

[draft]

MINUTES 2021-2022
UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 1
Wednesday, October 13, 2021

Presiding Officer: Joan Groessl, Speaker of the Senate

Parliamentarian: Steve Meyer, Secretary of the Faculty and Staff

PRESENT: Riaz Ahmed (RSE), Tanim Ahsan (RSE), Mike Alexander (Chancellor, *ex-officio*), Dana Atwood (PEA), Gaurav Bansal (BUA), Devin Bickner (RSE-UC), Kate Burns (Interim Provost, *ex-officio*), Thomas Campbell (TND), Gary Christens (A&F), Marcelo Cruz (PEA), Tara DaPra (HUS), Greg Davis (RSE), William Gear (HUB), Joan Groessl (SOCW-UC), Lisa Grubisha (NAS), Richard Hein (Manitowoc Campus), Todd Hillhouse (PSYCH), Elif Ikizer (PSYCH), James Kabrhel (NAS), Dan Kallgren (Marinette Campus), Mark Kiehn (EDUC), Mark Klemp (NAS), Michelle McQuade-Dewhirst (MUSIC), Eric Morgan (DJS), Paul Mueller (HUB), Val Murrenus-Pilmaier (HUS), Rebecca Nesvet (HUS), Aniruddha Pangarkar (M&M), Matthew Raunio (Sheboygan Campus), Bill Sallak (MUSIC), Jolanda Sallmann (SOCW), Jon Shelton (DJS-UC), Heidi Sherman (HUS-UC), Karen Stahlheber (NAS), Patricia Terry (RSE-UC), Christine Vandenhouten (NURS), Sherry Warren (SOCW), Sam Watson (AND), Aaron Weinschenk (PEA-UC), and Joseph Yoo (CIS)

NOT PRESENT: Gold star for perfect attendance

REPRESENTATIVES: Virginia Englebert (ASC) and Sue Machuca (USC)

GUESTS: Scott Ashmann (Assoc. Dean, CHESW), Janet Bonkowski (Executive Director, Marketing and University Communications), Bill Dirienzo (Assoc. Prof., NAS), Matt Dornbush (Dean, AEC SOB), Susan Grant Robinson (Cabinet Liaison, Internal Affairs), Ben Joniaux (Chief of Staff), John Katers (Dean, CSET), Holly Keener (Provost Asst.), Tetyana Malysheva (Assoc. Prof., RSE), Ryan Martin (Assoc. Dean, CAHSS), Melissa Nash (HR Manager), Amanda Nelson (Assoc. Dean, CSET), Mary Kate Ontaneda (Executive Assistant, University Leadership), Rasoul Rezvanian (Assoc. Dean, AEC SOB), Jennifer Schanen-Materi (Sr. Lecturer & BSW Field Coord), Courtney Sherman (Interim Assoc. Provost), Jessica Van Slooten (Assoc. Prof., HUS), Kris Vespia (Prof., Interim CATL Director), Wendy Woodward (Asst. Vice Chancellor/CIO), and Mike Zorn (Assoc. Dean, CSET)

1. CALL TO ORDER.

With a quorum reached, Faculty Senate Speaker Joan Groessl called to order the second Faculty Senate meeting of the 2021-2022 academic year at 3:01 p.m.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 1, September 15, 2021

Faculty Senate approved the September minutes by consensus.

3. CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

Chancellor Alexander wished to thank everyone who participated in the UW-Green Bay "Day of Service" on Friday, 1 October 2021. It was a wonderfully successful event with about 500

students, staff, and faculty involved in various acts of service being performed on the campus and around the community. The goal is to make this an annual event. With the HLC accreditation visit just wrapping up the previous day, the Chancellor thanked everyone who participated in the process; special thanks were extended to Interim Associate Provost Courtney Sherman and former Associate Provost Clif Ganyard for their leadership in organizing the site visit. The Chancellor announced that we will once again have a COVID testing site on campus. He also updated senate on the UW System President search; northeast Wisconsin is well represented on the search committee with two Regents (Robert Atwell and Dr. Ashok Rai) and Associate Professor Jon Shelton.

Questions for the Chancellor began with UC Chair Heidi Sherman who asked about getting signage with clear, consistent, and explicit language about masking requirements for everybody while on campus. (The Chancellor requested suggestions regarding where signage should be posted – where are the biggest problem areas?). How close are our students to meeting the 70% vaccination level to qualify for the \$7,000 scholarships being provided by UW System? (We are currently at 64% - still need approximately 300 students to provide proof of vaccination to qualify for the UW System scholarships – Friday is the deadline). There were many follow-up questions regarding COVID including the data being reported on the university's dashboard (the data relate what we officially know, what has actually been reported to the Dean of Students Office, there is no speculation on reported cases); whether SGA is being included in the plan to increase student vaccination rates, make students aware of the scholarship funding available if they reach 70% vaccinated, and spread the word to not come to class if they are not feeling well (SGA is going to each First Year Seminar to talk about these issues); will booster shots be available on campus (likely no, there is simply not enough demand, but we are willing to be a booster vaccination site); concern over unmasked students exploiting lounges areas on campus under the guise of being in an eating/drinking area; students eating/drinking in classrooms and in faculty offices during office hours (faculty have the discretion to forbid food/drink in their classroom and, obviously, in their offices – if the student fails to comply, report that student immediately to the Dean of Students); is this campus in crisis mode or normal mode (it is difficult to call this a crisis on our campus when the moment students walk off campus there are zero rules and no restrictions to prevent them from being irresponsible; on campus we try to act as if we are in crisis mode (for the safety of everybody on campus), but one step off campus gives the appearance of normal mode (which is a big shift from last year)).

4. OLD BUSINESS

A. Evaluating Teaching Effectiveness: Student Ratings of Instruction Plan

Jessica Van Slooten brought forward the revised Student Ratings of Instruction Plan for a second reading. A working group made up of members from across the institution, in a variety of programs (both accredited and non-accredited), from the Additional Locations, and from all levels of instruction has spent two years working on a new approach to evaluating teaching effectiveness.

Senator Shelton moved to approve the plan, seconded by Senator Sallmann. Much discussion ensued, including a number of queries (and responses):

- How frequently would peer evaluations take place? (the working group is hoping to have a pilot program with guidelines);

- Will student evaluations of instruction be closed before grades are submitted? (yes, state procedures will be followed that were in place for online courses prior to COVID, that procedure is to send out the evaluation tool two weeks before the end of the semester, then give students a two-week deadline for returning evaluations, before their grades are submitted – results are sent to faculty after grades have been submitted);
- Are the same set of questions being used for online courses as for in-person courses? There was concern expressed that certain questions would lead to worse ratings for online courses; for example, questions asking whether the “instructor encouraged engagement” and if the “instructor fostered an inclusive environment.” (the questions were developed to be used across modalities – the working group felt the standards of teaching effectiveness should be the same and while the modalities may be different the core values should be the same);
- Will the evaluation tool be available next week for 7wk1 courses? (yes, the evaluation tool will be available, but the working group is waiting on today’s vote to program in the questions);
- Would you consider in your Likert Scale questions an “N/A” option?
- Some faculty perceive the goal of student evaluations is to get as close to a “perfect score” as possible because of what it means in their merit review, when they should be looking to receive feedback from the student to improve their course. (the new evaluation tool is an attempt to try to shift the culture of teaching effectiveness so that student ratings are not seen as the primary tool, rather as a way for individual faculty to gather information from the students to reflect on their teaching; quantitative evaluations will no longer be on a 10-point scale, the Likert Scale will range from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree);
- For accredited programs, course evaluations are an expectation, so should the language used for online courses shift from an evaluation of the instructor to an evaluation of the course? (the plan is to use the new tool for an academic year then do an assessment to get faculty feedback on whether we should make shifts in the language).

When the question was called, **the motion to approve the plan passed 36-2-0.**

5. NEW BUSINESS

a. Changing the UWGB Writing Competency from WF100 to WF105 (first reading)

Jennie Young, Director of the Writing Foundations Center, spoke on behalf of the proposed change that would make the two-semester sequence of WF100 “First Year Writing” and WF105 “Research and Rhetoric” the writing competency graduation requirement for all students. Research shows that the disciplinary standard for First Year Writing Programs is generally a two-course sequence, ideally one during the Fall semester of the students’ first year and one during the Spring semester. Currently, our writing competency is met by completing just WF100. Based on how our students struggle with writing, this change is needed to prepare our students to succeed in college (and beyond). The problem with our current requirement is that many of the writing skills needed by students, such as valid research skills, citation, APA format, and logical development are taught in WF105, but our writing competency requirement stops at WF100. If the change is made, some students could still test out of WF100 and go directly into WF105 (or WF200 for Business majors); some could even test out of WF105/WF200. This

proposal has unanimous support from the Writing Foundations faculty, the GEC, the Registrars Office, and the UC.

Questions and comments from faculty senate (and responses) included:

- Writing requirement comparisons are made to three universities in the UW System, but there are 13 universities in the system, were those three universities selected for a specific reason?
- What is UWGB's writing competency compared to the other UW universities in light of our writing emphasis (WE) requirements – two WE courses at the 100-200 level and two at the 300-400 level – and, at least in the sciences, the skills covered in WF105 are already part of our curriculum?
- There are limits to the number of credit hours you can put into a program, also if a student needs to spend six credit hours in their first year on WF courses this could be challenging depending on the requirements of their major, i.e., some majors have curriculums that are heavily scheduled with supporting courses their first two years in order for students to complete the major in four years. (the proposal, as written, gives students until the first half of their sophomore year to complete the sequence; also, lack of writing skills is the number one complaint of hiring managers and CEOs across all disciplines);
- If Business has a course equivalent to WF105 (i.e., WF200), would courses from other Units be considered as satisfying the WF105 requirement – for example, NAS has ENV SCI 339 Scientific Writing? (that is certainly something that could be considered)
- The idea of a disciplinary requirement might be worth looking into, continue to teach WF100 by Writing Foundations faculty, then have WF faculty work collaboratively with each of the four colleges to determine what the most appropriate follow-up course would be based on the needs of the disciplines in those colleges.

A second reading of this proposal will be presented at the November senate meeting.

b. UWGB Faculty Senate Statement on the Title and Total Compensation Project

Senator and UWGB Faculty Rep Jon Shelton reported that discussion at the UW Faculty Rep meeting in September centered on the impact of TTC on non-faculty university employees. At all campuses, TTC has employees feeling undervalued as their position titles/descriptions don't match the work they are actually doing. The UC thought UWGB faculty should acknowledge our staff colleagues by adapting a statement about TTC drafted by UW-Milwaukee to fit our campus. In no way should this be interrupted as disrespect to our UWGB HR personnel. If there is a positive vote on this statement showing support for our Academic and University Staff colleagues, we want to be clear that this is not an indictment of our HR Department. Under the parameters in which they have had to tackle the TTC, Melissa Nash and her staff are to be commended for their efforts in trying to help everybody understand the process and put everyone on this campus in the best position possible. The message of the proposed statement is that this has been a top-down process and has left a lot of staff feeling demoralized and disempowered.

Senator Bansal moved to accept the statement, seconded by Senator Raunio. USC Chair Sue Machuca thanked Senator Shelton on behalf of all staff members for bringing this statement forward and expressed appreciation for the faculty support. She also seconded Senator Shelton's

feelings regarding UWGB's HR Department. University Staff are definitely frustrated by the process and the feeling of being devalued by System. In some cases, University Staff personnel who have been here many years have had their several-page-long position description reduced to four bullet points. In other cases, new TTC position qualifications call for "high school diploma preferred" when the person working in that position has a bachelor's or master's degree. The education qualification is often associated with the job title which, in turn, determines the employee's salary range. Senator Shelton took the opportunity to remind everybody that this type of retitling work is a direct consequence of Act 10. For the three years that Senator Shelton has been our Faculty Rep, faculty and staff have been pointing out the problems of the TTC and how it is being implemented, but UW System has simply ignored it. Virginia Englebert, ASC Chair, also wanted to express appreciation to the faculty for their support. Two of the issues Academic Staff have with the TTC are: 1) there is no transparency regarding the salary ranges until the decision is made on these titles, and 2) once the titles are determined and the appeal process is completed there is no changing it. **The faculty accepted the statement supporting our Academic and University Staff colleagues by a vote of 35-1-1.**

c. Discussion on Mandatory Mask Use Signage

This discussion was initiated during the Question and Answer portion of the Chancellor's Report. There was no need to address this agenda item here.

d. Request for future business

It's that spooky time of the year
There's so much we all should fear
Witches, black cats,
And vampire bats
Trick-or-Treat must be very near
(there was no new business brought forward by the senators this month)

6. PROVOST'S REPORT

The newly crowned Provost had several items for discussion. Thanks were extended to Interim Associate Provost Courtney Sherman and former Associate Provost Clif Ganyard for organizing the HLC accreditation visit. The visiting HLC delegation was impressed with UWGB and wanted to know our secret to enrollment growth at all of our locations. We will likely be dinged on our assessment, but otherwise a good report is anticipated. Final Fall 2021 enrollment numbers will be out on Friday, those are the numbers that will be reported to System. At this moment, we have a headcount of 9,095, a 1.4% increase over Fall 2020. Admissions of Spring 2022 freshmen (those high school graduates who took the Fall semester off before starting their college education) are up. Program reviews are back on the Provost's radar. One of the recommendations of the Comprehensive Program Review was making program reviews more automated so they are not such a workload burden and also making them more meaningful.

Questions from the senate (and responses) included:

- Is our enrollment growth CCIHS-based (which doesn't really help FTE or tuition growth)? (reported enrollment numbers are based on headcount; in terms of budgetary impact, CCIHS students are not paying tuition; overall, our FTE and student credit hours numbers are up just a bit);

- If student numbers are going up, why do units have such a difficult time getting positions through the Position Review Committee (PRC)? (we have a certain number of FTE positions available, so that is the challenge; we can “buy” additional lines where we see growth by putting them on 131 funds, but that is a balancing act as we bet on ourselves to continue the enrollment growth in those areas);
- Do we still have one of the worst faculty/student ratios in System (yes), if so, some of the benefits of this enrollment growth need to come back to the units. (100% agree, the Board of Regents needs to see how funds are allocated to each institution, they need to see/hear our compelling story – how we have been doing incredible work and how we have seen incredible growth – and they need fund us accordingly to match our efforts).

7. OTHER REPORTS

a. Academic Affairs Report. Written report found on page 31 of the agenda.

b. Graduate Academic Affairs Report. Written report found on page 34 of the agenda.

c. University Committee Report. Chair Heidi Sherman mentioned that much of the business covered in today’s senate meeting is what the UC has been spending its time on recently. Also consuming the UC’s time has been ongoing discussions of the protective measures for faculty, staff, and students against COVID. Upcoming discussion will include the point at which faculty could/should pivot from in-person instruction to online instruction if events in their lives warrant such a change. Other upcoming agenda items for the UC include preparing an instrument for the review of administrators (i.e., Chancellor, Provost, Deans) and discussing administration’s proposed raising of course caps. The proposed course caps prompted many comments from faculty:

- Increasing enrollment should translate to more teaching lines, where are those new lines?
- Given our Open Access Mission, increased enrollment without increased academic support in the form of more teaching lines, TA support, etc. is setting students up for failure.
- A witches’ brew of converging factors (increasing student numbers, consistently greater demands on our time, faculty lines not being replaced) is adding to faculties’ frustration with the Position Review Committee; in particular, the lack of transparency with the PRC and the lack of faculty input on PRC decisions.

d. Faculty Rep Report. Faculty Rep Jon Shelton told senate that at their most recent meeting most of their time was spent on COVID and TTC. The deadline for receiving applications for the UW System President position will be closing soon. One faculty rep brought up a concern about library books; specifically, the policy which limits the checking out of library books through “resource sharing” to a maximum of two years. Apparently, some faculty keep them longer than the two-year limit. If there is any interest in changing that policy, please contact Jon.

e. Academic Staff Committee Report. Virginia Englebert, Chair of the ASC, expressed her thanks on behalf of the Academic Staff for being included to take part in university-level meetings, such as the HLC meeting, the governance meeting in Madison, the listening sessions at the Provost interviews, and the open forum led by the Regent who was looking for feedback from faculty/staff regarding the next UW System President. The ASC is soliciting feedback on

Administrator Evaluations, possibly converting that into a climate survey, and bringing it before the Academic Assembly which is planned for 7 December 2021.

f. University Staff Committee Report. Sue Machuca, Chair of the USC, passed along the wonderful news that the first ever Systemwide University Staff award went to UWGB's Monika Pynaker. Congratulations, Monika!! A well-deserved honor! Also, our University Police received a nomination for the group award. The University Staff Professional Development Conference had to be canceled.

g. Student Government Association Report. No report provided.

8. ADJOURNMENT at 4:56 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Steve Meyer, Secretary of the Faculty and Staff