

MINUTES

University Committee Meeting
Wednesday, February 25, 2015, 3:00 PM
Cofrin Library 735

Present: Clifton Ganyard, Katrina Hrivnak, Sylvia (Mimi) Kubsch, John Lyon, Steven Meyer (Chair), Christine Style, Kris Vespia, and Tyler Sterr (representing the SGA President)

The meeting was called to order at approximately 3:05 p.m.

1. The minutes from the February 11, 2015 meeting were approved.
2. As an information item, Chair Steve Meyer shared a memo from UW-Platteville communicating one administrator's analysis of the public authority proposal in the state budget.
3. Associate Provost Greg Davis met with the UC to discuss proposed changes at UW System level to UWS 4, 7, and 11 related to sexual assault, sexual harassment, and stalking. The revisions are being made to bring the System into compliance with federal rules associated with the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013 and Title IX. Campuses are being asked to provide feedback on the drafts, and Davis is to communicate that feedback from UW-Green Bay. The UC had two questions they shared as possible feedback for submission. The first related to a revision in required level of proof in rendering disciplinary hearing decisions (i.e., preponderance vs. clear and convincing). The second was a question about why only the complainant appeared to have standing to challenge a hearing committee member for disqualification in this revised code.
4. Director of HR Sheryl Van Gruensven joined the UC for a second time to continue a conversation that was delayed about work policy rules recently passed on other campuses. She reminded the UC that the implementation of the new UPS system for personnel means that "work rules" are not incorporated in the same way. She again stated that the recent promulgation of codes of conduct on individual campuses is likely a result of trying to fill any gap that might be left as a result. Copies of UW-Madison's new "Language Describing Hostile and/or Intimidating Behavior" code and UW-Milwaukee's "Faculty/Staff Code of Conduct" were distributed as examples. She also shared the Workplace Expectations portion of the current UPS draft as background. At this point, Van Gruensven noted that there were advantages to being proactive with regard to creating and implementing any rules we would like to see as supplements to the UPS policies before they begin to take effect this summer. She further recommended that any supplementary policies created apply to all classifications of employees. She asked for the UC's perspective about pursuing this issue right now, admitting that she had reservations about timing given all the time and energy necessary to focus on budget at the moment. She indicated that work rule additions could be formulated at any time after UPS takes effect, as well. UC members expressed a willingness to examine this issue next year and agreed with Van Gruensven's reservations about the timing of this particular semester given the number of time-sensitive concerns currently facing governance bodies and the campus as a whole.

5. UC Chair-Elect Clif Ganyard shared an issue brought to his attention regarding adjunct instructors and possible concerns about a lack of opportunities to voice support for the University and/or voice concerns related to budget. UC members had a number of questions regarding the exact nature of the voice/forum being sought, as well as the remedy individuals might be requesting. They also discussed existing opportunities, such as sharing information with supervisors, attending open forums, and so on. Without additional information about the precise nature of the opportunities or remedies being sought and why, there was no detailed response the UC could provide, but a willingness to hear more about any issues was clearly expressed.
6. Provost Fritz joined the meeting briefly to update the UC on the budget process. He shared that every budget line was being carefully considered. He also discussed an upcoming opportunity for all System Chancellors to meet with President Cross and to share different campus strategies for addressing the impending budget cuts. He noted there is still much discussion of the public authority issue and much that is unknown in terms of associated details. He expected updates of all of these issues at the next scheduled Town Hall meeting. He then left to re-join a concurrently scheduled budget meeting.
7. UC members discussed procedures for identifying and selecting the UW-Green Bay Faculty Representative. It was decided that new code related to this issue is not needed at this time, but some priorities for identifying the person who will serve (e.g., maximizing time of service, maximizing two-way communication with the UC and Senate). It was agreed that current practice of the UC Chair being the first choice for the role has many advantages, but members also discussed alternatives for the Chair identifying a designee should that person be unable or unwilling to take on both time-consuming leadership roles.
8. SOFAS Cliff Abbott was invited by the UC to discuss his role as University Ombudsperson. Given the posting of the position as open right now, it seemed a reasonable time to inquire about any possible role conflicts between SOFAS and Ombudsperson, as well as the amount of time that took for the person in the SOFAS role. Abbott described the approach he had taken to the Ombudsperson portion of the job, indicated he had experienced no significant role conflicts, and stated that it had not been a substantial time commitment. He felt the knowledge the SOFAS has of University code was very helpful in this capacity, and his recommendation was that the UC leave the position as currently configured.
9. SOFAS Abbott also joined the meeting to talk about the identification of Executive Committee members for the proposed Data Science program. Abbott shared the interpretation of Code as requiring consultation with/consent of the faculty identified as possible members. At this point the process will proceed as outlined in Code, and Associate Provost Davis will be in charge of implementation.
10. Finally, UC members began very preliminary discussion of agenda items for the next Senate meeting. More specifically, they would like an information item related to Senate scheduling and a desire to examine a return to monthly Senate meetings for 2015-16.

The meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Kris Vespia