

MINUTES  
UW Green Bay University Committee

Present:	7 February 2007
Scott Furlong (Chair)	3:15 to 5:20 p.m.
Chris Style	
Kevin Roeder	
Dean VonDras	
Donna Ritch	Previous meeting:
Terence O'Grady	31 January 2007
Paula Ganyard (Academic Staff Representative)	

Guests: Provost Sue Hammersmith, Secretary of Faculty and Academic Staff Cliff Abbott, Mark Everingham, Angela Bauer-Dantoin Eileen Kolb, and Forrest Baulieu

- 1) Call to order. The University Committee's minutes from 31 January 2007 were accepted with minor revision.
- 2) Information sharing and discussion with Provost Hammersmith.
  - A) The Provost noted that the First Nations major is still being discussed by System and submitted to the Regents in the near future.
  - B) The Provost also discussed the proposed 53.11 code change, sharing with the UC the revised job descriptions of the Associate Dean and the administrative duties the Associate Provost will do relating to General Education that would make the reporting chain and responsibilities of each position distinct. The proposed code change is intended to recognize scheduling of General Education courses as an administrative duty of the Associate Provost. The Provost indicated that this delineation of job description will make clear the duties of each position and does not change the status quo or shift the determination of curricula to the Provosts office.

The Provost also provided a brief update concerning a recent letter regarding a campus giveback that will likely be paid by System.

There was also discussion of the Weidner Center funding as well as access to the Weidner facility. It was noted that the university now pays \$250,000.00 annually for maintenance of a building yet its use is restricted. Further, the Provost indicated the real costs of a darkened Weidner may be as much as \$400,000.00 annually. It was suggested by UC members that "use and access" of the Weidner should be made available to various programs if university money is being provided for its maintenance. Some members of the UC commented that many campuses use student segregated fees as one way of financing the arts.

### 3) Continuing business:

- A. There was long discussion of the procedures and policies of the Academic Affairs Council (AAC). During this part of the meeting, the UC was joined by Mark Everingham, Chair of the AAC, and other members of the AAC, Angela Bauer-Dantoin, Forrest Baulieu, and Eileen Kolb. It was noted by Mark Everingham that Jennifer Ham and Patricia Ragan are also members of the AAC but were unable to attend this meeting with the UC.

The first issue discussed was the process of curriculum review and possible changes in code that would clearly reflect what is meant when the AAC makes a positive or negative recommendation regarding a new course proposal. Mark Everingham noted that it was the recent consensus of the AAC that “approval” of the AAC for curricular issues such as new courses and programs should be required, and thus they supported a change that would amend the code to read “approve” in place of the current “recommend”. Mark also indicated that this change in language would make clear the AAC’s authority in this process, and help to promote constructive exchange between the AAC and initiators of proposals. Further, Mark indicated that the current process is one that invites dialogue and exchange between the AAC and those who initiate new course proposals. Members of the UC agreed that a change in code to indicate the need for the AAC’s “approval” may be necessary. Members of the UC, however, suggested that this code change also include a mechanism for appeal of the AAC’s decision.

In further discussion, it was noted by Mark Everingham that the AAC would prefer to resolve any uncertainty or conflict prior to making a decision on a proposal, and indicated that the AAC could further specify how dialogue and exchange may take place prior to the final decision stage so that there may be revision and refinement of the proposal. In relation to this desire by the AAC, Mark noted that it was the current consensus of the AAC to oppose a formal appeal process after they make a final decision because the appeal process may circumvent the AAC’s responsibility to evaluate and recommend proposals. Further, Mark noted that presently there is opportunity for exchange and discussion of concerns before the final decision is made, and that appeals of an AAC decision usually go to the Deans. Mark underscored the willingness of the AAC to allow further discussion and maintain an open dialogue with those who initiate a proposal so that concerns of the AAC may be addressed before a decision is made by the AAC. It was suggested by members of the UC that if there was a formal appeal process of an AAC decision, then the Faculty Senate would be the appropriate body to consider the appeal.

The discussion then took up the Bachelor of Applied Studies (BAS) proposal and its review by the AAC. Mark Everingham indicated that following the initial review of the BAS proposal, the AAC gave it a “very negative recommendation.” However, Mark indicated that they were open to receiving a revised BAS proposal, but had not yet been asked formally to review any such revision.

In continuing discussion, there was indication that a previous memo regarding the AAC's evaluation of the initial BAS proposal and suggestion of "broader discussion" was open to different interpretations, and that there may have been misunderstanding in what the AAC was conveying in the memo regarding their "recommendation" and "broader discussion" of the BAS proposal. It was suggested that the Provost re-initiate review of the revised BAS proposal by the AAC. Members of the UC encouraged the AAC to provide a very expeditious review so that the Senate may have their recommendation when they continue open discussion of the revised BAS proposal.

4) New business:

- A. An agenda for the Senate meeting on 14 February 2007 was created with Cliff Abbott and Provost Hammersmith.
- B. There was report on the discussion of the UW-System sick leave policy by UW Faculty Representatives. This policy is still being discussed by System.
- C. The WTCS Transfer Program policy was briefly discussed as it concerns UW-Green Bay. It was noted that System was discussing and will soon vote on a policy for how such transfer programs could be created.
- D. The UC discussed a Senate Resolution in support of Domestic Partnership Benefits for all State of Wisconsin employees, and decided to send this forth to the Senate for its consideration.

The meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dean D. VonDras, secretary pro tempore