

## **Annual Report of the University Committee 2003-2004**

The University Committee members - Clifford Abbott (chair), Illene Noppe, Greg Aldrete, Greg Davis, Sally Dresdow, and Richard Logan - met weekly. Most meetings were attended by a representative from student government (Matthew Voigt) and one from the academic staff (John Landrum). A part of most meetings was held exchanging information with the Provost. There were frequent meetings with the Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff, a few meetings with the deans, a meeting with the Chief Information Officer, one with the Athletic Director, and several with various faculty members. During the summer the UC continued its practice of inviting incoming members (Christine Style, Scott Furlong, and Regan Gurung) to join in its deliberations.

If there is a theme to the discussions and actions of the UC this past year, it might be the weakening of institutional memory as a guide for routine action. The UC's response was to pay attention to written policies, to routine procedures, and to planning as guides for action.

The attention to written policy led to several changes in our codification in order to clarify the following issues:

1. faculty status for lecturers
2. representation on the Personnel Council
3. representation on the Faculty Senate with alternates
4. open meetings for personnel reviews (to align with state law)
5. definitions of quorums and memberships
6. approval process for minors without majors.

Attention to procedures led to the following:

1. adoption of house rules for Faculty Senate procedures
2. use of open forums in Faculty Senate meetings
3. increased channels of communication between the UC and other faculty governance committees (UC members acting as liaison with specific committees)
4. meeting with student and academic staff governance groups
5. continuing work on approval processes for curricular actions.

The UC was also involved in several planning efforts, somewhat modestly in facilities planning, a bit distantly in strategic budgeting, and more actively in campus climate where a committee was created to report to the Faculty Senate next spring.

The UC began its year with great resolve to be proactive and brainstormed a set of agenda items, including issues such as workload and definitions of interdisciplinarity. It found, however, plenty of issues to react to. Some of these came from the state: health care premiums, pay package, the proposed Taxpayers' Bill of Rights, and relationships with the Technical Colleges. Others were part of the UC's regular personnel responsibilities in making appointments

or recommendations for appointments. Still others, mostly from the Provost, had the UC playing the role of traffic cop in referring issues to the appropriate committees for action. On a few occasions the UC found it worthwhile to create ad hoc committees to deal with issues. This worked well with a review of student-led courses and is continuing with issues of campus climate. The UC also grappled with the issue of evaluating administrators. There was no formal instrument for collecting evaluation in a widespread or systematic way, but there was plenty of discussion and some influence in getting concerns heard.

Faculty governance does not happen automatically. It depends on the commitments and actions of many people. It is the same with the University Committee. I wish to thank my colleagues on the UC for spirited discussions, dedicated work, and fine secretarial skills; all of the people in the SOFAS office for their efficiency, attention to detail, and gentle guidance; all of the faculty who kept the UC informed of their concerns and answered the call to serve governance groups of all sorts; our colleagues in administration for their respect for shared governance; and for the staff at UW-Green Bay for their cooperation and forbearance.

-submitted by Cliff Abbott, chair

UW-Green Bay Faculty Senate  
15 September 2004