

AGENDA

UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 2

Wednesday, 19 October 2005, 3:00 p.m.

Phoenix Room C, University Union

Presiding Officer: Gregory Davis, Speaker

Parliamentarian: Professor Kenneth J. Fleurant

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 1, SEPTEMBER 14, 2005 [page 2 attached]

3. CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

4. CONTINUING BUSINESS - Presented by Sally Dresdow, University Committee Chair

- a. Curriculum Approval Procedures [page 7 attached]

5. NEW BUSINESS - Presented by Sally Dresdow, University Committee Chair

- a. Code Change to Chapter 6 (first reading) - [page 6 attached]
- b. Discussion of adding a grade of C/D
- c. Requests for Future Senate Business

6. PROVOST'S REPORT

Presented by Provost Sue K. Hammersmith

7. UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE REPORT

Presented by Sally Dresdow, Chair

8. OPEN FORUM: Proposal for Founders Degree

9. ADJOURNMENT

MINUTES 2005-2006
UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 1

Wednesday, September 14, 2005
 Phoenix Room C, University Union

Presiding Office: Gregory Davis (NAS-UC), Speaker

Parliamentarian: Kenneth J. Fleurant, Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

PRESENT: Scott Ashman (ED), Forrest Baulieu (ICS-UC), Joy Benson (BUA), Peter Breznay (ICS), Francis Carleton (URS), Gregory Davis (NAS-UC), Sally Dresdow (BUA-UC), Scott Furlong (PEA-UC), Clifton Ganyard (HUS), Alison Gates (COA), Victoria Goff (ICS), Cheryl Grosso (COA), Sue Hammersmith (Provost, *ex officio*), Derek Jeffreys (HUS), Harvey Kaye (SCD), John Katers (NAS), Mark Kiehn (ED), Michael Kraft (PEA), Mimi Kubsch (NUR), Judith Martin (Soc. Wk), Daniel Meinhardt (HUB), Terence O'Grady (COA-UC), Debra Pearson (HUB), Tara Reed (NAS), Bruce Shepard (Chancellor, *ex officio*), Christine Style (COA-UC), Brian Sutton (HUS), Rebecca Tout (COA), Kristin Vespia (HUD), David Voelker (HUS), Michael Zorn (NAS).

NOT PRESENT: Meir Russ (BUA), Adam Warpinski (Student Government Association Representative).

REPRESENTATIVES: Lucy Arendt (Academic Staff Representative).

GUESTS: Clifford Abbott (ICS), Dean Fritz Erickson, Associate Dean Regan Gurung, Interim Dean Fergus Hughes, Associate Provost Timothy Sewall, Associate Provost Jan Thornton.

1. Call to Order. With a quorum present, Speaker Davis called the Senate to order at 3:02 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes of UW-Green Bay Faculty Senate Meeting No. 7, April 27, 2005.

The minutes were approved without change by voice vote.

3. Introduction of Senators. All senators introduced themselves. There were no alternates to seat for the day.

4. Chancellor's Report. Chancellor Shepard reported on three items:

1. Backup appointments. Our house is in good order and the Regents' actions have had no effect on our practices. The rationale behind backup appointments is that they are needed to hire the best. However an alternative can often be found in the way contracts are issued. Offering tenured positions to Deans, Provost and Chancellor is not part of the problem for the Regents who agree that it is important that these officers have the ability to speak freely to the Board.

2. Constitution Day. The Legislature has required campuses to hold commemorative activities or lose federal grants. We are doing much more than the minimum and excellent events are planned.

3. The recent Lawton Gallery situation was one of the most difficult the Chancellor has had to deal with in his career. We need to keep the dialog going and he is willing to visit units to discuss the issues. Controversies like this can be healthy if they foster dialog without rancorous contention. His action was not, he said, a question of first amendment protected speech. The right to protected speech under the amendment depends on the venue. If you viewed the Gallery as a classroom, it would be protected. But it is more than that as the hundreds of invitations to the public indicate. The University's reputation is attached to the Gallery. He

faced a “lose-lose” decision, the appearance either of being afraid of controversy or of advocating a violent, illegal act.

Responding to two of the criticisms he received: a) “He didn’t consult and tried to hide his decision.” This bothers him since he tried to hide nothing at any point and hundreds received his memo. b) “He did this to avoid offending donors.” But there are other pieces in the exhibit even more likely to offend donors so that concern was never responsible for this decision.

5. New Business.

a. Election of the Deputy Speaker of the Senate for 2005-06. The Speaker opened the floor to nominations. Scott Furlong was nominated by Senator Style. There being no further nominations, the Speaker called for the election and **Senator Furlong was elected 27 for, none opposed, with 1 abstaining**.

b. Curriculum Approval Procedures. Presented by Speaker Davis. In a passing point of order, Senator Kaye asked why this was not being presented by UC Chair Dresdow. The latter said she asked the Speaker to present because he did so much of the work on this last year. Davis presented a draft table of curriculum approval procedures summarizing the process of approving academic changes from adding a degree to deleting a course.

Senator Kaye called attention to the fact that, under the proposal, minors would not need Senate approval. This poses a serious problem since UW-Green Bay places far more emphasis on minors than other universities. The status of minors on this campus is a major issue that cannot be relegated to a category called “submajor.” He insists that this be revised to reflect our academic philosophy. When the UC and Senate are no longer seriously involved in the process of approving interdisciplinary program minors, we cease to be the university we are. UC Chair Dresdow said the UC will check code because she believes the Senate did vote to require changes in minors to come before the Senate. The document has been worked on for a long time and this may have been missed. Senator Kaye recognized that this has been an ongoing discussion, but pointed out that this issue arose when the Senate discussed the Global Studies minor. Consequently he does not see this as an innocent oversight.

Senator Voelker asked whether some of the issues might reflect problems with code and whether it was the UC’s intention to bring this to a vote in Senate. Speaker Davis suggested that code does not address all cases of curriculum approval, and that his personal preference would be to bring curriculum approval procedures to the Senate for ratification. To facilitate any future discussions, Senator Baulieu asked if it would be possible to determine which are codified, which represent established practice, and which are being proposed. Davis said that it should be and the UC would attempt to do so.

Senator Kaye suggested that the Senate should also be reviewing names of degrees. He asked for further serious review of the entire curriculum approval process. Some discussion ensued of the System term “submajor” and whether it is useful to use it on our campus.

c. Proposal for Founders Degree. At the invitation of the Speaker, Professor Cliff Abbott explained that at its core this proposal offers an alternative route to the baccalaureate degree, giving students greater freedom of academic exploration. The cost for this freedom would be that these students would not have majors listed on their transcript. They would assume responsibility for explaining their education to employers. The University would simply certify that they have had 120 credits of quality courses. Professor Abbott hopes the idea will be the subject of the considerable discussion it needs prior to implementation. Students who select majors have an idea where they would like to end up after four years. Students likely to be interested in the Founders degree (unlikely to be many) are not so sure where they would like to end up but come to college for a potentially transforming academic experience. Some of the questions he has heard about the proposal include whether a major is important, whether this much freedom is good for students, whether accountability needs to accompany the freedom and what form it should take (portfolio for example). How does one assess the success of such a

degree (would it be any harder or easier than assessing traditional programs?). He is curious to know what it will take to get faculty to move in creative and innovative directions, the forces of turf and resources being as strong as they are.

Senator Kaye said he “instinctively loved the proposal,” and sees some similarities to his own Weidner fellow proposal for general education. One major difference is that students would need to apply to be a Weidner fellow. He expressed some concern that an open degree could become the choice for students who just got lost. Senator Kaye is not concerned about accountability. Senator O’Grady is concerned that students might have trouble accounting for their degree after four years, and Abbott recognizes the need for discussion. Senator Sutton asked whether the intention is to allow a student to take nothing but lower-level courses. Abbott’s inclination is to leave it as free as possible, but he recognizes the value of discussing this as well. Senator Breznay agrees this could be an interesting experiment for a few years, but he is concerned about granting a degree based on the number of credits alone. If students want to take courses for exploration sake that is fine, but why should we grant a degree? Abbott suggested that if we offer quality courses, quantity is not the only standard.

Senator Grosso is concerned that transcripts could be misleading if a student is unable to get into a major and just takes courses to look like that major. Senator Reed feels we couldn’t accept this proposal without abolishing general education. Abbott suggests that those students who are willing to take responsibility for their own education take the proposed path. Those who want faculty help with the choices should take a traditional degree. The Speaker said this topic would return next month as a forum.

d. Requests for Future Senate Business. Senator Jeffrey requested an information session on the position allocation process, noting confusion on campus about it and the role of the Administrative Council.

6. Provost’s Report. Provost Hammersmith distributed a written report (attached) and added the following comments:

Contract letters are being produced. Next year you will not have to wait so long to receive it. In the future, if the State is still debating the budget, as happened this year, letters will be sent out indicating that final salary figures will be available at a later date.

Regarding the pay plan, faculty shouldn’t be surprised if their raise is less than the 2% announced increase. System regulation stipulates that new employees only receive a third of the increase (the portion attached to satisfactory performance). A portion of the pay package is also reserved for the Chancellor’s discretionary fund used to fund the Chancellor’s portion of faculty promotions. If any remains, it may be redistributed. This year none remained for faculty, but some did remain on the academic staff side and it was used for several AS equity adjustments. Six faculty did receive market adjustments made possible by internal reallocation. Distributing pay raises is complicated, but at least it is better than having no raises to plan. Senator Ashman asked about summer school plans. Dean Hughes was invited to respond. No major changes are planned. Internet courses were popular and served students from other universities. There was a 250% increase in undergraduate specials, and we will want to build on that demand. Senator Dresdow noted that there is still confusion about how summer salary is calculated.

7. University Committee Annual Report. Previously distributed. There were no questions.

8. University Committee Report. Presented by UC Chair Dresdow. The Student Senate would like a faculty representative. Senator Kaye found the experience “rejuvenating” last year and was willing to take on the assignment again, but deferred to Senator Breznay who expressed an interest. The UC still has concerns about campus climate and will become more proactive in addressing these. Before any recommendations on schedule change, they would like to experiment with the common meeting time recommended by last year’s Climate

Committee--perhaps two or three times per semester on Friday afternoon. The UC is looking at ways to help move the general education debate forward. They are reviewing UWGB Chapter 6 on complaints and grievances to make sure code is clear and consistently applied. Today's discussion on the Founders degree was an introduction to next month's forum. The hope is that introducing topics one month will lead to fuller discussions in the next. This will also allow time to consult with constituents. The UC invites communication about any issues of concern.

9. Adjournment. The Speaker called for a motion to adjourn, which was made and approved at 4:52 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kenneth Fleurant, Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

**PROPOSED CODE CHANGE TO
UWGB CHAPTER 6
COMPLAINTS AND GRIEVANCES**

The proposal is to add the language in bold face between the brackets

UWGB 6.01 Complaints.

Complaints are allegations by the administration, students, faculty members, academic staff members, classified staff members, or members of the public concerning conduct by a faculty member which violates university rules or which adversely affects the faculty member's performance of his/her obligation to the university, but which are not serious enough to warrant dismissal. [**Any complaint against a faculty member substantial enough to imply prosecution under the provisions of UWS 6.01 or UWGB 6, including those for which the level of intended penalty is the placement of a letter of reprimand in the faculty member's personnel file, must be adjudicated according to the procedures outlined below.**]

CURRENT & PROPOSED CURRICULUM APPROVAL PROCEDURES (October 13, 2005)

Academic action	interdisciplinary program ^a	General Education Council ^b	Graduate Board ^b	Academic Affairs Council	UC & Faculty Senate	Dean(s)	Provost	Chancellor	UW-System Administration	Board of Regents
New degree (53.05.A) (f)	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
New major (52.01.F & 54.03.A.1 53.05.A) (f)	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y ⁱ	Y ^f	Y ^f
New or change an emphasis or minor:										
Change major (53.05.A)	Y	NA	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	I	Y ^k	I ^k
New minor (54.03.A.1, 53.05.A)	Y	NA	NA	Y	Y ^g	Y	Y	I	I	I
Change minor area (52.01.F & 54.03.A.1)	Y	NA	NA	Y	N	Y	Y	I	I	I
New Emphasis (54.03.A.1, 53.05.A)	Y	NA	NA	Y ^j	N	Y	Y	I	I	N
Change emphasis (53.05.A)	Y	NA	NA	Y ^j	N	Y	Y	I	I	I
Certificate program	Y	NA	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	I	I	I
Rename a degree or major or submajor (53.05.A)	Y	NA	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	I	I
Change program requirements (53.05.A)	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y ^e	I
Add a course (53.05.A, 53.10.F., 53.05.E, 53.12.D, 54.03.A.2, 53.11.E & 54.03.C.1 & 2)	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y ^h	Y	N	N	N
Major change of a course (Same as "Add a Course")	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y ^h	Y	N	N	N
Minor change of a course (53.05.A)	Y	N	N	N ^c	N	Y	N	N	N	N
Drop a degree (53.05.A)	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	I
Drop a major (52.01.F & 54.03.A.1)	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	I
Drop a submajor (minor or area of emphasis) (53.05.A)	Y	NA	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	I	I
Drop a course (Same as "Add a Course")	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y ^h	Y	N	N	N
Add/merge/drop an interdisciplinary, disciplinary, or other unit (52.01.E (per 53.01.B and 53.06.B), 53.01.B, 53.06.B)	Y	NA	Y	Y ^d	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	I
Add a cooperative program	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Offer an existing degree program off-site	Y	Y	Y	I	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	I
Offer an existing degree program via distance educ.	Y	Y	Y	I	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	I
Articulation agreements - (This would be new policy or code)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	I
Y = approval needed; I = information only; N = approval not needed; NA = not applicable										
NOTES: Shaded Boxes indicate that the approval is discussed in the Faculty Handbook Code										
The columns above are not intended to imply exact order of approval. That would be outlined in a Curriculum Handbook										

CURRENT & PROPOSED CURRICULUM APPROVAL PROCEDURES (October 13, 2005)

Notes for Current and Proposed Curriculum Procedures

The UW System and Board of Regents columns may need some revision. Some of the I or N notations need further verification.

For unshaded boxes, it has been difficult to ascertain if all the approval procedures noted above areas followed consistently and whether they are customary practice. During the UC's discussions there was not always agreement in the approval path followed by various programs.

(a) implies consultation with units involved in academic action; including appropriate disciplinary programs

(b) applies only if the action is part of general education or graduate program;

(c) AAC determines when a change is minor or major; (d) AAC meets jointly with Personnel Council;

(e) only if changes are significant; (f) only if change involves renaming

(f) An entitlement to plan must be obtained from UW System prior to any formal campus approval process. Then the campus follows its approval process and it must go back to System for approval

(g) At this time only minors without associated majors require Senate approval (52.01) - whether all minors should come before the Senate is an issue to be discussed by the Senate and a change made to code if desired by the Senators.

(h) 53.10 does not specify a dean actually has to approve -- it is implied by "submits through the appropriate dean(s)"

(i) The Provost can approve the major on behalf of the Chancellor

(j) It appears common practice that approval of an emphasis area is between disciplinary, interdisciplinary units and the dean(s) and that the AAC does not review emphasis areas -- this appears to be an area of discussion for the Senate

(k) For a substantive redirection of a Major/Degree UW System Must Approve

NOTES: While a faculty elective committees, the AAC and GEC are advisory to the Provost according to Faculty Handbook Code.

There are plans to develop a Curriculum Policy and Procedures Handbook separate from the Faculty Handbook Code. It is the intention of the members of the University Committee to propose Code for the Faculty Handbook that would stipulate that the Faculty Senate is the body that would be authorized to approve a Curriculum Procedures Handbook. In addition, the Faculty Senate would be the body to approve any changes to the policies and procedures contained in the Curriculum Handbook.