

## AGENDA

### UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 6

Wednesday, 15 March 2006, 3:00 p.m.

Phoenix Room C, University Union

Presiding Officer: Gregory Davis, Speaker

Parliamentarian: Professor Kenneth J. Fleurant

#### 1. CALL TO ORDER

#### 2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 5, February 15, 2006 [page 2]

#### 3. CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

#### 4. CONTINUING BUSINESS

- a. Proposed Policy Regarding Procedures Followed in Response to Student Complaints Made against Faculty Members [page 7] Presented by Sally Dresdow
- b. Code Change to UWGB 3.08 4(d) and 3.09 1. Second reading [page 8] Presented by Sally Dresdow.
- c. Resolution Regarding Proposed UWS Chapter 7, Wisconsin Administrative Code, Procedures for Dismissal of faculty in Special Cases. [Resolution page 9] [Senate Position Statement page 10] Presented by Sally Dresdow

#### 5. NEW BUSINESS

- a. Discussion of Proposed Global Studies Minor [page 12]
- b. Requests for Future Senate Business

#### 6. PROVOST'S REPORT

#### 7. UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE REPORT

Presented by Sally Dresdow, Chair

#### 8. SENATE FORUM: Discussion Regarding Eliminating the Rule that Either a Major or Minor in an Interdisciplinary Area is Required of All Prospective UW—Green Bay Graduates.

[talking points page 17]

#### 9. ADJOURNMENT

## MINUTES 2005-2006

### UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 5

Wednesday, February 15, 2005  
Phoenix Room C, 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), Victoria Goff (ICS), Cheryl Grosso (COA), Sue Hammersmith (Provost, *ex officio*), Derek Jeffreys (HUS), John Katers (NAS), Mark Kiehn (EDU), Harvey Kaye (SCD), Michael Kraft (PEA), Mimi Kubsch (NUR), Judith Martin (SOCW), 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: Rebecca Tout (COA).

REPRESENTATIVES: Lucy Arendt (Academic Staff Representative), Erik Mims (Student Government Association Representative).

GUESTS: Associate Dean Regan Gurung, Scott Hildebrand (University Communications), Interim Dean Fergus Hughes, Andrew Kersten (SCD), Associate Provost for Outreach and Adult Access Jan Thornton.

**1. Call to Order.** With a quorum present, Speaker Davis called the Senate to order at 3:03 p.m.

**2. Approval of Minutes of UW-Green Bay Faculty Senate Meeting No. 4, December 14, 2005.**

The minutes were approved without change by voice vote. However Senator Katers requested that the minutes of today's meeting note for the record that the "WPS green energy facility" on page 3 would be more accurately referred to as the "WPS green energy *program*."

**3. Chancellor's Report.** In view of weather forecasts, the Chancellor began with a reminder that our storm policy is biased against cancelling classes, which only happens when buses are unable to get to campus. Faculty who tell students that their classes will not meet because of predicted weather create confusion, and would do well to await an official campus decision prior to such announcements. A bit of good news: funds for remodeling the Student Services area have been approved which will modernize and improve services to reflect current needs.

The last Regents' meeting was unusually substantive. It began with a presentation on the growth agenda that makes room under the System umbrella for our own aspirations. Regents took action on three items. One is on the Senate's agenda today regarding treatment of faculty following serious criminal misconduct. He advised Senators to read the text carefully and focus on the most problematic language and suggest specific substitutes in consort with faculty on other campuses, since it is clear that changes will be made to UWS 7. The second action item was a modest reduction in out-of-state student tuition reversing a previous legislative increase in non-resident tuition as a means to increase revenue. The result was a severe decrease in out-of-state students and millions of

dollars in lost tuition. Newspaper editors mistakenly see reductions in tuition for non-residents as a disservice to state citizens. The reality is that Regents' policy sets tuition for each out-of-state student in such a manner that each non-resident admitted covers the full cost of educating one Wisconsin student. Admitting out-of-state students makes it easier, not harder, to educate more Wisconsinites. And finally, newspapers have reported that campus chancellors have received raises. The Legislature determined salary ranges for chancellors but never approved raises, meaning that some chancellors are actually being paid below the minima approved by the Legislature, itself. The irony is that the Legislature that wrote the law is now blaming the Regents for trying to raise salaries to stay within the law. The Regents recognize the need to get all faculty and staff back to competitive salary levels.

Senator Grosso asked how our growth agenda and the System growth agenda align as the Chancellor indicated. Growth is necessitated by the economic and cultural transitions taking place in regions such as ours. Economic growth will come from jobs requiring educated workers and Wisconsin needs strong regional universities that will grow to meet the need. The President's arguments in this regard reflect ours. Expanding his response to include growth without reducing academic standards, the Chancellor noted that parents' income is a better indicator of academic success than SAT scores. We can't forget that as a public institution we have a mission to accept students who may well fail because we have the chance of having a real impact on the lives of those who succeed. Without lowering admission standards, we must be willing to take risks as we grow. Senator Grosso asked whether we would grow by adding non-traditional students. The Chancellor said we would grow by adding students who are actually much like students we now have and not so much non-traditional students. Senator O'Grady followed up by commenting that on the surface it appears that we are talking about adding non-traditional students by including transfers from the technical colleges and other non-traditional populations. The problem is that we don't know what those students will want to major in and we can't predict our needs. The Chancellor said there are programs we must have to be a university and we will have those. But student interests will dictate where we need to expand programs. Yet, students take a small portion of their overall program in their major. The other areas that fill out a student's education cannot be neglected. They, too, will need to grow as students select their courses. It isn't possible to say up front which programs will grow in the process. There are too many variables and we will need to track student choices at the same time we decide what kind of university we wish to be since it is not possible to accurately predict demand even 5 years from now. We need to see money up front before any growth takes place.

Senator Carleton asked about growth by promoting under-enrolled programs. That is something to consider. Carleton also asked about the status of the Weidner Center Committee and the campus's downtown mall space. A Weidner Committee report is forthcoming. The challenge is to find sources of funding to support shows that lose money, which includes most of the fine arts programming so important to the region. Nobody yet knows how the mall problems will affect the University.

#### **4. New Business.**

a. 2006-07 slate of nominees for faculty elective committees presented by Committee on Committees and Nominations chair Forrest Beaulieu who reminded Senators that additional nominations may be submitted to the SOFAS within 10 days by petition of three voting faculty members with the approval of the nominee. There was an increase in expressed interest in committee service this year although several committee ballot slots were hard to fill. The CCN decided not to include names on the ballot where winning both elections would not be allowed by code regarding

mutually exclusive committees. **Senator Martin moved acceptance of the slate of candidates and the motion passed unanimously.**

b. Memorial Resolution for Professor Emeritus Irwin Sonenfield. Following a reading by Professor Andrew Kersten, **the resolution was unanimously approved by the Senate.**

c. Memorial Resolution for Professor Anthony Galt. Following a reading by Professor Andrew Kersten, **the resolution was unanimously approved by the Senate.**

d. Proposed policy regarding procedures followed in response to student academic complaints made against Faculty members. This was presented by UC Chair Sally Dresdow who explained that although Student Affairs has a clear policy posted on their Web site, some confusion continues to exist on the faculty and administrative side. The current proposal is meant to remedy that situation. Associate Provost Keihn reminded the UC that deans are required by law to log signed, written complaints with her office. These are made available to accrediting teams. The UC believes that students with academic complaints should begin by speaking with the professor, and they bring this policy statement to the Senate because that has not happened consistently. Chair Dresdow noted that some faculty members have questioned the need for another policy statement such as the one the Senate is considering. Others suggest that students are afraid to go to faculty with complaints. The policy statement attempts to take that into consideration by allowing an alternate route in some instances. But the UC believes that, whatever path the complaint takes, faculty have a right to know of academic complaints made against them.

Senator Kraft asked why disciplinary chairs played less of a role than unit chairs. Sending a student to the unit chair is a complication for students. Senator O'Grady said the unit chair has the codified authority in these matters. Nothing would stop the unit chair from consulting the disciplinary chair, however. Provost Hammersmith suggested clarifying the term "unit chair" so it is clear that it refers to the interdisciplinary unit. Senator Grosso noted that item 3 requires the dean to consult with both disciplinary and unit chair and questioned why unit chairs weren't expected to consult the disciplinary chair. O'Grady assumes that unit chairs will seek the information needed. Language requiring consultation with disciplinary chairs could be added if that would help. Conversation followed regarding the nature of academic complaints, some of which might seem too petty to warrant such another policy (e.g. the teacher gives too much work or assigned an unfair grade). The Chancellor suggested the need to determine whether students simply wish to express exasperation or have a true request for remedial action. O'Grady sees the possibility of petty concerns but believes a consistent policy in which faculty are informed of complaints of any sort is advisable. Senator Vespia asked what would happen where the faculty member who is object of a complaint and the unit chair are one and the same. The assumption is that it would go to the dean but perhaps it needs to be stated. Senator Kubsch feels that the complaint policy will make students lodging complaints more accountable. Senator Breznay asked whether the intent was to make this part of code. Chair Dresdow said it would not be part of our procedural code, but would be placed in the policy section of the Faculty Handbook. By way of summary of what needed to be done before the policy proposal returns to the Senate for action, Senator O'Grady said that the University Committee would respond to suggestions and questions, in particular clarification of the term unit chair, the role of the disciplinary chair in the complaint process, and what happens should the complaint be against an instructor who is also unit chair. The Chancellor suggests that it might be good to distinguish between simply complaining and lodging a complaint.

e. Possible Code Change to UWGB 3.08 4(d) and 3.09 1. Presented by UC Chair Dresdow who explained that the UC proposal is meant to make personnel review procedures more transparent

by addressing the way in which faculty are notified of the outcome of renewal and promotion reviews. Presently when a unit executive committee recommends against renewal or promotion it does not have to provide reasons unless requested. Many units do provide reasons initially, but campus practice is inconsistent. In addition, when reasons are requested, current code provides no specific time frame for receiving them. The proposed code change is intended to clarify the process and assure that due process would occur in a timely manner. Reasons for a negative decision would be expected automatically, the faculty member would receive a copy and unit chairs transmitting results to the dean would be required to copy members of the executive committee as well. In addition, the faculty member would retain the right to request more detailed reasons in cases where the original reasons are insufficient. Chair Dresdow has checked System documents and met with university counsel, and she believes the recommended policy is consistent with System policy.

There was considerable discussion of the right to “a more detailed explanation of reasons” given the fact that reasons would be required in the letter transmitting a unit’s recommendation. Some Senators felt that the result might be less detail than most units now provide in anticipation of the need to provide additional reasons later. Senator O’Grady feels that those units that currently provide detailed explanations will continue to do so and a proper response to requests for yet more detail can be met with a response that detailed reasons were already provided. He offered the example of a letter referring without qualification to “weak scholarship” as the occasion for a valid request for “more detailed explanation.” Senator Sutton suggested alternate wording on the order of “In cases where a more detailed explanation could reasonably be expected, the faculty member may request such an explanation within 10 days of receipt of a negative decision.” Provost Hammersmith suggested specifying whether the time periods refer to calendar or business days.

f. Proposed Chapter UWS 7, Wisconsin Administrative Code, Procedures for Dismissal of Faculty in Special Cases. Chair Dresdow characterized the code change being considered by the Board of Regents as a political necessity in light of recent high-profile cases of faculty following serious criminal misconduct. While aware of the political necessity for a policy, faculty reps from various campuses have expressed concern with some of the policy’s wording. The draft attached to the agenda was approved at the Regent’s last meeting. Campuses may soon be asked to respond with little turn-around time. A unified response from faculty senates across the System is a possibility and this information is being presented to the Senate now to allow time for careful consideration. The assumption is that provisions of the policy would rarely be invoked. However, the policy has serious implications that make wording critical. Whether being charged with criminal misconduct could be cause for suspension without pay is one of the questions posed by the text. There is need for greater clarity and stronger protections. Once Regents receive comments from campuses, their proposal will be subject of an open legislative hearing prior to becoming part of Wisconsin administrative code. The Legislature previously passed legislation stating that there can be no discrimination on the basis of a prior conviction unrelated to a faculty member’s contractual duties. This appears to be in contradiction to the proposed modification of UWS 7. The Chancellor suggested that the wording of the policy may actually be cleverly crafted by lawyers and that it does manage to take the law regarding prior conviction into account. Others thought that the fact that the wording doesn’t specifically state that someone has to be arrested, much less convicted, before action can be taken was still of concern. There would also be a requirement that faculty report illegal activity to the Provost even without arrest or conviction, and such self-incrimination is highly problematic. It is possible that the Regents did not intend these consequences, but the wording leaves open such a possibility and creates the feeling that one could be considered guilty until proven innocent. It does appear that dismissal would remain completely impossible prior to conviction but the fear is that suspension without pay would be a likely eventuality. The reference to “behavior that constitutes the

commission of a felony” is unclear and judgment on such behavior should be the job of a prosecutor and not a provost.

g. Requests for Future Senate Business. Senator Carleton asked whether the proposal for a global studies minor would return to the Senate. Yes, it is in the works and may return as soon as the March meeting. There were no further requests.

**5. Provost’s Report.** Provost Hammersmith previously distributed a written report (see <http://www.uwgb.edu/provost/Report2.15.06.doc>) and she responded to questions:

-Has the Provost’s group talked about UWS Chapter 7? No but it may be on their next agenda.

-What went wrong in the Dean’s search? A job description had been circulated and it clearly called for credentials appropriate to the rank of tenured full professor. Somehow the actual posting did not refer to full professor, but only mentioned tenure. It is unclear where the error crept in, but a decision was made to stop the search and repost with the correct expectations. That has been done.

-In the Comprehensive Program Review Cycle (CPRC), what happens to tenured faculty of discontinued or downsized programs? Tenured faculty positions are not at risk under this review. The Chancellor added that the only way tenured faculty might lose their position is if the university declared financial exigency. No university would want to do so.

-Is it the expectation in CPRC that programs submit an annual report? No. The review process would be ongoing and the frequency of program reports has yet to be decided but it will be more than yearly—more likely every fourth year.

**7. University Committee Report.** Presented by UC Chair Dresdow. Much of the day’s business reflects current UC concerns and issues. In addition, the UC will discuss posting the SOFAS position with the Provost and Academic Staff Committee. The Committee continues to discuss the Comprehensive Program Review process and has provided the Provost with feedback. Part of our institutional assessment plan calls for a review of administrators and this is under discussion in committee and soon with the Academic Staff Committee. Since one has not been done in some time, it may happen this spring. Discussion continues of proposals for schedule change brought forward last year as part of the Climate Committee report. One such proposal may appear before the Senate soon.

**8. Adjournment.** There being no further business, the Speaker called for a motion to adjourn, which was made and approved at 4:52 pm.

Respectfully submitted,  
Kenneth Fleurant, Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

## **Policy Regarding Procedures Followed in Response to Student Academic Complaints Made Against Faculty Members**

Revised

1. As indicated in the guidelines published by the Dean of Student's office, students who have complaints related to course grades, conduct of classes or other course matters should address those complaints first with the instructor of the course. A complaint may be presented via e-mail, letter or in person.

If the student is not satisfied with the resolution, the complaint can then be taken to the chairperson of the budgetary unit responsible for personnel decisions concerning the faculty member. If resolution is not achieved there, the student may then go to the appropriate academic dean.

2. If a student brings the complaint directly to the budgetary unit chair, the chair should re-direct the student to the relevant faculty member unless the chair determines that a productive dialogue between student and faculty member is unlikely. If the student brings the complaint to the chair of the disciplinary program, that chair should direct the student to the faculty member in question or, alternatively, to the budgetary unit chair. It is assumed that the budgetary unit chair will consult with the chair of the relevant disciplinary program in the investigation of the complaint.

At the point in which the budgetary unit chair is considering the student complaint, he/she must immediately inform the faculty member of the nature of the complaint and request that the faculty member respond to it. The budgetary unit chair will then attempt to mediate the situation by discussing the issue with both student and faculty member, either together or independently as the chair chooses. Both the student and the faculty member in question will be immediately informed of any decision made by the budgetary unit chair.

3. If the complaint remains unresolved after these discussions take place, the student has the option to bring it to the relevant dean. The dean will, after consulting with the relevant disciplinary and budgetary unit chairs and requesting a written statement from the student articulating the complaint and a written response from the faculty member against whom the complaint is made, attempt to resolve the situation. Both faculty member and student must be informed of the resultant outcome in a timely fashion.

## Proposal for Code Change to UWGB 3.08 and 3.09

To clarify and assure a faculty member's due process is protected, the following changes to code are being proposed. Changes are noted with in brackets and bold.

### 3.08 REVIEW PROCEDURES (Merit, Promotion, Renewal)

3.08.4.d – The faculty member shall be notified in writing [**of the recommendation and reasons for the recommendation**] by the committee or office making the recommendation within 20 days after each recommendation at each reviewing level. [**The faculty member and Executive Committee members should receive a copy of the transmittal letter.**]

And

### UWGB 3.09 NONRENEWAL OF PROBATIONARY APPOINTMENTS

#### 1. Statement of Reasons

In cases of a negative recommendation, if requested in writing by the faculty member within 10 days of the receipt of a decision, [**a more detailed explanation of**] the reasons will be provided in writing to the faculty member [**within 10 days of the receipt of the request**] by the chairperson of the interdisciplinary unit executive committee, the appropriate Dean(s), or the Chancellor, depending upon the level at which a decision was reached.



**Draft resolution concerning**  
**Proposed Chapter UWS 7, Wisconsin Administrative Code**  
**Procedures for Dismissal of Faculty in Special Cases**

*Offered for consideration to the  
University of Wisconsin Green Bay Faculty Senate*

Whereas, the Proposed Chapter UWS 7, Wisconsin Administrative Code Procedures for Dismissal of Faculty in Special Cases contains several provisions that conceivably could be used to circumvent due process in a court of law; and

Whereas, a number of ambiguities exist in the proposed procedures, such as whose judgment shall be exerted, what constitutes credible information when deciding whether to proceed in a case against a faculty member, and who bears the burden of proof; and

Whereas, a faculty member could conceivably be terminated upon mere suspicion of having committed a crime; and

Whereas, as currently worded in UWS 7.06(1), a faculty member could conceivably be suspended without pay upon mere suspicion of having committed a crime; and

Whereas, shared governance has been consulted only in a *pro forma* fashion in development of the proposed procedures;

Therefore, be it resolved that the Faculty Senate of the University of Wisconsin Green Bay hereby declares its rejection of the proposed procedures as currently drafted. We urge the Board of Regents to make revisions to UWS 7 to address faculty concerns as outlined in the attached "University of Wisconsin Green Bay Faculty Senate Position Paper" dated March 8, 2006, before further action to approve UWS 7 is made.

Faculty Senate Continuing Business 4(c)  
March 15, 2006

# University of Wisconsin Green Bay Faculty Senate Position Paper

Concerning  
Summary of Recommended Changes  
Regarding the Disciplinary Process for Serious Criminal Misconduct  
and  
Proposed Chapter UWS 7, Wisconsin Administrative Code  
Procedures for Dismissal of Faculty in Special Cases

## Executive summary of the Senate's position

The Faculty Senate of the University of Wisconsin Green Bay entertains serious doubts about the current draft of the documents titled Summary of Recommended Changes Regarding the Disciplinary Process for Serious Criminal Misconduct and Proposed Chapter UWS 7, Wisconsin Administrative Code Procedures for Dismissal of Faculty in Special Cases. During a lengthy discussion of the documents, several areas of concern were identified and are summarized in this paper. Although both documents as currently written are rejected by the Senate, however general points of agreement are noted.

### **Item 1: Despite a statement to the contrary in the Summary, the documents demonstrate disregard for due process and contain ambiguities that could be used to circumvent due process.**

- UWS 7.02(1) states that serious criminal conduct is defined as “engaging in behavior that constitutes commission of a felony.” This is an ill-defined standard that differs significantly from a felony conviction in a court of law. Any person can be accused of a crime, with or without substantiation. The terminology is excessively vague and could allow a faculty member to be subject to UWS 7.05 with merely an allegation made against him/her. It is not clear how this proposed wording protects the faculty member’s right under Wis. Stats. 111.322(1).
- UWS 7.02(1)(b) does not establish how one will judge if the faculty member’s conduct “seriously impairs the public trust in the university....”
- UWS 7.02(1)(c)(2) does not establish how one will judge if the faculty member’s conduct “seriously impairs the efficiency of the colleagues and students with whom he or she works.”
- It is not clear how the wording of UWS 7.04 protects the faculty member’s right against self-incrimination.
- The Proposed Chapter does not require any formal legal charges to be filed. A tenured faculty member therefore could be dismissed based simply on “other credible information that a faculty member has engaged in Serious Criminal Misconduct” [UWS 7.05 (1)].
- Felony is a broad legal classification. Under the language of the proposal, a tenured faculty member conceivably could be dismissed for tax evasion.
- Provosts are required to make judgments concerning probable cause to believe whether a crime has been committed. Provosts generally do not have sufficient legal training to make such judgments.
- Judgments by provosts would be based on evidence collected by a university-appointed investigator; no qualifications are specified for such investigators.
- Provosts are interested parties in the proceedings. Due process demands that disinterested parties hear evidence and hand down judgments.
- Even if legal charges were to be filed, the proposed timeline would require provosts to hand down judgments while law enforcement officials were still conducting an investigation. Police, prosecutors and defense attorneys alike are highly unlikely to share their evidence prior to trial. Any evidence, therefore, would come solely from a single investigator with no specified qualifications.
- No standard of evidence is specified. The Proposed Chapter [UWS 7.05(8)] simply states: “The burden of proof shall be a preponderance of the evidence.” There is no specification as to the credibility of the source of the evidence.
- Furthermore, “preponderance” is the lesser standard used in civil litigation. The criminal standard of evidence is defined as “beyond a reasonable doubt” and requires a unanimous vote by a jury. A felony — the conduct under discussion — is a criminal act.

- The wording of UWS 7.06(1)(a) is not clear that the faculty member has been charged with a felony by a district attorney. As currently written, the word “charged” could refer to a charge made by university personnel or others than a district attorney.
- UWS 7.06(1)(a) states: A faculty member can be suspended without pay if “there is a substantial likelihood that the faculty member has engaged in the conduct as alleged...” which is a weak, ill-defined standard of proof.

**Item 2: Shared governance has been unfairly disenfranchised during the process of developing the Proposed Chapter.**

- The Proposed Chapter was developed by a committee with a bare representation of faculty in its membership.
- The Summary statement contains an egregious factual error. The Proposed Chapter is not “subject to shared governance review.” Under Wisconsin Statutes, changes to Chapter 36 must be approved by shared governance.
- The top-down process of drafting the Proposed Chapter, therefore, is fundamentally flawed, since it has failed to take into account the perspective of the primary stakeholders – the faculty of the University of Wisconsin System. (However, the faculty thanks Regent Spector for meeting with the Faculty Representatives March 3, 2006 and listening to the concerns regarding the February draft of UWS7.)
- In addition, we note the glaring absence of academic staff and administration from the Proposed Chapter.

**Item 3: The Senate agrees with the broad sentiment expressed in the Proposed Chapter.**

- We agree with the statement in UWS 7.01: “The University’s effectiveness and credibility are undermined by criminal activity that poses a substantial risk to the safety of others, that seriously impairs the public trust in the university or the university’s ability to fulfill its missions, or seriously impairs the faculty member’s fitness or ability to fulfill his or her duties.”

## Interdisciplinary Minor in Global Studies

Date: February 15, 2006

To: Sally Dresdow  
Chairperson of the University Committee

From: Fergus Hughes  
Interim Dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences

Fritz Erickson  
Dean of Professional and Graduate Studies

Re: Global Studies Minor

On September 12<sup>th</sup>, 2005, we received a proposal from Mark Everingham, Associate Professor of Social Change and Development, for an interdisciplinary minor in Global Studies. We were informed by Professor Everingham that supporting letters were forthcoming from faculty in various units throughout the campus. After the letters had been received, we submitted all materials to the Academic Affairs Council on October 4<sup>th</sup>, 2005 for the Council's review and recommendations. On January 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2006, we received the recommendations of the Academic Affairs Council, which supported the implementation of the minor.

We consider the proposal to be well-conceptualized and viable, and it appears that additional resources will not be needed for the implementation of the minor. We anticipate the need to create a "Disciplinary or Other Unit" for the minor according to procedures outlined in Section 53.06 of the Faculty Governance Handbook. Since it is envisioned by its originators as a free-standing minor, rather than a minor contained within an academic program, it will need the review and approval of the Faculty Senate. It's our expectation that, while the minor involves the participation of faculty from and will appeal to students from all areas of campus, the program, if approved, will be housed in Liberal Arts and Sciences and will report to the Dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences. We hereby transmit this document and supporting materials to you as the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate.

cc: Sue Hammersmith, Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs  
John Lyon, Chairperson of the Academic Affairs Council  
Mark Everingham, Associate Professor of Social Change and Development

Senate New Business 5(a)  
March 15, 2006

## **Interdisciplinary Minor in Global Studies Curricular Proposal (September 2005)**

Global forces transcend geographic, political and cultural boundaries and generate profound paradoxes. The increase in the number and scope of global actors challenges state authority in ways that make it more difficult for governments to protect and provide for citizens. Economic integration and trade liberalization produce greater material wealth, yet they pose serious threats to ecological integrity, biodiversity and human sustainability. Advanced technologies in communication, information, and transportation connect diverse communities, but elicit cultural resistance from peaceful expressions to extreme reactions. The positive effects of globalization like democratic transitions, open borders, and economic competition are vitiated by the negative consequences of greater human migration and dispersion in response to political tyranny, tribal conflict, environmental decay, and extreme poverty. In turn, citizens of diverse affected societies come to share common concerns for remedies and solutions.

An interdisciplinary minor in global studies encourages students to become aware of how contemporary political, economic, social, and environmental problems affect vast regions and diverse communities. The curriculum links global awareness to local concerns, emphasizes the responsibilities of democratic citizenship, and engages the challenges of human rights and justice, values and ethics, resource flows, cultural resistances, and environmental crises. The requirements of 24 credits complement general education at the introductory level, promote sharp thematic study in the upper-level core, and offer opportunities and experiences outside the classroom. Students ask frequently: *What is globalization?* The answer is multifaceted but also raises more practical questions: *What accounts for the phenomena of globalization? When did the world's polity, economy, environment, culture, and society become global? What analytical tools exist to help students understand globalization's influence on politics, cultures, values and ecosystems?*

An interdisciplinary introduction provokes students to think about how globalization touches their lives and to analyze distinct responses to globalization's effects on societies, governments and natural resources. Introductory courses are drawn from existing general education requirements with categories listed in parentheses. **Students should check carefully the prerequisites for upper level courses in the minor before choosing lower level general education courses. 9 credits total are required.**

**Students are required to take (6 credits):**

Geography 102: World Regions and Concepts (Gen. Ed. SS-1)

Environmental Science 102: Introduction to Environmental Science (Gen. Ed. ES-1)

**Students must choose one (3 credits):**

Political Science 100: Global Politics and Society (Gen Ed. SS-1, World Culture)

History 100: History of the Modern World (Gen. Ed. SS-1)

Anthropology 100: Varieties of World Culture (Gen. Ed. SS-1, World Culture)

Urban and Regional Studies 201: City Life and Globalization (Gen. Ed. SS-2)

Soc C D 251: Sustainable Development (Gen. Ed. SS-2, World Culture)

Public and Environmental Affairs 102: Environment and Society (Gen. Ed. SS-2)

These supporting courses are *recommended* as part of the general education program:

Introduction to Urban and Regional Studies (URREST 100; SS-1)

Introduction to Sociology (SOCIO 202; SS-1)

Introduction to Women's Studies (SocCD/WOST 241; SS-1)

Introduction to Human Development (HumDev 210; SS-1)

Macro Economic Analysis (ECON 202; SS-1)

Micro Economic Analysis (ECON203; SS-1)

Introduction to Religious Studies (HumStud 103; H-3)

Physical Geology (Earth Science 202; ES-1)

Ocean of Air: Weather and Climate (Earth Science/Geography 222; ES-1)

Nutritional Sciences 250: World Food and Population Issues (NS-2)

### **Global Studies upper level core requirements (15 credits):**

Faculty members will deliver an upper-level core curriculum examining multiple themes from interdisciplinary perspectives. An analysis of a variety of historical experiences and cultural preferences is essential for the dissemination and the acquisition of knowledge about globalization. Core requirements address the implications of globalization for citizens, states and communities around the world, include surveys of recent literature, and strengthen communication skills and critical thinking. Faculty members will offer advanced courses on *a two-year rotating timetable*.

**Students must select *five courses (15 credits total)* from the thematic categories below. At least three courses must be from different categories. Lower level prerequisites are listed first in parentheses; general education categories are listed second in parentheses.**

#### **Global Democracy: institutions and citizenship.**

Political Science 351: Comparative Political Systems (PolSci 100 or 101; World Culture)

Political Science 360: International Relations (PolSci 100 or 101)

Spanish 358: Latin America Today (Spanish 225)

#### **Global Environmental Sustainability: natural resources, biodiversity and climate change.**

Environmental Science 425: Global Climate Change (EarthSci/Geog 222 or EnvSci 102)

Environmental Science 303: Conservation of Natural Resources (EnvSci 102 or Biol. 203 or EarthSci 202; NS-2)

Economics 412: Economics of Sustainability (Econ 202 or 203)

Public and Environmental Affairs 461: Ethics and the Environment (Pol Sci 100 rec.)

#### **Global Human Security: basic human needs and services.**

Nursing 492: Global Aspects of Health Care

Anthropology 340: Medical Anthropology (Anthro 100; SS-2)

Human Development 342: Cross-Cultural Human Development (Anthro 100 or HumDev 210 or Psych 102; SS-2, World Culture)

#### **Global Peoples: nationality, ethnicity, race and religion.**

Humanistic Studies 351: Interdisciplinary Themes-Globalization and Cultural Conflict (none)

Humanistic Studies 384: Perspectives on Human Values in Other Cultures-Values and Human Nature in Asian Perspective (none; World Culture)

Social Change and Development/Women's Studies 345: Women, Race and Culture (SocCD241 or Anthro 100 or Soc 202 or Hist 100; SS-2, World Culture)

Urban and Regional Studies 300: World Cities (Geog/URREST 100)

**Students may earn credit toward the upper level core through community learning and field practicum.** Global studies faculty members will propose different destinations and rubrics under which students can earn credits toward the minor. Anticipated travel opportunities and practical experiences abroad will explore globalization through on site intensive study and community engagement.

**Public and Environmental Affairs 499: Global Conservation Science and Policy Interfaces (PolSci 100 or EnvSci 102 recommended).** This travel course puts UW-Green Bay's values into action by inviting students and faculty from a broad cross section of disciplines to participate in hands-on learning with the facilities and staff of the Carara National Park in Costa Rica. This experience represents a significant relationship between the university and the Central Pacific Conservation Area of the Ministry of the Environment and Energy of Costa Rica to carry out research in environmental sciences, policy and administration, and for direct assistance in carrying out their preservation and educational missions.

**Two travel courses are offered alternately under Urban and Regional Studies 361. Ecuador: Land of Contrasts** explores the various ecological niches and biomes found in the Ecuadorean Andes and Amazonian basin, urban development and history, and the ethnic/racial diversity of the country.

**Switzerland: City Life and Mountain Tops** explores the urban dynamics of the Global City of Zurich, its urban history and development and current issues facing one of Europe's most attractive cities, and explores global impacts on the Engadin valley challenging ethnic identity of minority groups that dominate the valley.

#### **Global Language Study:**

At least one language course in each of the first four semesters is strongly encouraged, although optional, in support of minor requirements. **At least two years of Spanish is highly recommended** especially given the local and regional impact of immigration and cultural and economic change in Wisconsin and the United States. Global studies will support the addition of other languages in the future. In 2002, the federal government identified shortfalls of translators and interpreters in five critical languages: Arabic, Mandarin Chinese, Korean, Persian-Farsi and Russian.

#### **Global Studies faculty and course numbers:**

1. Participating faculty members agree to have formal appointments in global studies in addition to their existing appointments in interdisciplinary units and disciplinary programs. An executive committee will consist of tenured faculty members:

Kevin Fermanich (tenured Natural and Applied Sciences and Earth Science)

Ganga Nair (tenured Natural and Applied Sciences, Plant-Forest Pathology, Mycology)

Steve Meyer (Natural and Applied Sciences and Earth Science)

Troy Abel (Public and Environmental Affairs)

Marcelo Cruz (tenured Urban and Regional Studies and Geography)

David Coury (tenured Humanistic Studies and German)

Hye-Kyung Kim (tenured Humanistic Studies and Philosophy)

Angeles Rodriguez (Humanistic Studies and Spanish)

Mark Everingham (tenured Social Change and Development and Political Science)

Kevin Roeder (Social Work)

Loretta Larkey (Social Work)

2. Election of chair to 3-year term: a one-course reassignment per academic year is justified to organize faculty meetings, coordinate teaching schedules, advise students, and seek external funding for curricular development, scholarly research and international partnerships.

3. A description of the minor will be included in the 2006-07 undergraduate catalog and an on-line registration identifier will be made available to students during spring 2006. Each lower and upper level course will have a Global Studies identifier and number as well as an interdisciplinary or disciplinary program identifier and number.



**OPEN FORUM TOPIC TALKING POINTS**  
**Faculty Senate, March 15, 2006**

**Discussion Of The Possibility Of  
Eliminating the Rule that Either a Major or a Minor in an  
Interdisciplinary Area Is Required of All Prospective UWGB Graduates**

Below are “talking points” for an Open Forum discussion at the Faculty Senate. Included are three interrelated reasons for advocating such a change:

1. *For most students, the current rule doesn't make UWGB an interdisciplinary institution in ways that distinguish UWGB from other institutions.*

For example, the interdisciplinary area with the most combined majors and minors at UWGB is Business Administration. While UWGB may well be justified in classifying Business Administration as an interdisciplinary subject, having a Bus Ad major and minor hardly distinguishes UWGB from other institutions of its size. The same is true for another of the most popular interdisciplinary areas, Education: we may be justified in classifying it as interdisciplinary, but having an Education program does not distinguish us from other institutions, institutions which make no special claims to interdisciplinarity and which do not have a similar rule regarding an interdisciplinary major or minor. The same goes for Nursing, Social Work, and perhaps even Environmental Science.

Granted, in many cases our interdisciplinary areas have no counterpart among most institutions our size. But even in these cases, most of the courses *within* those interdisciplinary areas would be considered disciplinary courses at other institutions. For example, most of our courses in Human Development would fit rather comfortably within the Psychology departments at most colleges, and many of our courses in Human Biology would be simply Biology courses elsewhere. Our Human Development majors would probably be Psychology majors elsewhere, without a major overhaul in what they were taught. If our courses were truly fundamentally different from those at other schools, then almost none of our interdisciplinary courses would transfer to other schools as anything but generic lower-division or upper-division credits, and our huge number of transfer students would have to start virtually from scratch to gain an interdisciplinary major or minor. At most, our interdisciplinary areas require largely disciplinary courses (whether disciplinary in name or simply in most of their content) in differing combinations than do disciplinary majors and minors at other schools. And as already stated, many of our most popular interdisciplinary areas are areas which can be found at almost any school.

2. *UWGB, as it is today, is not a uniquely interdisciplinary institution, and it is counterproductive for us to pretend otherwise.*

In its failure to distinguish UWGB from “non-interdisciplinary” schools, the rule in question is no different from the rest of the UWGB curriculum.

- Other than their H-1 and H-2 requirements, students can complete their entire UWGB general education requirements without taking a single interdisciplinary course—and Humanistic Studies has recently strongly advocated a revision of H-1 and H-2 so that even those two requirements could be satisfied without students' having to take interdisciplinary courses. (For that matter, the interdisciplinary classes at least half the students currently take to satisfy

their H-1 and H-2 requirements—the Foundations of Western Culture sequence—would be placed in History programs at most colleges without a second thought.)

- The proposed freshman seminar appears likely to gain approval for a pilot run only on the premise that it must use existing courses, rather than adding a new interdisciplinary requirement.
- The leading proposals for gen ed reform being considered by the GEC all involve loosening restrictions and moving still further from interdisciplinary requirements.

On the whole, it seems almost certain that the education UWGB students receive isn't significantly more interdisciplinary than the education they would receive at most colleges.

This isn't to say that interdisciplinary education at UWGB is dead—merely that such education exists mainly in only the same form in which it exists at other schools. For example, because Dr. Henze is on sabbatical, this semester I am teaching the Shakespeare class. The course is, and should be, classified as an offering of the English discipline—after all, we deal with literature every class period. But most class periods we also deal with issues related to Theatre; in many, perhaps most, class periods, we deal with History, whether theatre history, British history, or occasionally even Roman history; we have devoted significant attention to the Music in Shakespeare's plays (a subject about which Dr. Henze is currently writing a book); we often deal with the Psychology of literary characters, or of audience reaction, and at least one student is writing a Freudian critique of a Shakespeare play for her term paper; we deal with the Philosophical ideas underlying Elizabethan England in general and the plays in particular, and several students are writing papers on philosophical topics; and so forth. In that sense, the course is highly interdisciplinary—but this doesn't distinguish it from Shakespeare courses taught at other universities. I suspect that the same could be said of nearly all courses we teach, whether their official categories is disciplinary or interdisciplinary.

The days of opening a UWGB Catalog and finding listings of exotic-sounding majors such as Analysis and Synthesis are long past. For the sake of honesty, self-knowledge, and truth in advertising, UWGB should stop claiming to be a uniquely interdisciplinary institution unless we are prepared to adopt requirements which cause all (or at least most) students to receive a uniquely interdisciplinary education. The requirement I am suggesting that we revoke simply doesn't do this.

*3. If difficult programmatic decisions must be made, disciplines should not have to compete with an artificial "subsidy" for interdisciplinary units, especially when the "subsidy" doesn't create a uniquely interdisciplinary education for most students.*

As the state continues to disinvest in higher education, our school is forced to make difficult personnel decisions. I recognize that no plans now exist for discontinuing any current major or minor, and I hope that no such plans come about in the future. But during various meetings within the past year I have heard three different people, including two administrators and an extremely influential faculty member, point out that we could continue to have *courses* in a given discipline without having a *major or minor* in that hypothetical discipline. And I have heard many people, both faculty and administrators, acknowledge that one difficulty for UWGB in course coverage, especially in matters related to general education, is that the school is committed not only to the usual array of disciplinary majors and minors of a school our size, but also to a second layer of interdisciplinary majors and minors. Again, I hope we are able to keep all our current programs, both disciplinary and interdisciplinary, and ideally to add more if needed. But if reallocation decisions come to a point where we begin thinking of eliminating one or more of our majors or minors with relatively few

students enrolled in them, it would seem to me unfair that the smaller disciplinary majors and minors have to compete with “subsidies” for the smaller interdisciplinary majors and minors, in the form of the current requirement of an interdisciplinary major or minor as a prerequisite for graduation. This seems especially unfair because the interdisciplinary majors and minors already enjoy a built-in protection because they are where faculty are “housed.”

If the current requirement truly caused most UWGB students to experience a uniquely interdisciplinary education, I would support it even at the cost of our current struggles to staff general education courses, and even with the possibility that we might lose some of the small disciplinary majors and minors in order to maintain the smaller interdisciplinary majors and minors. But the current requirement doesn’t have the positive effect we wish it had, and therefore its potential negative effects—especially its “enabling” tendency, allowing us to think our school is something that it is not—are such that I feel the requirement should be revoked.