for GEC approval. Sutton also noted that the GEC is not advocating any one of the plans in particular. He clarified that plan 2 is essentially what we have now except for the domain committees. Plan 4 would only change the Humanities that have been waiting for approval of new general education requirements. Their request which, Sutton said, would make humanities requirements more like those of other areas, has been held up by discussions of campus-wide GE reform. Plan 4 suggests associating current learning outcomes with GE courses in the catalog. Senator Kaye said that the current social science learning outcomes do not correspond at all with social science GE courses. Senator Breznay mentioned that the Student Government expressed a preference for Plan 2.

There was some conversation about whether the goal is for each individual student or for the general student body to meet GE requirements. Speaker Davis suggested that certain of the proposed plans would be ruled out if the answer is each student. Senator Voelker agreed that plan 1 would have to be ruled out with that answer. Under the status quo plan 2, the courses don't line up with outcomes. Plan 4, he believes, fits best if every student is to meet the learning outcomes. Senator Kaye countered that there is very little correlation

between a distribution requirement and learning outcomes. Senator Vespia suggested that none of the plans necessarily is based on an expectation that each student will achieve the same outcomes. Senator Grosso requested that the Senate receive copies of the proposed Humanities revision. Sutton was ready and distributed them. She also asked why the natural sciences require more GE credits than the other areas. Sutton said he has heard others say that the science requirement equals the 12 credits of combined humanities and fine arts. Discussion followed on whether the GE areas are actually meaningful. Senator Dresdow is opposed to a plan that would allow students to simply choose what they want to complete their GE requirement. They should at least be required to take courses from different disciplines. Speaker Davis proposed considering multiple models of GE since it is difficult to conclude that there is one model better than all others. Senator Furlong sees relatively few real differences between all the proposed plans. Those who believe general education is “broken” are not convinced any of these plans will fix it. He suggests thinking of the feasibility of developing a general education plan for each new student if the advising issues can be worked out.

## 5. New Business

**Added item. UC Chair Dresdow and Speaker Davis conspired to bring the following rogue resolution before the Senate:**

### RESOLUTION OF THE UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE HONORING PROFESSOR KENNETH FLEURANT

WHEREAS our esteemed colleague has served the academic and governance areas of the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay for some 36 years; and

WHEREAS Professor Fleurant has provided exemplary leadership in those capacities, culminating in his tenure as our most recent Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff; and

WHEREAS Professor Fleurant has been a model of what all academics ought to aspire to be: knowledgeable, thoughtful, wise, articulate, well-reasoned; and

WHEREAS Professor Fleurant has served the community in an outstanding manner and has built relationships between community members and the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay; and

WHEREAS Professor Fleurant has been a most diligent interpreter and defender of the highest values of our academic institution; and

WHEREAS Professor Fleurant has always conducted himself in a collegial manner; and

WHEREAS Professor Fleurant looked so dapper in his tux at Convocation—

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of UW-Green Bay, meeting on this tenth day of May 2006, wishes to express to Professor KENNETH FLEURANT its deepest appreciation and most heartfelt gratitude for his long and selfless service to our institution, and wishes him Godspeed and rich rewards in whatever endeavors he might pursue hereafter.

**The speaker interpreted the general applause as an affirmative vote and the resolution passed for which the scribe would like to express his humble and profound gratitude.**

a. Election of Faculty Senate Speaker for 2006-07. Senator O’Grady nominated Senator Christine Style. Their were no further nominations and Senator Style was elected by acclamation.

Senator Kaye **moved (with second) to shift items B and C on the agenda**. Senator Breznay moved to amend the motion by tabling item B. The Speaker ruled the motion to amend out of order since it represented a completely different motion. UC Chair Dresdow acknowledged the length and importance of the Curriculum Guide and clarified that the intent of the UC was simply to have the Senate begin discussing it today. **The motion passed unanimously**, and discussion turned to item C on the agenda.

c. Discussion of First Nations Major. UC Chair Dresdow opened the floor to discussion noting that the description of this proposed new major was distributed at the April Senate meeting. Without objection, the Speaker recognized Professor Lisa Poupart, Chair of First Nations Studies, to speak of the proposal. Professor Poupart explained that the proposal comes forward following lengthy discussions involving faculty, students and members of the First Nations of the region. This major is unique in the country in its emphasis on the Oneida, Menominee, and Mohican nations. The inclusion of Oneida language as well as culture and an emphasis on oral tradition and elder epistemology also contribute to the distinction of the proposed major. Large numbers of students are not anticipated, but the major is expected to contribute in important ways to the knowledge base needed to promote a knowledgeable citizenry with regard to the First Nations of the region and nation. Being, as it is, on Menominee land, the University should reflect the first people of the region.

Senator Carleton wished clarification on whether the proposal was to create a new interdisciplinary major without creating a new interdisciplinary, budgetary unit. Discussion of the status of the program ensued. The chair of Humanistic Studies was invited to speak, explaining that the First Nations faculty would remain attached to their current budgetary units in similar fashion to faculty in Communication, also an interdisciplinary but not a budgetary unit. Faculty in FNS would be hired by and tenured in their budgetary unit. Course approval would also come through the budgetary executive committee. Others saw a comparison with Women’s Studies, a free-standing interdisciplinary program. Senator Voelker supports the new major recognizing that the importance of its courses extends beyond the anticipated small number of majors to other students who will be enriched by taking courses.

Senator Kaye expressed support for the proposed major while concerned that it is terribly understaffed for an interdisciplinary major and that the curriculum needs to be filled out. Senator Furlong echoed those sentiments asking whether the 12 credits based on elder-student relationship, credits that would essentially be outside faculty control, would be different if more campus resources were available. Professor Poupart explained that the substantial reliance of the major on the wisdom of the elders is intentional. Additional tenure lines in the program, as welcome as they would be, would not reduce the importance of elder knowledge at the core of the major. The Provost drew a comparison with clinical programs that commonly send students off campus to clinical sites for their final year. There was additional discussion of the mechanics of elder teaching, its importance to the major, and the implications for quality control and program evaluation. Professor Christensen addressed the importance of elder epistemology in First Nations culture. Senator Kaye repeated his concern that the core still needs rounding out and additional faculty resources are needed so that students won’t miss important coursework, even if elder epistemology is central to the major. Professor Poupart responded that the major, as a reflection of the cultures it represents, is purposefully based on the principle of sovereignty. As such, students have the right to choose the knowledge they wish to pursue.

UC Chair Dresdow clarified that any eventual Senate approval of this major will be subject to ratification by System administration.

b. Curriculum Planning and Procedures Guide. The Guide was previously made available in PDF format

at: [http://www.uwgb.edu/sofas/facGov/facsenate/AGENDAS/Curriculum\\_Guide5-2-06.pdf](http://www.uwgb.edu/sofas/facGov/facsenate/AGENDAS/Curriculum_Guide5-2-06.pdf).

UC Chair Dresdow explained that this Guide is an attempt to better understand, describe, and record the various processes for curricular approval, some of which are codified and many of which simply follow common practice. This is a first pass through this draft. The UC proposes that the best way to see whether these curricular approval procedures will work is to take a test run to pilot them. Many issues related to curricular approval will need further consideration and the UC next year is likely to continue to discuss them. The purpose of today's agenda item is not to ram this Guide through but rather to present a draft open to revision and propose a pilot run. The UC recognizes that issues such as whether the role of the GEC and AAC in curricular decisions is to approve or recommend, will continue to be debated. Senator Baulieu reminded the Senate that the curricular approval process can be changed at the direction of the Senate.

Senator Breznay expressed discomfort with the title page of the draft that reads "Approved by the University Committee and the Faculty Senate, May 2006." He also questioned whether curricular procedures should be expressed as policy or as codification. Code can only be changed by faculty approval. Should that not be the case with curricular approval processes? UC Chair Dresdow responded that there are elements of curricular approval that are found in code. The entire process, however, is often more complicated and this guide is an effort to pull the various elements of curricular approval together. The UC, she said, has determined that changes in policy will not be arbitrarily made. Once the process is worked out, the Senate will be responsible for curricular policy. The Senate is the only body that can change the policy.

Senator Sutton commended the UC for its attempt to bring all this policy together. Senator Dresdow complimented Associate Provost Tim Sewall who drafted the document (and she underscored that the document should read "draft" and not "approved."). Speaker Davis encouraged all to read the draft thoroughly and to inform the UC of potential problems with the process as described.

d. Proposed Code Change to UWGB 3.09.02. (first reading). UC Chair Dresdow presented this item, explaining that it is an effort to clarify our campus code regarding negative personnel decisions by adopting language closer to that of UW System administrative code (bolded text represents added language from UWS 3.07). One other sentence was rearranged. The Provost noted two typos in 2 (a ) 1. "Unity" in line one should read "unite" and there is a superfluous bracket in line three.

There was no further discussion and the text will return for the requisite second reading in the fall.

The Speaker recognized SGA representative Eric Mims who thanked the Senate for its practice of including a student government representative at its meetings and also thanked Senator Breznay, the Faculty Senate liaison to the student senate, for great generosity with his time and for his invaluable advice. He then deferred to Student Government President Nate Petrashek who introduced the incoming Student Government president, Trista Seubert, who will represent student government on the Faculty Senate next year.

e.) Requests for Future Senate Business. This item escaped notice this time around. Any requests may be made directly to the UC.

**6. Provost's Report.**

Provost Hammersmith previously distributed a written report (see <http://www.uwgb.edu/provost/report05.10.06.pdf> ). As she drafted her report she realized how much has been accomplished across the campus this year. She congratulated faculty and units for moving forward in significant ways.

**7. University Committee Report.** UC Chair Dresdow expressed her pleasure at having had the opportunity to serve as UC Chair this year and thanked everyone for their support. She received a sustained round of applause.

**8. Adjournment.** The Speaker called for a motion to adjourn, which was made and approved at 4:59 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Kenneth Fleurant, Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

## Proposed Code Change to UWGB 3.09 2

The purpose of this change is to be clearer about the Reconsideration Procedure and bring UWGB code more into alignment with UWS 3.07.

### 2. Reconsideration Procedure

Every faculty member for whom a negative recommendation is made will have the right of reconsideration upon written request of the faculty member within 15 days of receipt of written reasons. The reconsideration review shall be held within 20 days of the written request for reconsideration. ~~The reconsideration committee or office will either be the interdisciplinary unit executive committee, the appropriate Dean(s), or the Chancellor, depending upon the level at which the decision was reached.~~

**(a) The purpose of reconsideration of a non-renewal decision shall be to provide an opportunity to a fair and full reconsideration of the nonrenewal decision, and to ensure that all relevant material is considered.**

1. The reconsideration committee or office will either be the interdisciplinary unity executive committee, the appropriate Dean(s), or the Chancellor, depending upon the level at which the decision was reached. **Such reconsideration shall include, but not be limited to, adequate notice of the time of reconsideration of the decision, an opportunity to respond to the written reasons and to present any written or oral evidence or arguments relevant to the decision, and written notification of the decision resulting from the reconsideration.**
2. Reconsideration is not a hearing, or an appeal, and shall be nonadversarial in nature.
3. The format and conditions will be as outlined for the original review--see UWGB 3.08(5). The faculty member will be notified in writing of the decision of the chairperson of the reconsideration committee, the appropriate Dean(s), or the Chancellor, within 20 days, with a copy to all levels of review within UWGB.
4. In the event that a reconsideration affirms the nonrenewal decision, the faculty member may appeal under the procedures specified in UWGB 3.10 **and UWS 3.08.**



UNIVERSITY of WISCONSIN  
**GREEN BAY**

Date: March 22, 2006

To: Sally Dresdow  
Chairperson of the University Committee

From: Fergus Hughes *F.H.*  
Interim Dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences

Re: First Nations Studies Major

On March 21<sup>st</sup>, 2006, I received the recommendations of the Academic Affairs Council concerning the implementation of a major in First Nations Studies at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay. I am enclosing the proposal for the major, the Academic Affairs Council's recommendations, and relevant supporting materials. The proposal will need the review and approval of the Faculty Senate. If the Senate approves the proposal, we will then proceed with efforts to obtain an entitlement from UW System to offer the major.

cc: Sue Hammersmith, Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs  
John Lyon, Chairperson of the Academic Affairs Council  
Lisa Poupart, Chairperson of First Nations Studies



CONNECTING LEARNING TO LIFE

March 13, 2006

To: Fergus Hughes, Dean, Liberal Arts and Science  
From: John M. Lyon, Chair, Academic Affairs Council  
Subject: Proposal for Major in First Nations Studies

The Academic Affairs Council has reviewed the proposal requesting approval of a First Nations Studies Major at UWGB. In our review of the proposal we have researched other “First Nations” majors in the United States and we have discussed the proposal with the faculty members of First Nation Studies and the chair of Humanistic Studies. In our review of this proposal we considered the need for the program at UWGB, the proposed curriculum of the major, the ability of the faculty to deliver the program and the impact that this major would have on other units on campus.

The University of Wisconsin Green Bay has had a history of scholarship and teaching in First Nations Studies that goes back to 1972. The program began with faculty working with native communities to preserve and teach the Oneida language and has evolved to one where all aspects of the history and culture of indigenous communities are explored. The cultures of the faculty members involved with the program have also changed significantly over the past 30 years. Initially, the program was staffed predominately by faculty members from non-indigenous cultural backgrounds. Today, the majority of the faculty members in the program have cultural backgrounds that are strongly rooted in indigenous communities. This transformation of the program has resulted in a restructuring of the curriculum and the incorporation of the teaching methods that have been traditionally used by indigenous communities. The program has evolved from one with traditional western teaching methods and research activities to one that strongly resembles one that would be found in what the Institute for Higher Education Policy calls a Tribal College.

Currently, the opportunity to engage in the study of American indigenous communities is offered through an independent interdisciplinary First Nations Studies minor and as an interdisciplinary American Indian Studies emphasis in Humanistic Studies. This proposal seeks to combine these two opportunities into one program that is under the sole direction of the faculty members of First Nations Studies and which offers both the interdisciplinary major and the interdisciplinary minor. The proposal presents seven reasons for the creation of a First Nations Studies major at UWGB. Each of these reasons is compelling. The AAC is swayed by these arguments to not apply the traditional measure of demand as a criterion for the evaluation of the need for the program. Based upon the arguments presented in the proposal the AAC concurs with the faculty members of First Nations Studies that now is the correct time for the establishment of a major in First Nations Studies at UWGB.

The proposed curriculum of the program and the ability of the faculty to deliver the program were reviewed by the AAC. The curriculum is designed around 30 learning outcomes that are listed under 6 knowledge areas. The requirements for the major are designed to address each of these learning outcomes and to do so in an academic program requiring a minimum of 9 credits of supporting courses work and 27 credits of upper-level course work. The major looks to be well designed and efficiently delivered. The AAC was concerned by two issues identified by Duane Champagne, an outside reviewer of the program from the Native Nations Law and Policy Center at UCLA. The first concern expressed by Mr. Champagne was with the requirement of an oral examination in the program and the second concern addressed the extensive use of elders in the delivery of the program. We have learned that the program is sensitive to the needs of its students as individuals and that a student who could not complete an oral exam would be given an alternative method to demonstrate their development as a student of the program at the end of their studies. We have also learned that even students with apprehensions regarding the oral exam requirement going into the program have embraced the opportunity

to perform the oral exam at the end of their studies. The faculty members of First Nations Studies contribute this to their reliance on the use of Elder Epistemology and Oral Traditions throughout the program.

The belief expressed by Duane Champagne that \$1000, the amount of additional S&E funds requested in the proposal, would not buy enough direct contact with Elders to make the proposed program work was also rejected by the faculty members of FNS. During the presentation by the faculty members of FNS to the AAC we learned how Elders contributed to the program and how they were compensated for their contributions. We were presented with the concept that when tribal members become Elders that one of the ways that they have traditionally contributed to the community is through teaching. We have learned that this role of the Elder in the tribal community is one taken by the Elder by their own free will. The First Nations Studies program has created a way for the tribal Elders to exercise this role as a teacher in the greater community to both native and non-native students. The expectation being that by increasing the understanding of the history and culture of the American Indian in both native and non-native communities that these two communities will be drawn together. We learned that the funds used by FNS to support the work by Elders in the program was not for teaching stipends, but for the reimbursement of Elders expenses and for the offering of honorariums to them as is expected by tribal tradition.

From our understanding of the curriculum of the program only the Elder Knowledge and Epistemology option, FNS 399, requires a significant contribution by tribal elders. The faculty members of FNS who spoke with us confidently stated that the current arrangement for the contribution of elders to this course is working fine and that they could not foresee a time when the contribution of elders to this course would not be available. Though this may be true, it's been the experience of many that building programs that depend heavily on those with no vested interest in the university is fraught with danger. We encourage the faculty members of FNS and the administration to nurture and protect this relationship such that future growth in the program does not exceed the capacity of tribal elders to meet the needs of the program. The suggestion made by Mr. Champagne to provide an appropriate recognition to Elders who contribute to the program should be strongly considered.

The request for the authority to offer a major in FNS states that 2.43 full time equivalent faculty positions are required to deliver the major. Based upon the number and periodicity of the courses offered for the major this number accurately reflects the faculty resources that are currently being used to teach the FNS courses. The number of faculty members who would contribute to this program is greater than the number required to teach the courses in the major. Four faculty members, Clifford Abbott, Rosemary Christensen, Lisa Poupart, and Denise Sweet are listed in the proposal as the faculty of the new major. In addition, Peter Kellogg has taught courses for FNS in the past. The AAC believes that the university currently has sufficient expertise among its faculty members to adequately support a major in First Nations Studies.

If the proposed major in First Nations Studies is made available to students it is expected that the American Indian Studies emphasis in Humanistic Studies would be discontinued. The number of students in this emphasis in HUS is very small and the faculty members of FNS believe that the new FNS major would be an appropriate alternative for these students. We do not think that a significant shift in the enrollment of patterns of HUS courses will result as a result of the proposed restructuring of curriculum of American Indian Studies emphasis in HUS into a separate FNS major. We also do not foresee any other academic program being significantly impacted by the creation of the proposed major.

Additional comments on the proposal.

The faculty members of First Nations Studies proposes that this interdisciplinary major should be offered by the faculty members of First Nations Studies acting as an independent faculty unit. The unit would have its own S&E budget for the direct operation of some aspects of the program, namely the reimbursement of the expenses of Elders who participate in the program, but it would not be considered a budgetary home to any faculty lines. The faculty members contributing to the program will remain attached to their current budgetary units and would expect to continue to function as full members of those budgetary units. This type of relationship is common at UWGB as all disciplinary majors have a number of faculty members who are responsible for the academic issues of the major and who are also members of a separate budgetary unit. While this structure can provide strength of numbers and valuable academic exchanges, it has a potential structural problem. The relationship between interdisciplinary budgetary units and disciplinary academic units provides a synergistic relationship. The budgetary unit as a whole benefits from the strength of the disciplinary units. The disciplinary units can often draw upon the expertise of faculty from other disciplines to strengthen each other academically. By creating this major as an independent academic unit we are creating a situation where no budgetary unit benefits from the success of this program. Besides good will, what would be the incentive for any budgetary unit to seek to hire a faculty member or to assign faculty load to contribute to the FNS major? If this program is to have any stability it must be able to expect the continued contribution of an appropriate level of staffing to the program. The direct assignment of faculty load to the program is one way for the administration to make a gesture of support to the program.

Our last question regarding the proposal deals with its interdisciplinary status. The curriculum of the proposed major is very broad and examines the history and culture of indigenous societies and the relationships between these societies and those based upon more recent emigrations. We do not think that anyone would expect a curriculum in First Nations Studies to include any more. The original intent of interdisciplinary studies at UWGB was to foster academic pursuits across traditional disciplinary boundaries in an attempt to prepare students to think about the world in new and creative ways. Our use of interdisciplinary studies as a foundation of our educational mission was innovative when our founding principles were developed. It was and continues to be a good idea. Today, our use of interdisciplinary studies is no longer innovative. In the review of academic programs on campus it is often difficult to understand why one program is considered to be disciplinary while another is interdisciplinary. Perhaps it is time to stop trying to make the distinction and time for all us to include interdisciplinary themes in all majors.

## **First Nations Studies Major Request for Entitlement to Plan**

### **1. Need and Market Demand.**

During the civil rights era of the 1960s, American Indian activists and educators turned to institutions of higher learning for assistance in addressing the social and political issues facing tribal people. In response, American Indian Studies programs were created at universities across the U.S. Thus, the demand for American Indian Studies came from outside the academy, from citizens in cities and on reservations. Today, the First Nations Studies program at UW Green Bay remains closely connected and responsive to the tribal communities that created it. The creation of a First Nations Studies (American Indian Studies) major at UW Green Bay is needed in order to meet the needs of all communities in northeastern Wisconsin including the Oneida, Menominee, and Mohican (Stockbridge-Munsee) Nations. As tribal communities expand and grow into the 21<sup>st</sup> century, American Indian and non-Indian citizens need a First Nations Studies major to prepare them to live, interact, and work with tribal people, agencies, and governing structures. This is particularly true in northeast Wisconsin where tribal economies are expanding and diversifying at a significant pace.

Although it is a relatively new field of study, American Indian/First Nation Studies is a recognized discipline within the academy. Doctoral degrees in American Indian Studies are granted at a number of institutions. The academy recognizes the intellectual need for First Nations Studies and American Indian Studies degree majors given that our society, as a whole, is ignorant about American Indian history, culture, and sovereignty. Citizens in northeastern Wisconsin need the academy to provide them with knowledge about their neighbors, the first inhabitants of the state. The creation of a First Nations Studies major at UW Green Bay will demonstrate the institutional commitment to American Indian intellectual traditions. This commitment, in turn, reflects back upon citizens reinforcing that First Nations Studies knowledge must become part of the mainstream educational process.

In an attempt to address racism and the widespread lack of knowledge about the first citizens of Wisconsin, in 1989, the state passed a law requiring all persons seeking a license to teach in the state to have received instruction in the history, culture, and tribal sovereignty of the federally-recognized tribes in the state (s.118.19(8) Wis. Stats.). Teacher education programs are responsible for incorporating this information into their courses of study to ensure that all graduates receive this instruction. To date, a systematic response has yet to emerge, and individual campuses have been unable to develop the capacity to provide this instruction in all but the most perfunctory ways. The First Nations Studies and Education faculty at UW Green Bay are working closely together to implement a systemic model that meets this state mandate. A First Nations Studies major at UW Green Bay will reflect American Indian core knowledge (organized into 4 pillars – history, sovereignty, philosophy, and law) and will assist in efforts to formalize structural knowledge to educate future teachers and citizens in the state.

A First Nations Studies major at UW Green Bay, like at other universities, will not draw large numbers of students. Even in states with high numbers of American Indians in the total population, there are proportionately low enrollments in American Indian Studies and First Nations Studies majors in those states. For example, Arizona has the second highest number of American Indians in the total population (255,879). However, on average only 120 students major in American Indian Studies at Arizona State University with comparable small enrollments in the Applied Indigenous Studies major at Northern

Arizona University and in the American Indian Studies major at the University of Arizona. As in Arizona, the need for a First Nations Studies major at UW Green Bay is not driven primarily by enrollment demands. The creation of a First Nations Studies major is driven by an intellectual need within northeastern Wisconsin and in our society as a whole.

The following chart lists enrollments in First Nations Studies majors (aka American Indian Studies, Native American Studies or Indian Studies) in our region as of March 2005.

College	Location	Majors
Bemidji State University	Bemidji, MN	20
Creighton University	Omaha, NB	7
University of Minnesota, Twin Cities	Minneapolis, MN	50
University of North Dakota	Union Station, ND	25
University of South Dakota	Vermillion, SD	25

## 2. Relation to Institutional Mission

The creation of a First Nations Studies major fits directly within the Core Mission and the Special Mission of UW-Green Bay. At the heart of all mission statements is the principle that institutions of higher learning “discover and disseminate knowledge. . . .” The establishment of a major will enhance the opportunities for students and faculty alike to research the growing knowledge of First Nations Studies and disseminate it for future generations.

Like all UW campuses, UW-Green Bay is committed to serving the needs of students of color, faculty, and community members. UW-Green Bay has a particular responsibility to the sovereign first nations that form a large part of our community, so we must enhance the visibility of our commitment to First Nations Studies. The creation of a FNS major will provide the visibility necessary to demonstrate to students and members of the community that we take seriously our responsibility to “build partnerships for a multicultural community” (Diversity Plan 2008, p. 9). The proportion of our American Indian students to the total minority population declined from 35% in 1997 to 25% in 2004; we must take steps to better serve our community.

The UWS Diversity Plan 2008 calls for campuses to implement curricular change as they prepare students for the future (Goal #6). We are taking this mandate seriously as we offer a FNS major. This will provide a hub to stimulate further curricular change as faculty in other classes can build on the research and other content developed for the FNS courses.

Finally, the FNS major is particularly well suited to UW Green Bay’s special mission of interdisciplinarity. This has been an interdisciplinary minor for many years, and has demonstrably integrated various disciplines (from art, literature, social sciences, linguistics, education, etc.) to explore problems in new, innovative ways. Moving to a major is the next logical step to fulfill the interdisciplinary mission. Furthermore, this major will allow us to “connect learning to life” in a meaningful way as students work with elders in the community to preserve and analyze oral traditions.

### 3. Relation to other UW System Programs

Two campuses in the system, UW Milwaukee and UW Eau Claire, offer a major in American Indian (First Nations) Studies. An American Indian Studies or First Nation Studies minor is offered at UW Stevens Point and UW Superior. In addition, UW Madison offers a 15 credit certificate in American Indian Studies, noted on the transcript. The chart shows that the numbers of majors in these programs reflect the national trend. However, in the State as well as in the nation, these programs are essential for their intellectual content.

College	Location	Majors
University of Wisconsin	Milwaukee	2
University of Wisconsin	Eau Claire	19

The First Nations Studies major at UW Green Bay is distinct from each of these other programs in its regional focus on and relationship with nations in northeastern Wisconsin -- the Oneida, Menominee, and Mohican (Stockbridge-Munsee) Nations.

The First Nations Studies faculty at UW Green Bay work closely with and provide leadership to the UW System American Indian Studies Consortium. Composed of American Indian Studies faculty from the four and two year UW campuses, the Consortium encourages and supports the creation of a major at UW Green Bay. We have verbal commitments of support from the education directors of all our local tribes, and we are attaching letters of support (Attachments A).

### 4. Projected Source of Resources

No new resources are needed to add a major in First Nations Studies for the following reasons: 1) As described above, we expect the numbers of majors to be low, and 2) The central pedagogical component of this major is the "Elder Epistemology and Oral Tradition" course, which can be up to 12 credits, and (as described below) will not require extensive commitment of faculty time.

#### Current Resource Allocations

There are currently four faculty members in the First Nations Studies (American Indian Studies) program, and only two teach First Nations Studies courses full-time. The faculty teach courses that serve General Education Ethnic Studies requirements and courses that serve the FNS minor. The current FNS minor requires two lower-level supporting courses (6 credits) and 15 credits upper level courses. (See the list of requirements in Attachment B.) There have been an average of 15 students a year minoring in American Indian Studies for the past five years. The lower level courses that satisfy the Ethnic Studies requirement serve hundreds of students a year.

#### The Major

The proposed major requires 9 credits of supporting courses and 27 credits of upper-level courses. The additional supporting course is one that is already offered for Ethnic Studies General Education, so it



will require no new resources. (See Attachment C for a list of the courses proposed for the Major.)

The additional 12 credits on the upper level (beyond that which is already required for the minor) comes from a new course, AIST 399: American Indian Elder Epistemology and Oral Traditions, which may be taken for 1 to 12 credits. This course is at the heart of the latest research in First Nations Studies, which recognizes that the foundation for study of native peoples is premised upon tribal elders who preserve and transmit knowledge. Students who earn a degree with a major in First Nations Studies must learn not only how to use resources in libraries, but how to study the oral traditions by working with tribal elders and language speakers. The faculty on campus will supervise and process their findings and evaluate (grade) their understandings, but the research and learning will take place between students and tribal elders. Students must learn how to approach elders and to conduct research using oral techniques - skills that are taught in their earlier course work. Then, students will interact and study with tribal elders to synthesize and acquire oral traditional knowledge. At this point, the course (and the major) deeply fulfills the mission of the UW System (and all of higher education) to discover and disseminate knowledge.

With the use of tribal elders as resources, UW – Green Bay can offer a major with no additional resources. Since this major is dependent upon the support of the native communities, the support we have gathered from local tribal leaders is essential to the program.

For all these reasons, UW-Green Bay is committed to establishing a First Nations Studies major to serve our community and to fulfill an intellectual need. We respectfully request permission to plan this major.





Sociology Department  
264 Haines Hall, UCLA  
Box 951551  
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1551

Sunday, January 29, 2006

Fergus Hughes  
Interim Dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences  
Office of the Dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences  
Theatre Hall 335  
2420 Nicolet Drive  
University of Wisconsin-Green Bay  
Greenbay, WI 5431-7001

Dear Dean Hughes,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposal to establish a major in First Nations Studies at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay (UWGB). First of all I commend the initiative and creativity of the project. The plan is very promising and uses the strengths of the present faculty at UWGB. The First Nations Studies group is very familiar with contemporary ideas and thought on American Indian or First Nations Studies, and yet at the same time have worked to balance of available resources and faculty capabilities to construct a program that will provide students with a sophisticated understanding of Native issues, culture and philosophy. The intent of the program is very well meaning, useful, and will result in providing students with knowledge, experience, and understanding of Native American culture, people, and policies. The emphasis on regional First Nations, concentrating on the Oneida, Menominee and Ojibwe communities, makes great sense. American Indian Studies should focus on communities, with special attention to local and regional communities, and at the same time giving attention to national and international policies and contexts, First Nations Studies, should foremost give attention to place, and engage in relations with local communities. Most Native students, who will take the major, will come from local communities, and it is very important that First Nations Studies be relevant to the issues that confront local communities and their students.

The presentation of Oneida language, and possible collaborations with teachers of Ojibwe and Menominee in other institutions, is a key initiative. Language are very powerful way to teach subtle understanding of culture. The Indian Studies program at the University of Minnesota uses Ojibwe and Dakota language as central their program, while some tribally controlled community colleges like Sinte Gleska University on the Rosebud Reservation require two years of Lakota language for all students, Indian and

non-Indian. Both programs are very successful. The regional and language emphasis in the UWGB proposal follows in the same paths, and with sufficient resources starts with a promising plan. Having faculty already committed to teaching language is a strong plus, and can form one core of the entire program.

The proposed major in First Nations Studies is congruent with contemporary initiatives and programs around the country. The primary emphases of the UWGB First Nations major are comparable components of the major programs now available across the country. Most programs give emphasis to history, culture and policy, and while most aspire to provide language and Elder's knowledge, few are able to go this far. The UWGB proposal makes a strong statement and utilizes local and regional cultural resources to great advantage. The students and communities in the region will find what they are looking for in order to prepare them for future scholarship, policy, cultural and linguistic understanding.

3 The concept of the major is well laid out, but perhaps a little too ambitious, for available resources. I have some comments that hope might be helpful. First, there is a logistical issue of having undergraduates give oral presentations to meet the requirements of the major. While that is commendable and demanding, I am aware of very few undergraduate majors that make this requirement, and I think it will cause students undue stress and anxiety. I would suggest that the usual fulfillment of course requirements suffice to graduate in the major. Oral exams will cause too much stress and will require more logical support from faculty than is readily available and is required for ascertaining that students are achieving sufficient levels of understanding. If a more rigorous level of achievement is sought for some students, then I suggest that students who want to graduate from the First Nations Studies major with honors have the opportunity to write a senior thesis or carry out an approved project under the guidance of a faculty member or a small committee. Graduating with honors should be an option for students, and not required for those students who do not seek honors.

A second concern is the support for the visiting elders and the requirements for student proficiency in elders knowledge and experience. Only \$1000 is allocated for elders to visit and interact with students at the university. Elders placed at the center of a major component of the majors learning experience, but elder's participation is greatly underfunded. Even if many elders are willing to give their time to the major, I do not think that they will have the time and commitment to support the major in the way that would provide the students with the experiences they need to fulfill the objectives of the major. I don't think elders are prepared to contribute this role in the way that fits well into a university setting. There is an example, at the University of Trent in Ontario Canada, where elder's knowledge is highlighted in their Native Studies curriculum, and some Native elders are granted honorary doctorates and are paid as members of the faculty. This arrangement may not be possible in most US universities. Many elders will not want to participate as faculty members in a university institution, since the goals, values, and organization is very foreign to them. I suggest that the emphasis on elder's knowledge be reoriented somewhat, not to emphasis direct contact with elders as central to the learning process. Direct contact with elders is highly desirable, but \$1000

in honoraria is not going to buy enough contact to give students the information and contact they need to fulfill the elder's knowledge portion of the major. For the budget given, several elders could come to campus and make presentations. Elders should make their presentations according to the style they normally talk with young people, and so the elders are making presentations in style and content on their own terms and in their own way. Students should have as much contact with elders as possible, but the primary burden of providing the basic information of elders' knowledge should not come from the elder's themselves directly, since the student contact with elders will be too little to provide sufficient experience and knowledge. Elders expect young people to spend their entire lives learning, and not all information can be given in brief presentations. The primary burden of providing elders' knowledge and related cultural and epistemological viewpoints needs to come primarily from the classes of the faculty who teach this material. Elders can complement and extend the knowledge given in the classroom, but the primary discussion and learning about elder's knowledge must come from the faculty, since that is where most of the university's investment in teaching lay, and therefore where the students should have the most contact. Programs that increase contact with elders should be encouraged in the future, but for the requirements of the university, the teaching and grading should come from the faculty who are most engaged and who teaching about elders and elders knowledge. There are plenty of readings and materials from Native American elders that provide the basis for considerable classroom discussion. If the faculty want to emphasize local and regional elders and their knowledge, and if this literature does not now exist in enough quantity and diversity, then the faculty need to take on the project of producing elders knowledge in readable form from Oneida, Ojibwe, and Menominee elders. I suggest that elders knowledge component rely mostly on faculty with supplemental materials from elders, since this fits the allocation of resources better. Otherwise, I fear that the elders are given too few resources, and their contribution is given disproportionately too much emphasis for the students to master.

In terms of viability of the program, the major is offered without departmental status for First Nations Studies, and therefore, the faculty reside in other departments. The formation of a major is then relatively cost-effective, although having the disadvantage that without a department or core faculty, most faculty will have split loyalties and demands, and there will be few if any faculty concentrating on the business of the First Nations Studies Major. The cost-effectiveness is traded off with a absence of concentration of leadership and curricular focus. Most Indian Studies programs are managed in a like administrative manner, but some attention should be given to improving the attention that can be given administratively to the program from all the faculty, as well as through a faculty who is chair of the major. The major can go forward without more concentrated attention and resources, but the program runs the risk of too little administrative attention and support, and therefore may perform less well commensurate with resources invested.

UWGB is well placed for creating and developing the proposed major. There are numerous reservations in Wisconsin, and increasingly Native communities want to see their students educated at the university. A First Nations Studies major will invite many

Native students to UWGB, and enable students in other majors to minor or take electives in First Nations Studies that will complement and augment their course electives and contribute to the intellectual diversity of the university. The First Nations Studies major will appeal to students at the university who are interested in the cultural reclamation and nation building projects that are currently underway in Indian communities. Students, Indian or non-Indian, who have an interest related to contemporary Native communities, issues, and culture will find the basic tools needed to understand culture, policy, and economic issues that currently confront Native and surrounding communities. The more the courses are seen as addressing critical local, national and regional issues, the greater the interest by the students.

I believe the First Nations Studies major will bear ultimate success, and the program is in capable and seasoned hands from the faculty already in residence. I strongly favor launching the major, after some modifications along the lines suggested above.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Duane Champagne". The signature is written in black ink on a white background.

Duane Champagne  
Native Nations Law and Policy Center  
UCLA Department of Sociology  
264 Haines Hall  
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1551  
(310) 475-6475  
Email: [champagn@ucla.edu](mailto:champagn@ucla.edu)



## MENOMINEE INDIAN TRIBE OF WISCONSIN

P.O. Box 910  
Keshena, WI 54135-0910

August 9, 2005

Fergus Hughes  
Interim Dean of L & S  
UW-Green Bay  
2420 Nicolet Drive  
Green Bay, WI 54311-7001

Re: First Nations Studies Major

This letter is in support of the proposed First Nations Studies Major at UW-Green Bay. This major will strengthen the teacher education program under the requirement of the 1989 state law requiring all persons seeking a license to teach in Wisconsin to have instruction in history, culture and sovereignty of Wisconsin tribes.

This major also falls in line with the university's efforts to expand its commitment to diversity. The program will address racism and the lack of understanding that is evident in the issues that tribes face in their efforts to grow. These issues are primarily based on ignorance of tribal history, sovereignty and culture.

The First Nations Studies Major will demonstrate UW-Green Bay's leadership in responding to the social and political needs of tribal communities in Wisconsin. It will also provide instruction to those who work with students in the school systems that will enable them to dispel the myths and misinformation that the media and movies have perpetuated among young people in the elementary and secondary school systems.

It is my hope this major will be adopted because it will greatly benefit students from the communities served by the university.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Virginia Nuske".

Virginia Nuske  
Education Director



ATTACHMENT A

# *Oneida Tribe of Indians of Wisconsin*

## EDUCATION AND TRAINING DEPARTMENT

P.O. Box 365  
Oneida, WI 54155-0365  
(920) 869-4396  
1-800-236-2214  
Fax: (920) 869-4039



August 12, 2005

Dr. Lisa Poupart  
Associate Professor of Humanistic Studies  
University of Wisconsin - Green Bay  
2420 Nicolet Dr  
Green Bay, WI 54311

Dear Dr. Poupart:

This letter is written in support of efforts being made by UW - Green Bay to provide a major in First Nations Studies. This effort should be considered as a natural line of progression from the current minor in American Indian Studies.

After review of the projected course requirements for this major, it is important to note that this is a good overview of what would be considered essential topics for interest and for learning. In addition, it would also meet the State requirements for the Teacher Training Program which was passed by the State Legislature in 1989.

I might add, that for too long, American Indian Studies has remained in the background of higher institutions of learning and yet, UW - Green Bay has had an early interest in providing American Indian topics of study. During the 1970's, there began this early partnering between UW - Green Bay and the Oneida Tribe which began with the Oneida Language Program which has continued up to the present time, and successfully too.

The fact that you are revitalizing this project and moving forward to incorporate a broader and futuristic scope for students attending the UW System in Northeastern Wisconsin speaks highly about moving toward a commitment toward the recognition that there is a need for a more fully recognizable program aimed at studying American Indian intellectual traditions. As we move into the next century, UW - Green Bay can be considered a leader in offering this important field of study.

As the Area Manager of Education and Training for the Oneida Tribe, this support has been acknowledged and supported by the team members in this division as well as by myself. We look forward to this project moving successfully through the processes required for its implementation.

Dr. Lisa Poupart  
Page 2  
August 12, 2005

Thank you for allowing me to comment.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Thelma McLester". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "T" and "M".

Thelma McLester  
Education & Training Area Manager

c: Interim Dean, Fergus Hughes, Letters and Sciences



Stockbridge-Munsee Education

August 17, 2005

Fergus Hughes  
Interim Dean of Letters and Science  
UW Green Bay  
2420 Nicolet Drive  
Green Bay, WI 54311-7001

Dear Mr Hughes:

This letter is in support of the proposed First Nations Studies Major at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay. This major will be a great addition to the already existing diverse minor in First Nations Studies. This minor has a wide array of curriculum that covers the needed information about surrounding Tribes that will provide your students with a base to work with Native Americans. With a First Nations Major, students who graduate from this major will be well prepared to work in the diverse world of today and be able to respectfully work for and with Native American Tribes and populations.

Our Tribe, the Stockbridge-Munsee Band of Mohican Indians, located about an hour northwest of Green Bay has a great deal to offer the First Nations Major with tours of the reservation, a library museum with many of our tribal documents for research, and a very active repatriation office that is working to repatriate many of our items back to our tribe. We would also like to see more classes offered in the First Nations Major relating to the Stockbridge-Munsee Tribe at your respective institution.

Our Tribe's Education Board and I are in full support of the First Nations Major and see it as a very important addition to bridging the Native American Culture with the university and other cultures.

If you would like to discuss this further, please feel free to call me at (715)793-4060 or e-mail me at [misty.cook@mohican-nsn.gov](mailto:misty.cook@mohican-nsn.gov)

Sincerely,

Misty Cook  
Director, Education and Cultural Affairs  
Stockbridge-Munsee Band of Mohicans Tribe





---

# American Indian Studies

## Interdisciplinary Minor

*Professor* — Clifford Abbott

*Associate Professors* — Peter Kellogg, Lisa Poupart (chair), Denise Sweet

*Assistant Professor* — Rosemary Ackley Christensen

Web site: [www.uwgb.edu/ais/](http://www.uwgb.edu/ais/)

American Indian studies is an interdisciplinary program which reflects the philosophy and wholistic worldview of American Indian people. American Indian studies is committed to broadening the knowledge of students interested in culture, history, language, art, and the contemporary situations of American Indian nations and people. The program is designed to preserve and promote the integrity and identity of the indigenous populations of North America, with particular emphasis on the nations of the Western Great lakes.

American Indian studies fosters a learning environment that emphasizes a holistic, tribal value construct conducive to both creative and critical thought. The program is of interest to both American Indian students and non-Indian students who wish to learn more about the traditional cultures and knowledges of Native people as well as the cultural changes experienced by American Indian nations as a result of contact with Europeans and Americans.

The program offers a minor which can be combined with numerous disciplines and professional studies, including business, history, the arts, humanities, education, social sciences, and social work. Courses will prepare students to interact with American Indian governments and organizations, and equip students with skills to work in a culturally diverse society.

## Requirements for the Minor

### Supporting Courses, 6 credits

AIST 225 Introduction to American Indian Studies: The Tribal World, 3 credits

AIST 226 Introduction to American Indian Studies: American Indian Social Justice, 3 credits

### Upper-Level Courses, 15 credits

Minimum of 3 credits and maximum of 6 credits:

AIST 391 American Indian Seminar, 3 credits

Repeatable seminar has variable topics such as: American Indian Women, American Indian Environmental Justice, Contemporary Issues in Indian Country, Repatriation, Tribal Government Administration, American Indian Law, and American Indian Social Welfare

Policy Requirement, 3 credits, choose one course:

AIST 392 American Indian Justice and Tribal Governments, 3 credits

AIST 393 American Indians and Educational Policy, 3 credits

Electives, choose 6 to 9 credits from:

AIST 301 Oneida Language Project I, 3 credits

AIST 302 Oneida Language Project II, 3 credits

AIST 303 Oneida Language Project III, 3 credits

AIST 304 Oneida Language Project IV, 3 credits

AIST 336 American Ethnic Literature: American Indian Writers, 3 credits

AIST 372 American Indian Mythology and Literature, 3 credits

AIST 374 Wisconsin American Indian Ethnohistory, 3 credits

AIST 385 Perspectives on Human Values: American Indian Nations, 3 credits

AIST 392 American Indian Justice and Tribal Governments, 3 credits

AIST 393 American Indians and Educational Policy, 3 credits

AIST 497 Internship in American Indian Studies, 1-12 credits  
(requires approval of American Indian Studies adviser)

AIST 498 Independent Study in American Indian Studies, 1-4 credits

## Proposed Course Requirements for First Nations Studies Major

### Supporting Courses, 9 credits

- AIST 224 American Indian Tribal Religion, 3 credits
- AIST 225 Intro to AIS: Tribal World, 3 credits
- AIST 226 Intro to AIS: American Indian Social Justice, 3 credits

### Upper-level Courses, 27 credits

#### Minimum of 3 credits and max of 6 credits:

- AIST 391 First Nations Seminar: Repeatable, variable content

#### First Nations Policy Requirement, 3 credits choose:

- AIST 392 American Indian Justice and Tribal Government, 3 credits
- AIST 393 American Indians and Education Policy , 3 credits

#### Oral Emphasis Requirement, 12 credits:

- AIST 301 Oneida Language Project I, 3 credits
- AIST 302 Oneida Language Project 2, 3 credits
- AIST 303 Oneida Language Project 3, 3 credits
- AIST 304 Oneida Language Project 4, 3 credits
- AIST 399 American Indian Elder Epistemology and Oral Traditions, 1-12 credits

#### Electives, choose 9 credits from:

- AIST 301 Oneida Language Project I, 3 credits
- AIST 302 Oneida Language Project 2, 3 credits
- AIST 303 Oneida Language Project 3, 3 credits
- AIST 304 Oneida Language Project 4, 3 credits
- AIST 336 American Ethnic Literature: American Indian Writers, 3 credits
- AIST 372 Indigenous Storytelling and the Oral Tradition, 3 credits
- AIST 374 Wisconsin American Indian Ethnohistory, 3 credits
- AIST 385 Perspectives on Human Values: First Nations, 3 credits
- AIST 392 American Indian Justice and Tribal Government
- AIST 393 American Indians and Education Policy, 3 credits
- AIST 399 American Indian Elder Epistemology and Oral Traditions, 1-12 credits

- AIST 497 First Nations Internship, 1-12 credits
- AIST 498 First Nations Independent Study, 1-4 credits

**General Education Council's  
Proposal for the Establishment of General Education Domains  
Presented to UWGB Faculty Senate April 19, 2006**

## **Rationale**

For more than a decade, faculty and staff have studied and debated changes to the General Education curriculum at UW-Green Bay. Despite widespread agreement that changes are needed, the General Education Program remains essentially the same as it was in 1979, perhaps even weakened as a result of the elimination of a senior seminar requirement.

Criticisms of the existing General Education Program include 1) lack of coherence, 2) lack of interdisciplinary focus, 3) inadequate assessment, and 4) inadequate student engagement. These issues have been addressed in different forums and by two or three unsuccessful proposals for general education reform during the past 15 years.

The General Education Council has approved a recommendation for a new approach to this issue. Rather than focus on the details and content of the General Education Program, we submit a proposal to change the *process* by which the program is assessed and improved. This proposal is aimed at increasing the sense of ownership in the program, providing a means for engaging more faculty in the General Education curriculum, and encouraging experimentation and innovation.

While some might characterize this proposal as nothing more than the creation of new faculty committees, it might also be considered a bold idea in the context of faculty governance in higher education. Most universities have an oversight structure similar to the existing General Education Council at UW-Green Bay. Representatives from different academic areas meet regularly to discuss policies and to review proposals for adding or deleting courses. The key feature of our proposal is development of a much broader structure for implementing general education. Responsibilities of the faculty domain committees will include program assessment, faculty development, and cultivation of new ideas in addition to the traditional tasks of curriculum design. With the ongoing demographic transition toward a younger, more diverse faculty at UW-Green Bay, we believe the time is right for a fundamental change in the General Education Program.

### The motion passed by the General Education Council:

- The General Education Council will create 5 new "Domain Committees," designed to broaden faculty participation in development, oversight, and assessment of the UW-Green Bay General Education Program. Specific responsibilities of these committees will be to:
  1. Recommend curriculum changes to the General Education Council,
  2. Cultivate opportunities for faculty development and collaboration regarding general education,
  3. Periodically review learning outcomes in the academic area represented by the Domain Committee,
  4. Help insure that existing courses are appropriately aimed at these learning outcomes, and
  5. Oversee assessment of success in achieving the learning outcomes
- Each Domain Committee will consist of at least 3 faculty members, representing the units identified on the attached pages. Committee members will be expected to teach or have taught general education courses or have expertise that contributes to the work of the committee. Academic staff and student participation is encouraged.

Faculty Senate Continuing Business 5(d)  
13 September 2006

- Elected members of the General Education Council will automatically be members of the most appropriate Domain Committee.
- The committees will meet at least twice annually, prior to the deadlines for development of the schedule of classes for the following semester.
- Changes approved by the domain committees will require GEC approval to be enacted.
- Changes broader in scope than a single domain (Interdisciplinary First-Year Seminars, for example, or changes in the General Education requirements for UWGB as a whole rather than for a single domain) will continue to fall under the purview of the GEC.
- Committee members will serve three-year terms and will be selected as follows:
  - a. For the Fine Arts domain, there will be one representative each from Art, Music, and Theatre. The chairs of each of these three disciplines will nominate one or more candidates to serve on the committee, and faculty in the discipline will vote to determine their committee representative. (Additional members may be added at the discretion of the chairs in the domain.)
  - b. For the Humanities, there will be one representative each from English, English Composition, History, Modern Languages, and Philosophy. The chairs or directors of each of these areas will nominate one or more candidates to serve on the committee, and faculty in the area will vote to determine their committee representative. (Additional members may be added at the discretion of the chairs and director in the domain.)
  - c. For the Social Sciences, there will be one representative each from Business Administration, Communication, Human Development, Public and Environmental Affairs, Social Change and Development, and Urban and Regional Studies. The chairs of each of these disciplines will nominate one or more candidates to serve on the committee, and faculty in their discipline will vote to determine their committee representative. An additional committee member should represent First Nations Studies, International Education, or Women's Studies, with the committee member's affiliation rotating among these three areas with each new three-year term. (Additional members may be added at the discretion of the chairs in the domain.)
  - d. For the Natural Sciences, there will be one representative from Computer Science and two representatives each from Environmental Sciences and from Human Biology. The chair of Computer Science will nominate one or more candidates to serve on the committee, and the chairs of Environmental Sciences and of Human Biology will nominate two or more candidates to serve on the committee. Faculty in each discipline will vote to determine their committee representatives. (Additional members may be added at the discretion of the chairs in the domain.)
  - e. For the Ethnic Studies and World Culture domain committee, there will be one representative from the Natural Sciences (alternating between NAS and HUB with each new three-year term), one from the Fine Arts, two from Humanistic Studies, two from the Social Sciences (alternating with each three-year term between one each from SCD and PEA and one each from HUD and URS), and one to be approved by the International Education Council. The appropriate chair (NAS, HUB, HUS, SCD, PEA, HUD, URS) will nominate at least the number of candidates needed for the committee, and members of the unit will elect their representatives. (Additional members may be added at the discretion of the chairs.)

## General Education Domain Representation

### **I. Fine Arts**

Art  
Communication and the Arts  
Music  
Theatre

### **II. Humanities**

English  
English Composition  
French  
German  
History  
Humanistic Studies  
Modern Languages  
Philosophy  
Spanish

### **III. Social Sciences**

Accounting  
Anthropology  
Business Administration  
Communication  
Economics  
Environmental Policy & Planning  
First Nations Studies  
Geography  
Human Development  
Information Sciences  
International Education  
Political Science  
Psychology  
Public Administration  
Public & Environmental Affairs  
Social Change and Development  
Social Work  
Sociology  
Urban and Regional Studies  
Women's Studies

### **IV. Natural Sciences**

Biology  
Chemistry  
Computer Science  
Earth Science  
Environmental Sciences  
Human Biology  
Mathematics

### **V. Ethnic Studies and World Culture (broad based)**

Natural Sciences (1 member)  
Fine Arts (1 member)  
Humanities (2 members)  
Social Sciences (2 members)  
One additional member to be approved  
by the International Education Council

### **Assigned by Area of Specialization**

Education  
International Studies  
Physical Education

**General Education Council Presents A  
Proposal of Four Alternative Plans for General Education at UWGB  
Presented to the Faculty Senate April 19, 2006**

**Rationale**

For more than a decade, faculty and staff have studied and debated changes to the General Education curriculum at UW-Green Bay. Despite widespread agreement that changes are needed, the General Education Program remains essentially the same as it was in 1979, perhaps even weakened as a result of the elimination of the senior seminar requirement.

Criticisms of the existing General Education Program include 1) lack of coherence, 2) lack of interdisciplinary focus, 3) inadequate assessment, and 4) inadequate student engagement. These issues have been addressed in different forums and by two or three unsuccessful proposals for general education reform during the past 15 years.

Given the difficulty in getting any single plan for General Education reform approved in a thumbs up/thumbs down vote, it has been suggested to the General Education Council on more than one occasion that it might be wise to provide the Faculty Senate with an array of plans, thus giving maximum options and possibilities for envisioning reform. The Faculty Senate might find a plan it approves from among the several submitted, or it might wish to combine elements from several plans, or it might prefer that UWGB remain with its current General Education requirements.

Accordingly, the General Education Council (GEC) has approved the idea of forwarding four plans to the Faculty Senate for the Senators' consideration. All four plans assume reform in the sense of creation of domain committees for general education, although most of them could be adopted without the idea of domain committees being enacted. Below is a capsule summary of ways the four plans differ from one another and from our current general education requirements:

**Overview of Plans**

Plan 1 has the advantages of maximum freedom and ease for the student in satisfying General Education requirements, as well as maximum freedom for the unit to experiment with course array in satisfying General Education requirements. On the other hand, one can argue that it's nothing more than a distribution requirement, and one might also envision some students taking some rather narrowly focused courses to satisfy what are supposed to be rather broad areas of knowledge.

Plan 2 is really simply what we have now, with the addition that domain committees and the GEC may wish to change some of what we have now. (Plan #2 originally involved noticeable changes from what we have now, but it got altered via amendments during the GEC's process of adopting this motion, and we probably didn't even notice that it ended up being simply the status quo plus domain committees.)

Plan #3 tries to allow students and units somewhat more flexibility in satisfying General Education requirements than is currently the case, but also seeks to expose students to a relatively wide array of disciplinary perspectives, as well as exposing them to an interdisciplinary perspective. It also seeks to combine General Education reform with the movement toward Interdisciplinary Freshman Seminars, although it doesn't require that all students take such seminars.

Plan #4 suggests no changes in requirements in most areas of General Education, with two exceptions:

- It suggests that the Catalogue should be revised to emphasize General Education courses as a means of helping students to acquire the knowledge and skills articulated in the General Education Learning Outcomes, rather than simply presenting the courses as a series of requirements to be satisfied/hoops to be jumped through;

Faculty Senate Continuing Business 5(e)

10 May 2006

- It in essence approves the Humanistic Studies plan for revising the list of courses satisfying the H-1, H-2, and H-3 requirements. The HUS plan involves a number of changes, with the most obvious one being that the H-1/H-2/H-3 lists would resemble lists in all other areas of General Education—three rather long lists of courses, with each list tied to a specific Gen Ed Learning Outcome, rather than only two courses to choose from for H-1 and only two for H-2, and no specific correlation of H-1, H-2, or H-3 with any one specific outcome from among the three Humanities Gen Ed Outcomes, as is the case currently.

The GEC also would encourage the Faculty Senate to consider “mixing and matching”—taking elements from one plan and adding them to elements from another plan, or deleting a certain element from a plan and adopting the rest. For one example among many possibilities, the Faculty Senate might like Plan #1 or Plan #4 with the addition of the Interdisciplinary Freshman Seminars material from Plan #3.

### **Proposal**

In addition to recommending that a system of “domain committees” be created, the General Education Council recommends that the Faculty Senate strongly consider enacting one of the following four plans for revising general education requirements. For each of the four plans, the following items apply:

- The current number of prerequisite-free courses or student seats must be maintained. (Oversight of this should go to the domain committees.)
- The English Competency, Math Competency, Writing Emphasis, Ethnic Studies, and World Cultures requirements will remain as they are.
- Each domain should be evaluated and streamlined if need be. Greater coherence to General Education may be given by reducing options available for meeting the requirements through elimination of courses that do not adequately address the learning objectives.
- Units/areas not featured in current general education domains can be included on the basis of domain committee recommendations.

Below are the four plans the GEC recommends that the Faculty Senate strongly consider:

#### **Plan #1.**

- Students will be required to fulfill the following **General Education Breadth Requirement**:
  - a. 3 credits in the **Fine Arts**
  - b. 9 credits in the **Humanities**
  - c. 9 credits in the **Social Sciences**
  - d. 10-12 credits in the **Natural Sciences**
- Any course belonging to units representing these *General Education Domains* will be eligible.

#### **Plan #2.**

- Domain committees will specify a list of courses within each domain which satisfy the General Education Breadth Requirement for that domain. This will permit flexibility in the array of courses eligible for the general education program. Lists recommended by the domain committees will be subject to approval by the General Education Council. Students will be required to fulfill the following **General Education Breadth Requirement**:
  - a. 3 credits in the **Fine Arts**
  - b. 9 credits in the **Humanities**
  - c. 9 credits in the **Social Sciences**
  - d. 10-12 credits in the **Natural Sciences**

### Plan #3.

- Students will be required to fulfill the following **General Education Breadth Requirement**:
  - a. 3 credits in the **Fine Arts**
  - b. 9 credits in the **Humanities**
  - c. 9 credits in the **Social Sciences**
  - d. 10-12 credits in the **Natural Sciences**
  - e. 3 credits of **Interdisciplinary Coursework**.
- Any course belonging to units representing these *General Education Domains* will be eligible.
- When more than one course is required from a Domain, courses must be from distinct disciplines.
- An **Interdisciplinary Requirement** will be fulfilled by completing any course offered by an interdisciplinary unit.
  - This course can only count for one area of general education (e.g., either satisfy Humanities or Interdisciplinarity).
  - New courses can be created especially for this category.
  - Interdisciplinary Courses may be *Interdisciplinary Freshman Seminars*.

### Plan #4.

- We urge that the General Education portion of the University Catalog list the UWGB General Education Learning Outcomes one at a time, with the courses satisfying that outcome listed directly beneath the outcome and with the following requirements:
  - Students would be required to take at least one course from each list. For the outcome that students should have “An understanding of the social sciences, including major concepts of social, political, geographic, and economic structures,” students would be required to take two courses. Students who do not complete a laboratory course would be required to take a second course from any one of the three Natural Sciences Outcome lists.
  - The lists for the three Humanities learning outcomes should be as put forth in the 2004 proposal approved by Humanistic Studies for revising the Humanities general education requirements or, if Humanistic Studies revises those lists, as subsequently revised by HUS.
  - Thereafter, changes in the lists would be originated by the domain subcommittees and subject to the approval of the GEC.



**Draft**  
**Resolution of the Several Faculties of the University of Wisconsin System**

Whereas, s. 36.13 (3), Wisconsin Statutes, provides

RULES. The board and its several faculties after consultation with appropriate students shall promulgate rules for tenure and probationary appointments, for the review of faculty performance and for the nonretention and dismissal of faculty members. Such rules shall be promulgated under ch. 227 [Wisconsin Statutes]; and,

Whereas, s. 36.13(5), Wisconsin Statutes, provides:

PROCEDURAL GUARANTEES. Any person having tenure may be dismissed only for just cause and only after due notice and hearing. Any person having a probationary appointment may be dismissed prior to the end of the person's contract term only for just cause and only after due notice and hearing. The action and decision of the board in such matters shall be final, subject to judicial review under ch. 227 [Wisconsin Statutes]. The board and its several faculties shall develop procedures for the notice and hearing which shall be promulgated by rule under ch. 227[Wisconsin Statutes]; and,

Whereas, the board and the several faculties of the University of Wisconsin System affirm the importance and necessity of working together to develop rules relating to faculty dismissal; and

Whereas, the board and the several faculties of the University of Wisconsin System endorse the importance and necessity of rules that will deal effectively with those infrequent cases when faculty members are involved in serious criminal activity that substantially impairs the safety, operation, or integrity of the university; and,

Whereas, the board and the several faculties agree that prompt and expedited attention to such cases of serious criminal activity best serves the state, its citizens, the university, the faculty, and the faculty member concerned; and

Whereas, the board and the several faculties believe that in cases involving serious criminal activity the proposed UWS 7 is appropriate in, among other things, specifying just cause for dismissal, ensuring due process, and protecting academic freedom;

Therefore, be it resolved that the faculty of the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay joins with the Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System to endorse and approve the promulgation of rules in ch. UWS 7, Wisconsin Administrative Code, as proposed by the board at its June 9, 2006 meeting (a copy of the proposed board order follows), and including such non-material amendments as may result through the process under ch. 227, Wisconsin Statutes, (Administrative Procedure and Review).

[texts of UWS 7 and UWS 11]

**Update/Faculty Senate Report**  
**September 13, 2006**

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

## **I. ENROLLMENT UPDATE**

This fall we welcome our biggest freshman class in UWGB's history, with 1029 new freshmen enrolled on opening day. That is a 13% increase over Fall 2005. We saw a slight decrease in some other enrollment categories (e.g., graduate students). The result is a net first-day-of-classes enrollment of 5621 students, up slightly over last year. Our students come from Wisconsin, 35 other states, and 25 foreign countries. We appear to have met our tuition target for Fall Semester. That is wonderful news since any shortfall would have to be made up from other sources.

Among our incoming freshman class:

- 22% graduated from a Brown County, Wisconsin, high school.
- 28% of them have completed at least one college-level (e.g., AP) course, and 6% have already completed the equivalent of one full-time semester of college-level work
- 8% are students of color. That's a 69% increase over last year in the number of incoming freshmen minority students.

A special congratulations and thanks to all who worked over the past year to bring in this year's freshman class.

## **II. NEW SECRETARY OF THE FACULTY AND ACADEMIC STAFF**

Please join me in welcoming Cliff Abbott as our new Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff (affectionately known as "SOFAS"). Dr. Abbott has had a long and distinguished career here at UWGB as a Professor of Information and Computing Science (Communication Processes). Of special significance to this new assignment is Cliff's extensive record of service to his colleagues and the institution. He served 19 years on the UWGB Faculty Senate. He has chaired the University Committee, the Academic Affairs Council, the General Education Council, the Committee of Six Full Professors, the Committee on Rights and Responsibilities, the Committee on Committees and Nominations, the Awards and Recognitions Committee, the NCA Review Committee on Assessment, and the Personalized Learning Committee. He has chaired the Information and Computing Science unit as well as the Communication Processes department and has served on numerous other University committees, task forces, and working groups. As a linguist, Cliff has worked extensively with the Oneida Nation to document, preserve, and teach the Oneida language. Cliff has received numerous grants and awards, including a Lilly Endowment Teaching Fellowship and several awards from the UW-Green Bay Founders Association—for Excellence in Institutional Service, Excellence in Community Outreach, and Excellence in Scholarship. Welcome, Cliff!

## **III. PHYSICAL EDUCATION EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

Upon the advice and recommendation of the Faculty Senate, we have formed a Physical Education Executive Committee to oversee UWGB's academic program in physical education. Members are James Coates (Education), James Marker (Human Biology), Laura Riddle (Communication and the Arts), and Scott Furlong (Public and Environmental Affairs), who will convene the committee.

## **IV. GLOBAL STUDIES MINOR AD HOC COMMITTEE**

Also upon the advice and recommendation of the Faculty Senate, we formed an ad hoc committee to follow up on questions and concerns about the proposed academic minor in Global Studies. Members of this committee are:

David Coury (HUS)  
Marcello Cruz (URS)  
Kevin Fermanich (NAS)  
Anne Kok (Social Work)  
Craig Lockhart (SCD)  
Dan Meinhardt (HUB)

Sarah Meredith (COA)  
Laurel Phoenix (PEA) -- Chair  
Janet Reiley (Nursing)  
Jill White (HUD)  
Asmamaw Yimer (Education)  
Karl Zehms (BUA)

The committee has begun its work, and its report and recommendations are expected for consideration at the October meeting of the Faculty Senate.

### **III. LAS DEAN SEARCH**

The LAS Dean's search has been reopened. The Search and Screen Committee includes the following:

Angela Bauer-Dantoin (HUB)  
Greg Davis (NAS) – Chair  
Sally Dresdow (BUA)  
Cheryl Grosso (COA)  
Bill Laatsch (URS)  
Brent Blahnik (International Education)  
Katrina Hrivnak (Assistant Registrar)  
Sheryl Van Gruensven (Acting Director of  
Human Resources and Affirmative Action)  
Alem Asres (community representative)  
A student representative is yet to be named.

### **IV. ACADEMIC PLANNING**

Over the summer, the Provost's administrative council continued to work with the Academic Affairs Strategic Plan. Each division reporting to the Provost will be asked to incorporate into its budget planning for the coming year those portions of the plan that are relevant and appropriate to that division. The plan is available for review at the Academic Affairs planning web site, <http://www.uwgb.edu/provost/aapc.htm>.

The Comprehensive Program Review Task Force also worked through the summer to complete its review of our academic programs. In the course of its work, the Task Force took a careful look at existing information about every program and also developed some innovative metrics to get new insights into our diverse array of academic programs. A draft of the task force's report is expected to be circulated for discussion, feedback, and possible revision before it is finalized and submitted to the Provost in October. This report is expected to be informative and important for guiding our future program planning, growth, and resource allocations.

### **V. ENGAGING STUDENTS AND REVISING INTERDISCIPLINARITY**

On October 13 and 27, our Instructional Development Council will hold two half-day workshops/ strategic planning sessions on student engagement and interdisciplinary teaching initiatives. The keynote speaker for the first session, on October 13, will be Dr. Jillian Kinzie, of the Center for Postsecondary Research and NSSE Institute at Indiana University. Each interdisciplinary unit has been asked to send two participants to these workshops, and the results will help guide the planning for future faculty development programs. These sessions are funded by the Provost and the UW System Office of Professional and Instructional Development. For more information, contact Heidi FencI.

## **University Committee Annual Report 2005-2006**

The University Committee (UC) members, Forrest Baulieu, Greg Davis, Sally Dresdow (chair), Scott Furlong, Terry O'Grady, and Chris Style, met weekly. Lucy Arendt was the Academic Staff Committee representative. During most meetings, Provost Hammersmith met with the committee in an information exchange. Professor Ken Fleurant, in his position as Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff, regularly met with the committee. During the year, various guests attended to discuss specific issues including Chancellor Shepard and representatives from the General Education Committee.

The UC continued a theme from prior years in that many of the areas covered in the faculty handbook need to be reviewed and updated. In addition, the UC continued to work on curriculum procedures. During the fall semester, an overview of the curriculum process was completed. The overview was given to Associate Provost Tim Sewall, who then prepared a draft of the written procedures. During spring semester, the UC reviewed the curriculum procedure process, suggested changes, and presented it to the Faculty Senate. Further discussion and work will occur during the 2006-2007 academic year.

During the 2005-2006 academic year, the UC discussed, reviewed, and proposed a number of issues that went to the Faculty Senate.

### Passed:

- Code change to University of Wisconsin-Green Bay (UWGB) Faculty Handbook Chapter 6
- Code Change to UWGB 3.08.4(d) and 3.09 1
- Addition of a C/D grade to UWGB's grading policy
- Procedure regarding student complaints made against faculty members
- Memorial Resolution for Professor Emeritus Irwin Sonfield
- Memorial resolution for Professor Anthony Galt
- Faculty Senate Resolution on the proposed UWS Chapter 7 proposed by the Board of Regents

### Presented, action to be taken in 2006-2007

- Global Studies Minor
- First Nations Major
- General Education Domain Committees
- General Education Plans

### Senate Discussion Items – action not required

- Proposal for Founders Degree
- Report from the Senate Committee on Planning and Budget
- Discussion on direction for General Education

### Other areas the UC addressed

- Input to Chancellor Shepard regarding the Board of Regents' Resolution on Employment Policies and Procedures and on his proposed Diversity Initiative.
- Extensive discussion on the proposed UWS Chapter 7. Feedback was given to the Faculty Rep Group that meets in Madison and through them to the Board of Regents.

- Working with Provost Hammersmith regarding the search process and the position description for the Dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences.
- Continuing the discussion of various proposals for changing the University class schedule.
- Discussing recent HERI and NSSE results.
- Reviewing and approving the proposal to establish the Center for Food in Community and Culture.
- Reviewing and recommending changes to the Provost's proposal for a comprehensive academic program review process.
- Reviewing and acting upon requests for Faculty Status for Lecturers.
- Providing faculty names to serve as replacements on the Personnel Council and Committee on Rights and Responsibilities.
- Lengthy discussions with the Provost, SOFAS Ken Fleurant, and the Academic Staff Committee regarding the position description for the SOFAS position. The discussions continued into the summer and will continue into 2006-2007.
- Working with the Academic Staff Committee to interview candidates for the SOFAS position and submitting the results to the Chancellor and Provost.
- Developing and administering a review of the Administrators.
- Reviewing and discussing the Personnel Council's report to the Chancellor.
- Issuing a clarification regarding Section 54.03 A. The Academic Affairs Council asked that the UC clarify what the term "recommend" means regarding the approval of new courses. There was spirited discussion and the discussions should continue into the 2006-2007 academic year.
- Discussing and approving the development of a Campus Community-Building Council that would report to the Chancellor. This was brought to the UC by the Academic Staff Committee.

On a personal note, I would like to thank the UC committee members for their spirited discussion, dedication, and support. Without all working together, we would not have accomplished all we did. Also, Ken Fleurant and Pat Przybelski in the SOFAS office provided invaluable advice and support. In addition, I want to say thank you to all the faculty who kept us informed of their concerns. It was a privilege to serve the UWGB community as Chair of the UC for 2005-2006.

Respectfully submitted by Sally Dresdow, Chair