

## AGENDA

### **UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 8**

Wednesday, April 11, 2012

Alumni Rooms AB, 3:00 p.m.

Presiding Officer: Derek Jeffreys, Speaker

Parliamentarian Pro Tem: Ray Hutchison

#### **1. CALL TO ORDER**

#### **2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 7**

**March 7, 2012** [page 2]

#### **3. CHANCELLOR'S REPORT**

#### **4. CONTINUING BUSINESS**

a. Proposed MS Degree in Nursing (second reading) [attached to previous agenda  
<http://www.uwgb.edu/sofas/structures/governance/senate/agendas/Agenda%2003-7-12.pdf> ]

#### **5. NEW BUSINESS**

a. Resolution on Granting Degrees: Presented by Speaker Derek Jeffreys [page 5]

b. Proposal to modify composition of Awards and Recognition Committee: Presented by UC Chair Michael Draney [page 6]

c. Proposal to modify composition of LITC: Presented by UC Chair Michael Draney [page 7]

d. Resolution from Committee on Workload and Compensation: Presented by UC representative to the CWC David Dolan [page 8]

e. Proposal to create Graduate Studies Council (first reading): Presented by Tim Sewall. [page 9]

f. Proposal to change periodicity of Senate meetings (first reading): Presented by UC Chair Michael Draney [page 11]

g. Requests for future business

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

#### **7. OTHER REPORTS**

a. Academic Affairs Council Report [page 12]

b. University Committee Report - Presented by Michael Draney

c. Academic Staff Representative Report - Presented by Kelly Kramp

d. Student Government Report - Presented by Heba Mohammad

**8. OPEN FORUM** On Accreditation by Higher Learning Commission - see attachment [page 13]

#### **9. ADJOURNMENT**

**MINUTES 2011-2012**  
**UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 7**

Wednesday, March 7, 2012  
Alumni Rooms, University Union

Presiding Officer: Derek Jeffreys, Speaker of the Senate

Parliamentarian: Clifford Abbott, Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

PRESENT: Andrew Austin (DJS), Kimberly Baker (HUB), Forrest Baulieu (ICS alternate), David Dolan (NAS-UC), Michael Draney (NAS-UC), Jorge Estevez (NAS), Clif Ganyard (HUS), Doreen Higgins (SOWORK), Derek Jeffreys (HUS-UC), Tim Kaufman (EDU-UC), Mark Kiehn (EDUC), Kaoime Malloy (AVD), Christopher Martin (HUS), Ryan Martin (HUD), Jennifer Mokren (AVD), Amanda Nelson (HUB), Adam Parillo (URS), Alma Rodriguez Estrada (NAS), Courtney Sherman (AVD), Mussie Teclezion (BUA), Christine Vandenhouten (NURS), Bryan Vescio (HUS-UC).

REPRESENTATIVES: Heba Mohammad (student government)

NOT PRESENT: Franklin Chen (NAS), Victoria Goff (ICS), Thomas Harden (Chancellor, *ex officio*), Ray Hutchison (URS-UC), Young Jin Lee (BUA), Karen Lieuallen (EDUC), Cristina Ortiz (HUS), Christine Smith (HUD), John Stoll (PEA), Julia Wallace (Provost, *ex officio*).

GUESTS: Tim Sewall, Sue Mattison, Scott Furlong, John Lyon, Janet Reilly, Derryl Block, Susan Gallagher-Lepak, Mimi Kubsch

**1. Call to Order.** Speaker Jeffreys brought the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m.

**2. Approval of Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting No. 6, February 15, 2012.** Speaker Jeffreys asked for any corrections and/or comments and, hearing none, accepted the minutes. (Later several typos were spotted, not in the minutes but in the agenda itself.)

**3. New Business.**

a. Slate of Candidates for Faculty Elective Committees for 2012-13 Co-chair of the Committee on Committees and Nominations, Janet Reilly, presented the slate of candidates and added Steve Kimball as a candidate for the Professional Studies vacancy on the Academic Affairs Council to the slate that was attached to the agenda and previously circulated to the Faculty. She also mentioned the procedure for additional names to be added before the March 19<sup>th</sup> deadline.

b. Proposal to Dissolve the Faculty Senate Committee on Planning and Budget University Committee Chair, Michael Draney, presented this proposal and explained the redundancy of this committee with the Chancellor's Planning and Budget Council. He also explained that the chancellor had agreed to protect the faculty interest in planning and budget issues by having faculty candidates identified by the University

Committee. **Senator Ganyard (Senator Baulieu second) moved adoption of the proposal.** The discussion centered on two issues: rehashing the history of ineffectiveness of the committee and preserving the contact with the Senate itself. Several senators suggested it would be preferable if the UC selected only senators as candidates for the Chancellor's Council. UC Chair Draney agreed with that stipulation and with no objections the Senator **approved the proposal unanimously (21-0-0) with the understanding that faculty representatives to the Chancellor's Planning and Budget Council would be senators.**

c. Proposal to Modify Senate House Rules UC Chair Draney presented the proposal to add to current rules of the Senate that in the future there would no longer be a call for abstentions in Senate votes. He explained that the intent was to decrease the number of senators opting to abstain from voting. **Senator Ryan Martin (Senator Kaufman second) moved adoption of the proposal.** The discussion was extensive. Many expressed the central problem as a search for how to discourage abstentions for the wrong reasons while still protecting the right to abstain. Some of the discussion focused on the extent of the problem (is it a growing trend? how is it handled elsewhere?). Many assumed that a lack of information or background was a cause of many abstentions. From that assumption there were suggestions of ways to address the problem other than the proposal under discussion. These alternatives included alternative parliamentary procedures on voting, restrictions on Senate membership (tenured people only), ways of educating senators (apprentice shadowing, initial training sessions, interactions with constituents). Exclusive of UC members, the current Senate is about two-thirds untenured faculty. This observation led to speculation over the legitimacy of using of the Senate as a place for junior faculty to learn about institution-wide issues (if not the Senate, where?). **The proposal failed to pass (7-15-0),** but the discussion apparently succeeded in reducing the number of abstentions.

d. Proposal to Create a Master of Science in Nursing This first reading for a new program was presented by Dean Mattison. It is a reworking of a proposal the Senate had previously approved for a collaborative program with UW-Oshkosh that was not implemented. The Dean described the program as a non-clinical cost-recovery program built on the Nursing program's strengths with intensive student-centered advising. It was designed on a part-time cohort model to meet a demonstrated need with an efficient and high-quality program that fits the mission of the university. There were no immediate questions and the proposal will return for action at the next Senate meeting.

e. Requests for future business The Speaker made the standard request and received a somewhat apologetic request to determine whether the Senate is meeting often enough to both educate itself and act on the issues coming before it.

#### **4. Reports.**

a. Academic Affairs Council The Speaker simply noted that this report was available as an agenda attachment.

b. University Committee Report UC Chair Draney announced a minor change in the charge to the Committee on Workload and Compensation clarifying the terms of the *ex officio* liaison members. Unless

there are objections that change will not be brought to the Senate for a vote. He reported that the UC has been concerned over the membership and lack of openness of the groups working on recommendations for a new personnel system. These concerns have created a lack of trust for this UW-System initiative. Another issue under discussion has been the Senate's effectiveness and he agreed to consider the just-received request to explore the issue of the frequency of Senate meetings. There are also continuing discussions on joint governance committees and a proposal from the Committee on Workload and Compensation that may be coming to the Senate.

c. Faculty Rep Report Rep Dave Dolan did not have a meeting to report on but alerted the Senate to some items on the agenda for the next meeting, specifically the revamping of the personnel system and the continuing saga of the May multiples.

d. Academic Staff Report No report

e. Student Government Report - Heba Mohammad thanked those who had responded to the survey on childcare. The next step will be a summit with the Chancellor and others. Another survey will soon be available dealing with access to on-line and hybrid courses. Elections for next year's student government are coming up in early April. And SGA will be lobbying against UW-Green Bay's support of the United Council because the United Council is not seen as lobbying enough on behalf of our students.

**8. Adjournment.** With business concluded, the Speaker adjourned the meeting promptly at 4:00 p.m.

**Resolution on the Granting of Degrees**

(Implemented as directed by Faculty Senate Document #89-6, March 21, 1990)

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate of the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay, on behalf of the Faculty, recommends to the Chancellor and the Vice Chancellor of the University that the students certified by the Registrar of the University as having completed the requirements of their respective programs be granted their degrees at the spring 2012 Commencement.

**Faculty Senate New Business 5a 4/11/2012**

## **PROPOSAL TO MODIFY AWARDS AND RECOGNITION COMMITTEE**

by making it a joint governance committee and increasing academic staff membership from three to four members

### **Joint Committee on Awards and Recognition**

1. The Committee on Awards and Recognition is composed of four appointed faculty members, with no more than two from one domain voting district, ~~three~~ **four** appointed Academic Staff members, one appointed Classified Support Staff member, and two appointed student members.
2. Appointments to the Committee shall be for a term of two years with the terms of faculty and academic staff staggered so as to ensure continuity of membership. Student members are appointed annually.
3. The committee coordinates with the Provost/Vice Chancellor and Chancellor in nominating candidates for awards and recognitions.
4. The committee nominates for the following awards: Faculty Award for Excellence in Teaching; Faculty Award for Excellence in Scholarship; Academic Support Award for Excellence; University Award for Excellence in Institutional Development; University Award for Excellence in Community Outreach; University Award for Excellence in Collaborative Achievement; Classified Staff Award for Excellence
5. The committee advises the Chancellor as to candidates for non-academic awards.
6. The committee advises on matters of public events and aids in arranging commencements, honors convocations, and other convocations and public functions as requested by the Chancellor.
7. The committee recommends names for buildings and other physical facilities and features of the campus.

NOTE: The faculty members on the committee constitute the core of the Honorary Degree Committee.

**Faculty Senate New Business 5b 4/11/2012**

## PROPOSAL TO MODIFY LIBRARY AND INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

by adding boldface items and deleting struck-through items in current Faculty Handbook language:

### Joint Committee on Library and Instructional Technology Committee

1. The Library and Instructional Technology Committee is composed of four faculty members, one from each of the four domain voting districts, ~~two~~ **three** persons from the Academic Staff, and one student. The faculty members are elected from a slate prepared by the Committee on Committees and Nominations. Faculty members serve three-years with terms staggered to assure continuity. **The academic staff members are elected from a slate prepared by the Leadership and Involvement Committee. Academic staff members serve two years with terms staggered.**
2. The Library and Instructional Technology Committee is advisory to the Associate Provost for Information Services, the Director of the Cofrin Library, and the Technology Council on policy matters pertaining to instructional technology and library automation. **Ex officio (non-voting) members of the committee include** the Associate Provost for Information Services, ~~and the~~ Director of the Cofrin Library, **Manager of the Learning Technology Center, and Director of the Advancement of Teaching & Learning.** ~~are ex officio (non-voting) members of the~~ Committee.
3. The Committee represents the Faculty and Academic Staff in making recommendations **on library and instructional technology** policy matters pertaining to all units which are under the direction of the Chief Information Officer and University Librarian.

Faculty Senate New Business 5c 4/11/2012

## **Committee on Workload and Compensation**

### **Resolution**

Whereas, the Faculty Senate created a new Committee on Workload and Compensation (CWC) in order to investigate, to raise awareness, and to make suggestions about compensation and workload issues for faculty and academic staff;

Whereas, the process of addressing these issues must be cooperative, collaborative, and transparent;

Whereas, although faculty salaries compared to benchmarks are reasonably well-known, academic staff salary comparisons are not;

Whereas, there is limited data about the nature of work and the kinds of workloads on the UWGB campus;

And, whereas, comparative data on workload and salary from an external professional analysis will be important in redressing workload and compensation issues;

Therefore, be it resolved that the Faculty Senate encourages the administration to continue to collaborate closely and to consult frequently with the CWC in order to find a process and a solution to the problems of workload and compensation at UW-Green Bay;

And, be it resolved that the Faculty Senate supports the administration's and the CWC's efforts including the initiative to bring in a neutral third-party, to provide the campus with the basis for policy and practical actions on the issues of compensation and workload.

**Faculty Senate New Business 5d 4/11/2012**

## Proposed Code Revisions of 53.12 (E) GRADUATE FACULTY BOARD OF ADVISORS

E. ~~Graduate Faculty Board of Advisors~~ **Studies Council**. **Members of t**he Graduate Faculty ~~Board of Advisors is~~ **Studies Council are** elected from among the tenured members of the graduate faculty [as defined in 53.12 (A)]. The Board is convened by the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs/Director of Graduate Studies and serves in an advisory capacity to the **Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs**, Associate Provost for Academic Affairs/Director of Graduate Studies and appropriate Dean(s). ~~The Board has the authority to make recommendations concerning curriculum, program and personnel within the graduate program.~~

1. ~~The Board of Advisors is~~ **Council members are** elected from among the tenured members of the graduate faculty and consists of two at-large members who serve for three years, with terms staggered to ensure continuity, and may not be elected for consecutive terms. Graduate program chairs and the chairs of cooperative graduate programs shall also serve as voting members of the ~~Board.~~ **Council**. The Associate Provost for Academic Affairs/Director of Graduate Studies, Dean of the College of Professional Studies, and Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences serve ex-officio, non-voting. Additionally, a graduate student shall be selected by the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs/Director of Graduate Studies to serve as a nonvoting member of the Board for a one-year term.
2. The Committee on Committees and Nominations shall nominate members for vacancies on the Board of Advisors, ensuring that the two at-large members do not belong to the same graduate program.
3. **Upon the request of the appropriate Dean(s), the Graduate Studies Council shall approve or disapprove all new programs or modifications to existing programs, and on all new credit courses or modifications to existing credit courses at the graduate level.**
4. **The Graduate Studies Council shall have the responsibility and authority for review and approval of all credit courses and all academic programs at the graduate level. Its official decision shall be forwarded to the Faculty Senate through the University Committee. The Faculty Senate will publish all curricular decisions made by the Graduate Studies Council in the minutes of its monthly meetings and forward them along with copies of all official Graduate Studies Council correspondence to the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.**
5. **In a case where the Graduate Studies Council does not approve a new course or program, the initiator of that new course or program may ask the Graduate**

Studies Council for reconsideration of the decision, providing new arguments or supplementary evidence in support of the proposal to can be made to address the Graduate Studies Council's objections. If this appeal fails to produce a satisfactory conclusion, in the view of the initiator, an appeal to the University Committee can be made. In such cases the University Committee may investigate the appeal themselves or establish an ad hoc committee to do so. If the University Committee chooses to overturn the decision of the Council, the results of that deliberation will be reported to the Senate, published in the Senate minutes and forwarded to the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

6. On its own initiative, or upon request of the University Committee, the Graduate Studies Council may advise the Faculty Senate about issues of graduate level education policy and implementation that falls within the jurisdiction of the Faculty.
  7. The Graduate Studies Council shall annually provide the Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff, for inclusion in the *Faculty Governance Handbook*, a current list of graduate programs, and graduate level certificate programs.
- F. ~~Curriculum Review. The course proposals and curriculum of the graduate program are subject to review and approval by the Academic Affairs Council.~~

**Faculty Senate New Business 5e 4/11/2012**

## PROPOSAL TO CHANGE

### THE PERIODICITY OF SENATE MEETINGS IN CODE

by adding items in boldface and deleting struck-through items:

#### 52.06 MEETINGS

- A. The Senate shall normally meet once ~~a month~~ **every three weeks (not counting spring break and winter break)** during the academic year, or as business dictates.
- B. Special Senate meetings may be called by the Speaker of the Senate or by petition of five senators.
- C. The majority of members constitutes a quorum.
- D. Any member of the University community (students or employees of UWGB) may be recognized by the Presiding Officer to speak on any matter on the agenda.
- E. Faculty shall receive agenda and summary minutes automatically, and may have access to the full proceedings on request to the Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff.
- F. There shall be time allotted for new business at each meeting. Items submitted at this time shall be discussion items at the next meeting and action items at the next.

#### 52.01 JURISDICTION OF THE SENATE

- A. The Senate shall represent the Faculty in all matters within the jurisdiction and powers of the Faculty as enumerated in UWGB Chapter 50.04.
- B. The Senate may decide, in matters of major importance, to request that action by the Faculty be taken.
- C. The Senate shall receive ~~regular monthly~~ **regular monthly** reports **at each Senate meeting** from the University Committee on appropriate matters, including educational policy, budget, legislation, and actions taken by the Board of Regents, and by the various faculties and faculty committees, and by other bodies or individuals related to the UWGB campus. The Senate may take appropriate action in response to these reports.

**Faculty Senate New Business 5f 4/11/2012**

**Academic Affairs Council  
Report to Senate**

The AAC conducted a program review of Art on March 23 and approved the on-line program in Sustainable Management on March 30.

## Quality Initiative Proposal

The Higher Learning Commission's Open Pathway requires the institution to undertake a major Quality Initiative designed to suit its present concerns or aspirations. The Quality Initiative is intended to allow institutions to take risks, aim high, and if so be it, learn from only partial success or even failure.

The Quality Initiative can take one of three forms: (1) the institution designs and proposes its own Quality Initiative to suit its present concerns or aspirations; (2) the institution chooses an initiative from a menu of topics, such as the following examples:

- Revision or restatement of its mission, vision, and goals;
- Multi-year process to create systemic, comprehensive assessment and improvement of student learning;
- A four-year institution joins with community colleges to create a program of dual admission, joint recruitment and coordinated curriculum and student support;
- The institution pursues a strategic initiative to improve its financial position;
- The institution engages in a Commission-endorsed program or process offered by another agency,

3) The institution could also choose to participate in a Commission-facilitated program. Currently, the Commission has one such program, the Academy for Assessment of Student Learning.

The institution must submit a Quality Initiative Proposal to the Commission for approval (October 1, 2012). The institution completes the proposal using a template provided by the Commission. Quality Initiative proposals are no longer than 4,500 words and submitted electronically. The Commission will have a form to submit proposals

The following are potential proposals submitted by UW-Green Bay Faculty and Academic Staff:

### **Option 1: Quality Matters**

As public funding for higher education decreases and educational costs to students increase, demand for outcomes assessment has never been more intense. Fundamental to any educational endeavor is the requirement that student learning and the effectiveness of teaching methods be honestly and accurately assessed.

Quality Matters (QM) is a faculty-centered, peer review process that is designed to certify the quality of online and blended courses. There are three major components to the QM system (the QM rubric, the peer review process, and QM professional development); the most commonly known and widely used component is the QM rubric. The use of the QM program for online courses at UW-Green Bay will provide reassurance that online courses and programs are consistently rigorous and constantly

improving. The adoption of such a system should convince current and potential students, the faculty, UW-system, and accreditation agencies of the quality of online education at UW-Green Bay.

### **Option 2: The Skills Initiative**

We presume that the education we provide our students includes certain skills in addition to breadth and depth in content areas. Commonly mentioned skills are:

Leadership, problem solving, communication, collaboration, creativity, critical thinking, information literacy, quantitative literacy

A skills initiative would seek ways to make the presumed development of such skills more transparent in each student's education by: defining the skills, tracking where in the curriculum (or co-curriculum) the skills are acquired, assessing the skills, certifying skill acquisition and helping students present these skills to the world.

### **Option 3: High Impact practices**

The University of Wisconsin-Green Bay prides itself on providing students with academic experiences that involve close faculty-student interactions. Many of these experiences are classified by George Kuh as "high impact practices" (HIPs; AAC&U, 2008): namely, they are practices that have been demonstrated to have a significant, positive impact on student retention and engagement, and ultimately ensure a valuable learning experience.

In order to ensure that all students – including underrepresented students - participate in a minimum of three HIPs during their undergraduate experience at UW-Green Bay, we propose a Quality Improvement Initiative that will allow us to both develop and implement an expanded variety of HIPs on campus. Some will be new to UW-Green Bay while others build upon pre-existing programs which have proven successful in increasing student success.

### **Option 4: Internships and Professional Practice Experiences**

Applied learning is purportedly a hallmark of a UW-Green Bay education, and indeed, many students avail themselves to opportunities for internships (for credit and/or for pay) and professional practice experiences in a effort to "connect learning to life". These experiences are invaluable in helping students make career decisions and build professional networks that lead to post-graduate employment. We believe there are a number of ways UW-Green Bay could improve its ability to offer high quality internship opportunities to more students. Included among these would be: greater coordination of internship opportunities; greater connection of internship experiences with career services; deliberately expanding the number of opportunities; standardizing expectations of internships; collecting better data on the number of students engaged in these experiences as well as their satisfaction.