

Minutes
Meeting of the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay University Committee
April 16, 2014
Cofrin Library 750
3:00 - 5:00 pm

Attendance: Kristin Aoki, (Academic Staff Rep), Greg Davis, Mimi Kubsch, Ryan Martin (recording), Steve Meyer, and Bryan Vescio (Chairperson)

Guests: Cliff Abbot, Chancellor Thomas Harden, and Provost Julia Wallace,

Meeting called to order at 3:00 pm

- I. Minutes from the April 2nd University Committee (UC) Meeting were approved with minor changes.
- II. Discussion with Chancellor Harden
 - a. Chancellor Thomas Harden surprised us with a visit to give us an update on the honorary doctorate he had discussed with us at a previous meeting. He indicated that things are proceeding nicely with the potential honorary doctorate and hopes it can be presented at the December 2014 commencement. He also discussed the onerousness of the process and hopes it can be revisited in the future.
- III. Announcements/Discussion
 - a. We discussed the 2014-2015 Faculty Senate Schedule, including the pros and cons of meeting every three weeks rather than once per month. We approved a schedule with meetings every three weeks.
 - b. Bryan Vescio indicated that he may need another member of the UC to sit in for him at two of the on-campus Chancellor interviews. Mimi Kubsch can fill in if need be.
 - c. We discussed the Shared Governance Conference that had been held on campus the week before. Bryan reported that more than 100 people had attended and there appeared to be a fairly even split amongst faculty, academic staff, and classified staff.
 - d. We discussed the April 9th Faculty Senate Meeting. Most of us were pleased with what we were able to get through at the meeting given how long the agenda was. We also discussed the positives and negatives of using senate taskforces to explore potential issues.
 - e. Steve Meyer provided an update from the Faculty Representatives Meeting. First, he described data from UW-System on how UW salaries have not stayed consistent with our peer institutions. He also discussed concerns regarding the Open Records Request that had been made by Representative Vos. He also mentioned that program prioritization is occurring at the University of Wisconsin-River Falls and there is concern at several institutions about the Associates Degree and how it may impact General Education Requirements at different institutions.
- IV. We discussed the status of the Essential Job Functions item that was read at the previous Faculty Senate Meeting. Bryan Vescio mentioned that he had received a number of concerned emails from various groups on campus. He described three possible courses of action: withdrawing it from the Senate agenda, withdrawing it and bringing it back to the senate later

(perhaps having a senate taskforce work on it), or bring it back as is. We'll discuss the issue further at the next UC meeting.

V. Meeting with Provost Julia Wallace

- a. Provost Wallace discussed the Academic Planning Meeting she held on April 15th. She expressed concerns about enrollment and the need to consider the four areas she has been emphasizing: repackaging courses, signature areas, graduate programs, and online education.
- b. She described concerns regarding the College Credit in the High Schools program. The Department of Public Instruction believes that students should not have to pay which would leave it up to the school districts to pay. This is likely impossible and would mean the program would not be viable.
- c. She discussed the proposed tuition freeze, indicating that it stems from the belief that UW-System hasn't spent the reserves down adequately.
- d. Bryan Vescio asked about the promotion of summer classes, wondering if we could make those programs more visible.

VI. Code Change: Graduate Studies Council

- a. This item will go back to Faculty Senate for a second reading with no changes.

VII. Code Change: Committee of Six Full Professors

- a. This item will be discussed more fully at the next UC Meeting. Concerns were brought up by Greg Davis regarding the potential weakening of our requirements for Full Professorship.

VIII. Administrative Review Process

- a. Bryan Vescio discussed feedback he had received regarding the Administrative Review Process that had been presented at the Faculty Senate Meeting. We discussed whether or not the review should occur every three years for all administrators regardless of when they started or if it should be a rolling process where administrators are reviewed every three years starting with on their third year in the position. We also discussed the purpose of the process and indicated that the purpose should be to provide administrators feedback and improve their responsiveness to faculty concerns.

IX. The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Ryan C. Martin