MINUTES
UW Green Bay University Committee

Present:        22 September 2010,
Derek Bergman, Student Government Representative  3:00 pm, CL 830
Dave Dolan
Mike Draney
Derek Jeffreys
Tim Kaufman    Previous Meeting: 8 September 2010
Illene Noppe, Chair
Brian Sutton

Guests: Julia Wallace, Provost

1. **Introductions.** The new student government representative, Derek Bergman, was introduced to the other committee members.

2) **Minutes.** The minutes of the 8 September 2010 meeting were reviewed and approved.

3) **Faculty Senate.** Committee members briefly discussed the previous week’s Faculty Senate meeting and ways the UC might ensure that Faculty Senate meetings run smoothly.

4) **Meeting with Provost.** The Provost joined the meeting and discussed several items with UC members:
   - The search process will soon begin to hire a Dean of Professional Studies. According to code, the search committee should not exceed nine members, including five faculty members, two academic staff members, one student member, and one member from the community. Also according to code, the Speaker of the Faculty Senate, with advice and consent of the UC, should provide a list of names of faculty members from which the Provost will select five faculty members for the committee. The Provost already had received a number of suggestions from unit chairs, and shared the names of those already suggested. UC members, including Senate Speaker Draney, approved the names already on the list and added a few more faculty members to the list.
   - The Provost concurred with UC members regarding creating a Faculty Senate motion to shift the Individualized Learning Committee from a Provost’s Appointive Committee into a Faculty Appointive Committee.
   - UC members mentioned to the Provost a recent communication from Interim Dean Block, introducing the idea of a potential Master’s Degree in Nursing and encouraging the Faculty Senate to act on this potential degree at the Senate’s November meeting. UC members pointed out that for major changes such as a proposed master’s degree program, the Faculty Senate normally discusses the proposal at one meeting but doesn’t vote on it until the next month’s meeting, to allow senators time to summarize the proposal at unit meetings and solicit feedback from unit members. The Provost said she knew of no reason that
Nursing couldn’t bring the proposal to the Faculty Senate in time for the October meeting, to allow for discussion prior to a vote at the November meeting. The Provost also encouraged the UC to invite Interim Dean Block and perhaps others involved with the proposed master’s degree to attend the next UC meeting, to maximize the chance that the proposal would be ready for the October Faculty Senate meeting. Finally, the Provost informed the UC that the proposed master’s degree would be a collaborative program with UW-Oshkosh, a fact UC members had not previously known.

• The Provost requested that for the next UC meeting (September 29), she meet with the UC at 3:00 rather than the usual 3:15. This would allow her to make it to her next scheduled meeting on time. UC members were fine with this.

5) **Reassignments for UC Chair.** UC Chair Noppe briefly clarified the situation regarding course reassignments or remuneration for the UC Chair. The UC Chair receives one 3-credit reassignment from teaching per semester, or alternatively may teach a regular load and receive 1/9 of salary over the summer at the close of his or her year as chair. Because she was not elected UC Chair for 2010-11 until after her Fall 2010 teaching assignments were already set, Professor Noppe will teach a full load for 2010-11 and will receive the 1/9 supplement in the summer of 2011. But she emphasized that in the future, the expectation was that the chair would receive one three-credit reassignment per semester, and that in order to facilitate this, the UC should elect its chair for the next school year early in the Spring semester, before the Fall-semester Timetable is set.

6. **UWGB Committee Structure.** UC members discussed various elements of the UWGB committee structure:

• The Intercollegiate Athletics Committee should be added to the list of committees the UC has been working with, and this committee should probably be classified as a joint committee.

• The Library Technology Committee could perhaps be combined with the larger Technology Council. UC Chair Noppe agreed to talk with Paula Ganyard about the situation of the Library Technology Committee.

• There was some concern that the Chancellor’s Diversity Committee seems to have been for all practical purposes deactivated. Professor Jeffreys agreed to check with the Chancellor’s Office regarding the status of this committee.

7. **Policy on Institutes, Labs, and Centers.** UC members discussed Professor Noppe’s revised version of her proposed Policy on Institutes, Laboratories, and Centers. UC members generally approved of the revisions. However, it was suggested that a “grandfather clause” sentence be added, stipulating that centers, laboratories, and institutes approved prior to the adoption of the policy need not apply for UWGB approval, although they must file end-of-year reports along with the more recently approved centers, laboratories, and institutes. It was also suggested that to minimize the chances of unanticipated problems coming up when the proposal is next brought to the senate, Professor Noppe should consider sending the draft of the proposal to the heads of all current centers, laboratories, and institutes, along with a message soliciting feedback.
8. **Task force on Graduate Education.** Professor Noppe informed the other UC members that the Chancellor seeks faculty nominees for a task force dealing with graduate education. UC members pointed out that we already have a Graduate Faculty Board of Advisors, a group which one might expect would perform many of the same functions as a task force for graduate education. UC members agreed that we should ask the Chancellor how the task force’s responsibilities would differ from those of the Graduate Faculty Board of Advisors.

9. **First-Year Seminars.** UC members discussed a proposal prepared by Professor Denise Bartell, calling for UWGB to “provide a first-year seminar course for every incoming first-year student.” There was some discussion of maturity issues surfacing when a class of 25 is composed entirely of first-semester college students, but it was also pointed out that this is not unique to first-year seminars, as every Fall semester roughly 25 sections of College Writing exist under these conditions. Ultimately, UC members generally seemed sympathetic to the goal of providing every incoming first-year student the opportunity to take a first-year seminar, but there were two main areas of concern: (1) the expense of providing so many low-enrollment sections of a lower-division course in difficult budget times, with possible effects on offerings in the majors as well as on enrollment caps in other lower-division courses, and (2) the possible conflict with academic freedom implicit in requiring all instructors, regardless of subject area, to make time in their course for an interdisciplinary exercise, “Intro to College 101” content and activities, and record-keeping for a requirement that all students attend at least three university-sponsored co-curricular activities. Also, it was not entirely clear whether or not the proposal entailed an additional general-education requirement: if UWGB will “provide a first-year seminar course for every incoming first-year student,” does this mean that every incoming first-year student will be required to take such a course? Eventually UC members agreed that we should invite Professor Bartell or Associate Dean Ritch, or both, to an upcoming UC meeting to discuss the proposal.

10. **Collective Bargaining.** UC members discussed the possibility of scheduling an information-sharing session, dealing with collective bargaining, during a future Faculty Senate meeting. Members were concerned about avoiding the problems encountered when such a session was scheduled during the previous year and other agenda items ran unexpectedly long, so that the discussion of collective bargaining didn’t begin until many Faculty Senate members were ready to leave. It was agreed that the October Faculty Senate agenda already looks rather full, but that a significant portion of the November meeting could probably be given over to such a discussion. UC members discussed the possibility of bringing in guests to provide information and answer questions—possibly a representative of the American Federation of Teachers, for example, or a faculty member from UW-Eau Claire, where the faculty recently unionized. It was also suggested that it might be useful to hear from someone from a university in a neighboring state where the faculty has been unionized for a number of years. Although it might be difficult for someone to make the long trip just to be part of this discussion, it was suggested that we ask the AFT if such a person could be found.
11. **Alternative Delivery Systems.** UC members discussed the increase in UWGB courses taught via alternative delivery systems, especially online courses, in recent years. Members agreed that the Faculty Senate agendas for October and November were already rapidly filling up, but that for the December meeting it might be good to schedule an open discussion of the potential for, and the concerns about, alternative-delivery courses.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00.

Respectfully submitted,

Brian Sutton
Secretary pro tempore