

AGENDA

UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 4

Wednesday, December 12, 2007, 3:00 p.m.

Phoenix Room C, University Union

Presiding Officer: Kevin Roeder, Speaker

Parliamentarian: Professor Clifford F. Abbott

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 3, November 14, 2007 [page 2]

3. CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

4. NEW BUSINESS

Requests for future business

5. PROVOST'S REPORT

6. UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE REPORT

Presented by Professor Dean VonDras, Chair

7. COMMITTEE REPORT

Senate Committee on Planning and Budget

Presented by Professor Timothy Meyer

8. OPEN FORUM

On possible alignment of disciplinary and other programs with interdisciplinary units [page 5]

9. ADJOURNMENT

MINUTES 2007-2008
UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 3

Wednesday, November 14, 2007
Alumni Room AB, University Union

Presiding Officer: Kevin Roeder (SOCW-UC), Speaker

Parliamentarian: Clifford Abbott, Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

PRESENT: Lucy Arendt (BUA), Scott Ashmann (EDUC), Kathleen Burns (HUD), Matthew Dornbush (NAS), Susan Gallagher-Lepak (NUR), Stefan Hall (HUS), Sue Hammersmith (Provost, *ex officio*), Catherine Henze (HUS), Curt Heuer (AVD), Ann Kok (SOCW), Vladimir Kurenok (NAS), Pao Lor (EDU), Kaoime Malloy (AVD), Daniel Meinhardt (HUB), Steven Meyer (NAS-UC), Timothy Meyer (ICS), Thomas Nesslein (URS), Kim Nielsen (SCD), Illene Noppe (HUD-UC), Terence O'Grady (AVD-UC), Debra Pearson (HUB), Laura Riddle (AVD-UC), Ellen Rosewall (AVD), Marilyn Sagrillo (BUA alternate), Denise Scheberle (PEA), Bruce Shepard (Chancellor, *ex officio*), David Voelker (HUS), Dean VonDras (HUD-UC), Jill White (HUD)

NOT PRESENT: Tian-you Hu (NAS), Meir Russ (BUA)

REPRESENTATIVES: Dan McIver (Academic Staff Committee), Crystal Osman (Student Government)

GUESTS: Associate Provost Tim Sewall, Dean Fritz Erikson, Scott Hildebrand, Dean Scott Furlong

1. Call to Order. With a quorum present, Speaker Roeder called the Senate to order at 3:05 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes of UW-Green Bay Faculty Senate Meeting No. 12, October 17, 2007. On a motion by Senator Ann Kok (second by Senator Laura Riddle) the minutes were approved by voice vote.

3. Chancellor's Report. The Chancellor spoke at length and addressed the following issues:

a. Service Recognition – The Chancellor's office is rethinking the way employees are recognized for length of service. There are ideas for changing the awards (perhaps gift certificates instead of plaques), the venue (perhaps a spring convocation instead of a December announcement/holiday celebration), and incentives for wider attendance (perhaps food).

b. Sexual Ethics in the Workplace – The Chancellor has received a proposal from his advisory group on gender equality and is considering it in terms of employee education, work culture, and consequences. He is searching for an alternative to mandatory training (perhaps a statement of values). There will be further discussion.

c. Review of Administrators – The Chancellor has received a proposal from the University Committee and is reviewing it. He talked about the need for performance review from several perspectives and a concern that the process be manageable. He also talked about some reciprocity in the process – what are the expectation, how can they be measured, and what can we do to help you achieve them.

d. Budget – With a characteristic candor that even he seems to feel will someday get him in trouble, the Chancellor revealed that we would not have to worry about lapses the Legislature built into the budget. The most positive point in the budget is the funding of the Growth Agenda.

e. Growth Agenda – The Chancellor confessed that in the past he has avoided being too specific when asked how (in what programs) we will grow. He offered that with appropriate flexibility we should grow where students and the region demand. The process of growth should raise the percentage of budget now spent directly on instruction from 48% to about 58%, comparable to the percentage at UW-Stevens Point which currently is the size we'd like to be.

f. Faculty Salaries – The Pay Plan recommending increases of 4% in both years of the biennium is going through the state process, but a more systemic problem of low salaries still needs attention. Some creativity is needed here. Some possibilities: using a higher percent of adjuncts to cover instruction (the Chancellor's read of last spring's Senate discussion was that there was no great enthusiasm for this); cannibalize faculty positions for raises; and index promotion raises to pay plan increases. Additional thoughts are welcome and discussion of these will continue.

g. Accreditation – The visiting team from the Higher Learning Commission has given a preliminary recommendation to continue accreditation for the next ten years. The team was very impressed by the institutional support from students, alumni, and community members, but they will be asking for a report on how the Growth Agenda is carried out.

h. Next Challenge – With the infusion of new funds for the Growth Agenda the Chancellor is looking for a new challenge and one possibility is to get some national recognition for some key programs.

i. Questions – The Chancellor then invited questions and got several, all on aspects of how growth will be handled. The general response was that, beyond searches and reallocations in the current year, decisions on specifics for the future have not yet been made and that some constraints faculty imagined were part of future growth spending may not in fact be real.

4. Continuing Business

a. Code Changes to UWGB Chapter 53 and 54 (second reading). Dean VonDras introduced the language revisions prompted by earlier discussions of this proposal and the revised version (attached to the Senate agenda) was then moved by Senator Steven Meyer (second by Senator Nesslein). Senator Dornbush began the discussion by reading a communication from a member of the Academic Affairs Council questioning the appeal process in the proposal. Two senators spoke in support of that appeal process. The Senate then voted approval of the Code changes (26-0-1).

5. New Business

a. Resolution on the Granting of Degrees. This routine resolution was read by the Speaker, moved by Senator Rosewall (second by Senator Tim Meyer), and passed by the Senate (27-0-0) without discussion.

b. Requests for future business. There were none.

6. Provost's Report. The Provost had submitted a separate written report but wanted to add what a pleasure the exit interview with the Higher Learning Commission team had been. General congratulations were offered with a specific shout-out to the leadership of Tim Sewall, who tried to demur and share the credit, but the Senate reflected it right back at him.

7. Committee Report

a. Senate Committee on Planning and Budget. Senator Tim Meyer presented the report on how the Committee had contacted the budgetary chairs to poll faculty on what should go into planning; how Committee chair John Katers is attending meetings of the University Planning Committee; and how at the next meeting the SCPB will express its concerns to administrators on monitoring the connections between planning and budget.

8. University Committee Report. University Committee Chair Dean VonDras listed a number of issues the UC has been working on, including:

- a. conversations with the SCPB;
- b. implementing a common hour in the new 14-week calendar (likely to be late on Monday afternoons);
- c. responses to UW-System inquiries on sick leave policy (the UC is urging continuation of colleague coverage and accrual of sick leave during sabbaticals);
- d. involving unit leaders in discussions of possible revisions to the program review process;

- e. refinements in the employee tuition assistance policy (largely for staff); and
- f. continuing discussion of student feedback on teaching and the CCQ instrument.

A couple of questions on the common hour and program reviews got clarifying responses, generally from the Provost.

9. Adjournment. Speaker Roeder then said, "It is not my goal to end early, but I am happy to do so" and the meeting concluded at 4:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Clifford Abbott, Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

PROPOSAL

Procedures for Determining the Curricular Relationship Between Interdisciplinary Units and Academic Programs

Introduction

Section 54.03 A. 5 states: "The Academic Affairs Council shall annually provide the Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff, for inclusion in the *Faculty Governance Handbook*, a current list of: 1) Interdisciplinary Units and 2) approved academic programs (including majors, minors, emphases, graduate programs, and certificate programs) and the Interdisciplinary Units responsible for them."

Section 53.10 F. of the *Faculty Governance Handbook* stipulates that the disciplinary or other unit chairperson "Submits through the appropriate Dean(s) new courses, major revisions of existing courses, and deletion of courses proposed by the disciplinary or other unit for action by an appropriate interdisciplinary unit, the Academic Affairs Council, and the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs."

Currently there are no written procedures regarding how the "responsible" or "appropriate" interdisciplinary unit is determined.

To facilitate communication between our academic programs and interdisciplinary units and provide a consistent method of determining what constitutes the "responsible" or "appropriate" interdisciplinary unit, the following processes are being proposed.

Please note that these procedures are intended to clarify and not change what is currently in the Faculty Handbook. In addition, they have no bearing on budget allocations or faculty membership in a particular interdisciplinary budget unit.

1. All existing majors, minors, emphases, graduate programs, and certificate programs, represented by their Executive Committee, must submit proposed program requirement changes to the responsible interdisciplinary unit for its action.
 - The "responsible interdisciplinary unit" will be determined by a majority vote of the major, minor, emphasis, graduate program, or certificate program Executive Committee subject to the approval of the appropriate Dean and the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The decision will be in effect for a minimum period of three years.
 - The "responsible interdisciplinary unit" for minors that have corresponding majors will be the same as the major.
 - All curricular actions are to be handled according to existing, approved, policies and procedures.
2. Proposals for new courses, major revisions of existing courses and deletion of courses initiated by a disciplinary or other unit should be submitted to an "appropriate interdisciplinary unit" for its action. In these instances, the appropriate unit will be determined by the Executive Committee on a course-by-course basis.