AGENDA
UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 5
Wednesday, January 23, 2008, 3:00 p.m.
Phoenix Room C, University Union

Presiding Officer: Kevin Roeder, Speaker
Parliamentarian: Professor Clifford F. Abbott

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 4,**
    December 12, 2007   [page 2]

3. **CHANCELLOR'S REPORT**

4. **NEW BUSINESS**
    a. Policy on Student Feedback on Instruction – page 6
    b. Code change to UWGB Chapter 54.03 A.5 (first reading) – page 7
    c. Code change to UWGB Chapter 54.03 A.5 and 53.10 F (first reading) – page 8
    d. Requests for future business

5. **PROVOST'S REPORT**

6. **UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE REPORT**
    Presented by Professor Dean VonDras, Chair

7. **MOVE INTO CLOSED SESSION** pursuant to Wis. Statutes, Sec. 19.85(1)(f) for discussion
    of an Honorary Degree

8. **ADJOURNMENT**

UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 4
Wednesday, December 12, 2007
Phoenix Room C, University Union

Presiding Officer: Steven Meyer, Deputy Speaker
Parliamentarian: Clifford Abbott, Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

PRESENT: Lucy Arendt (BUA), Kathleen Burns (HUD), Matthew Dornbush (NAS), Susan Gallagher-Lepak (NUR), Stefan Hall (HUS), Sue Hammersmith (Provost, *ex officio*), Catherine Henze (HUS), Curt Heuer (AVD), Tian-you Hu (NAS), Steve Kimball (EDUC alternate), Ann Kok (SOCW), Vladimir Kurenok (NAS), Pao Lor (EDU), Kaoime Malloy (AVD), Daniel Meinhardt (HUB), Steven Meyer (NAS-UC), Timothy Meyer (ICS), Ray Hutchison (URS alternate), Kim Nielsen (SCD), Illene Noppe (HUD-UC), Terence O'Grady (AVD-UC), Debra Pearson (HUB), Laura Riddle (AVD-UC), Ellen Rosewall (AVD), Denise Scheberle (PEA), Bruce Shepard (Chancellor, *ex officio*), David Voelker (HUS), Dean VonDras (HUD-UC), Jill White (HUD)

NOT PRESENT: Kevin Roeder (UC-SOCW), Meir Russ (BUA),

REPRESENTATIVES: Dan McIver (Academic Staff Committee), Ricky Staley (Student Government)

GUESTS: Associate Provost Tim Sewall, Dean Fritz Erikson, Scott Hildebrand, Dean Scott Furlong, Professor Alison Gates

1. Call to Order. With a quorum present, Deputy Speaker Meyer called the Senate to order at 3:03 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes of UW-Green Bay Faculty Senate Meeting No. 3, November 14, 2007. On a motion by Senator Terry O'Grady (second by Senator Kim Nielsen) the minutes were approved by voice vote.

3. Chancellor's Report. The Chancellor spoke about:

a. Salaries – There are behind-the-scenes efforts to improve the current 2% + 2% + 1% proposed pay package, but the Governor has not yet been convinced that those improvements ought to extend to non-instructional staff. Internally, an indexing of promotion raises, along with a "fairness adjustment" for those promoted in the last six years, is being considered. This would come out of the Chancellor's 10% of the pay package.

b. Growth Agenda – By January 15th plans for how the funds will be spent for next year will be released on a website. Planning beyond that is still very preliminary.

c. Office remodeling – The Chancellor's office is soon to be remodeled to reflect some updating and reorganization. He reassured senators about the funding source *entre nous* and that he was not building a pleasure palace.

d. Administrator evaluations – The Chancellor has shared a couple of implementation questions with the University Committee but is happy to see this matter move forward.

e. Gatherings – The holiday gathering previously held at the Chancellor's residence will be expanded and held at the Weidner Center this year. Commencement will remain at the Weidner Center as long as it can accommodate the crowd. A spring semester convocation is planned to recognize years-of-service awards, have a meal, and hear a Chancellor's update on the state of affairs for the institution. And finally, the Chancellor will be sharing his fanaticism over quality coffee by offering some personally roasted and ground brew.

f. Questions – The Chancellor was asked about the politics of decoupling faculty and staff pay plans and was reminded how unfortunate this was and how the coupling had never in the past worked to the detriment of the faculty. He responded that he was pessimistic over the short run about improving staff salaries but would work on finding better data. It did occur to him that faculty may well be the most persuasive advocates for staff salary increases. He was also asked when we might be receiving contracts and confessed he did not know – everyone was waiting on UW-System.

4. New Business. The Speaker asked for requests for future business and received none.

5. Provost's Report. The Provost offered in addition to her written report her best hopes that everyone would find ways to recharge over the break. She also alerted all about two events coming in January: an instructional development conference on January 17 and a workshop on international education on January 25.

6. University Committee Report. Chair VonDras reflected some warm comments of support and cooperation to the Provost and Chancellor and then listed issues the UC has been working on: teaching evaluations (Student Government Representative Staley added that they will be surveying students on teaching evaluation instruments); the program review process; the implementation of administrator evaluations; salary issues; opportunities for training sessions on sexual harassment, ethics, diversity, and such; System efforts to formalize roles of faculty and staff reps; and unit alignments.

7. Committee Report. Tim Meyer reported on the activities of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budget over the last month. The Committee's chair, John Katers, will continue to represent the Committee in planning meetings. The Provost will be launching a website soon where information will be available on salary savings, the Growth Agenda process, the Star Retention Fund, operating plans, and academic planning. The Committee would like to serve as the conduit between faculty responses to these items and the administration. The Committee also discussed salary and compression issues. [The SOFAS office subsequently received a written report and it is attached.]

8. Open Forum on unit alignment. Deputy Speaker Meyer introduced the forum on how non-budgetary units should be aligned with budgetary units by asking Associate Provost Tim Sewall to comment on a proposal attached to the agenda. He identified the problem that led to the proposal in the lack of guidelines for who approves actions non-budgetary units take in changing their curricula. Code uses vague language like "appropriate interdisciplinary unit" or "interdisciplinary units responsible" without defining those terms. He also offered that it was important to distinguish that the proposal was not a _re_alignment since alignments have not been formally identified in Code and that the problem really only exists for actions other than course proposals. The discussion was extensive among senators and guests and several themes emerged.

Several senators argued that the lack of alignment was not currently a problem so alignment would "create parenting for units that don't need parents." Senators offered possible harms from formal alignment: formal responsibility would threaten cooperative negotiation currently common among several programs; a forced choice would be politically divisive for some programs; added bureaucracy would be created; any standardization would threaten working relationships that have developed differently through long practice.

A few senators allowed that even if current practices, though sometimes messy, are able to get things done, there is the potential for problems if non-budgetary units take actions with budgetary consequences, even if those consequences are small or indirect. Current harmony is no guarantee against future discord.

Another theme of the forum was the relationship of Code to practice. There is a discomfort when negotiations lead to actions, however harmonious, that are at odds with Code. There were suggestions to change Code: to clarify the rights of non-budgetary units; to provide for mediation or review by disinterested parties; or to let non-budgetary units make a case-by-case choice of who gets to approve their actions. One senator offered that we face a classic organizational choice between dialog (appropriate for flexibility in less stable contexts) and standardization (appropriate for efficiency in more stable contexts).

9. Adjournment. The Deputy Speaker thanked the assembly for their contributions, asked for a motion for adjournment, and urged a vote by action at 4:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Clifford Abbott, Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

FACULTY SENATE PLANNING & BUDGET COMMITTEE REPORT

December 10, 2007 Meeting:

The Committee met with Deans Furlong and Erickson and Provost Hammersmith to discuss the Committee's role in the budget and planning process. Committee Chair John Katers relied on the charge from the University Committee to address the agenda for our Committee's involvement.

1. John will continue to attend the budget planning meetings with the Provost.
2. Provost Hammersmith told the Committee that the Provost's web site was about ready to go online; the prototype was about to be unveiled to the University's Planning Committee and would then be available to the entire university committee. The Provost will be glad to receive faculty feedback regarding what is or is not available on the web site. **The Committee felt that it was best for feedback to go through the Committee and then to the Provost.** This feedback process would help keep the Committee in the loop and minimize a series of specific "back and forths" that would potentially necessitate the expenditure of a great deal of time. **A link to the Committee will be added to the Provost's web site.**
3. Among the key items for inclusion on the web site and to be made available through other channels as well:
    (a) **Salary Savings** – how does it work and where does (did) the money go?
    (b) **Growth Agenda** – where will the money be spent and when will it be decided; faculty with ideas or proposals for new initiatives should continue to submit them through budgetary unit chairs for further consideration.
    (c) **Star Retention Fund** – the guidelines and explanation of how this process works will be included on the web site.
    (d) **Operating Plans** – the overall objectives and initiatives of each unit will be available.
    (e) **Academic Plan** – new update is now being circulated for comments before it is made public.
4. We also discussed faculty salary issues, relating to salary discrepancies and compression; all agreed that it was a very complex and difficult issue which defied any easy, straight-forward solutions. All of us agreed, however, that the related salary issues needed to be addressed and discussed.
5. Finally, the Provost reminded us that the process for building the budget for next year was upon us and that very soon we would begin building the budget for the next biennium.

The Committee will meet again in either later January or early February.

(Prepared by Tim Meyer)

POLICY ON STUDENT FEEDBACK ON INSTRUCTION

Affirming the centricity of teaching to faculty performance and therefore the need to provide ~~adequate~~ **effective** evaluation of teaching, the faculty of the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay has always recognized that student response to teaching is one important source of information for that purpose, **and is especially important for providing information about the instructor's classroom demeanor, conduct and professionalism.** The faculty reaffirms its policy on the use of student feedback on teaching to provide data for (a) the improvement of instruction; (b) retention, promotion and tenure decisions; and (c) merit increase deliberations. These policies are expressed in terms of faculty and unit responsibility and the University's use of the students' comments, and are in accordance with <u>Regent Policy #868 **20-2**</u>

<u>Unit Responsibilities</u>:

1. Student comments on teaching performance ~~should~~ **shall** be obtained in every course taught by means of ~~an approved written feedback process.~~ **a standardized, university-wide student feedback instrument. Each unit shall also include a list of questions or a separate instrument pertinent to additional teaching issues deemed important by that unit.** A standardized technique for administering the student feedback process, established by the instructor's unit, ~~should~~ **shall** be implemented. The process should encourage students to write open-ended comments. End-of-course feedback ~~should~~ **shall** not be shown to the instructor until grades are submitted.

2. The executive committee of each academic budgetary unit ~~should~~ **shall** establish guidelines for the use of a student feedback process, in conformity with Board of Regents and University of Wisconsin-Green Bay policy requiring use of student ratings for merit, retention, and promotion decisions as part of the data considered regarding teaching, **and in accordance with norms and research done on each item on the instrument. Each unit's policy shall be submitted to the Provost's Office and made available in writing to all members of the unit.** These guidelines ~~should~~ **shall also** include provisions to ensure that:

    a. for all untenured and teaching academic staff, results are reviewed annually
    b. for all tenured faculty, results are reviewed at least biennially

3. To enlarge the information base used in evaluation of teaching performance, faculty members should be encouraged to place in their personnel files (a) a list of courses taught, (b) a current syllabus for each course taught, (c) a copy of a representative assessment tool to measure student performance for each course taught, and (d) samples of other materials distributed to students.

4. Positive recommendations for promotion, retention, or annual merit increases must be supported by evidence of teaching effectiveness, including but not limited to data from a student feedback process.

UWGB Faculty Senate Approved March 1976 and 1980
UWGB Faculty Senate Revised and Approved June 1989
UWGB Faculty Senate revised and approved January 1997

<div align="right">

Faculty Senate New Business 4(a)
23 January 2008

</div>

PROPOSED CODE CHANGE TO
FACULTY HANDBOOK CHAPTER 54.3 A.5

[Proposed changes are marked by strikethroughs]

54.03 FUNCTIONS OF THE COUNCILS

    A. Academic Affairs Council

        5. The Academic Affairs Council shall annually provide the Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff, for inclusion in the *Faculty Governance Handbook*, a current list of : 1) Interdisciplinary Units and 2) approved academic programs (including majors, minors, emphases, graduate programs, and certificate programs). ~~and the Interdisciplinary Units responsible for them.~~

PROPOSED CODE CHANGE TO
UWGB CHAPTERS 54.03 A.5 AND 53.10 F

Policy and Procedure for Determining the Curricular Relationship Between Interdisciplinary Units and Academic Programs

[Proposed changes are marked by strikethroughs and bold font]

54.03 Functions of the Councils

    A. <u>Academic Affairs Council</u>

        5. ~~The Academic Affairs Council shall annually provide the Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff, for inclusion in the *Faculty Governance Handbook*, a current list of: 1) Interdisciplinary Units and 2) approved academic programs (including majors, minors, emphases, graduate programs, and certificate programs) and the Interdisciplinary Units responsible for them.~~

53.10 <u>Disciplinary and Other Unit Chairperson: Duties</u>

    F. Submits through the appropriate Dean(s) **proposed program requirement changes,** new courses, major revisions of existing courses, and deletion of courses proposed by the disciplinary or other unit for action by an appropriate interdisciplinary unit, the Academic Affairs Council, and the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. **The appropriate interdisciplinary unit shall be determined by the Executive Committee at the time the program requirement change, new course, course modification or deletion of a course is proposed.**