

AGENDA

UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 2

Wednesday, 15 October, 2025

3:00 p.m., TEAMS

Presiding Officer: Christine Smith, Speaker of the Senate

Parliamentarian: Michael Draney, Secretary of the Faculty and Staff

- 1. CALL TO ORDER: Welcome and Introductions**
- 2. CHANCELLOR'S REPORT**
- 3. PROVOST'S REPORT**
- 4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 1. September 10, 2025 (Pages 2-8)**
- 5. OLD BUSINESS—None.**
- 6. NEW BUSINESS**
 - a. Resolution on Regent Policy (Dirienzo; Pages 9-10)
 - b. First Reading on Proposal: Eligibility of Associate/Full Teaching Professors to Serve as Chairs (Tara DaPra; Jon Shelton; Pages 11, 12)
 - c. Discussion Item: Program Monitoring Working Group Update (Katers; Pages 13-17)
 - d. Requests for Future Business
- 7. OTHER REPORTS**
 - a. University Committee Report—Presented by Bill Dirienzo
 - b. Faculty Rep Report—Submitted by Patricia Terry (Page 18)
 - c. University Staff Report—Submitted by Becky Haeny (Page 19)
 - d. Student Government Report—Presented by Nathan Halbach
- 8. ADJOURNMENT**

DRAFT MINUTES

UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 1

Wednesday, 10 September, 2025

3:00 p.m., TEAMS

Presiding Officer: Christine Smith, Speaker of the Senate

Parliamentarian: Michael Draney, Secretary of the Faculty and Staff

PRESENT: Rebecca Abler (NAS); Rochelle Amundson (Alternate-AWE); Angela Baerwolf (SOCW); Erin Berns-Herrboldt (NAS); Thomas Campbell (TND); Bill Dirienzo (NAS-UC); Jennifer Downard (HUB); Clif Ganyard (UC-HUS); Jonas Gardsby (Alternate, AWE); Bill Gear (HUB); Elif Iziker (Psych); Heather Kaminski (AcctFin); Tim Kaufman (UC; Educ); Shawn Malone (NAS); Tetyana Malysheva (UC; RSE); James Marker (Alternate, HUB); Mike McIntire (Alternate, NAS); Samantha Meister (EDU); Valerie Murrenus-Pilmaier (AWE); Abigail Nehrkorn-Bailey (Psych); Ray Parth (Bus Adm); Laurel Phoenix (PEA); Kristopher Purzycki (Faculty, HUS); Daniel Radosevich (UC, Mngt&Marketing); Kimberly Reilly (DJS); Jolanda Sallmann (SOCW); Sera Shearer (Alternate, TnD); Heidi Sherman (Alternate, HUS); Hyeonsik Shin (Alternate, BusAdm); Chris Smith (UC-Psych); Christy Talbott (Music); Sam Watson (UC, Art & Design); Keir Wefferling (NAS); Rojoba Yasmin (RSE); Jian Zhang (RSE); Michael Alexander (Chancellor); Kate Burns (Provost); Mike Draney (SOFAS).

REPRESENTATIVES: Becky Haeny (USCA Rep); Nathan Halbach (SGA Rep); Katrina Hrivnak (ASC Rep). Patricia Terry (Faculty Rep to UW-System).

GUESTS: Scott Ashmann (Assoc. Dean, CHESW); Dana Atwood (Faculty, PEA); Bardia Batala (Faculty, Bus Adm); Devin Bickner (Faculty, RSE); Michael Bubolz (CIO); Fernando Cano Banda; Cory Carline (Faculty, SocW); Juli Case (Faculty, AWE); Alise Coen (Faculty, AWE); David Coury (Faculty, HUS); Jason Cowell (Faculty, Psych); Matt Dornbush (Dean, CSB); Rene Ettinger (Library Research Asst Dir); Kate Farley (Digital Coll and Metadata Librarian); Patrick Forsythe (Faculty, NAS); Paula Ganyard (Library Director); Susan Grant Robinson (Chief of Staff); Joan Groessl (Faculty, SocW); Tamara Hoff (Faculty, Nursing); Craig Hulce (Faculty, Accting, Fin); Brianna Hyslop (Manager, Learning Center); Njeri Karanja (Academic Advisor); John Katers (Dean, CSET); Raj Keshab; Zack Kruse (Faculty, AWE); Kate LaCount (Executive Assistant, Provost Office); Jess Lambrecht (Director, CECE); McKinley Lentz (Administrative Asst., Grad Studies/G&R); Kelly Leon (Faculty, Educ.); Vince Lowery (Faculty, HUS); Ashley Luebeck (Academic Advisor); Kayleigh Mapes (Grad & Exec Ed Coord); Heather Masters (Academic Program Manager, HUB); Kelley McGuire (Faculty, Nursing); Kim Mezger-Schutz (Access Coordinator); Melissa Nash (Director of HR); Amanda Nelson (Assoc Dean, CSET); Chrissy O'Connell (Dept. Asst., CSET); Cristina Ortiz (Faculty, HUS); Jodi Pierre (Librarian); Dylan Polkinghorne (Faculty, Mngmt & Marketing); Brian Rammer (Director of Alumni Relations); Carli Reineke; Darrel Renier (Director of Academic Advising); Rasoul Rezvanian (Faculty, Acct & Fin); Sawa Senzaki (Assoc. Dean, CSET); Courtney Sherman (Associate Provost); Alex Sorensen (UWGB Student); Meghan Strehlow (AVC, Student Access & Success); Amy Van Oss (Academic Advisor); Christine Vandenhouten (Faculty, Nursing); Kris Vespia (Director, CATL); Aaron Weinschenk (Assoc Dean, CAHSS); Amanda Wildenberg (Dean's Assistant, CAHSS); Pang Yang (CSB Advising Manager); Jennie Young (Assoc Dean, CAHSS); Michael Zorn (Assoc Dean, CSET).

Thanks to Becky Haeny for taking attendance today.

1. CALL TO ORDER: Welcome and Introductions. 3:00 pm.

Speaker Smith welcomed everyone to 2025 Senate season. We decided not to have individual introductions (other than Smith and Draney)

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 7. April 30, 2025

Sallman/Reilly moved to approve minutes. We decided to approve by consensus instead of a vote.

3. CHANCELLOR'S REPORT (at 3:03 pm)

Welcomes us back to the Fall semester. Chancellor Alexander knows he's sent us a lot of information in the last few weeks, and maybe will address whatever questions Senators might have.

Provost and Chancellor continue to communicate with UW-System and Legislators about the recent happenings in the state; a work in progress.

Gear: Question related to White Paper, on transfer policy. We want to be able to transfer 90 credits in, but there's 0 transferability? As an example, what if the transfer student is also switching majors from Business to Human Biology? Chancellor: This all assumes the student is in the same major, etc. But: We didn't take a student's credits from the U. Michigan, and that seems very wrong. Of course there may be technical reasons we can't take some credits into accredited programs.

Gear: Is concerned about the way it reads, like "we have to do it". Chancellor wants to start a conversation. If we just left it to programs, we'd have what we have now, and that needs to change.

Phoenix: An email from a faculty in PEA: Why do we want to make such a drastic and irreversible change to our current model? Chancellor: It has been 7-8 since we created that model, and we need to check and see if its working. Much has changed in last 7-8 years. We need to ask "is it working?" on a regular basis.

Phoenix (2nd question): Concern about area directors model. New people couldn't know what we're doing in each program. Chancellor: We need to think about number of administrators we have relative to number of teachers. Our model comes from small liberal arts colleges. Is that appropriate still with our larger institution? We need to examine this. There will be tradeoffs for sure, but we need to ask the questions.

Murrenus-Pilmaier: More Questions about the white paper: Space Issues: what exactly does that mean? Second question on tenure: Doesn't understand about the section on tenure changes in terms of how tenure benefits outside community. Third question is about feedback on the white paper: UC only, or town halls, etc.? Chancellor: First question is about space...how do we use space to "make community". Students often complain our places lack a certain feel, lack a human connection. We need to get to a more connected place. How do we create that atmosphere? He is totally in support of remote work where possible.

(Chancellor continues) Question about tenure: We haven't formed a work group on tenure, it should be done through Academic Affairs. But Chancellor wants us to rethink how we do tenure. He says young faculty feel threatened by how they are treated by senior faculty; tenure feels like a threat. We want to reward the contributions that we most value. We all have different skills, how do we honor that diversity? We don't want to reward things that aren't relevant.

Last Question (on communication, work groups, etc.). We have four work groups. After that, we'll come back to shared governance to hear concerns and get ideas, then in the winter we'll put these ideas to Faculty and staff. We want feedback, but we can't have these issues drag on for years, that could threaten our institution as well.

Reilly: Representing DJS. This is uncomfortable to say to you, but on a personal level, this white paper was gutting to read, it felt demeaning after working here for over a decade. Tone was not respectful or acknowledging of the amount of work we do because we care about the students. We have questions about space: How will this work, practically speaking? We have basic issues of privacy and personal possessions. We want the students to be able to find us, and they disclose stuff to us that require privacy.

Chancellor: I Totally respect how the white paper made you feel. I'm caught in a difficult place. He wrote that paper to get administration/leaders to understand the urgency of the situation we're in, so that we do what we need to do to meet the situation. Chancellor needs to push us all to change so we don't stand still. This isn't a knock on UWGB, it's a problem with all institutions. Chancellor is always listening to what community members are saying. They have a perception of higher ed that is not flattering. Chancellor believes that private sector has already solved this problem: Workers don't have private offices, but do have places to put their stuff and places to have private meetings, etc. We need to engage in a different way that creates more connection. Students go to offices and find them dark and empty.

Reilly: Now research: A two-tiered system. What will that mean specifically? What about SOTOL? Is it applied and benefit the community? This would have a profound impact on our lives: Who gets to decide? Third question: What aspect of the work that chairs do do you find ineffective?

Chancellor: Research question: Chancellor is interested in us sharing our research with the community, not just publishing and being done. Thinks SOTOL is exactly what Chancellor is thinking of. Pure research too. It's fascinating, but how do we get this out to a broader audience?

Now about the Chairs: Don't take this personally, he is taking this question in a very broad sense. There's a reason why corporations don't switch leadership every three years, and don't ask leaders to go back to the ranks. We don't train leaders or compensate them well for being chairs. This is new in academia: No one used to get trained in administration in academia. Some are great chairs anyway. But it's a hard job. Can we do this differently? Are we a fully nimble organization that is capable of communicating in a way that allows us to solve problems? Probably not, right now.

Abler: Not representing NAS today (we haven't had a chance to discuss the white paper yet). One disconnect is that what we read is making a lot of assertions, but what you say is that "these are just ideas for discussion". We want to know where these assertions are coming from, and we'd like evidence that your assertions are supported by evidence? A few questions: Wants to know about the Director idea as well. If you remove a faculty colleague, there's less ACCOUNTABILITY from that leader. Collegiality protects us. What's the plan to install two-way accountability with Director Model? This all sounds familiar to those of us in the Colleges. Some of us are afraid of units dissolving and faculty getting fired.

Chancellor: Appreciates the comments. Directors are “at will” they are highly accountable in that way. They can lose their administrative position immediately. There are pluses and minuses to Directors, too. Any search for Directors would include faculty in that discipline. Chancellor says the only way we end up firing faculty is when we stand still and don’t address the need for change until it’s too late. Once an institution is in a downward slide, it is very hard to turn it around, and that’s what he wants to prevent. There’s a greater risk to standing still right now than the risk of moving. We do need to make smart, evidenced-based decisions.

Berns-Herrboldt: Echoes that faculty voting for their leaders is a good system. NAS has worked hard over the last year to encourage us to remain experts in their field while maintaining excellence in teaching and service. Would hate to see that shaken up yet again, any tenure/promotion decisions should involve unit-specific faculty input. Promotion goals need to be big, hard, and celebratable.

Chancellor agrees. What you’re doing in NAS is exactly what I want units to do. The load issue is for Academic Affairs to decide. Legislature decided to take this on and micromanage us, which he disagrees with, but we do need to address these issues or they will be addressed for us. Is our load management at UWGB understandable and defensible to outside community? Not sure about that. He wants us to use the 4/4 load requirement in a way that helps our students. Chancellor also wants “hard goals” for tenure, but doesn’t understand why it always has to be the same “publish or perish” model as we’ve used in the past. Change is hard and messy. Chancellor empathizes with us, and lauds NAS for having these conversations already.

Sallmann. As a unit chair, Sallmann has struggled with how to communicate what the community wants, and also with protecting her people in the face of high faculty (and administrative) turnover. Odd “UWGB specific” guidelines may not help people in moving to other positions. Sallmann felt gutted at convocation. A relative of hers thought it sounded like the Chancellor was telling us we’re doing a terrible job! Appreciates the talk about giving units a lot of input.

Chancellor feels more urgency now that when he started in the middle of COVID. He believes there’s an existential threat to higher education right now. He could be wrong, he admits. But we need to have these conversations. Is not upset at disagreement, as long as you don’t just say “we’re not changing.” He thinks it is very important to have “clean” promotion/tenure documents, which protects the faculty, because BY LAW they must be followed. So Chancellor believes we are on the same page.

Berns-Herrboldt: Follow up on your assertion that Directors will operate better than with Chairs....how?

Chancellor: Someone to advocate in the community for the unit. Someone who is a trained administrator, trained in dealing with stuff faculty shouldn’t have to deal with.

Berns-Herrboldt: That sounds like a Dean....

Ch. Directors are different from Deans. Usually there’s more specialized Directors with specific expertise to lead their unit? So they don’t have to “roll up” to Deans, Provosts, etc. When you talk about structure, you have to take the specific people out of the conversation, and talk about our mission.

Coury: I hear you saying we need to change, imploring us to. There’s a perception that universities are unwilling to change. Over the last ten years, we’ve gone from 2 to 4 colleges, eliminated interdisciplinarity, renovated Gen Ed several times, new modalities, merger. We’ve changed a lot. Faculty and staff are willing to change, but need to know it’s the right change. Coury has been around 30 years, 10 Deans, and has seen a lot of this kind of talk. People are overwhelmed and exhausted with the change that has already happened.

Chancellor: A strange part of what I do is that you can't see when I talk to the community. People ask why we're succeeding, and its because we are willing to change more than most. If you're successful, people will copy you and as soon as you rest on your laurels, you're losing ground. I'm not asking us to do something out of a panic, but just to get in front on the big changes we see on the horizon.

Gear: We also have program and graduate program chairs, what about those roles and how they will be structured?

Chancellor: About 2/3 of our faculty have some kind of chair title....think about that. [Provost jumped in and says she doesn't think it is 2/3! Chancellor walked back... maybe 1/3? Still, he says, Wow....is that really the right model for us? UC Chair Dirienzo posts that the number is closer to 25%.] Chancellor appreciates that faculty will see things different from administrators, which is why we need to get input from all constituents.

Watson: Will we know who's on the working groups so we can get input to them?

Chancellor: Yes.

Senzaki: Where are we heading to? We need change, but what are we going to be in 10-15 years? Less liberal arts, more job skills? Our strengths are critical thinking, values, etc. Reducing the time in college works against that.

Chancellor: We wants to minimize the different between what we do and what the student wants from us. How are we responding to this disconnect? We need to. Both parties are asking "is it worth it to get a high education?" He predicts that AI will drive a move TOWARD the liberal arts. We should NOT be a technical college, Chancellor agrees with Senzaki 100%.

4. OLD BUSINESS—None.

5. NEW BUSINESS

- a. Election of Deputy Speaker of the Senate, 2025-26

Do we have any nominations?

Dirienzo nominates **Malysheva**. Malysheva is willing to serve. No other nominations.

Smith calls for a second: **Dirienzo/Watson. 28/0/0.**

- b. Requests for Future Business.

6. PROVOST'S REPORT at 4:11

Filling in gaps on email that was sent out previously.

Enrollment: 8,402 students. We estimate about 11K after all High School students, etc.

Year to year retention is up about 1% from last year. Very mindful of connections to make students feel engaged and supportive.

Reduced credit bachelor's degrees: Right now, there is policy language that bachelor's degrees are 120 credits. This will be updated to allow for variation (that is justified), in accordance with recent HLC recommendations. An 8 month process plus a site visit. Just a handful of programs would qualify, not an across the board reduction in credit requirements. These are not new degrees but modifications of

existing degrees. Maybe three programs are thinking about this at UWGB? Possible F26 launch. Mount Mary is now offering reduced credit degrees in cybersecurity and [one other...Marketing?].

24 credit load initiative. That's a 14% increase. Should we reduce our course caps by 14%? Doesn't really seem like a significant load reduction. We need to think more creatively about that 8th course. Maybe the eighth course could have a lower course cap? Maybe an applied learning experience? Maybe a practicum where students help with your research? Maybe an internship-type experience? Team teaching for the eighth course? But if your program already has 120 credits, we shouldn't add any. If you're already teaching an eight course, we shouldn't add another one. System is working through the reassignment issue to see what options we have.

System will have a proposal to BOR in November; we need to decide on curriculum stuff by December catalog deadline. So units, please have some conversations on this.

Happy to answer any questions....

Berns-Herrboldt: In NAS, we're having hallways conversations. Overload supplements our income, and having that sucked into load really affects how people "do life". Provost: On the bright side, we're trying to get everyone up to 90% of CUPA compensation. 24 + overload = Teaching Professor load, that's too much to expect research and service.

Sallman: A bit confused about the CUPA readjustments, not sure how to start a conversation on this. Provost: The email was in response to Act 15, which has a lot of aspects, including compensation plans for "high demand fields"; this is a separate issue from our Compensation Plan. Sallman: Is the "high demand fields" thing relevant to our plan? Provost: Yes, in that UWGB wouldn't have to find its own money to make those adjustments.

Berns-Herrboldt: Questions from colleagues about whether Act 15 would change our contracts?

Provost: Too soon to say: Could go either way, since we are technically under a 24 hour contract already (we currently get 3 credits reassignment for teaching/service).

7. OTHER REPORTS

a. University Committee Report—Presented by Bill Dirienzo

UC dealing with Act 15 and the Chancellor's white papers. Possible listening sessions/working groups? Some Faculty Handbook changes coming....allowing Teaching Professors to be Unit Chairs. More Committee changes from that working group last year; Curriculum Guide update from Courtney/Draney.

By the way, by Dirienzo's calculations about 25% of faculty have some chair position.

b. Faculty Rep Report—Presented by Patricia Terry

System Faculty Reps met with Rothman, *et al.* about Act 15. 24 hour teaching load: A working group was formed. Another working group was formed to work on the Gen Ed realignment. (all UW campuses would have same categories and same 36 credit requirements for Gen Ed).

Important: It is a 24 CONTACT HOUR, not CREDIT HOUR requirement. There are only two faculty on the working group, and one is from Madison (not affected by the 24 hour requirement). Reps complained, but were ignored.

Gen Ed working group: This will likely change nothing for UWGB, it looks like. Reps are mad about Legislation mandating curricular issues: overreach. lawsuits may be forthcoming.

Working group will give document to UW-System in October; to BOR; to JCER (Joint Committee on Employee Relations); approval by February. That gives us 2-3 weeks to do Fall timetable!

System money to retain faculty in “hard-to-retain” job areas or “hot job” areas. Which are these?

c. University Staff Report—Submitted by Becky Haeny (Page 5)

d. Student Government Report—Presented by Nathan Halbach

SGA starting off good. We have every committee position filled. Main goal is to continue strengthening collaboration. We’ve built strong relationships with the community. We are working with state reps, like Ahmad Rivera Wagner. We want to ensure student voices are heard and build meaningful relationships between students and faculty/community, etc. Encourages faculty to attend SGA meetings. Looking forward to it.

8. ADJOURNMENT. 4:45 pm.



The UW system's efforts to push through a universal general education curriculum is a clear violation of the faculty's obligation and duty to develop the curriculum on their respective campuses. It is also not legally necessary under Act 15, which only obligates individual campuses to accept the transfer of general education credits. The higher education council of AFT-Wisconsin drafted this faculty senate resolution, and we encourage the faculty senate of every campus to pass this resolution as swiftly as possible to demonstrate the widespread opposition to this obvious overreach from UW system. Please contact AFT-Wisconsin President Jon Shelton with any questions: shelton@aft-wisconsin.org.

A Resolution to Protect the Integrity of Faculty Control over the Curriculum

Whereas Act 15 states that the "board shall establish policies for the appropriate transfer of credits between institutions within the system, including postsecondary credits earned by a high school pupil enrolled in a course at an institution within the system under the program..."

Whereas according to the UW System Administration, students transferring from one UW school to another UW school wishing to transfer general education credits **comprise only 2%** of the over 160,000 students enrolled in the UW System;

Whereas the proposal recently offered by the UW System Administration goes far beyond the requirements of the language in Act 15 by creating an entirely new, standardized, general education program;

Whereas this new program was created by System administrators and consultants without any consultation from faculty ;

Whereas current UW policy places development and oversight of the curriculum with the individual campuses, and best practices dictate that the faculty have the most relevant knowledge and expertise to develop the curricula offered at their respective campuses;

Whereas UW System Administrative Policy 135 already dictates that a course designated as fulfilling a general education/breadth requirement at one UW university should transfer as general education/breadth at the receiving UW university;

Whereas Chapter 36 of state law clearly states "the chancellors of the institutions in



consultation with their faculties shall be responsible for designing curricula and setting degree requirements,” which makes curriculum design and oversight the exclusive responsibility of the individual campuses;

Be it therefore resolved that this Faculty Senate, as it is our statutory right under Chapter 36 to our “primary responsibility” for advising administration on “academic and educational activities,” rejects any efforts by UW system to dictate the general education curriculum on our campus.

Be it further resolved that the Board of Regents should not adopt any proposed regent policy from UW system administration that needlessly curtails campus leadership from determining their own curriculum;

And be it finally resolved that the Board of Regents should adopt the following policy pursuant to Act 15: “To accommodate students transferring within the UW System, the faculty senate of each institution will draft a policy to ensure that all general education credits from one UW institution will be accepted at their institution as general education credits.”

Subject: Proposal to permit Teaching or Research Professors who have achieved the rank of “associate” or “full” to serve as unit and disciplinary chairpersons.

Submitted by: Tara DaPra, Teaching Professor, Applied Writing & English and Jon Shelton, Professor, Democracy & Justice Studies

Date: April 1, 2025

OVERVIEW

UW-Green Bay, like most institutions in our category, is hiring more teaching professors than in the past. Over time, this has pushed more service and administrative duties on to increasingly fewer tenured faculty members.

Our current handbook permits only tenured faculty to serve as unit and disciplinary chairpersons; this creates inequity for both tenured professors and those in the teaching professor category. While tenured professors face the burden of frequent administrative work, teaching professors are denied the opportunity to serve in leadership roles. Because teaching professors play an essential role in the mission of the university, including teaching a significant number of students, they should be represented in leadership roles in their disciplines.

Additionally:

Opening the field to promoted teaching professors will diversify the number of candidates for chairship. For programs/units facing a dearth of interested candidates, opening the field to teaching professors could help to remedy this challenge.

As a teaching institution, UW-Green Bay should welcome experienced and promoted teaching professors into leadership roles where they can actively represent the interests of both UW-Green Bay students and of faculty.

PROPOSAL

We propose to change the handbook language as detailed below.

Current Handbook Language:

53.04 Interdisciplinary Unit Chairperson: Selection

A. The chairperson shall be elected by a simple majority of the interdisciplinary unit members with the approval of the appropriate Dean(s) usually for a term of three years. In circumstances where both the Executive Committee and the Dean are in agreement, the term of appointment may be set for one to five years. There is no limit on the number of terms a chairperson may serve. The vote shall be at an interdisciplinary unit meeting with the results to be counted and announced immediately at said meeting.

The results of the election shall be transmitted to the appropriate Dean(s) for his/her approval. Removal of the chairperson by the appropriate Dean(s) during the term of office normally shall take place following a vote of no confidence. A vote to determine confidence in the chairperson may be held at any time upon petition of 50 percent of the interdisciplinary unit faculty or on request of the appropriate Dean(s).

B. The chairperson must have the tenured rank of associate or full professor and shall be elected from among the members of the interdisciplinary unit.

53.09 Disciplinary and Other Unit Chairperson: Selection

A. The chairperson shall be elected by a simple majority of the disciplinary or other unit members with the approval of the appropriate Dean(s) for a term of three years. There is no 25 limit on the number of terms a chairperson may serve. The vote shall be at a meeting of that unit with the results to be counted and announced immediately at said meeting. The results of the election shall be transmitted to the appropriate Dean(s) for his/her approval. Removal of the chairperson by the appropriate Dean(s) during the term of office normally shall take place following a vote of no confidence. A vote to determine confidence in the chairperson may be held at any time upon petition of 50 percent of the unit faculty or on request of the appropriate Dean(s).

B. The chairperson must have the tenured rank of associate or full professor and shall be elected from among the members of the disciplinary unit.

We propose to change the highlighted passages in 53.04 and 53.09 to this:

B. The chairperson must have the rank of associate or full professor, associate or full teaching professor, or associate or full research professor, with faculty status, and shall be elected from among the members of the (inter)disciplinary unit.

RESOURCES NEEDED TO MAKE THIS CHANGE

None

Program Monitoring Working Group

Draft Proposal

October 3, 2025

1. Background and Purpose

- 1.1 The purpose of this policy is to establish UW-Green Bay campus protocols for implementing the following:
 - 1.1.1 UW System Policy 102 Section 3.1: Eliminating an Academic Degree Type
 - 1.1.2 UW System Policy 102 Section 3.2: Renaming or Redirecting an Academic Degree Program including renaming and redirecting an academic degree program
 - 1.1.3 UW System Policy 102 Section 3.3: Suspending Admissions to an Academic Degree Program including all sub-sections related to suspension and reinstatement
 - 1.1.4 UW-System Policy 102 Section 3.4: Eliminating an Academic Degree Program
 - 1.1.5 UW System Policy 102 Section 6.3: Monitoring Academic Degree Programs
 - 1.1.6 Regent Policy 20-24 related to Procedures relating to Financial Emergency or Program Discontinuance Requiring Faculty Layoff and Termination
- 1.2 This policy has been created following the Provost's charge to the Program Monitoring Working Group created in January 2025 to review other university models for program monitoring and create a program monitoring process that would work in tandem with UWGB's annual program review process.
- 1.3 The purpose of this policy is to clarify the expectations and process steps for implementing the above UW System policies.
- 1.4 This policy will also encourage the following: a) delivery of high quality teaching and learning, b) engagement in proactive and deliberate planning to strengthen academic programs at UW-Green Bay, c) support efforts to continuously improve recruitment and retention of students, and d) build a fiscally sound and sustainable program array that meets the needs of the region we serve.

2 Constraints

- 2.1 Program array can be constrained internally and externally by policies, available resources, and other limitations. Therefore, careful consideration must be given to all academic programs as they are established, maintained, and reviewed on a regular basis.
- 2.2 New Program approval process
 - 2.2.1 Program potential and viability are determined based on internal and external analysis and approved by the Board of Regents through a formal review process (NOI, authorization document, etc.).

- 2.2.2 Reasons for objections to new programs could include the following:
- a) There will be undue enrollment competition, which disproportionately impacts other universities within the UW System.
 - b) There will be capital infrastructure (e.g., capital projects) expenditures, which disproportionately impact other universities within the UW System.
 - c) There will be a disproportionate impact on financial investment (e.g., equipment, servers, software, access to library databases, etc.), and /or physical resources (e.g., renovation of laboratory or technical spaces).
 - d) There will be a disproportionate impact on investment in human resources.

Neither duplication nor differentiation can be utilized to object to a proposed degree program, unless data driven analyses clearly demonstrate disproportionate resource and/or enrollment impact upon a UW System university or universities.

3 Definitions

- 3.1 Dashboards: Information made available to internal and external constituents at the website for [Institutional Strategy & Effectiveness - UW-Green Bay](#).
- 3.2 Academic programs: All majors and minors at UW-Green Bay
- 3.3 Quantitative indicators: Key performance indicators (KPI's) that provide data on the academic program
- 3.4 Qualitative indicators: Key performance indicators (KPI's) that provide alternative ways of demonstrating the overall contributions of an academic program

4 Policy and Procedure Statements

- 4.1 Upon completion of the previous academic year, all academic program chairs will have access to dashboards from the Office of Institutional Strategy and Effectiveness.
- 4.2 Dashboard metrics are relevant to the ongoing operation, management, and assessment of academic programs.
- 4.3 The most significant quantitative metrics that would be utilized are as follows:
 - 4.3.1 Number of declared majors in the program at the junior and senior level for the past three years;
 - 4.3.2 Number of total declared majors in the program by year for the past three years;
 - 4.3.3 Trend in the number of total declared majors in the program by year for the past three years, serving as an early indicator of enrollment trends.
 - 4.3.4 Average number of graduates per year for the past five years;
 - 4.3.5 Student credit hour production in the program for the past five years;

4.4 The program data will then be coded to signal the performance of academic programs as follows:

- 4.4.1 "Green": This is a signal that the academic program has met or exceeded performance on all quantitative metrics. This signal will be acknowledged by administration through direct communication to exchange insights and explore future opportunities.
- 4.4.2 "Yellow": This is a signal that the academic program has variable performance or is demonstrating a downward trend or if the metric scores remain static near the goal level over time on any one significant quantitative metric. This should signal the need for a meeting between administration and the academic program members to discuss the metric(s) and/or provide resources to strengthen and enhance program performance.
- 4.4.3 "Red": This is a signal that the academic program has not met a significant quantitative metric and there is a need for an immediate meeting between administration and the academic program members to discuss the metric results and determine next steps to strengthen program performance.

4.5 The metrics for Green, Yellow, and Red for the program metrics identified are as follows:

		Thresholds and Range			
Primary Metric	Goal	Green	Yellow	Red	Comments
Average Majors (Jr./Sr.)/yr (3 years)	15	>15	$10 < X < 15$	< 10	Universities of Wisconsin Metric
Average Majors/yr (3 years)	>40	>40	$25 < X < 40$	<25	UWGB Metric
Trend in Majors (3 years)		Increasing	Neutral	Decreasing	UWGB Metric
Average Graduates/yr (5 years)	10	>10	$6 < X < 10$	<6	UWGB Metric
SCH taught in Major (5 years)		Increasing	Neutral	Decreasing	UWGB Metric

4.6 For purposes of the Green, Yellow and Red, the above specified metrics are significant, but additional qualitative information may also be considered in evaluating program contributions to the overall mission of the university.

- 4.6.1 Academic program receiving a "red" or "yellow" signal may opt at their choice to summarize and present a case explaining their qualitative contributions to administration. The purpose of this qualitative indicator "case" will be to situate the role of the program as being essential to the university despite the "red" or "yellow" signals received on quantitative metrics. The operating assumption should be that all academic programs are expected to perform well or reasonably under the quantitative metrics unless there is an excellent and unique reason why qualitative performance is sufficient.

5 Implementation Timeline

Time Period	Activity	Parties involved	Comments
December (AY1)	Final Review and Determination of Green, Yellow, Red for 2024-25	Deans and Chairs	Fall 2025
January (AY1)	Meetings initiated with programs in Yellow/Red identified as needing action plans, with a focus on continuous improvement	Deans and Chairs	Dean could also appoint a designee
Spring (AY1)	Development and implementation of a 3-year action plan for programs reviewed in previous Fall of 2025	Internal discussions between Deans, Chairs, Departments etc.	
Summer (AY1)	Internal discussions	Report from the Deans to the Provost	Supplemented with information from Annual Program Review
September (AY2)	Final Review and Determination of Green, Yellow, Red for 2025-26. Continued implementation of initial 3-year action plans for programs in Yellow/Red	Internal discussions between Deans, Chairs, Departments etc.	Fall 2026 Year 2 of initial 3-year action plans
October (AY)	Meetings initiated with programs in Yellow/Red identified as needing action plans, with a focus on continuous improvement	Deans and Chairs	
Spring (AY2)	Development and implementation of a 3-year action plan for programs reviewed in previous Fall	Internal discussions between Deans, Chairs, Departments etc.	
Summer (AY)	Internal discussions	Report from the Deans to the Provost	Supplemented with information from Annual Program Review
September (AY)	Final Review and Determination of Green, Yellow, Red for 2026-27. Continued implementation of 3-year action plans for programs in Yellow/Red	Internal discussions between Deans, Chairs, Departments etc.	Fall 2027 Year 3 of initial 3-year action plans
October (AY3)	Meetings initiated with programs in Yellow/Red identified as needing action plans, with a focus on continuous improvement	Deans and Chairs	

Spring (AY3)	Development and implementation of a 3-year action plan for programs reviewed in previous Fall	Internal discussions between Deans, Chairs, Departments etc.	
Summer (AY3)	Internal discussions	Report from the Deans to the Provost	Supplemented with information from Annual Program Review
Summer (AY3)	Progress Update – Final Review of initial 3-year action plans to determine program status.	Provost, Deans, and Chairs	Provost determination on ongoing program status.

Faculty Rep Report to Senate

10-15-2025

System representatives continue to work on issues associated with Act 15. At the System level, there are groups working on alignment of General Education and Workload documents to hand over to the Board of Regents (BOR) for approval before Dec 1st. Again, the Board of Regents will hand these to the State Legislature as BOR Policy.

These working groups continue to provide weekly or every other week updates to the faculty reps.

There was also discussion of the money allocated by the State Legislature to give pay raises for faculty in so called, “high demand” jobs. There was not much clarity, but indication that the Wisconsin Workforce Development jobs list will be a starting point. All decisions are pending legislative acceptance of the BOR Workload and General Education policies, so don’t expect decisions until spring 2026.

Michael Ford from the WI Institute for Citizenship and Civil Dialogue visited and listened to concerns regarding the impending faculty survey on the same topic. Faculty expressed opinions and continued to voice concern after he left that any data collected would be used against us.

Respectfully,

Patricia Terry

**University Staff Committee
Report for Faculty Senate Meeting
October 15, 2025**

- The first meeting was held September 18, 2025.
- Rachel La Crosse provided an HR update.
- The election committee reported they are seeking a replacement for Rianna Kaiser on USC to complete her term as she is leaving the University.
- Professional Development committee reported that the fall conference is not going to be held at this time due to declining attendance. They are working on virtual opportunities for university staff on January 7, 2026.
 - There was a reminder about funds available for professional development for conferences, trainings etc.
- Bill Dirienzio, University Committee Chair, gave an update on the white paper sent out from the Chancellor and Act 15.
- The Chancellor and Provost will be attending the October University Staff Committee meeting to answer questions and provide updates.
- The next University Staff Committee meeting is October 16, 2025, from 10:00 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. Please email usc@uwgb.edu for the meeting link.

Respectfully submitted,

Becky Haeny, Chair
University Staff Committee