

## AGENDA

### **UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 1**

Wednesday, 14 September 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. 7, APRIL 27, 2005 [page 2 attached]**

#### **3. INTRODUCTION OF SENATORS**

#### **4. CHANCELLOR'S REPORT**

#### **5. NEW BUSINESS – Presented by Gregory Davis**

- a. Election of Faculty Senate Deputy Speaker for 2005-06
- b. Curriculum Approval Procedures [page 12 attached]
- c. Proposal for Founders Degree [page 6 attached]
- d. Requests for Future Senate Business

#### **6. PROVOST'S REPORT**

Presented by Provost Sue K. Hammersmith

#### **7. 2004-05 UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT [page 10 attached]**

Presented by Professor Gregory Davis, 2004-05 University Committee Chair

#### **8. UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE REPORT**

Presented by Professor Sally Dresdow, Chair

#### **9. ADJOURNMENT**

MINUTES 2004-2005  
**UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 7**

Wednesday, April 27, 2005  
 Phoenix Room C, University Union

Presiding Office: Sally Dresdow (BUA-UC), Speaker

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

PRESENT: Greg Aldrete (HUS-UC), Scott Ashman (ED), Denise Bartell (HUD), Angela Bauer-Dantoin (HUB), Forrest Baulieu (ICS), Joy Benson (BUA), Gregory Davis (NAS-UC), Sally Dresdow (BUA-UC), Scott Furlong (PEA-UC), Regan Gurung (HUD-UC), Sue Hammersmith (Provost, *ex officio*), Derek Jeffreys (HUS), Timothy Kaufman (ED), Harvey Kaye (SCD), Michael Kraft (PEA), Mimi Kubsch (NUR), Judith Martin (Soc. Wk), Steven Meyer (NAS), Tom Nesslein (URS), Ellen Rosewall (COA), Christine Style (COA-UC), Rebecca Tout (COA), Bryan Vescio (HUS), David Voelker (HUS), William Witwer (COA), Michael Zorn (NAS).

NOT PRESENT: Peter Breznay (ICS), Andrew Fiala (HUS), Steve Muzatko (BUA), Debra Pearson (HUB), Tara Reed (NAS), Bruce Shepard (Chancellor, *ex officio*).

REPRESENTATIVES: Rachel Abhold (Student Government Association Representative), John Landrum (Academic Staff Representative).

GUESTS: Dean Fritz Erickson, Associate Dean Joyce Salisbury, Scott Hildebrand (University Communications), Robert Howe (NAS), William Laatsch (URS), Illene Noppe (HUD), Associate Provost Timothy Sewall

**1. Call to Order.** With a quorum present, Speaker Dresdow called the Senate to order at 3:05 p.m.

**2. Approval of Minutes of UW-Green Bay Faculty Senate Meeting No. 6, March, 23, 2005.**

The minutes were approved without change by voice vote.

**3. Chancellor's Report.** Chancellor Shepard was away on business so there was no report.

**4. New Business**

a. Resolution on the Granting of Degrees. Following reading of the resolution by Speaker Dresdow, **Senator Baulieu moved (with second) adoption of the resolution that passed unanimously.**

b. Election of the Speaker of the Senate for 2005-06. The Speaker opened the floor to nominations. Senator Gurung nominated Gregory Davis. After sufficient time for further nominations, and there being none, Senator Benson moved (with second) to close nominations, and the motion passed unanimously. **The Speaker called for the election and Senator Davis was the unanimous choice.**

c. and d. were deferred by the Speaker pending arrival of key participants.

e. Requests for Future Senate Business. Senator Meyer asked the UC to revisit the absence of a CD grade in the grading system. Senator Benson requested a forum next fall on faculty leadership in the program

assessment process. Senator Voelker asked the UC to bring the issue of writing emphasis courses back to the Senate for further discussion.

d. Proposal by General Education Council for revised Natural Science requirements. Speaker Dresdow invited GEC chair Bob Howe to present the proposal. Howe explained that this proposal addresses two issues: a) students create a backlog by taking this component of the GE requirement last, partly because courses fill rapidly and are not available and b) college base scores in the sciences have steadily declined since the mid 1990s. This proposal addresses both issues. The sciences simply do not have the faculty to cover the need for all students to take a lab course. Because of this, and for quite some time, students have had the option of taking four non-lab courses instead of 3 courses with at least one lab component. The current proposal only applies to students who select the non-lab option and separates the former NS-2 category into two parts, one composed of courses in Human Biology and Nutritional Sciences and the other from Environmental Science and related areas. Students will no longer be able to meet the requirement by taking both courses from Nutritional Science and Human Biology, a situation which put pressure on those courses while some of the Natural Science course remained under-enrolled. This proposal requires student to take a course in both the natural and physical sciences and human biology and both HUB and NAS faculty have approved the proposed change.

**Senator Davis moved (with second) approval of the proposal.** The Provost asked how many students currently take the 4-course option. Generally speaking, the response is “many.” Speaker Dresdow offered that most students in Business Administration do so. The Speaker asked when the change would take effect. The Provost suggested the fall of 2006 since the changes need to be published. With that understanding and there being no further discussion, **the motion passed unanimously by voice vote.**

c. Continuation of the Campus Climate Committee. Presented by UC Chair Davis. The UC recommends a) extending the committee’s mandate for one year b) an open call for anyone interested in membership c) better representation across campus domains and d) that the CCC finish its work on the proposed schedule change this summer and then move on to explore other options. Speaker Dresdow requested a motion.

Senator Baulieu asked who would appoint the members. Speaker Dresdow responded that the UC assumed it would do so as it had last year.

**Senator Gurung moved that the Campus Climate Committee be continued for one year with an open call for those interested in serving.** The understanding is that the current committee will finish its work on the schedule proposal by the end of the summer and move on to other issues. The Senate was not ready to finalize the wording of a motion and preferred to continue discussion first, so the motion died for lack of second. Senator Kaye, although not adamantly opposed, does not feel the committee should continue since its purpose remains unclear and it is a waste of time to have a committee without power to act. If the UC believes changes are called for to improve climate, it should work with academic staff and other governance groups to make them happen. Senator Gurung agrees that the UC is in a better position to act, but believes that it first needs people to study the issues and make recommendations. It does not have time to function as a Climate Committee, which should be continued for another year. Senator Baulieu believes the Committee on Committees and Nominations should be involved in the selection process of committee members since one of its concerns is workload and committee assignment balance. Since the UC does not intend to involve the CCN, he opposes the UC’s recommendations. Senator Benson suggests that the Senate issue a clearer charge if it continues the committee. Senator Baulieu does not feel the committee is likely to be productive and believes that looking for discontent can actually do damage.

Speaker Dresdow invited Climate committee members Illene Noppe (chair) and Bill Laatsch to respond to some of the issues. While praising the current committee for its hard work and dedication, Noppe doesn't mind having the CCN recommend membership since it is important for the campus to continue the committee which has identified significant issues in need of further consideration and continued dialogue. The current committee made the conscious decision to try to effect change in one area (schedule change) it felt could make a positive contribution to that dialogue, but there are many other ways the committee could go should the Senate decide to renew its charge. Senator Gurung feels it is premature to abort the committee's efforts. Following some moments of silence, the Speaker reminded the Senate that in the absence of its action the committee will have completed its work. Senator Style believes the issues deserve another year of committee study. At the very least she wants to allow the committee to complete its work this summer on the schedule change.

Senator Kaye sees this debate as a symptom of larger problems: a State legislature that does not properly support the University; a campus structure that does not allow innovation; too much work. Our reaction was to form a climate committee. It is an insidious way of responding to these problems. There is no leadership on this campus, he feels, and the UC needs to take more responsibility. If we had resources climate would improve. He believes that the UC needs to forget the climate committee, "do something meaningful," and bring some innovative ideas to the Senate.

Senator Style **moved (with second) that the current Climate Committee be continued through the end of the summer in order to complete work on its schedule proposal and present its proposal to the UC and the Senate.** Senator Kaye asked why the UC couldn't handle this if it believes in it rather than assigning the task. Senator Baulieu notes that it is inappropriate to ask committee members not on summer contract to do this work. Committee chair Noppe indicated that the committee is close to finishing its work on the schedule proposal, so there would not be a need for many meetings.

Senator Rosewall asked what would happen to the work of the CCC should the motion fail. The Speaker said that it would go to the UC for its consideration. **The motion failed 3 votes in favor, 15 opposed, with 6 abstentions.**

**5. Provost's Report.** Provost Hammersmith distributed a written report at the meeting (attached). With enthusiastic applause from the Senate, she presented an honorary gavel to Speaker Sally Dresdow and a letter opener to UC Chair Greg Davis as tokens of gratitude for their fine service in 2004-05.

The Chancellor asked the Provost to share the following in his absence:

--TABOR appears to be dead in the current legislature—good news for education in Wisconsin;

--The Governor's budget includes funds for retaining faculty. If it survives the legislative process, and if our campus receives a proportionate share, we could receive \$56,000 and would plan how to use it in the fall. It could not simply be divided up equally. The Chancellor prefers not to use these funds to counter offers faculty receive from other institutions; we need to retain faculty before they go out on the job market, not promote job searches that encourage people to leave. One possibility, among many, would be to add the money to the named professorship base to create an additional one. Send comments and suggestions to the Provost, Chancellor or the University Committee.

--Summer school is operating under an experimental model this year, and enrollment is up 34% at this point. Projected revenue is up 49% but expenses have also increased since there are more courses, so this will be tracked carefully through mid summer when final figures will be available.

Senator Meyer asked about graduate assistant funding. The Provost noted that if the restored assistantships are to continue beyond next year, money will need to be found elsewhere, since they are not in the budget.

In response to a question from Senator Davis about accreditation, the Provost explained that the Higher Learning Commission (HLC—previously the North Central Commission) has expressed concern about faculty with insufficient English proficiency for teaching. That will have no implications for us since position descriptions already include communication skills. The Speaker invited Associate Provost Sewall, project coordinator, to speak on assessment progress. He underscored that there will be a stronger than ever emphasis on assessment of student learning in this accreditation cycle.

Senator Gurung said transfer students with sufficient GPA to graduate with honors were being denied acknowledgement of the honors at commencement because they don't have enough residence credits in time for the program notes. The Provost said that it is a perennial problem that deserves further discussion in the UC and Senate.

**6. University Committee Report.** UC Chair Davis, inviting input, reported on several agenda items for an upcoming System faculty representatives meeting:

1. Post-tenure salary increases. Full professors have few opportunities for salary jumps. The Eau Claire Senate passed a resolution calling for post tenure adjustments. He doesn't yet know whether their chancellor has approved. The faculty reps will be discussing a recommendation for such increases.
2. Open meeting statutes, especially for meetings at which votes are expected.
3. Possibilities for joint meetings of the System faculty reps and System academic staff council.
4. How complaints against faculty are routed at various institutions.

**8. Open Forum: Committee Reports to the Senate.** Speaker Dresdow explained the UC's concern that committee reports (including those of committees of the Senate) are not often made available to the Senate for discussion. This forum is intended to gauge whether the Senate would like to change that and in what manner. What kinds of reports and updates would the Senate wish to receive and from what committees? Senator Kaye and Provost Hammersmith suggested that the Senate should receive regular reports at least from the Academic Affairs and General Education Councils. Speaker Dresdow suggested adding the Academic Actions Committee. There was no further discussion, but the Speaker, in the spirit of this discussion, acknowledged Senator Rosewall who reported on an immediate concern of one committee. The Senate Legislative Affairs Committee requests that faculty contact their elected representatives immediately, encouraging them to protect the compensation reserve fund that the Governor set aside to fund a 2% faculty raise. It was in danger of being raided for other purposes.

**9. Adjournment.** There being no further discussion, the Speaker called for a motion to adjourn, which was quickly made and approved at 4:27 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Kenneth Fleurant, Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

draft 4/05

## Request for an Entitlement to Plan a New Degree

### Preamble

Forty years ago UW-Green Bay was founded in a spirit of innovation. Certain orthodoxies of higher education have not been easy to change, but UW- Green Bay has had some success in offering its graduates an education flexible enough to keep up with the modern world. In these days of tightening resources, innovative ways of getting a college education are often frustrated. This proposal seeks to follow UW-Green Bay's mission of innovation by challenging a current orthodoxy of higher education, offering a quality alternative, and increasing options for students without incurring major new costs.

Most current baccalaureate degrees are founded on four elements:

**Quantity** – This is currently a minimum of around 120 credits.

**Quality** – The courses must be college-level, faculty-designed, and offered by an accredited institution.

**Relevance** – The courses must be aimed at some ideal of an educated person, not just for training or entertainment.

**Manner** – The courses must provide faculty-specified depth (a major) and breadth (general education).

The essence of this proposal is to challenge the last of these four elements, that the manner of higher education must be through faculty-specified breadth and depth. The other foundational elements (quantity, quality, and relevance) are not questioned, and the alternative to faculty-specified breadth and depth proposed here is student choice.

The current dominant metaphor for higher education is that students are purchasing a product. While that kind of thinking may help in administrating the complexities of modern higher education, it is a kind of thinking that many people, some students as well as faculty, are as uncomfortable with as many are with viewing health or homeland security as a purchasable product. An alternative metaphor for education is to envision it as an exploration. That is the preferred vision for this proposal.

This is not a proposal to remove any existing programs. It is to add an alternative route to a baccalaureate. The basis of the alternative is that students get the freedom to explore the courses and define for themselves the manner of their education in exchange for giving up the faculty-certified manner of breadth and depth. Students who agree to the exchange can get a baccalaureate degree but not in any existing major or minor. Those students who feel they need a major to credential themselves for a potential employer or graduate school should not opt for the exchange. Those who feel they can market themselves with their own course selections should have the option of doing so.

### The Proposal

The proposal is for UW-Green Bay to seek from UW System Administration an entitlement to plan for a new baccalaureate degree to be known as the Founders Degree, in honor of the innovative spirit of the institution's founders. Students taking this degree must satisfy current requirements for number of credits (120), GPA (2.0), and residency. They are exempt from general education and major requirements and in return are unable to have specific majors or minors designated on their transcripts. They are free to complete the 120 credits from their own selections from UW-Green Bay's course array. They are required to document their learning through a portfolio or senior statement.

### Discussion

### **1. What is the potential audience/need for the proposed degree?**

Not every student who begins college can commit to or maintain a commitment to a specific major. In fact if the college experience is meeting at least one of its goals – to broaden students’ horizons – then one can expect a certain number of students to change their minds about their majors. When the only option for students is to eventually complete a major, then these changes are seen as false starts and often wasteful of institutional resources. The curriculum offers no way to legitimize a student’s exploration, no matter how educationally rewarding, unless it includes the right selection of required courses for some program.

There are several audiences for the proposed degree – those who place a higher priority on getting a degree than on completing a particular major; those able students the institution now loses because of their frustrations with meeting all requirements; those students who value a college experience more for acquiring certain skills than for satisfying certain requirements; and those whose learning keeps redefining for them what there is to learn. None of these audiences in themselves may be particularly large. The vast majority of students wants, and probably needs, the structure of requirements, but for those who don’t their needs are currently not being met.

### **2. What is the proposal’s relation to the institutional mission?**

UW-Green Bay’s special mission is to offer an interdisciplinary problem-focused curriculum. It does this currently through its requirement that all students complete an interdisciplinary program (major or minor) to graduate. The institution has designed a number of these interdisciplinary programs for students to choose among, but the number of possible problems that could be studied from multiple perspectives at UW-Green Bay is of course much larger. Normally what restrains an institution from offering individually tailored programs for its students is the need to make efficient use of its resources. This proposed program offers UW-Green Bay a way to follow its mission of being innovative and its mission of offering interdisciplinary programs with greater options of students without losing its current efficiencies.

### **3. How is the proposed degree different from existing programs?**

UW-Green Bay and several other schools in the UW System allow students to create individual majors. At UW-Green Bay the option is rarely used, probably because it puts many demands on the student to articulate how specific courses can form a coherent major distinct from all existing majors. This planning has to be done, along with a design for meeting general education requirements, before the courses are taken. It is not a program for educational exploration. It is designed for someone who has a specific goal in mind and knows how to reach it. It is a very special individual who comes to college with both the commitment and ability to do this planning.

### **4. What will the proposal cost?**

No program is totally free, but this is one that will not require new faculty lines or facilities. Costs for administrative oversight are minimal. There will be one more program to assess, but there may well be some institutional advantages in that.

### **5. What is the potential for student abuse of the program?**

While the goal of educational exploration may be noble enough, it is important to ask whether the proposed degree invites abuse from those with less noble intentions. Given the freedom from breadth and depth requirements, can students find a quick and dirty route to a college degree without the learning the degree ideally represents? Can a student select and complete 120 credits of courses (with at least the minimum GPA of 2.0 required of all graduates) and not get an education? This is hard to answer without some experience in trying, but given that no current set of degree requirements can really guarantee every

student who satisfies them will be well educated, it seems worth experimenting with more freedom. Some easily-imagined alternative principles for selecting courses – sampling from as many programs as possible; staying within a single program; searching out the best teachers; searching for particular skills; selecting for small classes; selecting for convenient time offerings; even searching for the easiest courses – don't seem like inherently impossible ways of becoming educated as long as there are enough courses and the courses themselves are of decent quality.

But what of the well-intentioned student? Can that student founder with the freedom of the proposed degree? Just as the university has the responsibility to help all students do their best, it owes students who opt for the proposed degree decent advising and support services. Students need to be encouraged to seek out and use those services.

#### **6. How can quality be assured? What are the faculty and institutional responsibilities for quality?**

Programs are currently defined as required subsets of the total course offerings of the institution and program quality is assured by a process of periodic program review. Assuring the quality of the proposed degree amounts to assuring the quality of the entire array of courses open to its students. Regardless of whether the institution currently has effective mechanisms for monitoring individual course quality, this is not a new responsibility for either the faculty or the institution. If students can find courses of low quality, the faculty should be able to find them as well.

Even if the individual courses were all of decent quality, it still might be conceivable for a student to make course selections that as a whole lacked quality because the whole selection was incoherent. Coherence can be a fairly relativistic notion. It would not be unreasonable to demand that students articulate their explorations and to have these articulations serve as a check on the quality of their selections.

#### **7. How can the program be assessed?**

Since any outcome measures are individually designed in this proposed degree, assessment of the degree depends on the articulations of graduating students and their subsequent success. For the typical alumni surveys that this institution does, it might be useful to have the graduates of the proposed degree serve as a control group. Do student-designed or faculty-designed programs lead to greater success in educational or marketplace success? The reactions of graduate schools and employers will be an important measure of the program's worth.

#### **8. How can the program enrich the educational process for all students?**

The proposed degree offers students more options and freedom and asks in return that they accept more responsibility for their own education. The institution can learn much from the choices students make in rich environments and those environments are further enriched by a greater diversity of students making different choices.

#### **9. How can the program enrich the instructional environment for the faculty?**

Most of the faculty will appreciate a few more students who take classes not because they have to but because they want to. Engaged, self-motivated students can enliven most classrooms. The opportunity to advise students about learning and education rather than describing and defending requirements may be welcomed by many.



**10. Will students of the proposed degree have special access to courses?**

Nothing in this proposal is intended to alter how access to courses is currently regulated. Prerequisite courses, preferential enrollment of declared majors, and other mechanisms for controlling access to classes will still apply.

**11. How should the program be governed?**

All degree programs need a governance structure so that quality can be monitored and changes can be proposed, deliberated, and instituted. This program will be the responsibility of the whole faculty, but it might be more reasonably governed by smaller group of faculty.

## **Annual Report of the University Committee 2004-2005**

The University Committee (UC) members – Gregory Aldrete, Gregory Davis (chair), Sally Dresdow, Scott Furlong, Regan Gurung, and Christine Style – met on a weekly basis. Most meetings were attended by a representative from student government (Rachel Abhold) and one from the academic staff (John Landrum). Most meetings included an information exchange with the Provost. There were frequent meetings with the Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff (SOFAS), a meeting with the Academic Deans, a meeting with the Chief Information Officer, a meeting with the Director of Public Safety, and one with the Campus Climate Committee. During the summer the UC continued its practice of inviting incoming members (Forrest Baulieu and Terence O'Grady) to join in its deliberations.

During the 2004-2005 academic year, the UC forwarded eight action items to the Faculty Senate with the following results:

### Passed:

- General Education Natural Science requirement (27 April 2005)
- Voting Status for Ex-Officio Members (23 March 2005)
- Implementing a Physical Education Executive Committee (17 November 2004)
- Resolution in Opposition to Constitutional Amendment Regarding the Definition of Marriage (17 November 2005)
- Amendment to Student-led Course Form (20 October 2004)
- Code change to UWGB 7.01 – Outside Activities and Conflict of Interest (20 October 2004)

### Defeated:

- Continuation of Campus Climate Committee (27 April 2005)
- General Education Writing Emphasis Proposal (23 March 2005)

This UC continued the practice of placing Open Forum topics on the Faculty Senate Agenda. Topics discussed this year included: Summer Session, Faculty Development, General Education, Class Schedule Proposal from Campus Climate Committee, Joint discussion of mutual interests with Student Senate and the Academic Staff Committee, and Senate Reports.

### Other tasks that the UC was involved in included:

- Clarification of curriculum approval procedures
- Appointment of faculty members/representatives on several University-wide committees
- Clarification of the role of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budget as well as the Senate Legislative Committee
- Evaluation of four lecturers having been recommended for faculty status

The UC began its year by selecting faculty development as a unifying topic of discussion. An attempt was made to evaluate the needs of faculty in order to function strongly in all three facets of our appointment; i.e., instruction, scholarship, and service. Deliberation on this topic dovetailed nicely with discussions related to our General Education Program and to the efforts of the Campus Climate Committee, including their class schedule proposal and the prospect of a common meeting time.

As UC discussions continued throughout the year, it became increasingly clear that additional University support for the Faculty, especially in the area of scholarship, is highly desired. It appears that time constraints may be the largest detriment to the pursuit of scholarship on our campus. Some felt that a change in class scheduling to a fourteen week semester would provide additional time for faculty development. The UC recognized that improved campus climate would also be beneficial in aid of increasing productivity on our campus. Members of the UC vowed to continue to look for ways to affect positive change on the campus climate.

I wish to thank my colleagues on the UC for energetic discussions, dedicated work, and for ably creating minutes that captured the time we spent together. I would also like to thank those in the SOFAS office who kept us on schedule, as well as all of the faculty and staff who kept the UC informed of their concerns.

Submitted by Gregory Davis  
University Committee Chair 2004-05

CURRICULUM APPROVAL PROCEDURES (7 September 2005)												
academic action	interdisciplinary program <sup>a</sup>	General Education Council <sup>b</sup>	Graduate Board <sup>b</sup>	University Committee	Academic Affairs Council	Faculty Senate	Dean(s)	Provost	Chancellor	UW-System Administration	Board of Regents	
add a degree	Y	NA	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
add a major	Y	NA	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
add or change a submajor:	Y	NA	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	I	I	I	
change major area of emphasis	Y	NA	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	I	I <sup>f</sup>	I <sup>f</sup>	
add a minor	Y	NA	NA	N	Y	N	Y	Y	I	I	I	
change minor area of emphasis	Y	NA	NA	N	Y	N	Y	Y	I	I <sup>f</sup>	I <sup>f</sup>	
certificate program	Y	NA	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	I	I	I	
add a cooperative program	Y	Y	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
offer an existing degree program off-site	Y	Y	Y	N	I	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	
offer an existing degree program via distance educ.	Y	Y	Y	N	I	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	
rename a degree or major or submajor	Y	NA	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	I	I	
change program requirements	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y <sup>e</sup>	I	
add a course	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	
major change of a course	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	
minor change of a course	Y	N	N	N	N <sup>c</sup>	N	Y	N	N	N	N	
drop a degree or major	Y	NA	Y	I	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	I	
drop a submajor (minor or area of emphasis)	Y	NA	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	I	I	
drop a course	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	
add/merge/drop a disciplinary or other unit	Y	NA	Y	Y	Y <sup>d</sup>	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	I	
add/merge/drop an interdisciplinary unit	Y	NA	NA	Y	Y <sup>d</sup>	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	I	
articulation agreements	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	I	I	
Y = approval needed; I = information only; N = approval not needed; NA = not applicable												
(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												