

AGENDA

UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 1

Wednesday, 16 October, 2024

3:00 p.m., TEAMS

Presiding Officer: Clif Ganyard, Speaker of the Senate

Parliamentarian: Michael Draney, Secretary of the Faculty and Staff

- 1. CALL TO ORDER; Introductions**
- 2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 8. May 1, 2024 [Pages 2-8]**
- 3. CHANCELLOR'S REPORT**
- 4. OLD BUSINESS: None**
- 5. NEW BUSINESS**
 - a. Memorial Resolution: Bob Wenger (read by Mike Draney) [Pages 9-10]
 - b. Memorial Resolution: R. Michael Ingraham (read by Jeff Entwistle) [Pages 11-13]
 - c. Governance Structure Working Group: Report to UC (Information Item) [Pages 14-25]
 - d. Changing residency requirement for honors (Courtney Sherman; Action Item) [Page 26]
 - e. Requests for Future Business
- 6. PROVOST'S REPORT**
- 7. OTHER REPORTS**
 - a. University Committee Report—Presented by Bill Dirienzo
 - b. Faculty Rep Report—Presented by Patricia Terry
 - c. Academic Staff Report—Submitted by Sam Robinson [Page 27]
 - d. University Staff Report—Submitted by Becky Haeny [Page 28]
 - e. Student Government Report—Presented by Karime Galaviz
- 8. ADJOURNMENT**

AGENDA

UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 8

Wednesday, May 1, 2024

3:00 p.m., TEAMS

Presiding Officer: Patricia Terry, Speaker of the Senate

Parliamentarian: Michael Draney, Secretary of the Faculty and Staff

PRESENT: Dana Atwood (PEA); Zhuoli Axelton (BusAdm); Erin Berns-Herrboldt (NAS); Doug Brusich (HUB); Thomas Campbell (TnD); Preston Cherry (BusAdm); Nazim Choudhury (RSE); Alise Coen (AWE); Jason Cowell (PSYCH); Bill Dirienzo (NAS-UC); Clif Ganyard (HUS-UC); Bill Gear (HUB); Joan Groessl (UC-SOCW); Stefan Gunn (RSE); Mahmoud Hammouri (NAS); Rick Hein (NAS); Todd Hillhouse (PSYCH); Rasedul Islam (RSE); Dan Kallgren (HUS); Mark Karau (HUS); Justin Kavlie (ICS); Vince Lowery (HUS); Shawn Malone (NAS); Ann Mattis (AWE); Mike McIntire (NAS); Samantha Meister (EDU); Omar Meqdadi (RSE); Valerie Murrenus-Pilmaier (AWE); Heidi Neverman (Nursing); Tariq Newaz (BusAdm); Laurel Phoenix (PEA); Kristopher Purzycki (HUS); Matt Raunio (AcctFin); Kimberly Reilly (DJS); Bill Sallak (Music); Jolanda Sallmann (SOCW); Sera Shearer (Music); Heidi Sherman (HUS); Chris Smith (PSYCH); Rebecca Stone-Thornberry (TnD); Patricia Terry (UC-RSE); Nischal Thapa (BusAdm); Christine Vandenhouten (UC-Nursing); Sam Watson (AND); Cary Waubanasum (SOCW); Keir Wefferling (NAS); Michael Alexander (Chancellor); Kate Burns (Provost); Mike Draney (SOFAS)

REPRESENTATIVES: Roshelle Amundson (ASC Rep); Karime Galaviz (SGA Rep); Lea Truttmann (USC Rep);

GUESTS: Moises Bahena-Martinez (UW-Green Bay student); Ubaldo Barrera (UW-Green Bay student); Michael Bubolz (CIO); Sarah Denis (Graduate Admissions Recruiter); Matt Dornbush (Dean, CSB); Susan Gallagher-Lepak (Dean, CHESW); Paula Ganyard (Library Director); Susan Grant Robinson (Chief of Staff); Marci Hoffman (Graduate Programs Manager); Ray Hutchison (Faculty-PEA); Brianna Hyslop (Manager, Learning Center); Amy Ibuaka (Dean Assistant, CSET); Njeri Karanja (Academic Advisor); John Katers (Dean, CSET); Alan Kopischke (Faculty-TnD); Kate LaCount (Exec Asst, Provost Office); McKinley Lentz (Adm Asst, Grad Studies); Trisha Linssen (Prog Specialist, Grants & Research); Ryan Martin (Dean, CAHSS); Melissa Nash (HR Director); Amanda Nelson (Associate Dean, CSET); Laura Nolan (Assoc Dir, Outreach Program); Darrel Renier (Advising Director); Rasoul Rezvanian (Associate Dean, CSB); Toni Severson (CECE); Courtney Sherman (Associate Provost); Nathan Smithson (Instructional Designer); Meghan Strehlow (AVC-Student Access & Success); Tina Tackmier (ADA, CSET); Tracy Van Erem (Financial Specialist); Kris Vespia (Director, CATL); Tamara Wang (Faculty-Nursing); Aaron Weinschenk (Faculty-PEA); Lauri Wellhouse; Amanda Wildenberg (Deans Assistant, CAHSS); Amy Yang (Academic Advisor); Jennie Young (Associate Dean, CAHSS); Mike Zorn (Associate Dean, CSET).

1. CALL TO ORDER...3:01 pm

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 7. March 27, 2024

Approved by acclamation.

3. CHANCELLOR'S REPORT....at 3:01

Thanks to Patricia, Clif, Lea, Laura, Christine as Faculty Rep....thanks to those shared governance leaders during this complicated year.

Ch calls attention to emails he's sent out this year...pleased about how faculty and staff are already thinking about AI's affect on our mission activities, including the positive ways that AI can interact with our teaching, etc. But also to continue to work on ethical issues and training so we can continue to use it responsibly.

Very important for all of us to model what its like to be "lifelong learners". One of the great ways we can build community as a campus is to learn together. We will all gather in January for a professional development opportunity across the entire campus...more info to come, and thanks.

Update on Marinette. We had great meetings at all additional campuses, and Chancellor left particularly inspired. Good ideas on how to move those campuses forward. No one should view our additional campuses as anything other than an asset, and the students at those locations are just the same as Green Bay campus students.

Marinette: City and County still negotiating on who will maintain campus going forward. We are still trying to be a resource to people in that part of the state, even though our face-to-face teaching activities there have been suspended.

Chancellor shares screen to give us some good news: Shows conceptual design of what Phoenix Innovation Park could look like into the future. A general conceptual map. Over the summer, we will meet with President Rothman, and come up with a governance plan for BOR in fall. [Shows architectural views of the new signature building in the works]. Chancellor is really excited about how the buildings and the Innovation Park will interact.

Chancellor reiterates that tunnel system is not ending, but there's a separation at that one spot. Chancellor hopes it inspires us to enjoy our beautiful campus more.

Chancellor invites us to cookout and thanks us for participation in Commencement.

Chancellor is grateful about our roles in accomplishing so much this year. Thanks to all. Hopes we all have some time this summer to reenergize.

Questions?

Gunn: Asks for clarification about the tunnel. Chancellor says it will still be there. The tunnel will end before entering Cofrin Library, but you can still walk to MAC then to the rest of the campus. Rose and Wood will be isolated from the rest.

4. OLD BUSINESS

- a. Proposed revision to Honors Requirements [Courtney Sherman]

Sherman re-introduces the proposal to lower the residency requirement for transfer students to get honors. They need 48 credits, which is a lot, the result being that many students qualify for the degree but do not

qualify to graduate with honors. The two policies are out of alignment, so this proposal recommends changing it. Sherman needs guidance about the exact change needed. Happy to hear your thoughts.

Speaker Terry corrects herself...this is NOT an action item at this point. Any comments?

Reilly: Question about what gets transferred....Sherman: Transfer students don't bring their GPA with them, so it's possible for a student to do really well for a short period and then get honors...this is why the requirement for honors is high (about 1.5 years or 3 semesters).

Hillhouse: What were UCs thoughts? What do other UW Institutions' policies look like? Ganyard answers for the UC: This issue has come up many times during the existence of the University. The requirement used to be 60 credits, and was reduced to 48 about a decade ago. Clif brought a similar proposal to drop the credits, and UC declined to act then. So this is ongoing...students tend to not like this requirement, but it makes sense to many faculty to have a stringent requirement. UC feels that Nursing Students, etc., should qualify in two years, but 30 credits....there was not consensus on whether that was enough or not. Some UC members wanted to count transfer credits (so keep it at 48, but count previous work)...that idea would be difficult to implement, though. Would need to be done by hand for every single student, so basically a non-starter. UC does feel that those transfer students should be eligible for honors, though. Registrar did look at maybe 6-7 other schools, the policies are all over the place. 2-3 have residency requirements that match the honors requirements. A few schools do count transfer credits. But no doubt some students would complain that their bad grades follow them through a transfer.

Phoenix: Wants to offer up a colleague's comment: Is it fair for regular students to have to use all their GPA, given that students tend to do better later in their careers. We shouldn't make things harder for our own students.

Wefferling: Reading Dirienzo's chat comment....can we offer a lower level of honors rather than cum laude honors for transfer students?

Karau: Confused about what Sherman is asking for today...just input? Or to vote on something?

Sherman: Feels there's no consensus, so the first question is "should we change it"? If so, will can draft something later.

Provost: Thought this was an action item?

Karau: Recommends a straw poll?

Hillhouse: Q about residency versus honors? Sherman clarifies: Residency is 30 credits, Honors is 48 credits.

Ganyard: Just re-read the memo from the Provost...UC took the memo as a request to reduce from 48 to 30, but now sees it's more ambiguous than that. We may need to come back in Fall with a different proposal, but someone COULD move to vote on the change to 30 from 48. Or we could do a straw poll. Nothing will happen until 2025, so we have time in either case.

Speaker waits for any motions to materialize from the Senate. None were offered.

Speaker Terry proposes a **straw poll: All those in favor of reconsidering the number of credits required of transfer students to**

24/10/did not ask for abstentions. Evidence that Senate is willing to reconsider.

- b. Proposal for new major in Criminal Justice [Ryan Martin, Elise Coen, Dana Atwood]

Ryan Martin briefly reintroduces. Very excited, could be important for CAHSS. In immediate future, would not require any additional resources. Right now, involves four different units, and could involve other Colleges later (Cybersecurity, for example). This is one of the most popular majors in the country, and there's considerable interest in the community for such a major. Many returning/Two-Year students interested in it, as well.

Speaker asks for a motion to approve: Karau/Murrenus Pilmaier

Discussion?

Sallmann: Social Work is opposing this, because they'd like to see a major with a stronger civil rights and progressive slant. Sallmann sees it as a missed opportunity to develop more new courses along this line.

Atwood: Defends the critical perspectives and social justice angles of many of the courses.

Martin: Social Justice is a central issue in CAHSS and everything we do dovetails with that. So he's not concerned with that angle.

Waubenasum: Can Dean Martin address some of Sallman's issues raised?

Martin: The instructors should address this. Dean Martin is troubled that this is even an issue.

Sallmann thinks it's a missed opportunity to develop specific courses.

Speaker calls the question: 33/3/1 Motion Passes.

5. NEW BUSINESS

- a. Resolution on Granting Degrees (Mike, Patricia)

Speaker asks for motion to approve: Karau/Meister

Any discussion? None. Vote: 36/0/0

- b. Election of Speaker of the Faculty Senate, 2024-25 [Terry]

Speaker asks for nominations: Vandenhouten nominates Clif Ganyard (Groessler seconds)

No other nominations. Vote: 33/0/0

- c. Thank you to Shared Governance Leaders, 2023-24 [Draney]

Virtual presentation of wine glasses and mugs; thanks to all Senators and Alternates as well.

Clif also thanked SOFAS....much appreciated.

- d. First Nations Education Unit Proposal (Lisa Poupart, Susan Gallagher-Lepak, Ryan Martin, Courtney Sherman)

First Nations Education wants to put all the efforts in this direction under one College. Mission realignment exercise inspired this, from First Nations program, which is located in two colleges (undergraduate, CAHSS, graduate program, CHESW). All levels wanted to make this change, creating a

stand-alone First Nations unit, creating a more holistic approach to First Nations education and create more momentum towards their initiatives.

Dean Ryan: CAHSS supports this change, noting the complications with the current system. Ryan Martin requests suspending the rules for this so that this unit will exist when some College reorganization happens during this summer.

Sherman: There have been a number of layers of approval...both units (Humanities, Education), PC, AAC, Registrar, etc., so we missed the last Senate meeting. Appreciates the consideration.

Sallman proposes suspending the rules (second, Sallak)

Any discussion? None: 38/0/0 Motion to suspend rules passes.

Motion to accept the proposal: Waubenascum/Sallmann

Discussion? None.

Vote: 38/0/0 Motion Passes.

- e. Sunsetting the Additional Campus Reps [Draney][Page 44]

Draney explained the sunsetting of the additional campus reps

- f. Requests for Future Business by Terry

Sallak mentions “disproportionate” response to student protests at colleges across the nation. Mentions the impending anniversary of Kent State massacre, asks for a drafting and passing of a resolution in response to this.

6. PROVOST’S REPORT

Provost is hopeful her malfunctioning monitors will hold up during this presentation.

Enrollment: We are at 86% of our summer headcount and 90ish percent of our credit count for summer.

4040 students registered for Fall so far. Puts us at 51%, but its super early. Right now we are down 10% on new Freshman versus last year. Problems with new FAFSA may contribute to this lag. UW-System has also made changes in application fees...right now we get 3 free applications, down from unlimited a few years ago.

Up 11% in new transfers, so that’s good news. They are harder to predict, because they tend to register later.

Last week’s Academic Excellence Symposium: Great work to library personnel for organizing, 56 posters, 10 virtual options, 112 student participants, 33 faculty sponsors.

In response to Friday’s email on OIE: This summer (2024) was a one-time cancellation of faculty-led travel courses. We have already approved Jan 2025 courses, and will seek courses in summer 2025. Maggie Ornelas is still the point person for those.

Questions?

Sallmann: Gen Ed Realignment question: We expect no information other than graduating seniors, but there’s 16 year olds in these classes. How do we deal with this conflict? Provost: The topic, the pace,

the resources can all be affected, true...how can we better share out what we have in terms of all this? In terms of content side...the gen ed committee is trying to find a balance between CCIHS students and more senior people in these courses. Operationalizing that can be a challenge (as Jolanda states).

Reilly: This issue is a problem in her history courses, as well. Push back from younger students that don't think the material is appropriate for them. Not sure what the instructor is supposed to say when the student pushes back? More guidance would be helpful. Provost: University legal Paquet has some good language on this, we will be sharing.

C. Ganyard: Committee was thinking about college level students, that's why the language is there. Clif understands these concerns (he teaches on Nazi Germany). We need policies, yes, but also a process to approve which courses are appropriate for these students! Clif and colleagues have refused to offer some 300, 400 level courses to HS students on maturity grounds. We need to develop a process for this. We should have this discussion, maybe a working group? Meagan Strehlow will be reporting to AAC on CCIHS, another way for problems to be communicated.

Provost adds that Rising Phoenix is different from CCIHS/Special Students. Rising Phoenix is more curated toward HS students. Agrees we need to work on this and communicate better.

Mattis: Shares a document that AWE worked on with Paquet for helping Distressed Students...trigger warnings and content warnings.

C. Smith notes that her 400 level class has a HS student, and she's teaching stuff that might be banned by HSs. As an LGBTQIA+ professor, Smith feels vulnerable in this respect.

Meister mentioned the responsibilities of a mandated reporter, and notes this makes things more difficult, and she needs more guidance on all this.

Vespia: (notes she's not a Senator, but was referenced in the chat). CATL is thinking about some prof dev projects involved College Students. Notes that content warnings and trigger warnings are controversial...hard to predict what may trigger. She gives blanket permission to students to excuse themselves. Notes 988, the new national suicide hotline.

7. OTHER REPORTS

- a. Academic Affairs Council Report—Submitted by Vince Lowery
- b. University Committee Report—Presented by UC Chair Clif Ganyard

His last UC report, yay! UC has been busy with administrative stuff. Meeting with Chancellor, Provost, Megan Strehlow. Working to put together a FYS working group, and Provost is putting together a Gen Ed task force to help with the many proposals that will come in. Administrative reviews for two Deans took quite a bit of time. Finally, we didn't get a chance to address everything, but incoming Chair Bill Dirienzo is aware, and we'll work with SOFAS on those next year.

- c. Faculty Rep Report—Presented by Christine Vandenhouten

Shared Governance meetings are this Friday. Discussing involvement of Faculty/Shared Governance in strategic budgeting on UW campuses. Also, curricular decision processes across the campuses.

- d. Academic Staff Report—Submitted by Laura Nolan
- e. University Staff Report—Submitted by Lea Truttmann
- f. Student Government Report—Presented by Karime Galaviz

We had our elections...Karime was reelected President. VP, Speaker were also elected. We'll be going to the Shared Governance Meeting as well. Talking to Student Regents on how to communicate better with them. Location Campus student rep will also be attending that meeting (and Senate meetings, I think).

8. ADJOURNMENT

Nice Day, taking a motion and second to adjourn...assuming the vote would be unanimous. Have a nice day and a restful summer.

Bob Wenger Memorial Resolution

Professor Emeritus Robert Benjamin (“Bob”) Wenger was among the first faculty members hired by the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay when the main campus opened its doors in 1969. He grew to become a respected scholar and institutional leader through the rest of the 20th Century. His caring disposition and intellectual passion might be traced to his family roots in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, where he was born in 1935. His academic background was shaped by undergraduate years at Eastern Mennonite College, the Master’s degree program at Penn State, and the University of Pittsburgh, where he earned a PhD in mathematics in 1969. At UW-Green Bay, Dr. Wenger held many impactful positions, including interdisciplinary unit chair (2 terms), Chair of Mathematics, Faculty Senator (3 terms), Speaker of the Senate, Chair of the University Committee, and member of the Committee of Six Professors, General Education Council, Committee of Rights and Responsibilities, Chancellor Search and Screen Committee, and many appointed positions. He was recognized by the Founder’s Association Award for Institutional Development in 1985.

Although he was foremost a mathematician, Dr. Wenger personified UW-Green Bay’s interdisciplinary culture during its formative years. His research collaborations, producing at least 22 scholarly articles and 3 books, included topics in pure and applied mathematics, waste management strategies, air quality models, environmental impact assessment, watershed conservation, undergraduate education, faculty merit fund allocation, optimal locations of fire stations, and even a mathematical approach to athletic scheduling using Latin squares. His scholarship was honored when he was named the third Barbara Hauxhurst Cofrin Professor of Natural Sciences in 1997.

Throughout his career at UW-Green Bay, Dr. Wenger valued collaborations beyond the campus and across international borders. He was a visiting professor at Aalborg University in Denmark in 1981-82 and Beijing University in China during 1987-88; he maintained these and other international relationships even after he retired in 1999. In 2005 he and Professor Emeritus Jack Day were awarded the Founder’s Award for Collaborative Achievement for their role in establishing the International Visiting Scholars Program, the first formal academic venture between UW-Green Bay and St. Norbert College.

Whereas Professor Robert Wenger built a highly productive career as a teacher, mentor, and historically important academic leader at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay, and whereas he lived as an impassioned supporter of the institution for over 5 decades,

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate mourns his 2022 death and expresses its deepest condolences to Professor Wenger’s family, friends, colleagues, and students, acknowledging the profound impact he had on countless lives throughout his career.

Be it further resolved that we recognize Dr. Wenger’s unwavering commitment to interdisciplinary scholarship, which enriched the academic community at UW-Green Bay and set a precedent for future generations of scholars. His ability to bridge diverse fields exemplified the university’s mission to promote innovative education and research. His leadership and vision were instrumental in shaping the university’s identity during its formative years.

Be it further resolved that the Faculty Senate encourages the university community to remember Professor Wenger not only for his scholarly achievements and leadership but also for his kindness, mentorship, and dedication to UW-Green Bay academics and athletics.

Be it finally resolved that this memorial resolution be entered into the official minutes of the Faculty Senate and shared with the broader university community, ensuring that the memory and contributions of Professor Robert Benjamin Wenger are honored and remembered.

Memorial Resolution for Associate Professor Emeritus R. Michael Ingraham

Associate Professor R. Michael “Mike” Ingraham died on July 10th, 2024, at MercyOne Waterloo Medical Center in Waterloo, Iowa. Mike, unfortunately, just couldn’t summon the strength and succumbed to the ravages of congenital heart failure. After receiving his MFA in Technical Theatre and Lighting Design from Mankato State University in May of 1993 Mike Ingraham was selected as our new Academic Staff Technical Director in a highly competitive national search process. As the chair of the search committee there was one particular phrase from one of Mike’s recommendations that I will never forget. That recommendation basically ended with “I know Mike is applying for a strictly Technical Director position and without question Mike will be an excellent Technical Director, but you should know that Mike has the soul of a Lighting Designer.” That comment said a lot to me and hearing Mike talk about Jean Rosenthal upon his arrival when talking about lighting design and his references to Jean Rosenthal’s seminal stage lighting text, “The Magic of Light” (Janey had gotten Mike a 1st edition of that text), I knew why a Stage Director and senior MFA mentor would talk about recognizing his lighting designer’s soul.

Mike arrived at UW-Green Bay Theatre in the Fall of 1993, and he was admittedly, a heavy smoker and would partake in more cans of Mountain Dew than most. Perhaps more importantly, he was probably the most well-read Technical Directors I had ever known. It also made him a great source for more intellectual discussions than one might usually hear between a scene designer and technical director. Mike and I worked as a team for the next 24 years as he led the development of one of the most successful and professional Technical Theatre Training Programs in our highly active and competitive Kennedy Center-American College Theatre Festival (five state) Region III. Shortly after Mike got settled in Green Bay, he was elected the President of the Northeast Wisconsin IATSE Local 470 for Union Stagehands. This was an important happenstance given the January 1993 grand opening of the Weidner Center for the Performing Arts since most of the high-end touring productions require that Union Stagehands work on the installation and the strike/restore of all technical production elements for those shows. The next important piece of Mike’s presence and leadership was that UW-Green Bay Theatre became the location for all education and testing for potential Local 470 members, and Mike Ingraham led the training and testing process. One of Janey’s fondest memories came as she was working as a union costumer for a touring production of Phantom in Appleton. The Show techs and Union hands were on stage, and they needed several more hands to get serious work going, so the lead Phantom Tech went to the loading area where all the student stringers were waiting to be called, and he yelled out, ‘Will all the students of Mike Ingraham and Mick Alderson (A close friend and Tech Director at UW Oshkosh) come with me to the stage now.’ The pros on tour new that Mike’s and Mick’s students knew the gig and knew what professionals would expect of them. Many of our graduates remain IATSE Union members here and in other union locals across the country.

Mike Ingraham did not follow the typical path to teaching in a university theatre program, however. After graduating from High School in Harvard, IL in 1971, he landed a position as the Technical Director at the Pheasant Run Playhouse in St. Charles, IL. His next step in the job market was to work as a Radio Disc Jockey at Radio Stations in Geneva, IL and Muscatine, IA. Indeed, Mike would often regale us with his “Sunday, Sunday, Sunday...” radio voice and talk about the differences in DJ patter when working for country stations versus other genre’s he had been responsible for. Mike also shared stories of what it was like in undergraduate school to be that 27-year-old man performing in Show Choir with all the other students fresh out of high school. Mike then found a home in 1984 as the Technical Director and Lighting Designer on the professional staff at the Waterloo Community Playhouse, one of the largest Community Theatres in the midwest and one of the few with a completely professional staff and some of those other professional staff members eventually suggested that Mike should consider graduate school. Mike did end up combining his professional work in Waterloo with the MFA Graduate Program at Mankato State University. Mike Ingraham

took quite a unique journey as he accumulated areas of expertise along with his undergraduate personal experiences all culminating in his graduate studies that finally placed him firmly in the university professorial career path.

After 4 to 5 years of successful professional work in the program it was clear to the program faculty that given the quality of Mike's professional work as well as the academic and facility development that he brought to the tech theatre program, we knew it was appropriate to seek a tenure track position in that area. After a great deal of research through USITT documentation and numerous colleagues around the country the most consistently positive tenure success came through positions that combined Technical Direction with one significant design area, most often Lighting Design. I would often tease Mike over the years about remembering that time when we eliminated his position and forced him to reapply for the enhanced version and that he would also have to compete against other applicants we would find in the search. Those other applicants in that search certainly had numerous lighting designs listed on their resumes but when talking with them about those designs there was something about lighting that became clear to the search committee. It is entirely and technically possible to hang and color lighting instruments and place them into a lot of light cues for a show. However, when talking about lighting design for different productions, directors, and other designers tend to think that those lighting cues must come from combining the structure and meaning of the play and those moments that are revealed on stage via lighting cues must be felt and understood and interpreted through the "Soul" of their Lighting Designer. R. Michael Ingraham got his new job back and the UWGB Technical Theatre Program took off. Mike continued to combine his exceptional professional and scholarly development with major academic and facilities development advancements in the theatre program. Mike Ingraham has left a legacy of a vast number of high-end theatre professionals working in places across the country while others are touring with productions all around the world.

In March of 2006 I was in NYC with many Theatre students when I got a call from Green Bay letting me know that Mike Ingraham was in the hospital after having a heart attack. We were all shocked with that information and when we returned, with Mike in recovery, one of his former students had been hired to complete the technical direction for *Enchanted April*, which had two full-stage and very detailed settings. Once Mike returned, I had never seen anyone give up smoking so fast in my life and there were virtually no cans of Mountain Dew around the shop any longer and Mike also came back with a new lease on life. The year prior to that heart attack, Mike had successfully received tenure and his scholarly work and technical direction continued to evolve and display a level of sophistication and professionalism that in the coming years, led to our Theatre Program receiving 6 Golden Hand-trucks for exceptional, safe, and professional quality technical theatre installations and strikes for those KC-ACTF Festival productions. At that time there was one other program in our five-state region that had earned three of those Golden Hand Trucks. To my knowledge no school has yet to match that record of technical achievement in the region to this day. Mike also had become one of the "GO TO" Lighting Designers working for the annual USITT (United States Institute for Technical Theatre) National Conference, working with professional industry designers and he had become a nationally recognized Lighting Designer and Theatre Program Technical Director in the process.

In the Spring of 2017, while I was serving as Theatre Chair, both Mike Ingraham and Linda Parins, received their Emeritus Recognition and Plaques before their retirement date so they could be recognized for this honor publicly before leaving campus. Mike and Janey Ingraham moved back home to a retirement complex in Cedar Falls, IA and Mike returned to his old work home at the Waterloo Community Playhouse to serve as Lighting Designer once again but volunteered his exemplary services in retirement and he would even design simple settings during those first few retirement years. The last time I spoke with Mike was about a month or so prior to his passing. I called him to let him know about campus action related to the UWGB Theatre and Dance program and to let him know that other than Nutcracker At The Weidner, I was trying to find a way to

let my colleagues in retirement know that I had really run out of gas. Mike's reply to me was, "it's funny you would say that...! I just finished programming the cues for the first act" of a musical he was designing and before completing that production programming he informed me he had begun drafting his letter of "retirement resignation" as he too felt like he was running out of gas. We had a wonderful conversation that day as we reflected on our work in the UWGB Theatre and Dance program together due to the news I had given him at the start of the call. It was obvious we both knew what it felt like to have that internal gas tank running on empty. However, Mike sounded so vibrant on that call, and I thought that he now had some time to kick back and enjoy really being retired. As I think back on that June phone call with Mike after working side by side with him for 24 years, it was a call that allowed us both to reflect on the great run we had together and the many shared successes.

It was a gut-wrenching shock when I got the phone call from Janey on July 11th. Janey had limited contact info and she had very few photos of Mike working at UWGB and she also sent me a copy of Mike's Obituary and information about his memorial in Cedar Falls the following Monday. I told her I would reach out through Facebook to share this sad news as I was pretty sure some students would send messages/stories and hopefully some pictures. I would send them to Janey as soon as they began coming in, but I think after three of those sharing messages with comments and pictures, Janey decided to get back on Facebook and she friended me so she could end up seeing all of those messages as soon as they were sent. In less than 2 hours we had received at least 150 responses (and stories and pictures) to the sad news (and still more came in over the following days). I lost track of how many of those messages quoted the Mike Ingraham Scene Shop Classic, "This is not a Hammer!" I hoped and felt that these stories and messages coming directly from his former students could be meaningful for Janey as well. One of the great unofficial tech student rites of entry into the UWGB Tech Theatre family was being invited to Mike and Janey's house for the annual "Cookout for The Old, The New, and The Currently Suffering". It is amazing how important that very early gathering was in making so many students feel welcomed and comfortable only one weekend into their first semester of college. Having a table filled with at least 7 graduates of the program along with Donna and me at Mike's Memorial on Monday, July 15th, was such a meaningful way to remember Mike together. Also, many family members and close friends came to our table to thank the students for coming and for the stories some of us shared about Mike during the service, as most of them knew very little about Mike's actions and interactions at UW Green Bay Theatre.

For so many of us in Theatre, at occasions like these, there is no more appropriate source to turn to than a well-known quote from William Shakespeare, and even though I have always enjoyed great memories and a good cry, I can only hope this is the last time I will have to prepare this kind of memorial. In fact, this time even the words in the play are so appropriate in recognition of R. Michael Ingraham.

From Shakespeare's Hamlet, Act V Scene 2. Horatio speaks: "Now cracks a noble heart. Good-night, sweet prince; And flights of angels sing thee to thy rest!"

Respectfully Submitted Jeffrey Paul Entwistle

Governance Structures Working Group: Report to the University Committee

Version: 30 September 2024 (Drafted Michael L. Draney, Chair of Working Group)

Contents

- 1) Summary of Working Group proposed changes to our shared governance: Page 1
- 2) Background and Charge (from Associate Provost): Page 1
- 3) Preliminary Report (drafted by Michael L. Draney, Working Group Chair): Page 3
 - a. History. Meeting times, topics; Other communications: Page 3
 - b. Desired Outcomes: Page 4
 - c. Guiding Principles: Page 4
 - d. Proposals for UC Consideration: Page 5
 - i. Dissolve the Committee: Page 5
 - ii. Remove from Shared Governance (and CCN Responsibility): Page 6
 - iii. Change from Elective to Appointive Committees: Page 7
 - iv. Eliminate Tenure Requirements: Page 7
 - v. Modify Committee Size: Page 8
 - vi. Modify Charge to Eliminate References to Domains: Page 10
 - e. Possible Net Effects of the Proposals: Page 11

Background and Charge from Associate Provost: Issued 27 October, 2023

Background: The University has undergone numerous changes over the past decade, including the adoption of a new mission, the reorganization into four colleges and schools, the addition of three branch campuses, the addition and growth of a number of new programs, and the addition of new degree programs. Some of these developments, perhaps especially the creation of four colleges and schools out of two in 2016, have affected how faculty are represented in shared governance. However, our governance structures have not been reviewed since these changes occurred.

The University Committee, the Office of the Provost, and the Secretary of the Faculty and Staff therefore are establishing a working group to review about our current governance structures and make recommendations for improvement.

Membership: The Governance Structure Working Group is an appointed working group. Membership includes:

Courtney Sherman, Associate Provost
Mike Draney, SOFAS (Volunteered to serve as convener, and then Chair)
Kim Mezger, SOFAS Program Associate
Bill Dirienzo, UC Rep
Adam Gaines, AH Rep
Kerry Kuenzi, SS Rep
Julie Wondergem, NS Rep
David Radosevich, PS Rep CSOB
Christine Vandenhouten, PS Rep CHESW
Tim Kaufmann, CCN Rep
Roshelle Amundson, Academic Staff Rep
University Staff Rep (none)

Two professional Studies domain representatives are included because that domain currently is split between CHESW and CSOB.

Charge: The purpose of the Governance Structure Working Group is to review the current shared governance structures at UW Green Bay and to make appropriate recommendations for restructuring. Specifically:

- Review the system-wide data compiled by UWSP for context and consideration of possible opportunities.
- Consider the complete array of governance committees at UWGB. Is this the correct array of committees for UWGB? Are there committees we no longer need? Are there committees we do not have that we should have.
- Review the composition and charge of committees. Do the membership and charge of each committee best reflect the needs of shared governance? Can the size or workload of any committees be reduced?
- Review the process for recruiting, electing, and appointing representatives to committees. Currently, for faculty, committee appointments are made by domain (AH, NS, PS, SS) which may not reflect the structure of a university with four colleges. Is there another way that representation on committees can be equitably and fairly distributed?

The working group will submit a preliminary report to the University Committee, Associate Provost, and SOFAS by **May 1, 2024**.

The working group will submit recommendations for improvements to the University Committee, Associate Provost, and SOFAS by **December 1, 2024**.

Note from M. Draney: Committee chair did not meet the 1 May deadline, but instead submitted a preliminary report with recommendations for improvements to the UC, Associate Provost on 1 October 2024.

Preliminary Report of the Working Group

a) **Working Group History:** Meetings, meeting discussion, and other communications

Meetings and topics. Note that at each meeting, a quorum was present, although we never voted on anything, we just sought consensus.

- 1) 29 January 2024, 11:30 am-12:30 pm, TEAMS: We discussed the pro's and con's of the "domain system" and what might replace it. One additional problem was identified....are IAS Faculty or Staff? Currently, they are "both, but sort of neither". We agreed we don't want "easy opportunities for service" just for its own sake.
- 2) 26 February 2024, 1-2 pm, TEAMS: Did a "first reading" on the Governance Structures Working Group Data Matrix: We discussed elective vs. appointive, existence of CWC, Removing IRB, IAUCAC, BioSafety, and Intercollegiate Athletics from Shared Governance. We discussed the domains, and whether we could eliminate them....maybe?
- 3) 25 March 2024, 1-2 pm, TEAMS: Reviewed our previous conversations and timeline (Goal: get changes to Senate in Fall 2024); We discussed (for all committees): Tenure status and Committee Size.
- 4) 29 April 2024, 1-2 pm, TEAMS: We talked about the domain problem: Getting rid of domains altogether is problematic because we still have committees that seem to need some kind of diversity of representation, and the unequal faculty size of Colleges makes Colleges a more problematic substitute. But we will try to reduce the need for domains by reducing the number of committees that need special domain representation (we all agreed many do not) and also by reducing the total number of committees and total faculty on some committees, which should reduce the service burden for faculty from the smallest Colleges.

Other communications: Chair Draney exchanged emails and met with:

- Roger Wareham, Director, Office of Grants and Research, about the desirability of removing some safety and ethical oversight committees from Shared Governance.
- Bill Gear, NCAA Faculty Rep and Chair of the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee, about the desirability of dissolving that committee.
- Adam Gaines, Chair of the International Education Committee, about possible changes to its charge and committee makeup.

b) Desired Outcomes

Essentially, we are trying to create a more efficient form of shared governance, specifically:

- Faculty time is expensive and faculty energy is precious. We want to reduce the total amount of faculty service devoted to shared governance.
- Shared governance is important work, and we want to make changes that don't compromise the effectiveness of our shared governance system.
- We want to create a shared governance system (including the processes of election/appointment) that is as simpler, easier to understand, and easier to implement than what we currently have.

c) Guiding Principles: This section summarizes some consensus achieved by the Working Group in making shared governance changes, although not all members would agree with all the statements made here.

- Committees should be justifiable in terms of hours of employee time versus benefit to UWGB's student-success oriented mission
 - Some committees could be eliminated altogether...some work may be more appropriately done by ad-hoc working groups rather than permanent standing committees.
- Number of Committee Members: All things considered, we want to minimize number of committee members in cases where that will not unreasonably increase the workload of remaining members.
 - Do we really need Faculty from each Domain? Do we really need USC and ASC rep, or just one staff rep? Do we really need a student rep? Etc.
- Distribution of Faculty Among Domains: Domains were erected to parse faculty representation more-or-less equally among faculty in different "parts" of campus.
Ideally, we would like to eliminate use of Domains altogether. This could be done by:
 - Trusting our colleagues from wherever their academic home is to do right by us.
 - Where a diversity of faculty is preferable, domains are not the perfect solution anyway. Some other possibilities:
 - 1) We could require that no two faculty on a committee are from the same governance unit?
 - 2) We could not require anything, and trust that most of the time, a diversity of faculty will inevitably occur.
 - 3) Other possibilities? Require that there be faculty from say 2 or 3 of the 4 Colleges?

- CCN committee charge asks CCN to "maximize the number of Colleges represented where possible" and "avoid having two people from one unit on a committee"
- 4) Some committees have committee-specific requirements (for scientists or non-scientists, for faculty currently practicing animal science, etc.)
- Requirement that Faculty be Tenured: This is sometimes a necessity, but we should minimize this for two reasons 1) Untenured people have a need to serve on committees to earn tenure 2) We have an increasing number of Teaching Professors (faculty without tenure status) and both efficiency and inclusivity mandate that we make an effort to welcome their efforts should they want to participate.
 - This requirement is important to protect the rights of tenured faculty to decide on personnel....how important is it in curricular decisions? Ideally, Teaching Professors and Assistant Professors (who are the future of the program) should have a say, no?
 - Having tenure protects people making decisions that might be in conflict with administration, but mainly those situations coincide with personnel decisions. But possibly the UC should be composed of tenured people for this reason.
- Elective versus Appointive: How do we feel about this?

On one hand, elective positions are more democratic and the process is more transparent.

On the other hand, elections are real work. Plus, do Faculty always need these positions to be "popularity contests"?

Clearly, the UC should be an Election (to match the elective process for Senators)

There is some disagreement which committees should be elective:

 - Most feel that PC and Cof6 need to be elective to establish trust.
 - CRR as well. Disagreement about CCN.
 - Some other committees: We could not understand the elective nature and propose to switch to appointive. Why not have CCN appoint some "lower stakes" committees which would save time and create less work.

d) Proposals for UC Consideration

Dissolve the Committee: This is obviously the most drastic change, and applies to committees whose work could better be done in another way. The Working Groups identified two committee that we feel should be dissolved; another is a candidate for dissolution, but there was some disagreement about whether instead the charge and membership couldn't be reviewed and changed.

- Intercollegiate Athletics Committee (IAC): The Working Group recommends dissolving this committee. According to Bill Gear (current Chair), NCAA only requires a Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR). There is a well thought-out process for selecting this position (which includes the UC but not SOFAS/CCN). Bill says the Committee doesn't recommend policy to the Athletics Director as stated in the charge, and does little other than review Student Athlete grades. He thinks perhaps it should be disbanded, and the Working Group Concur.
- Individualized Learning Committee (ILC) does not always have much business to conduct, and is probably the best example of a shared governance committee whose work might better be done on an ad-hoc basis. The Associate Provost would create a small (but pedagogically appropriate) ad hoc committee (of perhaps three faculty) to review an individualized program rather than the current practice of having a large and fairly unwieldy committee (with seven faculty and two ex officio members).
- Committee on Workload and Compensation (CWC): This is a Committee we should consider dissolving. It doesn't (and maybe can't) do what it was meant to do, which is provide Faculty and Staff with a "seat" at the table. It seems that now there are other avenues for this (the Chancellor confers regularly with the UC, ASC, USC; there could also be Joint meetings of these). The UWGB Coffee Breaks instituted in recent years also provide a two-way exchange of information in a fairly efficient and effective format. Some members (including the Work Group Chair, who was one of the faculty who helped create the committee more than a decade ago) feel that the committee is not effective, and it is a large committee that has historically been difficult to fill. The charge is also burdensome and often not met, it asks the committee to create actionable items each semester for the Faculty Senate, USC, and ASC to consider.

However, some Working Group members (especially Staff representatives) saw real value in such a Joint Committee as a way to have employees' voices heard. The Chair of that Committee from 2024 (Jena Richter Landers) communicated to the Chair in favor of keeping the committee. As an alternative, the charge and committee membership could be revised.

Remove from Shared Governance (and CCN Responsibility): We recommend three Provost Appointive Committees dealing with safety and ethical oversight issues to be removed from Shared Governance (which could theoretically create conflicts of interest) and place under the jurisdiction of The Director of Grants & Research (or designee). Director Roger Wareham states that UW-Green Bay is the first institution of many he's worked for in which these oversight committees are part of shared governance. These would remain appointive committees, with the Director of Grants and Research doing the appointing (as is currently the case), but the CCN/SOFAS would no longer be involved in the process. Note, these committees would still stand, and there's no reason why their status in evaluating Faculty/Staff service should change.

- Institutional Review Board (IRB)
- Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC)
- Institutional Biosafety Committee (IBC)

Change from Elective to Appointive Committees. There is some feeling that these curricular committees don't require the democratic/representational benefits that elections afford, and should be considered Faculty Appointive Committees, which could be efficiently filled by appointments by the Committee on Committees and Nominations (CCN). Note however, there was not consensus on this point, so UC can think about the pros and cons of such a move.

- Academic Affairs Council (AAC)
- General Education Council (GEC)
- Graduate Academic Affairs Council (GAAC)

Eliminate Tenure Requirements for Faculty Participation: There are two clear reasons for requiring tenured status for committee participation. One is that the committee does work that is the prerogative of the tenured faculty (such as committees that make decisions about tenure and tenured faculty promotion: the Personnel Council and the Committee of Six Full Professors), and the other reason is that the committee does work that might benefit from Tenured Members, either to protect the members from potential retaliation due to the nature of the work, or as an index of experience when the committee might be asked to do work that is controversial or fraught. Examples of committees of this sort include the Committee on Rights and Responsibilities, and the University Committee.

The "grey area" in terms of tenure requirement involves Committees that deal with curriculum. Traditionally, curriculum has been considered the purview of Unit Executive Committees (i.e., the tenured members of units), but in practice, many units now encourage untenured faculty to participate in curricular decisions that obviously they have both a stake in, and expertise about. An additional factor in favor of dropping tenure requirements for curricular committees is that our Faculty (in the broad, shared governance, sense) now includes ALL academic staff formerly known as Instructional Academic Staff and now known as Teaching Professors. These colleagues really ought to have more opportunity to serve on shared governance committees, and in this case, they often come in with additional expertise, as their job usually involves more teaching than the tenure track faculty do.

Finally, the CCN has a tenure only requirement that could have to do with the time required or the need for people who have been around long enough to know many faculty colleagues, we are not sure what the original reason was. Many of us thought this committee should be opened to non-tenured faculty, and others suggested that maybe it should be limited to Tenure track OR Teaching Professors, but only at the Associate or Full level.

- Academic Affairs Council (AAC): Open to non-tenured Faculty.
- General Education Council (GEC): Open to non-tenured Faculty.

- Graduate Academic Affairs Council (GAAC): Open to non-tenured Faculty. [change charge to reflect service on Graduate Courses].

Modify Committee Size (Especially in Reference to Number of Faculty): The appropriate number of committee members is a difficult question, because the number is always somewhat arbitrary. Each faculty member is “expensive” in terms of faculty time and energy as well as the need to keep a position filled, but more members can lighten the committee’s workload (by dividing up the tasks) and more members result in a higher diversity of perspective and broader representation. Still, this is an area where we can gain considerable efficiency, and in some committees, the Chair does the majority of the work outside of meeting time. The Working Group agreed with the Chair that committees get “unwieldy” as they get large (and it seems to inhibit some members from active participation). It is suggested that often a group of five voting members makes for a fairly efficient group, with the odd number reducing ties in case of contention. Some committees may require a larger number (a few cases are discussed below), and in some cases, a committee simply needs some faculty “representation” in which case perhaps a number as small as one may suffice.

- University Committee (UC). This is one committee that might need to actually grow. There seems to be a trend of this being THE committee that administration confers with to get input from Faculty, and it is certainly important in setting the agenda (and the tone) for Faculty Senate. An Additional Campuses representative was formerly part of the UC, but that provision sunsetted at the end of AY2324 since additional campus people no longer have Senate representation separate from their home units. The current makeup is six members (one from each domain plus two at-large); The Working Group suggests changing that to seven faculty (one from each domain plus THREE at large).
- Committee of Six Full Professors (Cof6): No one seems to know why this committee has six members, other than because its in the name. We propose changing it to The Committee of Five Full Professors, one from each domain plus one at-large. Besides requiring one fewer Full Professor, the new makeup also seems to have less possibility of a contentious case resulting in an unfortunate tie vote.
- General Education Council (GEC): The current makeup of this Committee also calls for six members, and we hereby propose five. The GEC is currently undergoing a “big year” and is showing how to deal with this, by creating a working group with the addition of non-committee members for periodic heavy lifts.
- Graduate Academic Affairs Council (GAAC): Current membership: Six Faculty. Proposed: Five. See under GEC, above.
- Academic Actions Committee (AAC): The current makeup is 5 faculty (+ 2 staff). The working group is divided on this one, some saying their workload justifies this number, and some suggesting that 3 faculty + 2 staff = 5 members is sufficient and would save the time and energy of two faculty members.

- Intercollegiate Athletics Committee (IAC): Working group recommends dissolving this committee, but if it is not dissolved, nine people still seems like a large committee. We suggest that 3 faculty instead of four (along with 1 staff, 1 student, 1 community member, plus the ex officio member = seven members, a good number).
- Individualized Learning Committee (ILC): Working Group recommends dissolving this committee, but if it is not dissolved, seven faculty + 2 ex officio = 9 seems like a lot. If not dissolved, we suggest three faculty.
- Instructional Development Council (IDC): Currently calls for eight members of the faculty. Working group suggests five should be sufficient (one from each domain plus one at-large).
- Institutional Review Board (IRB): Working group recommends removing this committee from Shared Governance, in which case committee size won't be our problem. Otherwise, we suggest going from six to four faculty (with at least one scientist and one non-scientist). [Legally need to have a certain number]
- Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC): Working group recommends removing this committee from Shared Governance, in which case committee size won't be our problem. Otherwise, we suggest going from four faculty (in a seven-person committee) to two faculty (1 animal scientist, one non-scientist), bringing committee down to a committee size of five?
- International Education Committee (IEC): This committee is currently six faculty plus ex officio = seven members. We suggest four faculty to create a committee of five.
- University Assessment Council (UAC): This Provost-Appointive Committee is perhaps too large to be effective, at something like 10 people. However, the Working Group has been told that this committee may be suggesting changes on its own, so we'll "pause" on this one.
- University Leadership Student Awards Committee (USLAC). This Dean of Students Appointive Committee calls for 12 members, including three faculty, three staff, and six (!) students. We suggest one or two faculty. With 2-3 students, the committee will still have seven members, and will be a lot easier to fill. In recent years, it has been difficult to fill the requisite student slots.
- Committee on Accessibility Issues (CAI): This Inclusivity/Student Affairs Appointive Committee seems large, but currently there is only faculty, so that seems fine.
- Health and Safety AND Wellness Committees (HS, WC): If these committees remain as-is, we suggest going from 2 faculty to one faculty for Health and Safety Committee. We also wondering if these two committees could be combined into one committee, which could also cut staffing in half?
- Council for Equity, Inclusivity, and Diversity (EDI): This VC Inclusivity-Appointive Council is not really in our purview, but we suggest that it uses a lot of faculty time, with some 32 members. We would suggest 3-5 faculty.

- Committee on Student Misconduct: Currently, there are three faculty (plus five students!) for a total of 11. We suggest a committee size of seven, with perhaps 2 faculty, 2 staff, 3 students?
- Awards and Recognition Committee (A&R): This Joint Governance Committee includes four faculty members plus two students for a total of 11 members. We suggest downsizing to 7 members (including three faculty and one student).
- Committee on Workload and Compensation (CWC): Some committee members suggest dissolving this committee, but if not, we suggest downsizing to less than 3 faculty plus 6 staff....maybe a total of 2 faculty plus 5 staff = 7?

Modify Charge to Eliminate References to Domains: One of the motivating factors in organizing this working group was the desire to eliminate the usage of the domains. The domain system exists as an attempt to balance faculty committee representation on committees (which calls for faculty from throughout different parts of campus) while at the same time attempting to correct for the very different sizes of faculty among the four Colleges (with CAHSS being much the largest College, and CSB and CHESW being significantly smaller). As a reminder, there are four Domains: Natural Sciences, NS = CSET; Professional Studies, PS = CSB and CHESW; and CAHSS is divided into Social Sciences, SS and Arts and Humanities, AH. So faculty and staff need to be educated/reminded of their own Domain, and SOFAS/CCN needs to keep track of the domain of each Faculty member. This system helps to balance faculty among these four rather arbitrary domains, but the split is not perfect: PS is still considerably smaller than the other four domains, with the result that it is harder to fill PS committee assignments, and faculty in PS tend to be asked to serve on Shared Governance committees more often.

Unfortunately, It is difficult to design a system that works significantly better at distributing faculty and is also as simple or simpler than the current system. And although some of the Working Group members would like to see us abandon the Domains altogether, that proves problematic, because then either 1) Faculty representation is not controlled for, leading to the potential for faculty to feel underrepresented on important committees, especially for elective spots where a larger college might elect their members disproportionately, or 2) we distribute faculty using a different, but really no less complex or satisfactory system, such as placing a limit of two faculty from a College (or even from a unit?).

Clearly, there are some cases in which domains can continue to be used to distribute faculty equitably in committees where faculty may feel that representation is important. In other cases, it might be sufficient to trust our faculty to represent all faculty, and to trust that usually faculty will come from various parts of campus due to chance. We recommend that if a committee's membership is changed, that would be a good time to revisit the current "faculty distribution" system and decide if any distribution besides chance is really necessary. A few comments below:

- Committees that would seem to need “distribution” in order to instill confidence and trust among faculty that they are being represented in the decision process:
 - University Committee
 - Committee of Six
 - Personnel Council
 - Committee on Committees and Nominations
 - Committee on Rights and Responsibilities

- Curricular Committees generally need some distribution to ensure that different kinds of pedagogical expertise are represented on the committee:
 - Academic Affairs Council
 - General Education Council
 - Graduate Academic Affairs Council
 - Instructional Development Council
 - University Assessment Council

- Other Committees that don’t seem to require special “representation” or “expertise” from across campus might include (excluding some we propose to dissolve or remove from Shared Governance):
 - Academic Actions Committee
 - International Education Committee
 - Research Council
 - University Leadership Student Awards Committee
 - Committee on Accessibility Issues
 - Health and Safety Committee
 - Wellness Committee
 - Committee on Student Misconduct
 - Awards and Recognition Committee
 - Committee on Workload and Compensation (note, this charge currently talks about Colleges and needs to be updated in any case).

Possible Net Effects of the Proposals

Currently:

- We have 26 Committees and Councils that CNN and SOFAS are responsible for filling with Faculty members.
- This includes 8 Elective Committees and 18 Appointive Committees.
- About 16 of the committees have some kind of faculty distribution needs that revolve around the Domain system.
- In total, our shared governance system has 44 spots for tenured and approximately 78 “tenured or not” faculty spots for a total of about 122 faculty spots.

If the only the consensus proposal was enacted (that is, tabling proposals that were not agreed upon by most working group members):

- We would have about 21 Committees and Councils that CNN and SOFAS are responsible for filling with Faculty members.....five fewer.
- This would include 5 Elective Committees (three fewer) and 16 Appointive Committees (2 fewer).
- About 10 of the committees would need some kind of Domain stipulation (down from 16))
- In total, our shared governance system would have just four “tenured only” committees (22 spots, down from 44) and 17 “open to non-tenured” committees (64 spots, down from 78) for a total of 86 spots, a reduction of 36 spots in Shared Governance
- However, 13 spots were removed were removed from shared governance but would still exist in Grants and Research, so a total “service slot reduction” of 23 spots, from 122 to 99).

To: University Committee

From: Kate Burns, Provost

October 7, 2024

I would like to request that the University Committee review our policy for graduation with honors for bachelor's degree students. The current policy (<https://catalog.uwgb.edu/undergraduate/general-information/academic-rules-regulations/honors/#graduation>) requires that students earn 48 credits in residence, in addition to the articulated GPA requirements. However, students only need to earn 30 credits in residence to graduate from UW-Green Bay.

While we try to communicate this policy effectively, this discrepancy is confusing and frustrating for students. Every year we receive complaints from transfer students who graduate from UWGB, but are not able to graduate with honors because they have earned less than 48 credits from us. These students are understandably upset because they have shown academic excellence, but their work is not being recognized.

The University Committee brought this issue before the Senate for consideration in 2018, but the policy was not changed at that time. Given the amount of changes we have experienced as an institution since then, I believe we should consider possible alternatives to our current policy. I brought this issue to the University Committee and Senate last year for discussion, but without a formal proposal that would have allowed a vote. I have now amended this memo to allow for formal discussion and vote by the Senate.

We have one of the highest transfer student populations of all of the UW comprehensives so this is an important issue for us to consider when we are devising a solution. We should aspire to a solution that will provide flexibility and equity and not be overly complicated for our students, staff, and faculty. In talking with the Registrar's Office, they have indicated that there would be a substantial manual workload if we were to count transfer GPA credits toward graduation with honors. If we were to reduce the number of credits required for graduation with honors, that would be a step in the right direction to ease these issues. However, unless we fully align our residency requirements (30 credits) with our honors policy (30 credits), we will still have transfer students who are caught between the inconsistent policies. Because of this, I am proposing that we change our graduation with honors policy for bachelor's degree students to 30 credits in residence at UWGB.

There may be a different creative solution to address these issues that we should consider instead, in which case this proposal can be amended. If the UC is in support of a change, I would ask them to bring this proposal before the Faculty Senate for discussion and a vote. I am happy to talk to the UC if there are additional questions.

October 2024 Academic Staff Committee Report

- The Academic Staff Committee continues to meet monthly and held its monthly meeting on October 16th, 2024
 - Current Membership
 - Samuel Robinson (Chair) – Student Services Center Manager
 - Katrina Hrivnak (Vice Chair) – Assistant Registrar
 - Roshelle Amundson – Assistant Teaching Professor
 - Laura Nolan – CEWT Program Manager
 - Nathan Ruetten – User Support Specialist
 - Nathan Smithson, Instructional Designer
 - Hleeda Vang, Student Success Coach

- At our September meeting, we discussed the following:
 - HR Report received.
 - FLSA pay increase
 - Deadlines to report missing leave and bank unused vacation
 - New parental leave benefit
 - Revisions to telecommuting policy
 - Health insurance premiums taken out for 9-month employees
 - Changes to Professional Development Committee Guidelines – approved
 - Reduced max award to \$500
 - Changes to application form
 - Inviting Provost Kate Burns to a future meeting (November) to discuss
 - Updates from the chancellor
 - Enrollment
 - Budget
 - System budget
 - Phoenix Innovation Park

- The agenda for our October meeting includes (will meet immediately prior to Senate meeting)
 - HR Report
 - GPR Funding
 - New Positions & Compensation Adjustments
 - 2024 Annual Compensation Analysis
 - Fall ASC Assembly

Our next meeting will be November 20, 2024 at 1:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Samuel Robinson, ASC Chair 2024-25.

**University Staff Committee
Report for Faculty Senate Meeting
October 16, 2024**

- The University Staff Fall Conference will be held on Friday November 1, 2024 at the Tundra Lodge, Green Bay, WI. The theme is Success in the Workplace! There are 49 confirmed attendees and registration deadline has been extended to Thursday, October 17, 2024. <https://www.uwgb.edu/university-staff-governance/professional-development/fall-conference/>
- Committee members for 2024-25 are Becky Haeny-Chair, Theresa Mullen-Vice Chair, Sara Chaloupka-Treasurer, Loretta Rafter-Secretary; Bradley Berger, Jennifer Buhr, Ben Counard, Parker Nadeau, Sarah Taylor.
- Our 2024-25 UW System Rep is Becky Haeny with Theresa Mullen as the backup.
- The first University Staff Committee meeting was held on September 19, 2024. Chancellor Michael Alexander and Provost Kate Burns attended to share updates. The next meeting is October 17, 2024 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