

Minutes
UW-Green Bay University Committee

Present:

Greg Davis	27 February 2013
Derek Jeffreys, chair	3:00 PM, CL 750
Mimi Kubsch	Previous Meeting
Steven Meyer	20 February 2013
Bryan Vescio	
Mary Simonsen, Academic Staff Representative	
Heba Mohammad, Student Government Association Representative	

Guests: Chancellor Tom Harden, Provost Julia Wallace, Cliff Abbott, Andrew Kersten, Angie Bauer

Excused: Ryan Martin

1. Minutes of the 20 February 2013 University Committee meeting were approved as written.
2. The meeting began with the Chancellor remarking that he was pleased with the Senate's positive response regarding the three Engineering Tech programs. The question he wanted to discuss however is the issue about whether the proposed programs are interdisciplinary or not. Greg Davis proposed that the Engineering Tech Programs could be classified as Professional Programs that do not have an interdisciplinary requirement. The Chancellor clarified that he is not trying to influence Faculty Senate to say whether the tracks are interdisciplinary or not. The Faculty Senate will make the decision. It was noted that the designation does not need to be made now but needs to be made before Fall 2013 when the Programs begin. It was brought up that faculty need to see of the components of the program to make a decision regarding interdisciplinarity. The Chancellor then noted that of the biennial base of 20M 3.4M dollars will go to fund the Engineering Tech programs. It is not certain how this money will be allocated. This is a one-time funding based on performance. The Chancellor said there is strong support for the Engineering program from the Regents and from industry and manufacturing.
3. Provost Wallace reported that there are several searches taking place and they are going well. She also noted that the MSW break off from Oshkosh has caught Oshkosh off guard because communication was not transparent. Due to this concern the process of separating the programs is being stalled.
4. Next the UC assisted Cliff Abbott in setting the Faculty Senate Agenda as follows:
 - a. Transparency document
 - b. Engineering Tech Programs
 - c. Joint Committee on Student Misconduct
 - d. Slate of candidates for elected committees
 - e. Report from faculty rep
 - f. UC report
 - g. Academic Staff report
 - h. Student Gov. report

Cliff noted that there is an open seat on the Committee of Six for a representative from Professional Studies. The problem is that there are no Full Professors in Professional Studies. Therefore two faculty from Social Sciences (John Stoll & Ray Hutchinson) will be asked to run for

Minutes
UW-Green Bay University Committee

election. It was also noted that a spot that on the Graduate Studies Council needs to be filled and that Susan Gallagher-Lepak is qualified and will run. It was pointed out that the UC has a role in selecting who will serve on the Rights and Responsibilities Committee. Tim Kaufman , Janet Reilly , Debra Pearson and Mike Draney have agreed to run.

Greg Davis commented on a related subject that there is a responsibility among faculty to serve on committees, noting that there are those faculty who do not serve on any. It was suggested that the Committee on Committee Nominations be able to appoint people who have not expressed an interest. There seemed to be general agreement to this idea.

5. The meeting then turned again to discussing the Engineering Tech Programs reflecting on what the Chancellor said. There seemed to be concern over initiating a program based on funding dependent on performance. Bryan Vescio noted that passing approval of the Program is dependent on whether we get funding for the three faculty lines. Then the conversation turned to estimating how many students will be interested in enrolling and whether those would come from the technical schools or from math or pre-engineering majors. It was noted that transferability from technical schools will be an issue especially with some courses such as calculus. To summarize the three issues regarding approval of the Engineering Tech Programs is whether or not the three tenure track lines are possible, the performance issue, and the interdisciplinary issue.
6. Next Andrew Kersten and Angie Bauer discussed the proposed "University Plan for Continuous Assessment of Student Learning". It was noted that the HLC issued new criteria last year and there is much more emphasis on Assessment. The new plan will require more annual assessment of programs and activities, but Andrew and Angie have worked to make the process as easy as possible. At this time Angie and Andrew are working on a revised draft of the plan. Updates will be put on GB Share.
7. Derek Jeffreys brought up the concern over the University Ombudsman. Seems there is a concern because of conflict of interest. For example there is a faculty member who has concerns over merit and cannot go to the Ombudsman because they are from the same Unit. Greg Davis brought up the idea of having multiple Ombudsmen. Bryan Vescio suggested that there should be two Ombudsmen. They should be tenured Professors , one from LAS and the other from Professional Studies. There seemed to be general agreement of this idea.
8. The topic of the scholarship forum at Senate was discussed. Derek Jeffreys asked UC members to submit ideas via email for what kind of support is needed. Greg Davis mentioned a concern that the message about our scholarship is not getting out. Greg says the University should "back" scholarship efforts. The topic of support for scholarship will be discussed at the next UC meeting which will be March 13.
9. The meeting adjourned at 4:50 PM

Respectfully submitted,
Mimi Kubsch