

University Committee **2006-07 Annual Report**

The University Committee (UC) members, Scott Furlong (chair), Terry O'Grady, Donna Ritch, Kevin Roeder, Chris Style, and Dean Von Dras met weekly. Paula Ganyard was the Academic Staff Committee representative. During most meetings, Provost Hammersmith met with the committee in an information exchange. Professor Cliff Abbott, in his position as Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff, regularly met with the committee. During the year, various guests attended to discuss specific issues including representatives from the General Education Council (GEC) and the Academic Affairs Council (AAC).

The UC spent the year discussing a number of issues related to UW-System initiative dealing with personnel concerns (e.g., UWS Chapter 7, Criminal Background Checks) and also had a number of discussions regarding faculty governance and responsibility for the curriculum particularly as it relates to the role of the GEC and AAC. As always, there were a number of code changes suggested and adopted. The other major issue areas were curricular as the University Committee discussed and brought forward a new Bachelors of Applied Studies degree program, the First Nations Studies major, the Global Studies minor, and changes to general education requirements.

The issues below of the activities of the Senate and the University Committee are categorized by categories and topics.

Senate Passed:

Curricular Issues:

- Curriculum Handbook
- An interdisciplinary minor in Global Studies
- Changes in the General Education Humanities requirement
- First Nations Studies Major
- Bachelor of Applied Studies degree

Resolutions:

- Faculty Resolution on UWS Chapter 7
- Faculty Resolution in support of Domestic Partner benefits
- Faculty Resolution on Wisconsin Technical College System transfers and including faculty governance in the review of such programs
- Faculty Resolutions for the Granting of Degrees (December and May graduates)
- Memorial Resolution for Werner Prange

Code Changes:

- Elimination of the Student Affairs Committee
- Code change to stagger the terms for the Committee on Awards and Recognition
- Code change in regards to the ex officio member of the General Education Council being from the Provost office and not the Dean of LAS.
- Minor change to the Search and Screen Procedures for Administrative Appointments

Other:

- Background checks for new faculty/staff
- A new UW-Green Bay Mission Statement
- In closed session to discuss the awarding of honorary degree
- Approved slate of nominees for faculty elective committees

Presented to Senate, action to be taken in 2007-2008

- Additional policy issues regarding sick leave reporting and colleague coverage.
- Revising code so that the AAC and GEC become committees of the Faculty Senate
- New administrator evaluation process
- Change in code regarding recusals from the Personnel Council and the Committee of Six

Senate Discussion Items – action not required

- Completed faculty administrator evaluations and met with the administrators to discuss results
- Student Government Textbook Resolution
- Comprehensive Academic Program Review
- Movement to a fourteen week academic calendar
- Addressed the LAB audit on sick leave reporting and suggested changes provided by UW System on sick leave reporting and collegial coverage.
- Faculty forum on the percent of lecturers used on campus and the issues related to this
- General Education domain committees

University Committee Discussion and Actions

Committee and Personnel Issues

- Provided names for the LAS Dean Search and Screen Committee
- Provided faculty names to the Assistant Chancellor for Advancement for an internal capital campaign committee
- Provided names based on recommendations from the Committee on Nominations for the Community Building Task Force.
- Replacement names were provided to the Personnel Council and the Committee of Six
- Provided nominations for the Committee on Rights and Responsibilities and the Senate Appointed committees
- Most UC members participated in the LAS Dean interview process
- Asked the deans to ensure that all units had written merit/tenure guidelines and that these be provided to the deans and SOFAS
- Discussed and provided recommendations on the creation of a centralized personnel file
- Discussions on the revising code so that the AAC and GEC become committees of the Faculty Senate

Salary, Workload, Campus Climate Issues

- Had numerous discussions with the Provost and others regarding the issue of faculty salaries and the process in which pay adjustments occur.
- Provided a recommendation to the Chancellor regarding the distribution of the Chancellor's 10% discretionary portion of the pay plan.

- Discussed the issue of faculty teaching loads at UW-Green Bay and other UW campuses.
- Discussed the issue of the privileges of Emeriti Faculty and began to develop information regarding the potential resources available and how emeriti may access these resources
- Discussed the legislative bill that would provide UW faculty the right to vote for collective bargaining

Governance and Curricular Issues

- Discussed the number of credits in residence requirement in order to be eligible for degree honors (brought forth by an academic program) and agreed with the current requirements and replied to the academic program on this issue.
- At the request of a Senate member, the UC discussed the issue of conducting roll call votes. After consultation with SOFAS, it was determined that any governance group can call for a roll call vote with a simple majority vote.

Campus Wide Issues

- Discussed the university's NSSE results and issues of Student Engagement.
- Discussed and commented on campus budget issues and implications including the costs of the Weidner Center
- Discussed CIT issues with Associate Provost of Information Services Kathy Pletcher. The UC thought it would be a good idea for CIT to put all classes onto faculty electronic calendars.

I would like to thank the UC members for the mostly enjoyable meetings that we had throughout the year. Their commitment to issues of concern to the University is significant. While we did not always agree with one another, there was mutual respect around the table and a desire to do the right thing for the campus. I would also like to thank Cliff Abbott for a seamless transition into his role as SOFAS as well as Pat Przybelski in the SOFAS office. Their support was extremely important for us as a committee. Finally, thanks goes to the Faculty Senate and the faculty who continue to keep us informed on issues that arise.

Respectfully submitted by Scott R. Furlong, Chair

Committee of Six

From: Illene Noppe, Chair

Date: May 24, 2007

Re: Requested Annual Report

The members of the Committee of Six for the 2006-2007 academic year were Greg Davis, Cheryl Grosso, Judy Martin, Illene Noppe (Chair), Laura Riddle and Larry Smith.

During the year we considered three candidates for promotion to the rank of full professor, and we forwarded our evaluations of the candidates to the Interim Dean for Liberal Arts and Sciences. Two of the three candidates for promotion were members of units and/or a minor to which committee members also belonged. In one of these cases, three committee members were required to recuse themselves, and in the other case two were required to recuse themselves from the promotion hearings. The University Council selected substitute members from a list of available full professors to participate in the promotion hearings.

An organizational meeting was held in November during which the Committee examined the criteria for promotion and reviewed the promotion process. In addition, the committee discussed the issue of evaluation of administrative hires, and sent a memo to the chair of the Search and Screen Committee for Dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences offering the committee's willingness to advise this search committee should the issue of promotion to full professor arise during the hiring process.

In addition to consideration of the three candidates for promotion, the Committee of Six also grappled with the question of recusal (see above) and how to help candidates prepare their files. Two initiatives emerged from these discussions. The first was a memo sent to the University Committee wherein a code change was requested for the criteria in which a Committee of Six member must recuse him or herself. The University Committee has brought a request for a code change to the Faculty Senate, and a first reading of the proposed code change took place during the May 11, 2007 Senate meeting. Further discussion and a vote on the issue will occur during the fall, 2007 semester.

The second initiative, of a more informal nature, was a proposal for the creation of a group of "Promotion Tutors." (PTs) who would help faculty coming up for promotion to associate or full professor in the preparation of their files. This would not be a mandatory requirement of the promotion process, but rather an informal collegial opportunity for faculty who have served either on the Personnel Council or the Committee of Six to offer specific mentoring to a candidate who would like to receive additional help in file preparation from someone outside his or her unit. The Secretary of the Faculty, the Instructional Developmental Council, and the University Committee have endorsed the idea, and a list of potential PTs will be created in time for the fall 2007 semester.

The Committee of Six is a significant and important committee on our campus. Although its decisions are termed "advisory," committee members take their duties very seriously, give careful scrutiny to the files of candidates for promotion, and operate under the assumption that their decisions will be upheld by administration.

We also are optimistic that the two initiatives of this year will be furthered during the fall semester, and will help to make the promotion process a smoother and fairer one for all involved.

UNIVERSITY of WISCONSIN
GREEN BAY

May 18, 2007

To: Cliff Abbott, Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

From: Mark Everingham, Academic Affairs Council chair

Re: **2006-2007 Academic Affairs Council Annual Report**

The Academic Affairs Council members in 2006-07, Jennifer Ham, Eileen Kolb, Forrest Baulieu, Patricia Ragan, Angela Bauer-Dantoin, and Mark Everingham, worked together collegially and productively during an extremely busy year. The AAC inherited a substantial backlog of proposals from 2005-06. The AAC carried out its charge in a highly professional and effective way. The AAC is a cornerstone of faculty governance.

Positive recommendations on new course proposals-

Interdisciplinary Freshmen Seminar Human Biology 198
Advanced Physics Laboratory NAS 420
Hmong 101 (Modern Language/HUS)
Arabic 102 (Modern Language/HUS)
Communication and Arts 480 Arts Management Seminar
Interdisciplinary Senior Seminar Human Development 440
Philosophy 103 Critical Thinking
Political and Policy Dimensions of Emergency Management PUENAF 339/559
Social Work 490 International Social Work in Guatemala
Accounting 303 Seminar in Accounting Professionalism

Interdisciplinary Freshman Seminar 198: The General Education Council will receive new proposals for seminars and review them as part of the business of the GEC's charge. The GEC will then generate a summary report of those seminars it approves and send the report *and* the proposals to the Academic Affairs Council for review and recommendation as would be the case for any new Form A course proposal.

Negative recommendations on new course proposals-

Human Development 427 Developmental Research Methods
PEA 477 Seminar in Economic Literature and Issues
URS 300 Research Methods
Urban and Regional Studies Special Topics 350
Studies in Comparative History HIST 470

Neither positive nor negative recommendation-

HISTORY 312: The Early American Republic: two votes in favor, two votes against, and one abstention; LAS Dean approval.

No formal action; proposals withdrawn by initiators- Music 349, Human Biology 405

Course proposals pending more information- URS 290 & 490; Env Sci 491

Other curricular changes-

Proposal to rename Communication and the Arts: positive recommendation to rename *Communication and the Arts* as *Arts and Visual Design*. *Communication and the Arts* major will be renamed as *Design Arts*. The AAC suggested the unit make this change simultaneously with the unit name change to facilitate clarity.

Masters of Science in Management: approved the proposed reduction of credits from 36 to 30 as requested by the Masters of Science in Management program.

Positive recommendation to change of the prerequisite grade of “C” to “B” for Accounting 301 in order to enroll in Accounting 313 and 314.

Social Work curricular change and Child Welfare emphasis: positive recommendation request to add SOCWORK 305 as a prerequisite for SOCWORK 351 and supported for the creation of Child Welfare Emphasis.

Program reviews completed-

Theatre
Human Development
Human Biology
Social Work

NEW ERA Bachelor of Applied Studies Degree-

On 23 January 2007, AAC members expressed concern about the *Governance Report* issued by the Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff on January 23, 2007. The *Report* includes the following statement: “Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) has deferred to the Faculty Senate in reviewing a new degree, Bachelor of Applied Studies, and the Senate is currently doing that review.” The AAC members agreed this statement is an inaccurate characterization of the outcome of the AAC’s interaction with the initiators of the BAS proposal on December 11, 2006 and contradicts the AAC’s current negative position toward and lack of approval of the BAS proposal as stated in an AAC memo of May 10, 2006.

On 6 February 2007, AAC members remained concerned about the misperception that it has deferred to the faculty senate in reviewing the revised BAS proposal. The AAC has not, in fact, deferred to the senate in the review of the revised proposal. While the AAC was made aware of a revised proposal at the December 11th AAC meeting, it has not yet had the opportunity to review and take action on the proposal. If the senate takes action on the revised proposal, it will be doing so without the endorsement of the AAC.

MEMO February 28, 2007

To: Scott Furlong, University Committee chair
From: Mark Everingham, Academic Affairs Council chair
Re: NEW ERA Bachelor of Applied Studies Degree

On February 16, 2007, according to UWGB 54.03 A.4, you as University Committee chair made a formal request of the AAC to conduct a review of a revised draft of the Bachelor of Applied Studies proposal dated January 10, 2007. Upon that request, the AAC agreed to advise the Faculty Senate about its recommendations on the implementation of the Bachelor of Applied Studies proposal prior to the Faculty Senate meeting of March 21, 2007.

The AAC began its review on February 20, 2007. Bill Laatsch and Jan Thornton attended the AAC meeting on that date. They provided information and answered questions about the revised proposal. On February 27, 2007, the AAC completed its review of the revised proposal and voted on two motions.

Motion 1: To recommend the Faculty Senate approve the Bachelor of Applied Studies degree proposal (dated January 10, 2007) as presented to the Faculty Senate on January 17, 2007. The AAC members voted 0 in favor and 5 against the motion.

Motion 2: To recommend the Faculty Senate approve a version of the Bachelor of Applied Studies degree proposal (dated January 10, 2007) that addresses specific concerns of the AAC according to the following principal areas: 1. Name change, 2. Logistics on implementation and oversight, 3. Student Senate review and approval, 4. Follow-up report to the Faculty Senate after two years; and, that appropriate changes to the proposal be effected in a timely manner prior to the implementation of the degree. The AAC members voted 4 in favor, 0 against, and 1 abstention on the motion.

The AAC elaborates on each of the principal areas of concern as follows:

1. Name change: The acronym “BAS” for “Bachelor of Applied Studies” has the potential to mislead employers, graduate school admission committees, and professional organizations. Specifically, “BAS” could be construed to mean “Bachelor of Arts and Sciences” as if it is a traditional four-year degree. The AAC recommends the new degree be named “Bachelor of Technical Studies”, “Bachelor of Vocational Studies”, or “Bachelor of Technical and General Studies” to avoid any confusion.

2. Logistics on implementation and oversight: The main issues are related to the methods and mechanisms to make decisions about how the transfer of 60 credits from two-year colleges or other institutions will be counted toward the *general education requirements* and the *area of the emphasis* in the new degree. For example, the current version of the proposal does not specify that a student cannot take an equivalent introductory course at UW-Green Bay, e.g., chemistry, that he/she has already taken elsewhere and receive 6 credits toward the degree for 3 credits of content. Another example is the proposal does not state how credits from other institutions will be assigned to the *general education* and *area of emphasis* categories given many UW-Green Bay courses are listed as general education options and as major/minor requirements. The AAC strongly recommends the administrators of the new degree work directly with the Registrar’s Office to address these issues prior to implementation.

3. Student Senate review and approval: Student government has not had an opportunity to review and approve the new degree in light of the direct impact it will have on student fees and access to student services (Admissions, Bursar, Financial Aid, Registrar, etc.).

4. The administrators and overseeing faculty of the new degree should submit a **follow-up report** to the Faculty Senate after two years in order to evaluate the impact of the new degree on the existing student body, academic standards and intellectual rigor, and institutional services.

Potential university code changes affecting AAC role and function-

On 6 February 2007, in preparation for a 7 February 2007 meeting with the University Committee, the AAC discussed possible code changes regarding the role of the AAC in approval of curricula. The AAC came to the consensus that it would be in favor of a revision in code that clarifies the role of the AAC in that AAC approval is required for curricular changes and new proposals and the AAC doesn't simply provide a recommendation.

As of 11 April 2007, the AAC was not aware of a concrete proposal, but rather several structural and procedural changes being considered that will affect the role and function of the AAC. There seem to be two areas of concern particularly about the AAC: 1) what does a negative recommendation mean and what can the initiators of curricular proposals for courses or programs do about it? (logically, everybody's happy with a positive recommendation; 2) how can the curricular approval process move faster? Based on these perceptions, structural and procedural changes are being considered.

At a UC/AAC meeting on 7 February 2007, the main issues were changing the code to clarify the term "recommendation" and whether there should be an appeal process. On the first point, the AAC suggested that "recommendation" be changed to "approval required". On the second point, the AAC suggested that specific criteria be established for appeal based on ongoing customary practices by the AAC to ask for more information and engage in collegial dialogue with initiators prior to a final decision and never close the door on the possibility of the submission of a revised proposal for re-consideration.

Due to scheduling conflicts, none of the AAC members were able to attend a UC meeting on May 16, 2007. However, the inability of AAC members to attend this meeting should **not** be interpreted or construed as a lack of interest in or concern about the code changes being considered with regard to faculty elective councils and shared governance.

Over the course of the 2006-07 academic year, the AAC expressed its concern consistently about intentions to redefine the AAC's role and functions. AAC members received by email the document entitled DRAFT Academic Affairs Council and General Education Council as Committees of the Senate. The attachment is "a DRAFT document that appears to be the direction we are considering. In this document, you see some background and rationale and then some **potential** code changes." This document was not a formal agenda item at the AAC's final meeting of the 2006-07 academic year on May 8, 2007. The AAC members did not have ample time to consider the ramifications of these code changes. Clearly, their impact on the AAC's capacity to attend efficiently and effectively to curricular proposals, program reviews and other related business would be significant.

Furthermore, the AAC membership will change substantially beginning in fall 2007. Two new faculty voting members and one new administrative non-voting member will come on board. Given these circumstances, on behalf of the Academic Affairs Council, the chair requested a postponement of further action on code changes affecting the AAC until the AAC reconvenes in fall 2007 and the document DRAFT Academic Affairs Council and General Education Council as Committees of the Senate can be placed on the AAC's agenda as a formal discussion item. Since the document is still a draft that contains "potential code changes", the AAC assumes other proposals can be presented as alternatives.

Attached below is former Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff Ken Fleurant's formal analysis of code interpretations regarding the AAC and discussions of code changes by the University Committee and the Faculty Senate during 2005-06:

March 16, 2006: *The UC made the following interpretation of code following a request by the AAC:*

Request from AAC for Code Interpretation regarding the dean's ability to reject a recommendation from the AAC concerning the approval of a particular course. The UC agreed that there was no question but that the AAC's authority in this case was only to make a recommendation on such matters to the dean who, acting upon the delegated authority of the Provost, has the power of final decisions.

I would ask that the UC review its decision in this matter. I believe that it is not only an incorrect understanding of code, but an unfortunate departure from our tradition of faculty governance in curricular matters that sets a precedent harmful to governance.

Our Faculty Handbook begins with a reminder of the powers vested in the Faculty in educational matters by Chapter 36:

(4) FACULTY. The faculty of each institution, subject to the responsibilities and powers of the board, the president and the chancellor of such institution, shall be vested with responsibility for the immediate governance of such institution and shall actively participate in institutional policy development. As such the faculty shall have the primary responsibility for academic and educational activities and faculty personnel matters.

Primary responsibility cannot be understood to mean no more than the power to recommend to the dean in matters of curriculum.

There is a legitimate need to move beyond chapter 36 to see what our own code says about the role of the AAC since one can legitimately suggest that the faculty of a unit can ask the dean to approve a course, as the faculty of HUD apparently did in the case in question (although it was not made clear that the request came from the HUD executive committee or the chair. I will admit that code uses the word "recommendation" but I do not agree that the term need be taken as bereft of all authority in the governance process. Indeed, the second paragraph of the codified charge to the AAC stipulates that:

The Academic Affairs Council shall have the responsibility and authority for review of all credit courses and all academic programs at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Its recommendations shall be forwarded to the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs for his/her action.

Responsibility and authority are inconsistent with the interpretation that committee powers are limited to telling the dean whether the committee favors approving a course or not. Indeed, the very word "recommendation" is best understood as a "favorable statement", to the point where the expression "negative recommendation" may be seen to be a non-sequitur. The issue becomes whether the dean needs to receive the recommendation (read the favorable statement) of the AAC to act on curricular matters. (Actually code does not give the dean the right-- or obligation-- to act. Instead that obligation is given to the Provost. Nonetheless, we must recognize the power of delegation in such matters.)

I have heard people attempt to draw a parallel to the Personnel Council since it is well-known that the PC is not actually a decision level in the tenure process. Yet there is a notable difference in the wording of code and I believe it is purposeful. Code for the PC says

The appropriate Dean(s) shall seek the advice of the Personnel Council whenever a candidate for appointment or promotion is to receive tenure.

It does not say that the recommendation of the PC is required, nor does it say that the PC has responsibility or authority in the tenure process. As I understand the history of this provision, the framers of the code meant to limit the authority of the PC in this way in order to preserve the independent nature of its advice.

Code, then, when it comes to curricular matters, in general, and course approval, in particular, can (and, I believe, should) be read as requiring faculty recommendation, or favorable statement, prior to administrative action. Tradition may moderate this somewhat by suggesting that the provost has the right to insist on reconsideration of a refusal to recommend, or to negotiate a settlement with the faculty committee empowered to make decisions in the matter. Such is the nature of governance within the Wisconsin tradition.

At the March 15 Senate meeting Sally reported that the UC was studying the curricular approval process, the working draft of which was prepared by Associate Provost Sewall. I would point out that that document suggests that approval of unit executive committee and of the AAC (and, where appropriate, the GEC) is required, as is administrative approval. This, too, is as it should be. If you make the favorable statement of the AAC no more than advice supplied to the dean who has the actual authority for approval, several things happen:

- *The AAC becomes no more than an advisory body;*
- *By extension, all committees become advisory to the dean. You might as well change all the A's (approval required) into "r's" (recommendation requested) in the Sewall draft;*
- *Deans (and even Provosts) assume authority meant to be shared with the Faculty;*
- *Shared governance is weakened since advice givers assume no "responsibility and authority" to govern or share anything.*

Ten years ago, the NCA accreditation team listed as an area of concern that "The shared governance structure is difficult to understand in that overlapping parallel processes exist." They also said we need to "more directly integrate the work of institutional governance bodies with the institutional decision-making process." I thought that some progress had been made in this area although more was needed. However, this ruling of the UC, stating so unequivocally that "there is no question but that the AAC's authority in this case was only to make a recommendation," makes our shared governance structure even more difficult to understand and further removes it from the decision-making process. The ensuing sense of confusion about shared responsibility and authority if left unattended will further undermine shared governance and campus climate, leaving us exposed to renewed criticism. As chair of the working group studying our organizational and governance structure in preparation of our accreditation self-study, I am concerned that this UC decision makes understanding our shared governance structure even more difficult this time around.

Shared authority that allows all components of the campus to have a meaningful say in the operation of the institution, and to work out differences that arise, is the only way to make shared governance work for the common good. I encourage the UC to revisit the AAC's question both in itself and in relation to the entire curricular approval process that you are currently examining.

My concerns go beyond the process for approving a single course. I do believe that the UC's understanding of the process of committee recommendation could seriously affect many other levels of the curricular approval process, chipping away at traditional faculty governance responsibilities. I urge senators to seriously consider every instance of a curricular decision in the Curriculum Planning Guide to determine the appropriate degree of faculty approval in the process. If the logic behind the UC's interpretation of "recommendation" is followed, further changes in the approval process --beyond those currently proposed-- will need to be made. For example, UWGB 53.08 (b) reads:

*The executive committee has the authority to make **recommendations** concerning the curriculum and programs within the disciplinary or other unit.*

I emphasize the word "recommendation" wondering whether anyone would interpret this to mean that a disciplinary executive committee might not have a decisive say in its own curriculum or whether anyone believes a budgetary unit could require a disciplinary major to accept a course its faculty did not approve. And although this is a personnel and not a curricular matter, the same logic would hold for budgetary units when it comes to appointments since 53.03 (b) also refers to unit recommendations:

*The interdisciplinary unit executive committee has the responsibility to make **recommendations** concerning appointments, dismissals, promotions and salaries of the members of the interdisciplinary unit and on other budget matters which are transmitted to the appropriate Dean(s) and to the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The executive committee has the authority to determine the internal affairs of the interdisciplinary unit.*

It is clear that administration has its own important prerogatives. It is also clear that units submit unranked names in the case of faculty hires and the dean and provost have hiring authority. But it is also true that promotions do not proceed without unit recommendation, and people are not hired or tenured without unit assent-- call it recommendation or approval, but do not confuse it with advice.

As a matter of fact the word "recommendation" is used 145 times in code. It is actually easy to see how the various uses of the term in so many contexts could lead to confusion and, for that reason, I fault no one for the current situation. Yet, it is precisely for this reason that I urge great caution in the interpretation of faculty prerogatives in curricular decisions. It is easy to give something away; it is difficult to win it back.

*Ken Fleurant
Professor of French and Humanistic Studies
Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff
University of Wisconsin--Green Bay
Cofrin Library 825
Green Bay, WI 54311
office phone: (920) 465-2211
direct line: (920) 465-2078
office fax: (920) 465-2430*

Replacement of Registrar's Office Liaison on the AAC beginning in 2007-08-

In April 2007, without prior consultation with the AAC, the Provost and Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs and the Registrar decided to replace the Registrar's office liaison with the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs on the Academic Affairs Council in 2007-08. AAC members met with the Provost and Associate Provost on May 3, 2007 to ask for an explanation for this decision. For years, the registrar's office liaison has enhanced the AAC's capacity to make informed decisions about university-wide academic affairs. The meeting addressed reasons and rationale for the change and the responsibilities envisioned for the associate provost's post on the AAC as opposed to a representative from the registrar's office. An agreement was reached that the AAC would revisit this issue early in 2007-08 to evaluate the impact of this membership change on the effectiveness and efficiency of the AAC.

To: Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

From: Steve Dutch, Chair, Personnel Council

Subject: **Personnel Council Report of Activities for 2006-2007**

The Council convened in the fall to elect a chair and review its charge.

Although there were only six candidates for tenure in 2006-2007, this turned out to be a challenging year because three of the candidates were from NAS, meaning that two members of the Council had to be recused in those cases. In addition, one other candidate required recusal. The large number of recusals made for a challenging task of finding alternates and workable time slots. Also, the short turnaround time in January limited the time available for meeting between semesters. Finally, one member of the group had his flight unexpectedly delayed by bad weather, resulting in postponement of a meeting. The Chair wishes to express his sincere thanks to all the regular members, their alternates, and the candidates for bearing with all these complexities so patiently.

The candidates were all strong contenders. All were approved unanimously and granted tenure by the Regents.

The Council revived a practice that had fallen into disuse. Rather than have a Council member summarize the candidate's record, the candidate was invited to give a summary of his/her record. This seemed to work very well because it enables the candidate to emphasize his or her strong points and reduces the work load on Council members. It is still a good idea to have someone prepared to back up the candidate and keep important points from being missed.

The only other item of business was nominating candidates for the Committee on Committees and Nominations, which cannot nominate its own members. Two candidates were selected.

GENERAL EDUCATION COUNCIL 2006-07 ANNUAL REPORT

To: University Committee

From: 2006-07 General Education Council Members: Greg Aldrete, Heidi Fencl, Regan Gurung (ex officio), Kumar Kangayappan, Bill Lepley, Debra Pearson, Larry Smith, Brian Sutton (Chair)

Subject: Year-End Report of the General Education Council

I. Actions with Relatively Wide Applications

The following “bulleted” items summarize 2006-07 GEC activities with application extending beyond individual courses:

- Following up on a motion passed by the GEC at the end of the 2005-06 school year, the 2006-07 GEC worked with unit chairs and discipline chairs to recruit members for the initial Domain Committees. The Domain Committees are intended to participate in development, oversight, and assessment of the UWGB General Education Program in each of the five “domains” (Fine Arts, Humanities, Social Sciences, Natural Sciences, and Ethnic Studies/World Culture). In Spring 2007, GEC members met with faculty who will serve on the initial Domain Committees, to explain the functions of these committees and to answer questions about them. The Domain Committees are expected to convene and begin their work in the Fall 2007 semester.
- After Humanistic Studies made certain changes to its proposal in response to GEC requests, the GEC unanimously approved the Humanistic Studies General Education Proposal. The proposal was later approved by the Faculty Senate. Provost Hammersmith then requested further changes. Humanistic Studies complied with these changes, and the proposal will now presumably go into effect starting in 2007-08.
- The GEC passed a resolution calling for the GEC Chair and the Associate Dean (or, in the future, presumably the Associate Provost) to send a message to all teachers of upcoming general education courses, asking them to review the UWGB General Education Outcomes, keep those outcomes in mind while planning courses, mention the relevant General Education Outcomes in the course syllabus and on the first day of class, and attempt to integrate specific course material with the students’ broader interdisciplinary education. In late May of 2007, a statement emphasizing these points was sent from GEC Chair Brian Sutton and Associate Dean Regan Gurung to faculty who will be teaching General Education courses during the Fall 2007 semester. It is the hope of 2006-07 GEC members that future GEC chairs and Associate Provosts will send similar messages to faculty before each upcoming semester.
- The GEC helped oversee General Education course assessment—that is, assessment of the extent to which gen ed courses offered within a given domain actually satisfy the General Education Outcomes applicable to that domain. H-1, H-2, SS-1, and World Cultures courses were selected for “embedded assessment” for Fall 2006, and HB 2 and lower-level writing-emphasis courses for Spring 2007. The embedded assessment program remains far from perfect; as in other recent years, only about half of the

teachers asked to participate complied. GEC members hope that the creation of the Domain Committees will lead to more effective assessment, whether through increased compliance in the current plan or through adoption of other methods of assessment.

- The GEC passed a proposal designed to assure that students incorporated sufficient breadth and interdisciplinarity in satisfying their General Education requirements. But statistics from Debbie Furlong, Director of Institutional Research, indicated that the proposal might be superfluous, as nearly all UWGB students already satisfied the guidelines of the proposal without being required to. Thus, the GEC requested that the proposal be withdrawn from consideration by the Faculty Senate.
- The GEC endorsed a policy submitted to it by the Provost regarding General Education requirements for transfer students, reentry students, and second degree students.

II. Actions Involving Individual Courses

During 2006-07 the GEC approved the following:

- Creation of a “198” designation for Freshman Seminars in any discipline. (Forms for individual freshman seminars must still be submitted to the GEC for approval and, once approved by the GEC, forwarded to the AAC. Individual freshman seminars approved by GEC during 2006-07 are listed below along with other courses.)
- Writing-Emphasis designation for these courses:
 - Business Administration 472—Seminar in Leadership
 - English 218—World Literatures I (new course)
 - English 219—World Literatures II (new course)
 - History 312—The Early American Republic
 - History 483X—History of the Russian Empire to 1700 (experimental course)
 - Human Biology 198—Explorations of Gender (new freshman seminar)
 - Human Biology 198—Fantastic Voyage: Science in Film (new freshman seminar)
 - Human Development 198—The 'Burbs: History and Future of Life in Suburbia (new freshman seminar)
 - Humanistic Studies 198—The Culture of Food (new freshman seminar)
 - special section of Humanistic Studies 101—Foundations of Western Culture (freshman-seminar section)
 - Philosophy 103—Critical Thinking (new course)
 - Psychology 198—Gods, Ghosts, and Goblins (new freshman seminar)
 - Social Work 451—Child Welfare Practicum
- H-3 designation for these courses:
 - Philosophy 103—Critical Thinking (new course)
 - English 218—World Literatures I (reactivated course)
 - English 219—World Literatures II (reactivated course)
 - Humanistic Studies 198—The Culture of Food (new freshman seminar)
- SS-1 designation for this course:
 - Psychology 198—Gods, Ghosts, and Goblins (new freshman seminar)

- SS-2 designation for this course:
--Human Development 198—The 'Burbs: History and Future of Life in Suburbia (new freshman seminar)
- NPS-2 designation for these courses:
--Human Biology 198—Explorations of Gender (new freshman seminar)
--Human Biology 198—Fantastic Voyage: Science in Film (new freshman seminar)
- NPS1 designation for this course:
--Earth Science/Geography 223—Ocean of Air: Weather and Climate Laboratory (NPS1 designation was already in effect for Earth Science/Geography 222, the “parent” course for this lab section.)
- World Culture designation for these courses:
--Humanistic Studies 483X—Florence: An Urban History (experimental course)
--Humanistic Studies 483X—Italy from Within: Contemporary Italy (experimental course)
--Spanish 483X—Special Topics: Mass Media in Latin America
--Completion of second-year (fourth semester) competence in Arabic, Hmong, or Japanese, the same as for second-language courses we have long offered in French, German, and Spanish
- A shift from World Culture to Ethnic Studies designation for this course:
--Nutritional Science 302—Ethnic Influences on Nutrition

Note: Of the freshman seminars, only the Explorations of Gender course (one of the Human Biology 198 courses) was approved from a Course Master Form. Thus, that course is the only one approved to be offered again after Fall 2007. The others were all approved from an Experimental Course form, and thus presumably are approved for Fall 2007 only.

III. General Observations

General Education Council members worked well together, and the GEC had an effective and useful year. Partly because of the implementation of a Freshman Seminar program, the GEC had more work involving specific courses than in other recent years.

Admittedly, some have suggested that the GEC should create a proposal for a large-scale overhaul of the UWGB General Education Program; but in the recent past, when such proposals have come from the GEC, they haven't come close to receiving Faculty Senate approval. And it should be noted that certain actions by this year's GEC could do a great deal to reshape General Education at UWGB: the Humanistic Studies proposal will cause relatively extensive changes to gen ed, and there is potential for revitalizing gen ed in both the creation of Domain Committees and the idea that the GEC Chair and the Associate Provost should collaborate to send a message to faculty before each semester, reminding them to incorporate General Education Outcomes in their course planning, their syllabi, and their overall gen ed courses.

On a smaller-scale and perhaps anticlimactic note, the current UWGB policy on writing-emphasis courses states, “**One** public discourse assignment must be evaluated and returned to the student before the end of the **4th** week of class. (This is to allow students to seek help with their writing early in the course.)” Although syllabi the GEC receives for courses seeking the writing-emphasis designation almost invariably satisfy all other writing-emphasis requirements, most do not satisfy the “fourth-week rule,” a trend which suggests that the rule might be somewhat unreasonable and in need of modification. On the other hand, many faculty members report having little difficulty incorporating a small-scale writing assignment and returning it in the first few weeks of a course, and ideally students should be informed as early in the semester as possible if they’re likely to encounter problems with writing in a course. The 2006-07 GEC briefly considered a proposal to change the guidelines so that instructors would have until the end of the fifth week of class, rather than end of the fourth week, to return the first writing assignment. Although the 2006-07 GEC tabled this motion, the upcoming year’s GEC might do well to give the matter more extended consideration.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Clifford Abbott
Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

FROM: Fritz Erickson, Dean
Professional and Graduate Studies

DATE: July 26, 2007

SUBJECT: ANNUAL SUMMARY, **GRADUATE FACULTY BOARD OF ADVISORS 2006-2007**

The members of the 2006-2007 Graduate Faculty Board of Advisors were:

Fritz Erickson, Dean of Professional and Graduate Studies, Chair
Patricia Terry, Chair, Environmental Science and Policy
Timothy Kaufman, Chair, Applied Leadership
Karl Zehms, Chair, Management
Edna Staerkel, UWO, MSW Coordinator
John Katers, Member-at-Large
Marilyn Sagrillo, Member-at-Large
Joshua Kaurich, Graduate Student Representative

Greg Davis served as the University Committee's liaison.

The Board held five meetings throughout the academic year.

The Board acted upon or reviewed the following policy or procedural items:

1. The elimination of the GR-1 or Program Plan form for three of the four programs. The form was replaced with an Official Declaration of MS Degree, designed more closely to that used at the undergraduate level.
2. Discontinuing the Graduate Catalog in its current print format, replacing it with updated print materials specific to each individual program and an updated website. The Graduate Catalog remains an on-line resource.
3. Established alternative English Proficiency Evidence standards to the TOEFL, offering more flexibility to International Students.
4. Approved a policy that undergraduate students enrolled in graduate courses would have to determine whether or not to have graduate status. Variables driving this decision may include financial aid and graduate tuition differential that would be charged at the time the credits are applied to the degree.

The Board acted on the following curricular matters:

1. Endorsed a proposal by the Environmental Science and Policy Executive Committee to allow undergraduates to enroll in graduate courses. This endorsement was contingent upon an investigation into the ramifications to the student in regard to enrollment plateau, dual profiles to determine tuition and financial aid.

The Board also reviewed, discussed, and/or provided advice to the Dean of Professional and Graduate Studies on the following topics:

1. The Fall Reception for Graduate Students and Faculty.
2. The Sixth Annual Graduate Fair held on campus in October.
3. Participation in the Business Expo at the KI Convention Center.
4. The Growth Agenda and how growth at the undergrad level may affect the continued support received from these programs at the graduate level.
5. Supporting graduate assistantships funded by other departments on campus and any possible problems with assistantships offered outside a student's direct area of study.

In summary, the Board functioned effectively, providing the procedural oversight of Graduate Programs and also advice to the Dean. The GFBA continues to work in a collaborative fashion to increase graduate enrollment and streamline the process for admitting students into graduate programs.

cc: Graduate Faculty Board of Advisors
Greg Davis, NAS, University Committee Liaison

TO: Chancellor Bruce Shepard

FROM: 2006-2007 Committee on Rights and Responsibilities Members: Andrew Austin, Derryl Block, Tian-you Hu, Brian Merkel (chair), Cristina Ortiz.

Date: May 15, 2007

RE: **Committee on Rights and Responsibilities Annual Summary Report**

During the 2006-2007 academic year, the Committee on Rights and Responsibilities heard one complaint, one grievance, and one dismissal case. One remaining case involving dismissal of a faculty member remains unfinished. We complete the year with the following findings and suggestions:

- Members of the Professional Program in Education consumed a significant percentage of the committee's attention. The committee is concerned about the escalating and persistent nature of the turmoil affecting the Professional Program in Education.
- The CRR is generally the logical group to hear cases involving nonrenewal appeals, complaints and grievances. However, despite multiple hearings spanning a two year period, the CRR mechanism has apparently failed to remediate the turmoil in the Professional Program in Education.
- The CRR is an advisory committee whose experiences are not overtly connected with the campus community. It is possible that the "behind-the-scenes" operations of this advisory committee are ill-equipped to address effectively repeated sources of tension. Therefore, the CRR suggests that the administration and the University Committee consider developing a plan to address persistent problems. This may become particularly important for an institution that is anticipated to grow significantly in the near future.

Library and Instruction Technology Committee

Summary Report, 2006-2007

Committee members: Franklin Chen; Sarah Detweiler; Andrew Kersten (Chair); Mark Kiehn; Bruce LaPlante (Secretary); Erik Mims; Andy Speth

Ex officio: Kathy Pletcher, Leanne Hansen

This year the LITC met on 6 October, 10 November, 11 December 2006 and 26 January, 13 April, and 4 May 2007. We discussed a wide range of issues but the following issues were central to our work this year:

Cofrin Library Remodeling: The LITC gave its unanimous support of the remodeling proposal put forth by the Library Director.

Information and Communication Technology Literacy Testing: The LITC supported the expansion of the ICTL test for use in conjunction with the Freshmen Seminars if not for every freshman and student wanting to improve their information and communication technology abilities.

Podcasting on campus: The LITC decided after some deliberation that the campus is not quite ready for podcasting at this time.

Student Response Systems (aka “clickers”): To help the campus decide if it should adopt a student response system and which system it should adopt, the LITC created a subcommittee to investigate “clickers”. This committee will provide a report at the end of the Fall 2007 semester.

Wikis: The LITC discussed web 2.0 technologies such as wikis and blogs and decided that the campus does not yet have the IT infrastructure to support these technologies. However, the committee experimented with wikis and found the technology viable and useful.

Respectfully submitted, Andrew E. Kersten (LITC Chair, 2006-2007)

Academic Actions Committee
Report for 2006-2007

This year's committee was comprised of: Sarah Meredith (AH), Kristin Vespia (SS), Warren Johnson (NS, Chair), Sylvia Kubsch (PS), Sandra Deadman (*ex officio* and therefore not voting), Darrel Renier (substituting for Sandra Deadman beginning in April, *ex officio* and therefore not voting), Michael Herrity (*ex officio*), Paul Gazdik (student), Ryan Tiefenthaler (student), Joshua Vandebusch (alternate student representative), and Matthew Winden (student)

At the December 1, 2006 meeting the Committee considered conflicting desires concerning the academic calendar. Our main focus was on study days at the end of a semester and having commencement after final exams. The Committee considered input from 16 faculty and staff received in response to an e-mail invitation on these issues. The Committee sought additional time to formulate its recommendation.

At the December 15, 2006 meeting the Committee approved a principle of including at least one study day at the end of spring semesters while also concluding final exams (with the exception of the make-up day) prior to commencement. The Committee also approved a calendar for the 2008-2009 academic year.

At the January 14, 2007 meeting eight student appeals of academic suspension were heard.

At the April 3, 2007 meeting a student petition for a late withdrawal from the University for Fall of 2006 was heard. The Committee requested that additional information be obtained. In the following weeks that information was shared with the committee members. After receiving input from the Committee members the Chair granted the student petition.

Also at the April 3, 2007 meeting the Committee reviewed plans for implementing a 14-week semester calendar beginning with the 2008-2009 academic year. Feedback was provided to both Tim Sewall and Michael Herrity to facilitate the new calendar scheme.

At the June 15, 2007 meeting two student appeals of academic suspension were heard.

The committee informed students of the committee's decision before proceeding to further business. Students also received a letter with the committee's decision.

Respectfully submitted,
Warren Johnson, Chair for 2006-2007
June 15, 2007

To: Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

From: Steve Dutch, Chair, Awards and Recognition Committee

Subject: **Awards & Recognition Committee Report of Activities for 2006-2007**

The full Awards & Recognition Committee met in mid-fall to elect a chair and review the charge to the Committee.

The call for nominations was sent out to all members of the University community in February and the Committee met in March to screen nominations, solicit final documentation and make the final selection. Strong candidates were submitted and an award made in all categories. The chair is to contact nominators on August 1 to ensure that the candidates will be present for convocation.

There was a widespread consensus among the committee that soliciting nominations from students was not working well. Students frequently failed to understand the criteria for awards and often nominated faculty for the wrong award. Students do not have access to the necessary documentation, and none of the students who submitted nominations submitted any follow-up materials. We suggest that students continue to be allowed to participate in the process, but that they be instructed to contact a faculty member or department chair familiar with the nominee's qualifications for assistance instead of submitting nominations on their own.

To: Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

From: Steve Dutch, Chair, Honorary Doctorate Subcommittee

Subject: **Honorary Doctorate Subcommittee Report of Activities for 2006-2007**

The Honorary Doctorate Subcommittee met in August, 2006 to consider an award for Paolo Del Bianco, who was approved unanimously.

During the Spring semester, the chair received nominations for two honorary doctorates, both submitted by Information and Computer Science. The first step in the process is ascertaining that these candidates are not under consideration for awards anywhere else. UW System confirmed that they are not under consideration. The Provost expressed her preference that the files not be sent to her until they are complete, and in addition to vitae, letters of support are needed. One has been submitted and the chair will remind ICS of the need to submit the remaining letters. The awards process can be lengthy since it involves coordination between the faculty, Chancellor, and UW-System, and then the awardee, not always in strict sequence. The Honorary Doctorate subcommittee felt that the candidates are clearly deserving based on the submitted vitae, but will need to approve the complete files before forwarding them.

Dan Spielmann expressed a desire to meet with the Committee to discuss involvement of the committee in nominating and selecting Commencement speakers. We were unable to find a workable meeting time during the Spring Semester, so this matter should be a priority in the Fall.

UNIVERSITY of WISCONSIN
GREEN BAY

TO: Cliff Abbot, Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

FROM: Scott R. Furlong, Chair, Intercollegiate Athletics Committee

DATE: May 10, 2007

SUBJECT: 2006-07 Annual Report for the **Intercollegiate Athletics Committee (IAC)**

2006-2007 Committee Membership

Charles Aslakson (community member)	Donna Ritch (FAR)
Kevin Collins	Lisa DeLeeuw
Scott Furlong (Chair)	Karen Swan
Tim Meyer	Patricia Terry
Paul Randall (student member)	Ken Bothof, ex officio (Athletics Director)

The full IAC met six times during the 2006-2007 year. The IAC conducted the following major actions during this past year:

1. Monitored athletic eligibility for all intercollegiate sports and also reviewed and discussed the Academic Progress Report (APR).
 2. The committee discussed and commented on the upcoming NCAA Certification Visit that will occur in the Fall 2007. Several committee members served on either the Steering Committee or the one of the subcommittees. Donna Ritch, the FAR, was the point person for the self-study.
 3. The IAC reviewed and approved both the gender equity and minority reports as part of the NCAA review.
 4. The IAC participated in the Women's Basketball coach search by serving as the interviewing body and asking questions in a public session to the four candidates.
 5. The IAC discussed updates and issues such as the Kress Event Center, the Phoenix Fund, sport rosters, growth agenda, change in the academic calendar, the new athletic logo, and the Athletics budget. The IAC provided comments and advice to the Director of Athletics on all of these issues.
 6. The IAC examined and discussed travel schedules.
 7. The IAC voted to allow post-season participation for various sports teams.
 8. The IAC discussed issues of academic support for student-athletes with the Men's Basketball Coach.
-

UNIVERSITY of WISCONSIN
GREEN BAY

TO: Cliff Abbott, Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

FROM: Brenda Amenson-Hill and Scott R. Furlong, Co-Chairs,
First Year Experience Committee

DATE: May 21, 2007

RE: Annual Summary Report (2006-07) **First Year Experience Committee**

The First Year Experience Committee did not meet during this academic year. There was a conscious decision made that this committee was not needed on a continuing basis but rather would be used if particular issues arose that needed the Committee's input. As co-directors, we also believe that we can get the appropriate people together when necessary. We did have meetings throughout the year with the FOCUS Planning Committee and the First Year Seminar group that are coordinating bodies for the university's first year programs.

In the coming year as the University begins further discussion regarding first year programming, it is possible that the committee will need to reconvene.

If you have any questions, or are interested in any of the element of FOCUS, please don't hesitate to give us a call.

Committee on Individuals with Disabilities Summary of Activities for 2006-07

Members of the Committee on Individuals with Disabilities for the 2006-07 school year included Rebecca Meacham (faculty), Sherri Arendt (academic staff), Becky Harrill (classified staff) and Jessica Knox (student). Assistant Director for Diversity and Employment Services Yarvelle Draper-King, Coordinator of Disability Services Lynn Niemi and Americans with Disabilities Act Compliance Coordinator Greg Smith served on this committee as ex-official members. Lynn Niemi and Greg Smith served as co-chairpersons.

The Committee on Individuals with Disabilities met officially three times this year as a full committee.

Areas the committee addressed this year were as followed”

- More Accessible Restrooms on campus – The committee reviewed the plans for more accessible restrooms on campus which were developed as a result of our request last year. Additional restrooms will be in CL, IS, and SA. This project will take place in the Summer of 2007.
- Issues with Accessibility with Campus Entrances – The committee reviewed several entrances on campus and identified areas of concerns. A memo was sent to the Provost and the copy of the memo is attached. This item will continue to be reviewed next year.
- MAC Hall Stairs – The Co-Chairs discussed with Chris Hatfield on how the stair could be marked so they would be clearly differentiated. Chris has attempted two different methods to mark the stairs however, neither was successful. Next year we will continue to work with Chris to look at ways to resolve this issue.
- Other accessibility concerns brought to the committee’s attention this year that were discussed include: accessibility of E-Reserves; faculty accommodations and the process to obtain accommodations; and monitoring renovations in the University Union, Kress Center and Student Services buildings.

The co-chairs of this committee feel that it has been doing valuable work and is worthwhile. We are ensuring individuals with disabilities have access to our campus and events held.

Minutes and memos from this year’s full committee meeting are included with this report.

Individualized Learning Committee

Year End Report, 2006 – 2007

Respectfully submitted to the Secretary of the Faculty and Staff by Kaoime Malloy, Chair.

Membership: Kaoime Malloy, Chair; Forrest Baulieu; Yolanda Sallman; Mark Kiehn; Pamela Gilson; Hosung Song and Bill Laatsch; Associate Dean Regan Gurung (ex-officio).

The committee met six times over the year.

The following Independent Majors were approved:

1. Rachel Eichhorst – “Arts Management”
2. Sarah Pressner – “Arts Management”
3. Ryan Penneau – “Arts Management”
4. Patrick Burns – “First Nations Studies”

We reviewed and approved curricular changes for the following existing/approved Independent Majors:

1. Matthew Babiasch
2. Rachel Eichhorst

We reviewed but did not approve curricular changes for the following existing/approved Independent Majors:

1. Ryan Penneau

The great majority of our time was spent reviewing one particular student’s proposal and its multiple subsequent revisions over several meetings. There was a general feeling of haste on the part of the committee with regards to this proposal, as it was submitted in the semester the applicant intended to graduate. We felt pressured into arriving at a quick resolution that would allow the student to graduate during the fall semester (even though we finally required substantial revisions that greatly enhanced the proposal and the student’s plan of study, necessitating courses in the spring semester). As a result, the committee considered adding language to the brochure and website stating that timely submission of proposals, well in advance of an expected graduation date is strongly encouraged in order to accommodate potential revisions requested by the committee.

We also discussed the question of individualized minors, a question brought to the committee by Jennifer Ham. The general consensus of the committee was that there was no need for individualized minors, that the possibility of individual majors, coupled with interdisciplinary and disciplinary minors, provides a large range of possibilities for plans of study without the need for an individualized minor as well. We also feel that the committee as it currently operates would not be able to support the potential flood of applications such a curricular change could possibly bring.

UNIVERSITY of WISCONSIN
GREEN BAY

May 18, 2007

TO: Provost Hammersmith

FROM: Dennis Lorenz, Chair of the IACUC

SUBJECT: 2006-07 Annual Summary of the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee

The premier season for the UWGB IACUC has been completed.

Three proposals were submitted, and all were approved:

- Robert Howe: "Influence of Human Activities on Habitat Use by Black Bears."
- Dan Meinhardt and Angela Bauer-Dantoin: "Effect of Endocrine Disrupting Chemicals on Frog Reproduction and Morphology."
- Brian Merkel and Dr. Phythyon (SNC): "Polychlorinated Biphenyl-Mediated Immunotoxicity in Inbred Mice."

April 20, 2007

To: Provost Sue Hammersmith

From: Heidi Fencil (chair) on behalf of the **Institutional Assessment Committee**

Re: Recommendations Regarding Evaluation of Teaching at UWGB

After more than a semester of discussion regarding evaluation of teaching in general and student evaluation of teaching in particular, the Institutional Assessment Committee unanimously passed the following motion during its February 23, 2007 meeting:

Resolved that UWGB meets the UW System criteria for Student Evaluation of Instruction (Regent Policy #868) but that there remains a need to improve uniformity in evaluation procedures and to improve explicitness of how those procedures are defined.

To that end, the IAC recommends the attached modifications (changes and additions are highlighted) to the UWGB Policy on Student Feedback on Instruction. These modifications address both the resolution as stated above and the philosophies that

- students are most directly in position to evaluate professional behavior and treatment of students,
- evaluation by students must be considered seriously, and
- individuals and units must therefore be provided with information about the norms, purposes and limitations of the Student Feedback instrument(s).

We recommend that to address the first of these philosophies, the CCQ be used by all units and teaching personnel on campus in the short term, with pilot use of the Rutgers University Student Instructional Rating Form to be conducted and evaluated within two years as the questions on the Rutgers instrument appear to have a strong tie to that point.

In addition, there is strong consensus among the committee that Student Evaluation of Teaching must be only one component of overall teaching evaluation, but that under current practice few units collect and effectively use additional information. This results in a current practice in which only limited elements of teaching are evaluated and is particularly problematic for the role that assessment of teaching is intended to play in improvement of teaching.

To that end, the IAC agrees that in order to effectively use assessment of instruction for the purposes of teaching improvement, retention/promotion/tenure decisions, and merit, teaching assessment must be conducted in a broader way than is currently the norm. Specific recommendations are attached under the heading "COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING." The IAC recommends further that these recommendations be brought to the Faculty Senate for discussion and inclusion into code.

POLICY ON STUDENT FEEDBACK ON INSTRUCTION

Affirming the centrality of teaching to faculty performance and therefore the need to provide effective evaluation of teaching, the faculty of the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay has always recognized that student response to teaching is one important source of information for that purpose, and is especially important for providing information about the instructor's classroom demeanor, conduct and professionalism. The faculty reaffirms its policy on the use of student feedback on teaching to provide data for (a) the improvement of instruction; (b) retention, promotion and tenure decisions; and (c) merit increase deliberations. These policies are expressed in terms of faculty and unit responsibility and the University's use of the students' comments, and are in accordance with Regent Policy #868.

Unit Responsibilities:

1. Student comments on teaching performance shall be obtained in every course taught by means of a standardized, university-wide student feedback instrument. Each unit shall also include a list of questions or a separate instrument pertinent to additional teaching issues deemed important by that unit. A standardized technique for administering the student feedback process, established by the instructor's unit, shall be implemented. The process should encourage students to write open-ended comments. End-of-course feedback shall not be shown to the instructor until grades are submitted.
2. The executive committee of each academic budgetary unit shall establish guidelines for the use of a student feedback process, in conformity with Board of Regents and University of Wisconsin-Green Bay policy requiring use of student ratings for merit, retention, and promotion decisions as part of the data considered regarding teaching, and in accordance with norms and research done on each item on the instrument¹. Each unit's policy shall be submitted to the Provost's Office and made available in writing to all members of the unit. These guidelines shall also include provisions to ensure that:
 - a. for all untenured and teaching academic staff, results are reviewed annually
 - b. for all tenured faculty, results are reviewed at least biennially
3. To enlarge the information base used in evaluation of teaching performance, faculty members should be encouraged to place in their personnel files (a) a list of courses taught, (b) a current syllabus for each course taught, (c) a copy of a representative assessment tool to measure student performance for each course taught, and (d) samples of other materials distributed to students.
4. Positive recommendations for promotion, retention, or annual merit increases must be supported by evidence of teaching effectiveness, including but not limited to data from a student feedback process.

¹ Available at www.uwgb.edu/assessment/teaching/evaluations_norms.html, <http://cat.rutgers.edu/sirs/>, and <http://www.comm.ucsb.edu/faculty/rrice/teachcon.htm>.

Recommendations Regarding

COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING

The executive committee of each academic budgetary unit shall establish a procedure for evaluation of teaching which is broader than exclusive use of a student feedback questionnaire, and which clearly establishes guidelines and process by which such evaluation is used formatively for improvement of teaching separate from the process by which it is used in personnel decisions.

Units are encouraged to adopt the recommendations of the Task Force on Teaching Evaluation (September, 1998), which can be found on the web at (http://www.uwgb.edu/assessment/teaching/taskforce_recommendations.html).

At the least, each unit's Teaching Evaluation Plan must examine the following elements for evaluation of every faculty member:

1. Objective evidence of teaching effectiveness
2. Evidence of teaching development
3. Evidence obtained through student-feedback
4. Report of how results of the previous evaluation were used for teaching improvement

Units should use flexibility in establishing evidence to be provided in each category so that the evidence is relevant to the individual's assignment. Suggestions include:

<i>Teaching Effectiveness</i>	<i>Teaching Development</i>	<i>Student Feedback</i>	<i>Teaching Improvement</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peer visits and review • Student Assessment of Learning Gains Instrument • Scores on standardized tests used in the discipline • External evaluation such as internship assessment • Student performance in later courses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in Teaching Scholars • Attendance at on-campus teaching events • Attendance at teaching conferences • Self-report on individual approach to development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CCQ or Rutgers instrument (required for all units) • Additional questions chosen by the unit or individual • Results of mid-term evaluations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-assessment narrative

The Personnel Council and Committee of Six shall clearly state policies for personnel decisions which reflect the recommendations of the Task Force on Teaching Evaluation and include examination and use of the four specified areas of evidence.

**Summary Report of the activities of the Institutional Review Board
of the University of Wisconsin – Green Bay for the academic year 2006-2007**

**Submitted by Dr. James C. Marker, Chair
June 8, 2007**

Proposals:

During the 2006-2007 academic year, the IRB met 8 times. The meetings were held on Friday afternoons, and they generally lasted around 2 hours.

There were 70 proposals submitted to the IRB (see attached summary). Of the seventy, 38 were reviewed as "expedited" or "exempt" status by the IRB chair. Thirty proposals were reviewed as "full board" proposals by the entire IRB, and 2 submitted proposals were deemed "non-research" and were not reviewed. Of the 70 submitted proposals, 3 were submitted as amended proposals and one as a renewal. There were two proposals that were submitted, but because of incomplete submission requirements, never acted on. One proposal was withdrawn. As of this writing, three proposals await final approval contingent on the PI providing follow-up information as requested by the IRB.

The proposals came from three main sources: (1) UW-Green Bay faculty who were doing research with students; (2) students enrolled in the UW-Green Bay / UW – Oshkosh Masters in Social Work program (w/ Dr. Judy Martin as PI); and (3) 30 graduate students in the Masters of Applied Leadership program here at UW-Green Bay. For the record, a significant number of the proposals dealt with pedagogical issues both at the K-12 and college level.

Handling Incompliant Research:

The IRB (and many other entities on campus) spent considerable time and effort dealing with a fairly high profile research endeavor that became incompliant to previously approved IRB guidelines and stipulations. In brief, some (not all) of the research on black bears had been conducted outside of the time frame designated by the IRB and involved techniques not approved by the IRB. The situation resulted in some fairly intense situations and a fair amount of emotional anxiety for a number of individuals including members of the UW-Green Bay community, government officials, and community members. While I am not privy to all of the ramifications resulting from this situation, it is my opinion that, all in all, it culminated in a reasonable and satisfactory resolution. As a consequence of dealing with this situation, there was a great deal of "education" that occurred on the part of the institution at many levels, including (1) an appreciation for the importance of all faculty and grad students being keenly aware of, and in compliance with IRB policies and regulations, (2) an understanding of the proper chain of command, and in particular, the role of the presiding officer (the provost in our case) in dealing with these situations, and (3) an awareness of the need for better education and training/awareness of principles of IRB across the campus as a whole. The IRB dealt with this situation of incompliant research as a consequence and pertinent to its past role as both an IRB and IACUC (animal subjects). For the record, the continuation (actually conclusion) of the research project was turned over to the recently formed IACUC which reviewed and approved the final component of that study. To the best of my knowledge, that study is now complete.

Proposal Processing:

As chair of the IRB, I used a technique I developed for other applications to streamline the process of dealing with proposals. This method has the advantage of being efficient, accurate, and professional. It also provides a detailed log of the proposals and relevant matters pertaining to them, e.g., any stipulations needed for approval. In brief, this technique involves entering the basic information from a proposal (PI, dates, etc) into an Excel spreadsheet which in turn is used as a data set to send e-mail messages via the Word "e-mail merge" program.

The Word document is a "form letter" set up with basic IRB response language, but the language changes somewhat depending on the status of the proposal (which is coded in the spreadsheet). (See sample e-mail letters). These e-mail messages provide an excellent record of the transaction and status of a proposal. As such, the final approval letter is sent to the Secretary of the Faculty and Tim Sewall as official record of the proposal being approved.

Related to the matter of processing proposals - one of my goals as chair was to pursue the development of a web-based method of processing proposals. I spoke with Paula Ganyard to give her the vision of the process. She, in turn, attended a meeting and discussed it with the IRB. This project did not go much beyond that discussion. After having experienced the IRB "process" over the past year, I'm not sure if this is the best approach. I say this because so much of this "process" is interactive and would be very difficult to handle with a "canned" program. (see below)

IRB Web Page revision:

As chair, I took on the challenge of upgrading the IRB web page. The emphasis for the revised web page was to help the user know where to start and what to do. I have heard several positive comments from faculty that the revised web page is more "user friendly" than it was in the past. There is still more to do, but at least faculty have a good sense of where to begin and/or what the overall process entails.

IRB Support – release and/or summer stipend:

For years, the work load of the IRB and, in particular, the Chair of the IRB has been a matter of concern! Having now experienced it, I concur with my past colleagues that the workload is excessive! (It is fulfilling, but it is excessive!) This matter has been discussed several times in the past with Tim Sewall (liaison to the Provost). His response has been to implement to use of support staff to help do the initial screening and check-off of the proposals. The specific office staff who would do this task of screening has never been determined, and the question of who should or could do this has always lingered.

Having now been chair, I would suggest that this strategy for reducing the load would be ineffectual as a whole and may, in fact, add additional work and time to the process by way of extra communication and (literally) transit time of proposals. The bulk of our time as chair involves two things – evaluation and communication! The majority of my time as chair of the IRB was spent in evaluating proposals (or the requested modification of proposals) and communicating as to that evaluation. These important tasks are something that need to be done by an IRB trained individual. In addition, the combination of evaluation and communication which typically go together are most effectively done by the same person. As such, the option of employing office staff to reduce the workload of the chair is not a realistic option. No doubt, we have competent office staff that could be trained to do such a task, but it is simply not their role, and there doing it would not be in the context of being a member of the IRB. While I appreciate the sentiment to get us some help, after having done the job for a year and experiencing the complicated nature of this "evaluating" and "communicating", I do not believe that providing staff support is the answer.

The answer – a course release for the chair! I have no qualms whatsoever about proposing this! I kept a detailed log (see copy) of my activities and time as chair over the Spring 2007 semester (including writing this report). As you can see averaging my total time over 15 weeks, I spent over **4 hours per week** on IRB related matters. Keep in mind, this is with my efficient data- mail merge method of dealing with proposals. Also keep in mind, that this did NOT include the mega hours spent on matters related to the "Bear Study". To put this in perspective, I spent half a day a week working on IRB matters. As a matter of comparison – how would that time commitment compare to the Chair of the UC who gets a release for her/his efforts?

Summer support? With the current status of the IRB – reviewing proposals during the summer is only possible if (1) the proposal is expedited and (2) the IRB chair is agreeable to review it (outside of her/his contract). As such (and I know that this has happened), faculty research can be impeded and/or postponed until after the summer. In addition, this situation increases the likelihood of other problems occurring. As a case in point – the "Bear Study", had it been dealt with early last summer (shortly after our becoming aware of the situation), could have had a much better/quicker resolution, particularly for the grad student, had it been addressed immediately. As it was, almost 6 months of "data" were effectively lost.

Please kindly consider the option of providing a release to the chair of the IRB along with some type of summer support. Perhaps the details could be negotiated somewhat with the faculty member involved, but clearly some type of release and/or compensation is appropriate for the excessive hours required as chair of the IRB

The IRB members:

The members of this 2006-2007 IRB demonstrated extreme professionalism, commitment, and competence in carrying out the important charge of this body! We had a lot of work to do, and as a whole, the committee members were dedicated to the task. They came to meetings prepared, and they approached the task of reviewing proposals in a spirit of problem-solving and collegiality. They are to be commended for their efforts to facilitate the ethical treatment of human subjects participating in research conducted at UW-Green Bay!

May 7, 2007

MEMORANDUM

TO: Cliff Abbott, Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

FROM: Dean D. VonDras, Chair, Instructional Development Council

SUBJECT: 2006-07 Instructional Development Council Annual Summary Report

The Instructional Development Council met monthly during the 2006-07 academic year. Ongoing activities are advisory, awareness-oriented, and in support of student engagement and excellence in teaching. Currently the IDC sponsors the following programs: Teaching Enhancement Grants, January Faculty Development Conference, an Orientation Program for New Faculty, Instructional Development Awards, Friday Discussions, the *IDC Newsletter*, and the new Recognition of Outstanding Scholarship in the Area of Teaching and Learning. The IDC also acts in an advisory role and supports the UW-Green Bay Sabbatical Leave Program as well as OPID initiatives of UW Teaching Fellows, and UW Teaching Scholars.

Advisory Activities:

- Recommended Dr. Peter Breznay to OPID for the WI Teaching Scholars Program, and recommended Dr. Kristin Vespia to OPID for the WI Teaching Fellows Program.
- Reviewed twelve sabbatical applications and found all acceptable for award.

Awareness-building Activities:

- Created and awarded a new category of curriculum development awards: In the fall, the Council voted to unanimously award Dr. Breznay the Spring 2007 Advanced Course Development Grant without deferral to a different semester. In the case that Dr. Breznay cannot accept the Grant for Spring 2007, the Council selected Dr. Haynie as the alternate grantee.
- In the spring, the Council voted unanimously to award Dr. Breznay the Fall 2007 award in Category I of the Instructional Development Grant. In Category II of the Instructional Development Grant, Dr. Uwe Pott provided a most outstanding proposal and was selected to receive the first award. Jill White was selected to receive the second award.
- Created a new award for scholarship of teaching and learning research. The call for this award is in development and will occur later in the year. This new award replaces the featured faculty and creative teaching awards.

- Revised and reformatted, published, and distributed “*IDC Newsletter*” to teaching faculty and staff in the Spring 2007 semester. The revised and reformatted newsletter allowed for a much more professional presentation and includes brief teaching and learning related essays composed by faculty, as well as information about instruction-related activities on-campus as well as System and national conferences and activities.
- Maintained an up-to-date web site of development opportunities and IDC news.
- Offered and promoted the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Poster-Session during the January 2007 Faculty Development Conference.

Activities to Support Student Engagement and Excellence in Teaching:

- Sponsored the “Engaging Students and Revitalizing Interdisciplinarity: A Kick-Off Event for Cross-Campus Teaching Development” on October 13 and 27, 2006. These workshops were led by Heidi Fencl, with special guest Jillian Kinzie of NSSE, and were supported by the Provost’s Office.
- Instructional Development Council member Angela Bauer-Dantoin sponsored presentations led by Dr. David Walton on November 9, 2007 on outreach in non-industrialized countries. This activity was supported by the Provost’s Office. It also included a discussion of the book “Mountains beyond Mountains” by Tracy Kidder.
- Hosted the 11th Annual Faculty Development Conference entitled, “Student Engagement and Interdisciplinarity: What’s In It For Me?” This conference was held on campus January 12, 2006 and included colleagues from St. Norbert College, Bellin School of Nursing, as well as other UW System campuses. The day long conference was noted as having the highest attendance in recent years. The conference keynote speaker was Deborah Hoskins who presented on the subject of interdisciplinarity in teaching. The distinguished luncheon speaker was Fergus Hughes who reflected on his teaching experiences. Other sessions included presentations from faculty serving in the areas of the Humanities, Biology, Environmental Sciences, and Extension Services. Overall, Conference evaluations were excellent.
- Provided a new year-long program to assist new-faculty. This program was directed at both new faculty and the broader teaching community, and consisted of a series of informal brown-bag meetings. The topics included collaborative learning (October 2006, facilitated by the members of the IDC), first-year issues (January 2007, facilitated by Tim Sewall), and problem based learning (March 2007, facilitated by Cliff Abbott).
- Sponsored a discussion of the FOCUS Program’s activity led by Georjeanna Wilson-Doegenes and Scott Furlong on April 13, 2007.

- Sponsored, with IDC Chair Dean VonDras serving as site-host, the OPID videoconference “Class Matters: Breaking Down Class Barriers in the Workplace and the Classroom” on April 16, 2007.
- Awarded Teaching Enhancement Grants in the Fall of 2006 to Denise Bartell, Forrest Balieu, Regan Gurung, Aeron Haynie, Terri Johnson, Donna Ritch, and Hosung Song.
- Awarded Teaching Enhancement Grants in the Spring of 2007 to Angela Bauer-Dantoin, Kristy Deetz, Mathew Dornbush, Alison Gates, Sylvia Kubsch, Sarah Meredith, Kristin Vespia, and Dean VonDras.

Ongoing Interests:

- To continue to promote faculty exchanges and discussions through the Friday Discussions program.
- To promote a Peer-Review of Teaching for interested educators on campus.
- To promote post-tenure mentoring through informal and faculty-led “learning-circles”.
- To promote post-tenure advancement through the “Promotion Tutors” program brought forth and presented by Dr. Illene Noppe to the Instructional Development Council.
- To create a new award for the scholarship of teaching and learning research. The call for this award is in development and hopefully will be released later in the year.

Conclusion:

The Instructional Development Council plays an important role in emphasizing student engagement in learning, promoting reflection on and discussion of effective teaching methods, and in facilitating opportunities for professional development. The Council is recognized for its service of providing Instructional Development Awards and Teaching Enhancement Grants during each semester. These are very important awards to the campus community and provide for a variety of professional development activities. In many ways the awards assist faculty in reflection about and refinement of teaching, as well as informational exchange with colleagues at regional, state, and national professional development conferences.

The Council looks forward to hosting the January 2008 Faculty Development Conference. The theme and title of the conference will be, “How Students Learn: Evidence from the Arts, Sciences, and Professional Programs.” The Council also looks forward to further involving faculty in professional development activities. As noted in the recent *IDC Newsletter*, faculty have been solicited to submit scholarly essays about teaching and learning, and to participate in peer-review of classroom teaching, development of a teaching portfolios, and participation in a professional development learning-circles. The Council is interested in facilitating these and other activities that not only provide new

opportunities for professional growth, but also build inclusive, cooperative, and interdisciplinary connections among peers. The Council, again via the *Newsletter*, invited interested faculty to lead peer-discussions that explore various teaching and learning topics, concerns, or issues. It is hope that faculty will come forth and lead these discussions, and thus throughout the year the Council hopes to continue to sponsor such activities. Indeed, in early Fall 2007 activities include the presentation of brown-bags on “Promotion Tutors” led by Dr. Illene Noppe, and an “Orientation for New Faculty” led by Tim Sewall. The Council also hopes to launch the new award for the scholarship of teaching and learning research in the coming academic year. Further, the Council will release its next volume of the *IDC Newsletter*, again in a format that includes scholarly and reflective essays composed by faculty and staff.

International Education Council

Annual Report for 2006-2007

Membership included:

Kristin Aoki (Academic Staff)	Kevin Fermanich (Faculty)
Brent Blahnik (Academic Staff)	Paula Ganyard (Academic Staff)
Diana Borrero-Lowe (Academic Staff)	Fergus Hughes (Administration)
David Coury (Faculty)	Shiyanke Goonetilleke (Student Representative)
Melissa Cousineau (Community Rep.)	Sue Keihn (Administration)
Marcelo Cruz (Faculty)	Anne Kok (Faculty)
Fritz Erickson (Administration)	

The International Education Council met regularly throughout the 2006-2007 academic year to provide guidance on topics related to international education. Discussion points included:

1. Semester in Florence study abroad program. The International Education Council reviewed and supported the “island” structure of UWGB’s newest study abroad initiative which will allow a UWGB faculty member to accompany a group of students to Florence, Italy for the duration of a semester-long study abroad program. The International Education Council also responded favorably to UWGB’s ability to control the academic content of the program.
2. The International Education Council supported the development of new study abroad programs. To that end, the IEC accepted responsibility for reviewing faculty site-visit grant applications and making award determinations based on strategic priorities for international education.
3. The International Education Council recommends that the recruitment of international students be an institutional priority. Recruitment should focus primarily on the top five producing countries that send students to the United States with a goal of increasing international student enrollment to 2% of the overall undergraduate population.

I wish to publicly thank my colleagues who served on the International Education Council for their dedication and commitment throughout the year.

Submitted by: Brent Blahnik, Chair of the International Education Council and Director of International Education

Research Council – 2006-07 Annual Report

Linda Tabers-Kwak and Michael Zorn, Co-Chairs

The UW-Green Bay Research Council met seven times during the 2006-2007 academic year. The members included: Greg Aldrete (Secretary), Craig Hanke, Linda Tabers-Kwak (Co-Chair), Kristin Vespia, Michael Zorn (Co-Chair), Michael Marinetti (ex-officio), and Lidia Nonn (ex-officio). The Research Council solicited and evaluated proposals from UWGB faculty and awarded funding in three programs: Grants in Aid of Research (GIAR), Grants for Integrating Research and Teaching (GIRT), and the new Research Scholar program. In addition, the Research Council also hosted the 7th Annual UWGB Research Council Exchange. These specific activities are summarized below in more detail.

Grants in Aid of Research (GIAR)

The goal of the Grants in Aid of Research program is to provide funding of up to \$600 to support faculty research activities. Proposals for data and/or materials collection for research, exhibition or performance projects are given the highest priority, while proposals for travel to a conference at which the faculty member will give a research presentation are also considered if funds are available. GIAR awards are made in both Fall and Spring semesters; 16 proposals were funded in the Fall 2006 semester and 16 proposals were funded in the Spring 2007 semester. A total of \$16,574 was distributed to faculty members through this program over the entire academic year. The GIAR award winners are listed on the UWGB Research Council's web site at <http://www.uwgb.edu/rc>.

Grants for Integrating Research and Teaching (GIRT)

The goal of the Grants for Integrating Research and Teaching program is to provide funding of up to \$1,500 to support faculty efforts that combine scholarly and pedagogical activities. Two proposals were funded in Spring 2007 and a total of \$2,843 was awarded through this program. The GIRT award winners are also listed on the UWGB Research Council's web site.

Research Council Exchange

The 7th Annual UWGB Research Council Exchange was held on Wednesday, April 25, 2007. The goal of this program is to provide an opportunity for UWGB faculty to gather together to discuss their scholarship activities with their fellow colleagues. All faculty members are encouraged to submit a brief description of their research/creative work for display at the event. In addition to the social aspect, the event also provides an opportunity for faculty members to demonstrate how they utilized the support of Research Council awards to further facilitate their research.

Of the 23 participants at this year's event, more than one-third of the participants represented Natural and Applied Science. These faculty included Professors Chen, Dornbush, Fermanich, Hu, Luczaj, Lyon, McIntire, Wolf, and Zorn. From Dr. Lyon's *Bi-metallic materials as catalysts* to Dr. Wolf's *Comprehensive Data Base of Wisconsin's Bee Fauna*, everyone enjoyed sharing topics and research of interest.

A comprehensive work by Carol Emmons from Communication and the Arts was titled *Surveying Desire XV: Overtures 2006*. Curt Heuer also showcased the outstanding work from Communication and the Arts with his *Lost in Context*.

Human Development hosted four participants including a stress management study by Professors Roethel & Gurung and others by Illene Noppe and Kristin Vespia. From Human Development and Psychology, Professors Martin and Wilson-Doenges shared information about the *Changes in Introduction to Psychology Students' Knowledge and Attitudes toward Psychology and Psychological Research*.

Anne Kok examined families on the housing choice voucher program waiting list in Brown County, and Mark Kiehn investigated music creativity. Professional Programs were also represented by Susan Gallagher-Lepak from the Professional Program in Nursing. Public and Environmental Affairs was represented by Terri Johnson, who shared *Wisconsin Electoral Data*.

Human Biology was strongly represented by Craig Hanke and Uwe Pott. As members or former members of the Research Council, it was a fine opportunity to see how council members continue to see the value in Research Council, even when their council membership has concluded.

Humanistic Studies Professor, David Coury, authored *Globalization and its Discontents: German literature before and after 9-11*, and Dr. Henze's ongoing examinations of *Shakespeare's Songs Restored* illustrates how a variety of Research Council awards can support the continuation of a study and/or support a professor's travel and collegiality in a variety of settings.

Overall, the 23 participants in this year's Research Exchange illustrate the value of the Research Council's work. Year after year, faculty continue to value the council's financial support in the continuation of ongoing research. The 2006-2007 Research Council Members wish to acknowledge this year's exchange participants, and we encourage all faculty to see the value in collegiality and how Research Council Awards can play a supportive role in faculty research.

Unlike previous Research Council Exchanges, this year's event also included an additional component. The Research Council decided that it would be a good idea to end the event with a presentation by the first winner of the UWGB Research Scholar award, Daniel Meinhardt. This program is discussed in more detail in the following section. Professor Meinhardt presented an overview of his *Development of a Collaborative Grant Proposal to Study the Effect of Endocrine Disruptors on Development and Reproduction in Amphibians*. Many members of the audience asked Dr. Meinhardt about the proposal process as well as about his research and how he used his course release time. Dr. Meinhardt also discussed the conundrum that results from a course release. As faculty know, ironically, there is quite a lot of prep work involved in not having to prep for a course.

UWGB Research Scholar Program

The purpose of this program, which was originally proposed to the council by UWGB faculty member, Illene Noppe, was to finance a three-credit course release for one of our faculty members each semester. Research scholars would use this "gift of time" to either prepare a publication or public performance of their scholarly work, or apply for extramural funding of their research activities. The Research Scholar initiative has a growing history of collaboration among Research Council Chairs and their respective committees, and we are quite proud of that accomplishment!

Under the leadership of the Research Council's 2004-2005 Chair, Uwe Pott, the council focused on the mission of UW-Green Bay. With UWGB being primarily a teaching institution, our faculty faced the challenge of performing scholarly research while teaching an average of seven courses per academic year. In addition to the time constraints that hampered scholarship there was often a lack of funding for research projects. In order to alleviate these challenges, the research council decided to go forward with an initiative to establish a novel, competitive funding program, the UWGB Research Scholar program. In June 2005, Chairman Pott and the Council submitted the proposal for the Research Scholar program to Provost Hammersmith for consideration. Unfortunately, funding was not available for this program at that time.

The council's fine leadership continued under the direction of Kris Vespia. And at the beginning of the 2005-2006 academic year, the council returned to optimistic discussions about the feasibility of the Office of the Provost funding a "Research Scholar" program. The Research Scholars, based on completing an application and likely a very competitive review process, would receive funds to use toward a course release during one semester, thus providing them with additional time to work on a publication, exhibition, presentation, grant proposal, or other form of scholarly activity. The Research Council worked throughout the 2005-2006 academic year to refine the initial Research Scholar Proposal. The committee expressed enthusiastic support for this potential new program. Members believed that time is a critical resource to provide to our faculty members as they work to advance their scholarship, and that any funds expended for this reason would likely see a return in the form of additional recognition for the University. At the conclusion of the 2005-2006 year, the Research Council forwarded a more comprehensive proposal for a "Research Scholar" program. This revised proposal included a sample call for proposals, timeline, and evaluation criteria. The council concluded the 2005-2006 academic year with optimism that the Provost's office would continue to consider this worthy endeavor, and the Office of the Provost assured the council that the proposal was, indeed, under consideration.

The 2006-2007 academic year began with celebration! The Provost announced that the Research Scholar idea would be funded by the Office of the Provost. One caveat, however, was that the council would need to "hit the ground running" in

terms of getting out the call and recommending the Spring 2007 Research Scholar to the Office of the Provost. On one hand, the council was delighted at the approval of the idea. On the other hand, time was of the essence, and several faculty felt constrained by the short timeline and questions about the outcomes that the proposal needed to provide. The council designed a rubric that would align their discussions and final recommendation. The Research Council web site was also updated to share evaluation criteria with faculty.

Two years of diligent work by 2004-2005 Chair, Uwe Pott and 2005-2006 Chair, Kris Vespia paid off, and the 2006-2007 Co-Chairs, Linda Tabers-Kwak and Mike Zorn were charged with a leadership task that would focus the council's work in getting the Research Scholar program off to a good start. For the first call, the Research Council received 5 proposals, and the council struggled with the outstanding quality of all proposals. The major dilemma was that a few projects were long-term in nature and others were poised and ready to be funded. Dialogue ensued about the purpose of the Research Scholar idea and what criteria were posted for the call. Finally, the Research Scholar proposal of Dan Meinhardt, *Development of a Collaborative Grant Proposal to Study the Effect of Endocrine Disruptors on Development and Reproduction in Amphibians*, surfaced as the most comprehensive proposal in terms of addressing all of the criteria. The council forwarded its recommendation to the Provost's Office.

Almost immediately after the Provost's announcement of Professor Meinhardt's award, the council met again to debrief and tackle the call for Fall 2007 Research Council proposals. The council was cognizant of the need to continue the impetus of this new program without diminishing the purpose of the program. Again, with many time constraints, the council put out the call for proposals. The second round elicited 7 proposals with Russell Arent being the council's recommendation for the Fall 2007 Research Scholar. Professor Arent's project was titled, *Listening and Speaking Across Cultures*.

One step the council felt strongly about taking was to invite Research Scholar recipients to present at the Annual UWGB Research Council Exchange as discussed above. Council members felt that if faculty could see and hear a successful proposer/proposal, perhaps they would gain a greater comfort and clarification about the purpose of the Research Scholar program as it is viewed in the Office of the Provost. The Research Council also discussed posting successful proposals on the Research Council web site so that faculty could access various models of awarded proposals.

As the Research Council looks toward the 2007-2008 year, one major goal is to establish an on-going process to streamline the Research Scholar calls (similar to other Research Council initiatives). Council members anticipate that a more predictable timeline and models of successful awards will enable faculty to have a better understanding of how and when they may apply for a Research Scholar award. The council is also cognizant of budgetary issues that arise within units or departments when a faculty member receives an award. A more predictable timeline and process would also provide faculty with a more predictable semester for which they may consider applying. This is particularly critical with workload issues as well as specialty courses.

The 2006-2007 Research Council members wish to thank the Office of the Provost and the Office of the Associate Provost for all of their support and guidance through the execution of the first year of the new Research Scholar initiative. The 2006-2007 Co-Chairs, Linda Tabers-Kwak and Mike Zorn wish to thank previous Council Chairs, Uwe Pott and Kris Vespia for "carrying the torch" for the Research Scholar Project, and Illene Noppe for sharing her original idea.

Technology Council

2006/07 Annual Report

Kathy Pletcher, Chair, Technology Council

Purpose & Membership. The Technology Council is advisory to the Provost and responsible for developing and monitoring the campus technology plan and recommending technology policies. The Council is chaired by the Associate Provost of Information Services. Membership consists of representatives from each of the divisions, three faculty members, and one student.

Members for 2005/06 were:

Academic Affairs – Tim Sewall
Advancement – Scott Hildebrand
Athletics – Dan McIver
Business & Finance – Sharon Dimmer
Faculty Representatives - Steve Dutch, Meir Russ, Kaoime Malloy
Information Services – David Kieper
Liberal Arts & Sciences – Fergus Hughes
Outreach & Extension - Jan Thornton
Planning & Budget - Dean Rodeheaver
Professional & Graduate Studies - Fritz Erickson
Student Affairs – Sue Keihn
Student Representative - Erick Mims
Chair – Kathy Pletcher

Activities for 2006/07

- Reviewed progress on *IT 2007 Action*
- Approved revised password policy to improve security and privacy of data
- Reviewed and Approved *Academic Computer Lab Plans for 2007/08*
- Revised *Acceptable Use Policy for Students*
- Reviewed lab utilization for all computer labs
- Sponsored Annual Technology Forum, May 3
- Sponsored *ECAR Undergraduate Survey of Computer Technology*

Value of the Council

The Technology Council members feel that the work of the Council is very important to the campus. The Council meets monthly during the fall and spring semesters and is very productive.

Chancellor's Diversity Advisory Council **Year End Report, 2006-07**

In 2006-07, the Chancellor's Advisory Council on Diversity researched and recommended diversity language for inclusion in the campus mission statement, reviewed the Equity Analysis Report and recommended specific action steps to the Provost, evaluated the hate/bias reporting form and process, reported on selected Campus Diversity Plan 2008 Phase II initiatives to UWS, followed up on the UWS holistic admissions policy, and offered recommendations for improving academic support services for all students, and minority athletes in particular.

Diversity Language for the Campus Mission Statement: The Council extensively researched sample mission statement language from other universities around the nation that made explicit the importance of diversity to the campus mission. The inclusion of the language was important in its own right, but was also strongly recommended by the Holistic Admissions Task Force. A variation on the language recommended by the Council was included in the new campus mission statement.

Equity Analysis Review and Recommendations: At the request of the Provost, the Council reviewed the Equity Analysis Report and recommended action on two items: 1) Increasing the percentage of completed applications by students of color to approximate that of majority students, and 2) improving equity of performance in selected gateway courses. The Council urged that the Equity Analysis Report be shared with unit chairs, shared campus-wide via a link on the Provost's website, and reported to the Community Diversity Council.

Hate/Bias Incident Reporting Form: The Council reviewed the Bias Incident Reporting Form, and received a summary of the number and type of reports that were received over the past 18 months (10 reports, 8 related to sexual orientation). The Council recommends the following: 1) Educate students, faculty, and staff about the existence of the form; 2) Make the form more readily available to encourage its more frequent use; 3) Clarify that the form can be completed by an aggrieved party or a third party; 4) include the form under the word "discrimination" in the university's website search engine; 5) Clarify that, at a student's request, any action that may be taken can be deferred until after the end of the semester in which it was reported to allay student fear of retribution from a faculty member.

Minority Student Athletes: With the support of the Council, the Athletics Department prepared and presented a document to the Provost outlining the major concerns of minority student athletes. Foremost among their concerns was the relative lack of academic support services (tutoring, college success coursework, etc) for students who may come from high schools where college preparation was less than adequate.

Assessment Training: Several members of the Council attended an all-day workshop in Milwaukee about Assessing Diversity Outcomes.

Holistic Admissions Follow-Up: The Council participated in UWS listening sessions leading up to the approval of a new UWS admissions policy that holistically assesses academic and non-academic factors, and is consistent with the Michigan Supreme Court Ruling of 2003.

Plan 2008 Phase II Programs and Initiatives Outcomes Reporting: The Council collected information about M/D “best practices” at UWGB for submission to UWS and inclusion in the annual report to the Board of Regents. Data and program descriptions were submitted for Phuture Phoenix, local recruitment initiatives for students of color, Office of Outreach and Extension Diversity programming, and precollege programs for students of color.

The Council recommends the following action items for 2007-08;

- Reconsideration of the community diversity council role and function: The Council seeks to explore alternatives to a formal community council, consider the possibility of meeting at community (instead of campus) locations, and developing stronger connections with public school personnel who have roles with diversity in the K-12 system.
- Strategic Planning for a Successor to Plan 2008
- Implications of new race/ethnic codes for Fall 08 applicants, and a process for verification of race/ethnicity of continuing students.
- Council involvement in HLC and NCAA accreditations.
- Diversity priorities within the growth agenda.
- Workforce diversity issues.
- Review of campus business practices that impact retention and climate.

Chancellor's Advisory Council on Equality for Women, 2006-2007

25 June 2007

Report of Activities: The Council's charge is to advise the Chancellor on issues related to the status of women on campus and monitor progress on recommendations from the May 2001 Report on Equality of Women. A focus for 2006-2007 identified by the Council was: Focus on Learning with Women as Teachers in the Classroom. It was also decided that we would look at existing data regarding female student needs as it relates to campus climate for students. The prior year the Council reviewed faculty and staff campus climate data.

Learning with Women as Teachers in the Classroom- A discussion among Council members explored possible professional development co-sponsorships, research using the CCQ (not available) and Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) faculty survey data. The available data showed UWGB men feel greater respect for their teaching and research from their colleagues than UWGB women do. It is uncertain whether that is a product of their academic rank.

Campus Climate for Students – Student data already available from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), the Freshmen Year Survey, the Graduating Senior Survey, and the Education Benchmarking Institute (EBI) Residential Life Survey were reviewed. Debbie Furlong reported that the results indicate:

- Generally the male and female students are not experiencing the campus climate differently.
- UWGB male freshmen report higher quality of relationships and more interaction with their faculty overall. Freshmen women feel significantly less comfortable than men asking questions in class.
- Feelings about safety differ between genders with men feeling more safe at both the freshmen and senior level.

Glenn Gray reported that the EBI results indicate no differences in gender on questions related to campus climate.

Campus Updates

- New Women's Leadership Initiative Series coordinated in Student Life
- Reviewed UW System July 11, 2006 Report of the Status of Women Working Group.
- Alternative Work Patterns and Telecommuting Guidelines policy drafts were shared.
- Human Resources implemented exit interviews.
- Studio Arts venting was resolved
- Unisex Restrooms and restroom accessibility will be improved in summer 2007 with State funding for remodeling and improvements.

Council Recommendations

- The Council recommended that the exit interview survey incorporate transgender and domestic partner options in the survey responses to inform policy issues at the local and state level.
- The Council reviewed the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics Gender Equity Plan prior to its approval by the Cabinet.

Suggestions for Goals and Charge for 2007-08 –

1. Review of Childcare options and recommend next steps if any changes since last report.
2. Recommend sexual harassment awareness campaign and training
3. Review and recommend academic programming and services to meet the needs of mothers.
4. Investigate the need and implementation of a mentor program for returning adult students.
5. Review whether women are fully represented in governance and if not make recommendations to governance.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sue L. Keihn,
Chair, Chancellor's Advisory Council on Equality for Women