AGENDA

UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 8

Wednesday, 21 April 2004, 3:00 p.m.

PHOENIX ROOM C, University Union

Presiding Officer: Illene Noppe, Speaker

Parliamentarian: Professor Kenneth J. Fleurant

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 7,

MARCH 24, 2004 (attached)

3. CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

4. CONTINUING BUSINESS – Presented by Professor Clifford Abbott

  a. Student-Led Courses (attached).

  b. Faculty Status for Academic Staff Lecturers (attached)

5. NEW BUSINESS – Presented by Clifford Abbott

  a. Resolution on the Granting of Degrees (attached)

  b. Code Change for Defining Unit Membership - first reading (attached)

  c. Code Change for Approval of Freestanding Minors - first reading (attached)

  d. Requests for Future Senate Business

6. PROVOST'S REPORT. Presented by Provost Sue K. Hammersmith

7. [UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE REPORT](#). Presented by Professor Clifford Abbott

8. ADJOURNMENT

MINUTES 2003-2004

UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 7

Wednesday, March 24, 2004

Phoenix Room C, University Union

Presiding Office: Illene Noppe (HUD-UC), Speaker

Parliamentarian: Kenneth J. Fleurant, Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

PRESENT: Clifford Abbott (ICS-UC), Greg Aldrete (HUS-UC), Denise Bartell (HUD), Forrest Baulieu (ICS), Derryl Block (NUR), M. Jan Bradfield (COA), Peter Breznay (ICS), Gregory Davis (NAS-UC), Sally Dresdow (BUA-UC), Michael Hencheck (NAS), Timothy Kaufman (ED), Harvey Kaye (SCD), Anne Kok (Soc. Wk), Michael Kraft (PEA), William Lepley (BUA), Richard Logan (HUD-UC), Steven Meyer (NAS), Steve Muzatko (BUA), Tom Nesslein (URS), Illene Noppe (HUD-UC), Gilbert Null (HUS), Ellen Rosewall (COA), Linda Tabers-Kwak (ED), Patricia Terry (NAS), Bryan Vescio (HUS),

NOT PRESENT: Sue Hammersmith (Provost), Craig Hanke (HUB), Jennifer Popiel (HUS), Bruce Shepard (Chancellor), William Witwer (COA).

REPRESENTATIVES: John Landrum (Academic Staff Committee), Matthew Voigt (Student Government Association)

GUESTS: Dean Carol Blackshire-Belay, Dean Fritz Erickson, Associate Provost Timothy Sewall.

1. Call to Order. With a quorum present, the meeting was called to order at 3:03 p.m. Speaker Noppe announced that Senator Bill Witwer was hospitalized in Italy and offered her best wishes for his rapid recovery and speedy return. She also congratulated Senator Aeron Haynie on the birth of a baby daughter. Both are doing well and neither will be attending Senate as they have faithfully done all year. Senator Jennifer Popiel was elected to replace her for the remainder of the academic year.

2. Approval of Minutes of UW-Green Bay Faculty Senate Meeting No. 6, February 18, 2004.

The minutes were approved without change.

3. New Business:

a. <u>Memorial Resolution for Professor Bela Baker</u>. Read by Senator Kaye. **Senator Logan moved acceptance of the memorial resolution for Associate Professor Emeritus of Social Change and Development, Bela Baker. The resolution carried unanimously.**

b. <u>Three Resolutions on Faculty Status</u>. Presented by University Committee Chair, Clifford Abbott. The University Committee offers three somewhat mutually exclusive resolutions in response to last month's open forum. The first resolution would ask the UC to withhold approval of future requests for faculty status, effectively ending the practice for anyone who does not already have that status. **Senator Baulieu moved acceptance of the first resolution**:

> Resolved that the Faculty Senate instructs the University Committee to withhold its approval, required by Section 51.12 of the Code, for any future recommendations for granting status to academic staff members.

Senator Block asked if the intent was to bind the UC forever? Abbott stated that this resolution would be easier to change in the future than an actual codification change. Arguments in favor of and against the resolution followed along the lines of previous discussions. Senator Kraft asked to hear from units with lecturers who have faculty status. Senator Dresdow mentioned that the Professional Program in Business has three fully integrated, longstanding lecturers with faculty status. They and two other lecturers were hired in lieu of tenure track faculty for economic reasons, and are valuable members of the unit who contribute to departmental service. Nonetheless she would not want to increase their number beyond the current level if it affected tenure track positions. Senator Kaufman said that Education has two lecturers with faculty status upon which the unit relies for their technological skills. With the recognition of the Speaker, the Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff suggested that it is important not to lose sight of the need for every group within the University to be represented in governance. Teaching academic staff often fall between Academic Staff and Faculty Governance and lose connection with governance on instructional issues that are central to their work. We fail Instructional Academic Staff by not integrating them fully into the units in which they teach. It is often easier for them to get involved at the campus level than at the unit level where they are often not provided with the same resources as tenure-track faculty—mentoring, sabbaticals, grants and professional development opportunities. System reports suggest that faculty status may be one way to increase participation, for some at least, in institutional governance. Senator Kaye said he lends no credence to System reports. He suggested that if we seriously wished to improve the situation we would demand a lower teaching load for IAS in return for a greater level of institutional and community service. Let the System address the problem in terms of better salaries, reduced teaching loads, etc. With the previous question moved, **the resolution failed with 8 in favor, 15 opposed and 1 abstention.**

Senator Davis moved acceptance of the second resolution:

> Resolved that the Faculty Senate instructs the University Committee to require from any unit requesting faculty status for an academic staff member a specification of that individual's responsibilities as a member of the unit faculty.

Senator Null asked whether the UC had anything in mind when expecting units to specify responsibilities of faculty status. Senator Davis agrees that a set of guidelines should be drafted so that responsibilities are relatively constant across campus. However, voting no would actually weaken the situation. Senator Aldrete suggested that different units might wish to specify their own criteria. The UC doesn't wish to establish a uniform set of criteria but could effectively judge the weight accorded to the responsibilities units assign to faculty status. Debate continued on whether criteria for faculty status should be uniform or unit specific, whether they should be developed by the UC or by individual units. Senator Block argued in favor of departmental faculty status, leaving the UC completely out of the approval process. Departments would create their own criteria, and representation of instructional academic staff would be at the unit level. Senator Kraft believes resolution 2 gives sufficient control over faculty status to units while allowing some oversight. **The resolution was approved 20 in favor, 1 opposed with four abstentions.**

Senator Hencheck moved acceptance of resolution three:

Resolved for any teaching academic staff who currently hold faculty status that the faculty status responsibilities of that staff member shall be identified by the budgetary units and conveyed in writing to the Secretary of the Faculty and Academic staff at the time of the next reappointment review of that staff member.

Without discussion, **the resolution was approved 21 in favor, none opposed and 3 abstentions**.

c. <u>Requests for Future Senate Business</u>. Senator Rosewall presented two requests on behalf of her constituents: 1) Discussion of concerns that Extended Degree has been reorganized without faculty input. 2) Adoption of a formal mechanism for the evaluation of administrators. As a follow-up to the day's Senate action, Senator

Baulieu asked the UC to try to provide units with some sense of what, beyond teaching, might be required for faculty status.

4. Provost's Report. Provost Hammersmith was away but submitted a written report that was distributed with the agenda.

5. University Committee Report. Presented by UC Chair Abbott:

a. The *ad hoc* committee formed by the Senate last month to look into student-led courses located the long lost guidelines and has formulated questions that the UC is now considering.

b. The UC is still working on a set of definitional problems—what constitutes a quorum, membership, *ex officio* status on committees, etc. Code is not always explicit and this is beginning to cause procedural problems.

c. The UC meets next week with the Academic Staff Committee and the Student Government Organization to explore common governance concerns. A report to the Senate could be ready for the next meeting.

d. System faculty representatives meet monthly in Madison, and they are currently concerned about assessment (especially for accreditation reviews), and evaluation of administrators. The Representatives are preparing a survey of methods used on System campuses for evaluating administrators. A local discussion is sure to follow.

Senator Null reminded the UC that his unit needs UC interpretation on quorum and membership issues before the administration will allow an election for chair, and he urged alacrity on item b.

6. Adjournment. With no further business for the day, the Senate adjourned at 4:11 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kenneth Fleurant, Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

---

Faculty Senate Continuing Business 4 (a), 4/21/04

PROPOSED ACTIONS ON STUDENT-LED COURSES

1. A question for the Faculty Senate:

"Should UW-Green Bay have student-led courses after the spring semester of 2005?"

2. If the Faculty Senate answers "yes" to the above question, we offer the following resolution:

The Faculty accepts the revised guidelines for student-led courses as specified in the attached document.

REVISED GUIDELINES FOR STUDENT-LED COURSES

(Revisions are that boldface material has been added to and strike-through material has been deleted from the original guidelines.)

I. General

A. Student leaders must demonstrate an ability to conduct the proposed course to a faculty advisor and the sponsoring department.

B. There should ordinarily be a maximum of three student leaders in any one course.

C. Normally student leaders receive the same credit as enrolled students. In addition, they may register for up to an equivalent number of credits as independent study for leading the course. The faculty advisor(s) submits a grade after evaluation of the completed course. Alternatively a student may register only for independent study credit, in which case faculty advisors will determine the appropriate number of credits.

D. Students may take a maximum of six student-led course credits/semester. A maximum of 18 credits can be accumulated in 281/481 courses except by special petition.

E. Student**-led courses will be graded** ~~leaders may request that their course be offered~~ on a pass/no credit basis.

II. Sponsorship

A. Student-led courses ~~may~~ **must** be sponsored by either a disciplinary or interdisciplinary academic unit.

B. Student-led courses should be clearly announced as such and are identified in timetables and elsewhere with the departmental student-led course number (281/481).

C. The sponsoring unit will review a course proposal prior to approving a student-led course and will provide information copies of the proposal (as approved) to the Dean.

D. Should the course not be approved, a brief written explanation should be offered student initiators. Where there is promise, modification of proposals should be encouraged.

E. The sponsoring unit provides for course supplies and expenses where appropriate and possible.

F. By accepting a course proposal, the sponsoring unit also accepts the student-chosen faculty advisor as the instructor of record. At least one advisor ~~should~~ **must** be a member of the sponsoring unit.

G. The sponsoring unit shall arbitrate any disputes between faculty advisors and student leaders where the University's legal responsibility is, or is potentially, at issue.

III. <u>Responsibilities of the Instructor of Record</u>

A. To help with course design and the course proposal, and endorse the proposal to be submitted to the academic department.

B. Be available throughout the course for help with academic issues and problems of class operation and management. **Regular meetings with the student leaders is strongly recommended**.

C. While faculty advisors need not attend class sessions, they are expected to follow the progress of the course.

D. Inform student leaders of relevant University procedures, policies, customs, and norms. **In addition, the faculty supervisor is responsible for training student leaders in FERPA requirements regarding the privacy of student records and to handle course responsibilities such as design of a syllabus, facilitating class discussion, grading, and management of course materials.**

IV. <u>Joint Instructor of Record and Student Leader Responsibilities</u>

A. Complete proposal form for student-led courses and submit to sponsoring academic department.

B. Agree on basic academic and operational policies before submission of proposal. When course is accepted, agree on final course syllabus and operational procedures before first class meeting. In the event that <u>either</u> faculty advisor(s) <u>or</u> student leader(s) want to change any aspect of syllabus after start of course, both parties have equal voice. Should they disagree and be unable to reconcile differences, no change may be made and original syllabus and operational procedures shall be adhered to. In the event any question involves, or potentially involves, the legal responsibilities of the University, the sponsoring units will decide the issue.

C. Decide on standards for ~~grading~~ **passing the course**. ~~If a course is to be offered as pass/no credit, decide on minimum standards for passing~~

D. At the end of the course, submit to sponsoring unit a short, written evaluation which should Include, at a minimum, basic course statistics (number enrolled, number completed, grade distribution), student evaluations, a personal estimate of degree to which course goals were achieved, and recommendations for revision if the course is repeated. A copy of the evaluations should be provided to the Dean's Office.

V. <u>Student Leader Responsibilities</u>

A. Find a faculty member or members willing to serve as advisor(s) or instructor(s) of record and initiate a request for acceptance of the course proposal on course proposal forms available in departmental offices and in the Dean's Office.

B. Keep the instructor of record informed of the progress of the course on a regular basis agreed upon at the beginning of the course.

C. Become familiar with the general responsibilities of instructors in a teaching situation and seek advice from the instructor of record and/or the concentration chairperson when necessary.

D. Inform class members of their responsibilities and obligations in the course, including standards for grading as would any instructor.

SENATE RESOLUTION ON FACULTY STATUS

1. Resolved that the Faculty Senate instructs the University Committee to require from any unit requesting faculty status for an academic staff member a specification of that individual's responsibilities as a member of the unit faculty.

2. Resolved for any teaching academic staff who currently hold faculty status that the faculty status responsibilities of that staff member shall be identified by the budgetary units and conveyed in writing to the Secretary of the Faculty and Academic staff at the time of the next reappointment review of that staff member.

Faculty Senate Document #03-8

Approved 24 March 2004

Faculty Senate Continuing Business 4 (b), 4/21/04

Proposed Guidelines for Responsibilities for Faculty Status

Requests for granting faculty status to academic staff require a specification of the responsibilities meriting that status. Those responsibilities must be more than just teaching and less than the full range of faculty responsibilities in service and scholarship. They should, however, be comparable in type. They generally include attendance at meetings and in addition may include such things as advising, curriculum development, internship supervision, program outreach, or curricular governance, but not simply such things as secretarial work or equipment repair.

Faculty Senate New Business 5 (a), 4/21/04

RECOMMENDATION ON THE GRANTING OF DEGREES

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

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate of the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay, on behalf of the Faculty, recommends to the Chancellor and the Vice Chancellor of the University that the students certified by the Registrar of the University as having completed the requirements of their respective programs be granted their degrees at the spring 2004 Commencement.

Faculty Senate New Business 5 (b), 4/21/04

PROPOSED CODE CHANGES

FOR DEFINING UNIT MEMBERSHIP

The proposal is to add the language in bold face between the brackets:

53.02 Interdisciplinary Unit Faculties: Membership

All University Faculty members as defined in 50.01 holding appointments in an interdisciplinary unit**[, excluding those university administrators without teaching assignments, shall be defined as members of that interdisciplinary unit and]** shall have the right to vote and otherwise participate in the governance of that interdisciplinary unit. Appointment is made by the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs upon the affirmative recommendation of the appropriate Dean(s) and the unit executive committee. A faculty member may have a split appointment or assignment with another interdisciplinary unit but may vote in only one interdisciplinary unit.

53.07 Disciplinary and Other Unit Faculties: Membership

All University Faculty members as defined in 50.01 holding appointments in a disciplinary or other unit**[, excluding those university administrators without teaching assignments, shall be defined as members of that disciplinary or other unit and]** shall have the right to vote and otherwise participate in the governance of that unit. Appointment is made by the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs upon the affirmative recommendation of the appropriate Dean(s) and the unit executive committee. A faculty member may have a split assignment with another disciplinary or other unit and may vote in more than one.

Note: the term "university administrator" is interpreted to mean the Chancellor, vice-chancellors, assistant and associate vice chancellors, deans, and assistant and associate deans. The term does not include unit chairs. "Teaching assignment" is interpreted as a regular, contractual responsibility.

Faculty Senate New Business 5 (c), 4/21/04

NEW PROGRAMS

The University Committee has been asked to clarify the procedure for creating new programs. After a careful review we find it important to distinguish two parts of that procedure: one is the process of putting together a proposal; the other is the process of approving the proposal. We further find that our codification specifies the approval process perfectly adequately. That same codification, however, is silent about the first procedure of putting together a proposal. This does not seem to us inappropriate

If as an institution we wish to encourage maximum freedom in exploring new ideas, we should not want to constrain the source for innovation to some specific agency within the university. But unless we expect implementation of innovative ideas only when there is perfect consensus (when every voice has a veto), there must be a way to negotiate among competing interests. For those ideas that generate within existing faculty groups, we have mechanisms (such as majority rule) for handling competing interests. For those ideas coming out of faculty across existing groups we rely on the academic leadership of our dean(s) to help with those negotiations. Since frequently points of contention have to do with the allocation of resources and since such allocation is a primary responsibility of the dean(s) (or the provost where the interests of the deans may be at odds), those administrators should help negotiate among competing faculty interests.

Any new program needs a governance structure. If a proposal for a new program does not specify an existing structure - such as an interdisciplinary or disciplinary program or an agreement to share responsibility among several units - then it is necessary to create one and our codification and the rules of UW-System give us a procedure for doing just that (53.01 B and 53.06 B).

To add clarity and consistency we recommend the following change in code.

Proposed Code Change – Freestanding Minors

The proposal is to add the language in bold face between the brackets:

52.01 Jurisdiction of the Senate

F. Upon recommendation of the appropriate Dean(s), the establishment, the merger, or the discontinuance of curriculum majors **[or freestanding minors]** shall receive the approval of the Faculty Senate.

Report to the Faculty Senate

Submitted by Sue K. Hammersmith, Provost

University of Wisconsin-Green Bay

April 21, 2004

I. INTERIM DEAN POSITION

As the Chancellor announced last week, Dean Blackshire-Belay's term as LAS Dean will conclude June 30, 2004. I have been in discussion with the University Committee, the Academic Staff Committee, the LAS unit chairs, the Chancellor, and others regarding an appropriate method and process for identifying an Interim Dean for LAS, the term of office that person should serve, and other

matters pertaining to the transition of leadership in LAS. My goal is to have the Interim Dean identified yet this semester. Look for further updates and a call for nominations and expressions of interest to come out shortly. Input and suggestions are welcome.

II. REPORT ON INQUIRY

This year some very serious concerns and allegations were voiced by Dean Blackshire-Belay with respect to one of our academic units, Humanistic Studies, involving matters that the University is required – by professional ethics as well as federal statute – to treat with utmost seriousness. In order to appropriately understand and address those concerns, I asked a team with appropriate experience and expertise to assist me in sorting through conflicting reports.

The team recently conducted a full and comprehensive examination of the concerns and allegations that had been voiced. They conducted in-depth interviews with the complainant and with all members of the Humanistic Studies unit, except one tenured member who declined to participate. The interviews were confidential (as to who said what in their interviews). After issuing their final report, the team's interview notes and working notes were shredded. Their written report, which gives summary results and conclusions, will be retained.

The picture is clear: there are no current issues of climate or inequity in the Humanistic Studies Unit. Theirs is a proud record of healthy respect for differences and strong support for its diverse faculty, including those who are female, minorities, and/or untenured.

The conduct of elections for Humanistic Studies Unit Chair, both in December of 2001 and in December of 2003, were also found to be without problems. In each of those elections, Brian Sutton was clearly and legitimately elected Chair.

I am grateful to Sally Dresdow and Dan Spielman, colleagues who invested untold hours and significant professional skill in helping me look into these matters. I also am particularly grateful to all those Humanistic Studies faculty who showed patience, courage, and professionalism as the necessary inquiry unfolded.

Where do we go from here? First, let's "clear the air" of any "hallway history" or malicious gossip regarding the unit in question, its climate, or its practices. Second, I am dedicated to working with you to ensure an administration and a culture where the open and unfettered flows of communication make unnecessary any repeat of the approach to "fact finding" that was recently required because of the conflicting reports.

III. COMMUNICATION

Chancellor Shepard and I are continuing to work to ensure that UW-Green Bay has channels of communication that are open, honest, robust, responsible, and responsive. We need to have free and open communication across units, between offices, and among different constituencies so we can build teamwork instead of silos. Only through such open communication across the institution can we be agile, efficient, and effective.

We also need free and open communication across levels of the institution, so that every level of the organization has access to and robust opportunities to touch base with every other level. Keeping everything within a rigid, hierarchical model of communication is not only dehumanizing, but also terribly inefficient. The hierarchical model increases the probability of bottlenecks, misinformation,

mistakes, and missed opportunities. It also discourages the kind of agility, feedback, teamwork, and creativity that we need to prosper.

Consequently, we will expand such practices as open office hours, faculty advisory committees, informal forums, visits to units and offices, and open use of email for ourselves and for the deans. Additionally, we will be including deans in the weekly meetings of the Chancellor's Cabinet. Other suggestions are welcome.

IV. CELEBRATING SCHOLARSHIP

Last week's **Academic Excellence Symposium** was an impressive display of student work and faculty effectiveness! Thanks to Associate Dean Salisbury for organizing the event. Faculty and staff scholarship and publications will likewise be celebrated this semester in two upcoming events. The **Founders Spring Reception** will be held in the Weidner Center on May 5. The second annual **Provost's Scholars Reception** will be held on May 13, 2:30-5:00. Take a break from grading, enjoy some fellowship, and join us in celebrate your and your colleagues' work over the past year.

Best wishes as your finish the semester and look toward summer.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue H.

Sue K. Hammersmith, Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

---

Attachment for University Committee Report, 4/21/04

INTERPRETATION OF CODE

1. Is an **ex officio** member a voting member of a faculty group? Most mentions of ex officio members in our code specify whether the membership is voting or non-voting. We interpret that where in code there is no specification of voting status ex officio members are non-voting.

2. What constitutes a **quorum**? A quorum is defined for many faculty groups in code. We interpret that where in code there is no specification, as for units and programs, a quorum is defined by taking the membership, subtracting any people who are on leave or who have an at-least-halftime administrative assignment, and then calculating a majority of the remainder.

3. What constitutes the **membership** of a unit or program? We can find nothing in code to interpret that faculty on leave or administrative appointment are not members of units and programs they hold appointment in. Nor is there any basis to interpret that academic staff with faculty status are not members as well. A different interpretation requires a change of code.

4. What constitutes a **majority vote**? Code mentions a majority vote in some places as a majority of the membership and in other places as a majority of those present and voting. We interpret that where in code majority vote is not defined it should be understood as a majority of those present and voting.

- interpretations of the University Committee April 7, 2004