

## UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE DOCUMENTS – 2003-04

<u>Number</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Date Approved</u>
<a href="#">#03-01</a>	Resolution on Current Benefits Structure, <b>Approved as Amended</b>	09/17/2003
<a href="#">#03-02</a>	Revision of Chapter 54.03 (B) Personnel Council	10/15/2003
#02-03	Recommendation on the Granting of Fall Degrees (Document #89-6 used each year)	11/19/2003
<a href="#">#03-04</a>	House Rules for Faculty Senate 12/10/2003 (See addendum, Document #03-07, Approved 2/18/04)	
<a href="#">#03-05</a>	Creating a Campus Climate Committee	01/21/2004
<a href="#">#03-06</a>	UWGB 3.08, Open Meetings [Pending approval by the Board of Regents]	02/18/2004
<a href="#">#03-07</a>	UWGB 52.03 B (2) and (4), Allowing Alternate Senators	02/18/2004
<a href="#">#03-08</a>	Senate Resolutions on Faculty Status	03/24/2004
<a href="#">#03-09</a>	Guidelines for Student-Led Courses	04/21/2004
<a href="#">#03-10</a>	Guidelines for Responsibilities for Faculty Status	04/21/2004
#03-11	Recommendation on the Granting of Spring Degrees (Document #89-6 used each year)	04/21/2004
<a href="#">#03-12</a>	UWGB 52.01 Jurisdiction of the Senate [Minors without an existing Major]	05/05/2004
<a href="#">#03-13</a>	UWGB 53.02 and 53.07 Defining Interdisciplinary and Disciplinary Unit Membership	05/05/2004

---

Faculty Senate Document #03-01, Approved as Amended 9/17/03

**Resolution in Support of the Current Benefits Structure  
of the University of Wisconsin System**

WHEREAS, the University of Wisconsin System stimulates the state's economy and provides invaluable resources and education statewide, yet is taking a cut in state funding that is disproportionate to its portion of the state budget; and

WHEREAS, the tradition of excellent benefits for state employees allows the UW to recruit and retain world-class employees, despite generally lower wages in comparison with the private sector; and

WHEREAS, the UW System is proposing to increase the portion of healthcare premiums paid by UW faculty and academic staff, effectively imposing a unilateral wage cut; and

WHEREAS, that increase imposes a special hardship on many lower paid employees of the UW System; and

WHEREAS, faculty and academic staff do not have the opportunity to negotiate our benefits as do represented state employees via their labor contract negotiations; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay Faculty Senate emphatically affirms its support for the current formula for calculating the portion of health insurance benefits paid for by the State of Wisconsin (the employer), and vehemently opposes the imposition of co-payments for health care beyond those that already exist.

---

Faculty Senate Document #03-02, Approved 10/15/03

**REVISION OF UWGB CHAPTER  
54.03 (B)**

## UWGB 54.03

B. Personnel Council

1. The appropriate Dean(s) shall seek the advice of the Personnel Council whenever a candidate for appointment or promotion is to receive tenure.
2. The Council shall develop written criteria to be used in providing its advice.
3. A member of the Personnel Council shall not take part in the deliberations or voting of the Council in the review of a candidate if the Council member is also a member of any other unit, program, or committee which is responsible for reviewing the candidate. When the operation of this rule reduces the active membership of the Council ~~below four~~, the University Committee will designate alternative members to fill all vacancies caused by recusal.
4. On its own initiative, or upon the request of the University Committee, the Personnel Council may advise the Faculty Senate about issues of personnel policy and implementation that fall within the jurisdiction of the Faculty.

---

Faculty Senate Document #03-04, Approved 12/10/03

Addendum, Faculty Senate Document #03-07, Approved 2/18/04

## House Rules for the Faculty Senate

### 1. Meeting notification

Notification of Faculty Senate meetings shall be in accord with the state requirements of Wisconsin's open meetings law. An agenda must be available at least 24 hours before the meeting. No actions may be taken at the meeting that are not listed on the agenda as planned or possible actions.

### 2. Preparation of agenda

Preparation of the agenda is the responsibility of Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff, Speaker of the Senate, University Committee, and the Chancellor (52.07 B. 1.). Items for future agendas may come from: items introduced in a Senate meeting during New Business (52.06 F.); petitions from ten percent of the Faculty (52.08 B.); or requests from individual faculty members through a senator (52.08 B.) or through the University Committee.

### 3. Parliamentary procedure

Parliamentary procedure shall be governed by Robert's Rules or the Standard Code.

### 4. Quorum definition

A majority of Senate members, not counting ex-officio members, shall constitute a quorum.

#### 5. Automatic consent

There shall be no "automatic consent" items on the Senate agenda, although there may be items such as the approval of minutes that are automatically included on the agenda.

#### 6. Proxy, absences, subs

Senators may be replaced as per (52.05) for the remainder of their terms, but if a Senator cannot make a particular meeting, there shall be no voting by proxy or substitution as per (52.03 B. 4).

#### 7. Speaking recognition and limits

The Speaker of the Senate must recognize all those who speak at a Senate meeting and may limit participation in the interests of full discussion. Robert's Rules suggest recognizing people who have not yet spoken before giving the floor to someone who has already spoken and that ten minutes is a reasonable limit for holding the floor.

#### 8. Disposition of approved motions

Actions taken by the Senate shall be sent to the Chancellor for implementation. Resolutions calling for action should include a date of effectiveness.

#### 9. Policy on first and second readings

Proposals to change codification or make significant policy change shall come before a meeting of the Senate for discussion prior to any action taken at a subsequent meeting.

#### 10. New business

New Business may include: discussion items intended to be enacted at the next meeting (first readings of proposals); discussion items not intended for action; items (except code changes and significant policy changes) for immediate action; and proposing items for future consideration.

#### 11. Open forum

An Open Forum is an opportunity for any member of the Senate to pose a question or raise an issue and an opportunity for other members to react. No motions may be enacted during an Open Forum.

#### 11. Order of business

The categories of business before the Senate shall have the following order:

Call to Order; Approval of the Minutes; Chancellor's Report; Continuing Business; New Business; Provost's Report; University Committee Report; Open Forum; Adjournment.

#### 12. Adjournment procedure

Adjournment happens automatically at 5:00 p.m. unless the meeting is extended by a two-thirds vote.

---

Faculty Senate Document #03-05, Approved 1/21/04

## **CREATING A CAMPUS CLIMATE COMMITTEE**

Proposal:

To create a committee reporting to the Faculty Senate, called the Campus Climate Committee, with equal faculty and academic staff representation (three members each) charged to find ways of improving campus climate. This committee shall:

- a. consider the various mechanisms for improving climate, as well as assisting individuals;
- b. pilot those that are feasible over a year's time;
- c. evaluate the results;
- d. and report back to the Senate.

### **The problem**

The need for improving campus climate is not solidly or specifically documented but the anecdotal evidence is persistent and points to either a lack of, or ignorance of, ways to redress perceived injustices short of formal grievances and lawsuits. The assumption is that providing well known and effective methods of redress will improve the campus climate. The current use of an ombudsperson is limited by definition to the dispensing of legal and procedural advice. Advocacy is not within the definition.

### **Rationale**

Institutional climate depends on institutional culture and there may not be any single best way to effect cultural change. UW-Green Bay has a prouder history of studying itself and proposing change than actually achieving planned change. It may be time to take a multiplicity of smaller steps and adjust as needed rather than to continue to seek the optimal solution.

### **Possible mechanisms**

The University Committee has considered the following six mechanisms along with their strengths and weaknesses.

Ombudsperson - This mechanism is currently in place in the person of Melissa Jackson, the University's legal counsel. Her legal training makes her an excellent source of information and explanation of rules, policies, and procedures, and many people have been bringing concerns to her as the ombudsperson. Many, however, perceive her dual role as a conflict of interest and although it is claimed that there are ways in place to resolve the conflict of interest, a perceived partiality may be preventing others from using this mechanism. Were any other person to serve in the role of ombudsperson, there may inevitably be questions of knowledge, trust, and limits to advocacy.

EAP model - This mechanism identifies a network of individuals with experience at this institution who are willing to advise and advocate for persons seeking redress. The advantages over a single ombudsperson are the distributed load of work and the freedom to advocate. The disadvantages are finding and possibly training willing individuals.

External help - The possibility of bringing in an external mediator/investigator has the advantage of impartiality and the disadvantage of being unfamiliar with out institution. Cost may also be an issue unless some reciprocal arrangement can be made with another institution or network.

Survey - This has the possibility of documenting and evaluating the need for change in other mechanisms. The prime disadvantage is that it is very easy to do bad and wasteful surveys. It takes some expertise and effort to do well.

Mentoring - Existing mentoring experiences are a source of information not currently being tapped for insights into climate issues. Mentoring, freely chosen and offered, can be a terrific boost for individual and institutional climate, but assigned mentoring can create vested interests in not complaining about the relationship or in holding the relationship accountable for more than it can deliver.

Advocacy committee - The Campus Climate Committee could offer itself (or some other group) as an advocacy committee that invites individuals to bring their concerns to the committee. The advantage of a committee is that trust, advice, expertise, and problem-solving are distributed in a group rather than a single individual. The disadvantage is that the workload is unknown and the more people involved the harder it is to assure confidentiality.

---

Faculty Senate Document #03-06, Approved 2/18/04;

Pending Board of Regents Approval

## **OPEN MEETINGS**

### **UWGB 3.08**

#### **Codification Changes**

##### **1. Merit Review Procedures for all Faculty**

c. Merit reviews shall be open unless **the reviewing committee, in accordance with state law and proper notification, authorizes a closed review. The faculty member under consideration has the right to attend reviews, whether open or closed.**

4. Authority for Decisions for Renewal and Promotion at all Ranks

a. ...The review meeting shall be open unless **the reviewing committee, in accordance with state law and proper notification, authorizes a closed review. The faculty member under consideration has the right to attend reviews, whether open or closed.**

5. Conduct of the Review for Promotion and Renewal at all Ranks

a. Review (whether required or by request) by executive committees, by the Personnel Council, by the interdisciplinary unit professorial committees, or by the Committee of Six Full Professors, shall be open unless **the reviewing committee, in accordance with state law and proper notification, authorizes a closed review. The faculty member under consideration has the right to attend reviews, whether open or closed.**

b. The faculty member under consideration shall be notified in writing 20 days (25 days if by first class mail) prior to the date of review of the time and place of the review session.

**Date of effect:** upon approval by the Board of Regents

---

Faculty Senate Document #03-07, Approved 2/18/04

## ALLOWING ALTERNATE SENATORS

### UWGB 52.03

#### Codification Changes

52.03 B. 2

The academic budgetary unit chairperson shall call a meeting to elect senate representatives, **and alternates**, for vacant positions in November of each academic year.

52.03 B. 4.

A district may **elect an alternate for any of its senators and the alternate may attend and vote at Senate meetings that the regular senator is unable to attend.**

## House Rules for the Faculty Senate

#6. Senators may be replaced as per 52.05 for the remainder of their terms. If a Senator cannot make a particular meeting, there shall be no voting by proxy, **but a duly elected alternate may attend and vote as per 52.03 B. 4.**

**Date of effect:** Senate elections of November 2004

---

Faculty Senate Document #03-08, Approved 3/24/04

## 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 #03-09, Amended and Approved 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?"

**Voting "yes" to the above question, the Faculty Senate accepts the revised guidelines for student-led courses as specified below.**

## **GUIDELINES FOR STUDENT-LED COURSES**

### **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 on a pass/no credit basis.

### **II. Sponsorship**

A. Student-led courses 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 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. Responsibilities of the Instructor of Record

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 in handling course responsibilities such as design of a syllabus, facilitating class discussion, grading, and management of course materials.

### IV. Joint Instructor of Record and Student Leader Responsibilities

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 either faculty advisor(s) or 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 passing the course.

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. Student Leader Responsibilities

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.

---

Faculty Senate Document #03-10, Amended and Approved 4/21/04

## **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 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 Document #03-12, Approved 5/5/04

## **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**

### **UWGB 52.01**

#### 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 minors without an existing major shall receive the approval of the Faculty Senate.

---

Faculty Senate Document #03-13, Approved 5/5/04

# **PROPOSED CODE CHANGES**

## **FOR DEFINING UNIT MEMBERSHIP**

### 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.

---