

AGENDA

UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 6

Wednesday, March 10, 2010 3:00 p.m.

Alumni Rooms AB, University Union

Presiding Officer: Laura Riddle, Speaker

Parliamentarian: Clifford Abbott

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 5 February 17, 2010 [page 2]

3. CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

4. CONTINUING BUSINESS

- a. Creation of Joint Governance Committees - second reading [page 5], presented by Cliff Abbott

5. NEW BUSINESS

- a. 2010-11 Slate of Nominees for Faculty elective Committees [page 7], presented by Laurel Phoenix
- b. Credit for Prior Learning [page 9], presented by Brian Sutton
- c. Abolish the Senate Committee on Planning and Budget [page 10], presented by Brian Sutton
- d. Task Force to create a Proposal for an Honors Program [page 11], presented by Illene Noppe
- e. How to Make UWGB Number One Again: the UWGB Leadership in Excellence Initiative [page 12], presented by Brian Sutton
- f. Requests for future Senate business

6. PROVOST'S REPORT

7. UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE REPORT

Presented by Brian Sutton, Chair

8. SENATE REPORTS

- a. Academic Affairs Council [page 18]
- b. Faculty Rep to UW-System

9. ADJOURNMENT

[draft]

MINUTES 2009-2010

UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 5

Wednesday, February 17, 2010
Alumni Rooms AB, University Union

Presiding Officer: Laura Riddle, Speaker of the Senate

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

PRESENT: Lucy Arendt (BUA), Scott Ashmann (EDU), Andrew Austin (SCD), Kimberly Baker (HUB), Caroline Boswell (HUS), Peter Breznay (ICS), Kathleen Burns (HUD), Toni Damkoehler (AVD), David Dolan (NAS-UC), Michael Draney (NAS-UC), Adam Gaines (AVD), Stefan Hall (HUS), Thomas Harden (Chancellor, *ex officio*), Tim Kaufman (EDU-UC), Steve Kimball (EDU), Janet Reilly (NUR alternate), Michael McIntire (NAS), Randall Meder (AVD), Dan Meinhardt (HUB), Steve Meyer (NAS), Thomas Nesselin (URS), Illene Noppe (HUD-UC), Laura Riddle (AVD-UC), Jolanda Sallmann (SOCW), Christopher Martin (HUS), John Stoll (PEA), Brian Sutton (HUS-UC), Patricia Terry (NAS alternate), Julia Wallace (Provost, *ex officio*), Jennifer Zapf (HUD)

REPRESENTATIVES: Brent Blahnik (academic staff), Megan Loritz (student government)

NOT PRESENT: James Loebel (BUA)

GUESTS: Dean Scott Furlong, Interim Dean Derryl Block, Associate Provost Steve VandenAvond, Associate Provost Tim Sewall, Associate Dean Donna Ritch

1. Call to Order. Speaker Riddle called the meeting to order at 3:04 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes of UW-Green Bay Faculty Senate Meeting No. 4, January 27, 2010. Speaker Riddle called for objections and, on hearing none, called the minutes approved.

3. Chancellor's Report. Chancellor Harden commented on two issues. The Growth Agenda, which began as a UW-Green Bay initiative to increase resources for additional enrollment and later became a UW-System initiative, is morphing again to a System initiative with two aims: to create more, and perhaps better prepared, graduates and to develop jobs within the state. Some involved in the discussion of this new initiative are also pushing for improved compensation and more flexibility for the highly regulated UW. The Chancellor was asked if the initiative to develop jobs might include jobs within higher education and he responded that it might but it was tied to the requests for resources and more flexibility. (Senator Noppe took the opportunity to put in a plug for honors programs as part of the initiative.) The second issue for the Chancellor was strategic planning. Here he announced that scheduling had begun for a series of affinity mapping sessions that most will have an opportunity to attend. He is also seeking individuals experienced or knowledgeable in strategic planning to advise him as we move through this process.

4. Continuing Business.

a. Wisconsin's Disinvestment in Higher Education UC Chair Sutton presented a resolution and made some minor initial corrections to the version distributed with the agenda. He explained that the intent was to call attention to a historic trend, now decades old, of reduced support for higher education from the state and its effects not just on faculty but on students and the state itself. He also explained that the tone of the resolution was purposefully not confrontational or demanding, but an attempt to make nice. The Speaker raised the question of to whom the resolution was addressed and although the Chancellor mentioned a number of possibilities, the **motion to adopt the resolution was made (Senator Hall with a second by Senator Noppe)** without the addressee issue being settled. The discussion included affirmatory comments (legislators need to be aware of the problems, the state seems more interested in putting people in prisons than in higher education), calls for discussion on related issues (what should be the ideal level of state support for higher education, the resource issue is tied up with the flexibility issue), and calls for possible revisions (a stronger ending, a call for more specific action, a call for moderate action - at least stop the decline). Without amendment, the **motion was called and passed (14-9-4)**.

b. Creation of Joint Governance Committees - first reading SOFAS Abbott presented the language amending the Faculty Handbook to allow for the creation of joint governance committees for faculty, academic staff, and administration. The actual creation, alteration, or dissolution of committees would be a separate later action once all three parts of shared governance agreed. The issue will return for a vote at the second reading next month. The only discussion was on whether particular committees had been targeted for this new status. The response was that those discussions would follow once the mechanism was in place.

5. New Business.

a. Requests for future Senate business Senator Breznay took the opportunity to inform the Senate that the University committee has decided not to bring before the Senate his proposal to add program averages to grades on student transcripts. (See UC Report below)

6. Provost Report. Provost Wallace warned the Senators that they were likely to be hearing more in the future about initiatives currently under discussion at UW-System, especially under the cover of "educational attainment." This includes: increasing the number of graduates, planning enrollments for the next decade and a half, getting more students through to their first degree within four years, retaining more students, and narrowing the achievement gap for minorities. On some of these issues UW-Green Bay is well positioned with work already done on Inclusive Excellence and Strategic Enrollment Management plans. The Provost invited comments and questions and received several about getting students through in four years. Several senators noted that plans do exist for completing programs in four years. The Provost responded that the issue was less the existence of the plans and more their visibility to current and prospective students. There were also comments on how a lack of resources can create bottlenecks in the curriculum, particularly introductory courses in the sciences.

7. University Committee Report. UC Chair Sutton listed the issues before the UC. Brian Sutton himself will be the faculty rep to System for the next year and a half. The UC had decided not to put Senator Breznay's proposal to add program averages on the Senate agenda. He had argued that employers need this information to be more transparent, but the UC was not convinced. The

proposal seemed to be aimed at grade inflation, which apparently is less documentable as an issue than the diversity among programs in grading standards. UC Chair Sutton thought there might be a mechanism for individuals to bring items to the Senate even if they are not supported by the UC. The SOFAS agreed. [Subsequent checking shows this is not quite accurate. It takes ten percent of the Faculty to place an item on the Senate agenda if the UC is unwilling to do so. - UWGB 52.08B] Additional items under discussion by the UC include: an honors program, support for collective bargaining, difficulties with the Task Force on Interdisciplinarity, traffic patterns outside Lab Sciences, legislative actions on the neutrality of administration in collective bargaining discussions, and the topic for this open forum.

9. Open Forum. Senator Noppe introduced the forum by recalling her earlier proposal of an apprentice system for committee service and while admitting that that may not have been the best solution, she wished to remind us of two problems: that in some units there were few opportunities for untenured people to serve on committees and that there should be some way to maintain an expectation that faculty (tenured or not) will nurture the institution. One thread of the discussion that followed revolved around the rewards for committee service. The consensus was that they were meager. They were most prominent at the two promotion points in an academic career and even there service on governance committees can often be supplanted by service to the unit or to the community. One senator observed that a balanced approach to work and life means setting priorities and things other than committee service often have higher priorities. Another thread was on the opportunities for committee service. Senators disagreed about whether there was a lack of opportunity or not. Some noted that untenured faculty do not have much control over creating opportunities for themselves. Mentors might help but even some mentors may find the process of getting on committees mysterious. People who had experience on the Committee on Committees and Nominations recommended the annual preference survey as a mechanism for expressing interest.

10. Adjournment. On a motion from Senator Hall (Senator Nesselin second) the meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Clifford Abbott, Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

A Proposal to Enable the Creation of Joint Governance Committees

Amend p. 45 of the Faculty Handbook by eliminating struck-through paragraphs and adding the bold-face paragraph:

FACULTY COMMITTEE SYSTEM

INTRODUCTION

~~Faculty governance at the University of Wisconsin - Green Bay is implemented through Academic Units, the Faculty Senate, and a system of elected and appointed committees. Some committees are defined by the UWGB Codification. These include the executive committees of the interdisciplinary and disciplinary units (UWGB Chapters 53.03, 53.08, 53.13) and several other elected committees. A second group of committees are the standing elected or appointed committees established by the Faculty Senate. These will be described below.~~

~~A third group of committees includes committees established at the pleasure of the Senate, or by one or more of the Senior Administrators on campus. This would include search and screen committees, the professorial promotion advisory committees, and others with responsibilities defined in actions taken by faculty bodies. Others in this group serve to advise the Senate or various administrators on specific policy issues.~~

Faculty governance at the University of Wisconsin - Green Bay is implemented through the Faculty as a whole, Academic Units and their executive committees, the Faculty Senate, and a system of governance committees. Some committees and councils are defined directly by UWGB Codification. Actions of the Faculty Senate have created additional standing committees that are either elected or appointed. Joint governance committees may also be created to represent the shared governance perspective of both the Faculty and Academic Staff to the administration. Additional special committees may be created by the Faculty Senate or by one or more of the senior administrators on campus in consultation with the Committee on Committees and Nominations.

It is the policy of the Faculty of the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay that any of its members taking a sabbatical or leave of absence for any purpose and for one semester or more shall relinquish his/her right of participation in All-University governance during the remaining term of the governance unit to which he or she was elected or appointed. A letter of resignation from any All-University standing elected or standing appointed council or committee must be tendered to the Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff well in advance of the beginning of the fall semester of the academic year involved. (Faculty Senate Doc. #89-8, Approved 18 April 1990)

...and adding the bold-face paragraph to the description of types of committees on p. 47-48:

TYPES OF COMMITTEES

1. Faculty Elective Committees

Faculty members are elected to elective faculty committees from a slate of names presented by the Committee on Committees and Nominations. Annually the Committee on Committees and Nominations nominates at least two candidates for each elective committee position to be filled. The list of nominations shall be sent by the Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff to each member of the Faculty prior to the Faculty Senate meeting at which the Committee on Committees and Nominations reports. Additional nominations, made by petition of three

members of the Faculty, must be received within 10 days of the report of the Committee on Committees and Nominations. Such nominations are made with approval of the nominee.

The election is held prior to the close of the academic year. Ballots are sent to each member of the Faculty from the Office of the Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff. Ballots shall be returned to the Office of the Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff for tallying. The Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff, one observer from the Committee on Committees and Nominations, and/or one observer from the University Committee, count the ballots. The Office of the Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff reports the results.

Terms of office begin in September of the following academic year.

Elected committee vacancies are filled for the remainder of the academic year in which the vacancy occurs by the candidate who has the next highest number of votes. If there is no such candidate, the position is filled by an election.

If there is no continuing chairperson in an elective committee, the Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff will act to convene the committee.

2. Faculty Appointive Standing Committees

Faculty members are appointed annually to appointive standing committees. Appointive responsibility has been delegated by the Chancellor to the Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff. The Committee on Committees and Nominations submits a panel of nominees to the Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff for consideration. Appointments are made with an effort to assure some continuity of membership from year to year. A convener is named by the Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff for each committee who may or may not be elected chairperson for the year. It is assumed that faculty members so appointed serve until such time as new appointments are made.

3. Special Faculty Committees

May be created, when a need arises, by the Faculty Senate or the University Committee in consultation with the Committee on Committees and Nominations, to perform specific tasks either a) of a limited duration, or b) for a function that requires special technical competence of its membership.

- a. Committees of limited duration will be given a specific written charge which shall be reviewed by the Committee on Committees and Nominations. Charges shall be examined to avoid duplication of function with existing or standing committees. Such a committee ceases to exist when it has completed its charge and makes its final report.
- b. Committees requiring special technical competencies shall be given a specific written charge which will be reviewed by the Committee on Committees and Nominations. Such committees are to be advisory on technical matters and they may be of limited duration or continuing committees. (Examples: Fringe benefits, Legislature, etc.)

4. Joint Governance Committees

Members of the Faculty, Academic Staff, or administration may propose the creation of joint governance committees. The proposal must specify a charge, or set of responsibilities, and a method of determining membership (including number, distribution, terms, and voting rights). The proposal must secure the approval of the Faculty Senate with advice from the Committee on Committees and Nominations, the Academic Staff Committee, and an appropriate administrator in order to advise or act on behalf of shared governance.

NOMINEES FOR 2010-11 FACULTY ELECTIVE COMMITTEES

The Committee on Committees and Nominations, the University Committee, and the Personnel Council have prepared the following slate of candidates for open 2010-11 faculty elective committee positions. Further nominations can be made by a petition of three voting faculty members. These nominations must have consent of the nominee and must be received by the Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff no later than March 22.

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COUNCIL

5 tenured members: one from each voting district, plus one at-large member.

Continuing members: Mimi Kubsch (PS) and Woo Jeon (NS), both 2-year terms; Christine Style (AH) and Dennis Lorenz (SS), both 1-year terms; Kaoime Malloy (AH) spring 2010 semester.

Outgoing members: Cristina Ortiz (at-large AH), spring 2010 semester replacement-Kaoime Malloy (AH)

1 to be elected for 3-year term: 1 from at-large

Nominees: Steve Dutch, NS
John Mariano, AH

PERSONNEL COUNCIL

5 tenured members: one from each voting district, plus one at-large member.

Continuing members: Craig Hanke (NS) and Robert Nagy (PS), both 2-year terms; Alison Gates (AH) and Dean Von Dras (SS replacement), both 1-year terms.

Outgoing members: Thomas Nessler (at-large SS)

1 to be elected for a 3-year term: 1 from at-large

Nominees: Patricia Terry, NS
Andrew Kersten, SS

GENERAL EDUCATION COUNCIL

6 tenured members: one from each voting district, plus two at-large members (with no more than 2 from a single voting district).

Continuing members: Steven Meyer (NS) and Stefan Hall (at-large AH), both 2-year terms; Steven Muzatko (PS) and Andrew Austin (at-large SS), both 1-year terms.

Outgoing members: Catherine Henze (AH) and Georjeanna Wilson-Doenges (SS).

2 to be elected for 3-year term: 1 each from AH and SS

Nominees: Kevin Collins, AH
Jennifer Ham, AH
Regan Gurung, SS
Thomas Nessler, SS

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE

6 tenured members: one from each voting district, plus two at-large members (with no more than 2 from a single voting district).

Continuing members: Michael Draney (at-large NS) and David Dolan (NS), both 2-year terms; Timothy Kaufman, (PS), Illene Noppe (SS) and Brian Sutton (at-large AH), all 1-year terms.

Outgoing members: Laura Riddle (AH).

1 to be elected for a 3-year term: 1 from AH

Nominees: Derek Jeffreys, AH

COMMITTEE OF SIX FULL PROFESSORS

6 tenured, full Professors: one from each of the voting district, plus two at-large members (with no more than 2 from a single voting district).

Continuing members: Timothy Meyer (AH) 2-year term; Michael Kraft (SS replacement), Gregory Davis (NS) and Jeffrey Entwistle (at-large AH), all 1-year terms.

Outgoing member: Judith Martin (PS), Robert Howe, (at-large NS)

2 to be elected for a 3-year term: 1 each from PS and 1 at-large

Nominees: Judith Martin, PS

Carol Emmons, AH
Tian-you Hu, NS

COMMITTEE ON RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

5 tenured members: one from voting district, plus one at-large. Members may serve up to three consecutive terms. A faculty member shall not serve on the CRR and the Personnel Council, Committee of Six, or the University Committee at the same time.

Continuing members: Bryan Vescio (AH), 2-year term; Kim Nielsen (SS) and Kaoime Mallow (at-large AH), both 1-year terms.

Outgoing members: John Lyon (NS) and Marilyn Sagrillo (PS)

2 to be elected for 3-year term; 1 each from NS and PS

Nominees: Steve Dutch, NS
Tian-you Hu, NS

Marilyn Sagrillo, PS
Bill Lepley, PS

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND NOMINATIONS

5 members of professional rank: one from each voting district, plus one at-large member. No member is eligible for more than one consecutive term.

Continuing members: John Lyon (NS) and Janet Reilly (PS), both 2-year terms; Laurel Phoenix (SS) and Rebecca Meacham (at large AH), both 1-year terms.

Outgoing members: Jennifer Mokren (AH)

1 to be elected for a 3-year term: 1 from AH

Nominees: Hye-Kyung Kim, AH
Kaoime Malloy, AH
John Mariano, AH

Using Credit for Prior Learning as Residency Credit

Credits earned at both the undergraduate and graduate level through the Credit for Prior Learning process (e.g., standardized examinations, challenge exams, portfolio development) may not be used to satisfy UW-Green Bay Degree Residency Requirements for degrees, major and minors.

Rationale:

Currently UW-Green Bay has no explicitly stated AAC approved policy that allows Credit for Prior Learning to count toward the residency requirement at either the bachelor's or master's degree level. Current practice at the undergraduate level is to allow these credits to be applied toward residency. This practice was established when UW-Green Bay adopted the PeopleSoft SIS system and was done to expedite the process of transcribing the credits earned through prior learning. At the graduate level current practice is to not allow students to apply any credit earned through prior learning to their degree requirements.

Because Credit for Prior Learning, by definition, represents learning that was not gained while a student was enrolled at UW-Green Bay this policy makes clear that credits earned through Credit for Prior Learning at both the undergraduate and graduate levels may not satisfy UW-Green Bay residency credit requirements.

Resolution to Discontinue Senate Committee on Planning and Budget

Resolution: The Senate Committee on Planning and Budget will be discontinued, effective at the start of the 2010-11 school year.

Rationale:

- According to the Faculty Handbook, this committee is “expected to play an active role during all stages of the University's budget-building process”—but it has never done so, as far as we can determine. The Faculty Handbook requires the committee to present a report to the Faculty Senate at least annually, “include[ing] an appraisal of the adequacy of resources provided to UWGB's academic programs, the distribution of resources among academic programs and between instructional and non-instructional activities at UWGB, and such other financial matters that affect UWGB's ability to achieve the goals of its academic mission.” But the committee has never done so, as far as we can determine, largely because the committee has never had access to the information it would need in order to prepare such a report.
- Over at least the last two years, members of the committee have repeatedly asked the University Committee to help clarify the Planning and Budget Committee's duties—in effect, asking “What are we supposed to be doing, given that we've never been able to do what the Faculty Handbook requires us to do?” Recently, the UC Chair and members of the Planning and Budget Committee met with the Provost, to try to determine what functions the Planning and Budget Committee might serve. The Provost agreed to find tasks for the committee—but it seemed clear that she had no immediate, specific tasks in mind. In other words, a number of busy, productive people have devoted a considerable amount of time to trying to figure out what the committee is supposed to do—time that these people could've more usefully used in other ways.
- While faculty undoubtedly should play an active role in the University's budget-building process, this committee does not play that role, and seems never to have done so during its almost two decades of existence. Given this record, it seems wise to discontinue the committee and concentrate on other ways for faculty members to play a role in the budget-building process.

Faculty Senate New Business 5(c)
March 10, 2010

Proposal to Create an Interdisciplinary Task Force on the Creation of a UW-Green Bay Honors Program

Presented by Illene C. Noppe

Background:

During the September, 2009 meeting of the Faculty Senate, UC Chair presented, as a discussion item, the possibility of creating a UW-Green Bay Honors Program. Both benefits and drawbacks were opined, but the general consensus amongst Senators was that this was worthy of further exploration. Since that time, UC member Illene Noppe attended the Annual Conference of the National Collegiate Honors Council and engaged in a number of conversations about the possible creation of an Honors Program with the UC, Dean Furlong, Associate Dean Ritch, and Provost Wallace. Although finding resources has been acknowledged as the biggest hurdle thus far in the creation of such a program, the Administration would be supportive of further exploration of what such a program would look like on this campus. In order to accomplish this, the University Committee proposes the creation of an Honors Program Task Force, to be convened by Illene Noppe that would:

- Decide on initial size of honors program.
- Establish admissions criteria.
- Develop curriculum.
- Elect a Director of the Honors Program.
- Establish time line for implementation.

.The Honors Program Task Force would be comprised of one faculty member from each of the four domains (in addition to I. Noppe), which are NS, SS, AH, and Professional Studies and one representative from Academic Staff. The task force would be given one year to complete its work, in the hopes that an Honors Program would begin in the Fall, 2011 semester. A call for volunteers will be made during the Spring 2010 semester; member selection will be made by the University Committee.

Proposal

The Faculty Senate of UW-Green Bay endorses the creation of an Honors Program Task Force.

Faculty Senate New Business 5(d)
March 10, 2010

Summary of Peter Breznay's Proposal Regarding GPA

(summary prepared by Brian Sutton)

1. For students graduating from UWGB in the future, the official grade transcript will “print, together with each graduating student’s grade point average, the mean and median GPA (possibly even standard deviation) of the graduating class that [the] student belongs to, for each major and minor” the student has completed.
2. The Office of Institutional Research will randomly select ten graduating students’ transcripts for each year over the past decade and will add to those transcripts the median and mean GPAs for these students’ majors and minors, as described in #1. The Office of Institutional Research will then examine the resulting 100 transcripts to see if the “value of making GPAs comparable with [those of] a student’s peers” make the students’ GPAs more meaningful. The Office of Institutional Research will report its findings to the Faculty Senate “at the earliest practical time.”
3. After considering the report from the Office of Institutional Research, the Faculty Senate will “decide what minimum sample size would be required to print mean and median GPAs.” In any event, majors or minors with fewer than five students in the graduating class will not have median and mean GPAs printed, because of privacy concerns. The median and mean GPAs for all students in a graduating class, regardless of their major and minor, will also be printed on the transcript as a counterbalance against potentially misleading information if a relatively small number of students in a major or minor resulted in an unusually high or low median or mean GPA for that major or minor.
4. Students who originally enrolled at UWGB prior to Fall 2011 will have the option of not having the median and mean GPAs for students in their major and minor, as well as the median and mean GPAs for all students in their graduating class, printed on their transcripts. However, if they choose not to have these median and mean GPAs printed on their transcripts, their transcripts will also contain a sentence stating that those medians and means are being left off the transcript at the request of the student.
5. UWGB will create a brochure explaining this policy and its intent, and UWGB will “attach [the] brochure to every transcript we send out.”
6. UWGB will seek “maximum media exposure” in order to take “maximum advantage of [this] policy.” Specifically, “the policy could be announced by the Chancellor at [a] large press event, possibly at an all-faculty or even an all-faculty and all-student convocation.” Because the inspiration for this proposal comes from recent changes at Princeton University, the Dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences at Princeton—who reputedly played a key role in initiating policy changes there—should be invited to take part in the UWGB convocation “as a sort of ‘keynote speaker.’” UWGB should then “engage in an intensive and on-going media campaign” to promote the policy. And UWGB should make a “concerted [and ongoing] effort to communicate . . . to the student body” the goals of the new policy and its advantages for the students.

Faculty Senate New Business 5(e)
March 10, 2010

How to Make UWGB Number One Again: The UWGB Leadership in Excellence Initiative

A Proposal to the Faculty Senate

Background:

40 years ago, at its founding, UWGB made national news with its bold new vision of higher education, its focus on environmental studies, interdisciplinary approach to teaching and research and its unusual, innovative structure. Since then the world of American – and international - higher education has moved on. Other institutions discovered interdisciplinarity and are often arguably better at it than we are. With the advent of global climate change and the attention it commands, environmental and green-energy research and technology development has become standard staple in both industrial and academic innovation. During the past 4 decades our school has rarely made news, serving quietly as a typical small, Midwestern 4-year comprehensive liberal arts college, with a few Masters programs. Our unorthodox institutional structure and interdisciplinary curricular regulations, once the pride of the institution, have become assets of questionable value. Students and parents sometimes complain about the seemingly arbitrary strictures of interdisciplinary requirements that show no apparently coherent logic, and about the almost impenetrable and arcane unit and program structures, the odd-sounding major names. Looking at our org. chart arguably turns off as many outside experts, prospective students and parents, talented young faculty candidates as it might excite. The nature of our community perception is often described as split at best – the community would like to take pride in its institution, but the presentations of our efforts are too often followed by puzzled looks and scratched heads, not to mention the lop-sided composition of our graduating classes and the questions related to the level of value we contribute to the Northeast Wisconsin region, the state and the nation, educationally, intellectually and economically.

One of the most repeated charges by opponents of publicly financed higher education is the accusation of low standards of education offered by an unnecessarily tenured and therefore un-industrious, negligent and complacent professorial body, covering up its shortcomings by a lack of transparency and accountability.

The current proposal aims at introducing a change in this *status quo* by simultaneously providing a hitherto unprecedented level of transparency and an undeniable proof of excellence, while potentially attracting the type of media attention that our first, foundational years were adorned by.

Proposal Objective

I propose that we make UWGB stand out locally, statewide and nationally as the “unknown little campus in the Midwest” that alone responds to academic leadership by Princeton University and that alone, and without precedence, takes up the Princeton challenge of academic excellence, in a unique way. Princeton University is at the center of a widely observed, but decidedly not followed, controversial and lonely experience trying to control what the leadership and some of the faculty see as creeping, rampant grade inflation. The essence of the experiment is mandating certain limits on top grades: across the Liberal Arts and Sciences domain at Princeton, no more than 35% of the assigned grades in large undergraduate classes can be in the “A” range: in their case, A+, A or A-. The policy does not apply to graduate courses, small and specialized topic classes, only to large, widely taught, generally required standard undergraduate classes. Given

that prior to the policy the percentage of grades in the “A” range was in the high forties (47%), Princeton, together with its Ivy League competition, have become, as some observers put it, the “Lake Wobegons” of higher education: campuses where “every kid is above average”. The distorted percentages are generally attributed to rampant grade inflation, stemming from the demands of the highly competitive, and high tuition paying, well-heeled, well-connected and legacy-entrenched student body as a whole. Students at Ivy League colleges do not submit themselves to grueling admission tests, high tuition and living costs, competitive and conspicuously consumptive peers without the expectation of getting a good start at high-flying careers with a quick payback for the incurred costs. As a result, the expectation of students at these institutions, more than at others, includes extra high grades and eye-popping GPAs, the better to impress future employers. The resulting pressure on professors partly by the schools’ reliance on the income generated by high tuition fees, partly by the need to please influential and deep pocketed alumni parents with multi-generational legacy ties to the institutions, and partly by perceived obligations to wealthy donors whose children are enrolled, has been enormous, with the long recognized “Lake Wobegon” results.

The leadership at Princeton decided in 2004 to change this state of affairs, embarking on the now famous “grade deflation” policy. Both the faculty and the student body have been highly critical, even hostile to the concept. Both would feel much more in their comfort zone with the good old Wobegon ways. No institution, including no Ivy League university, followed suit.

Enter UWGB. I propose that we introduce a variation of the policy, aimed less at “fighting grade inflation” than at an unprecedented level of disclosure that would make our grades and our GPAs much more meaningful, while increasing, but only indirectly, the pressure on students to strive academically and making our academic standards more rigorous, with the advantage that no mandate, and therefore no intrusion in faculty grading policies are imposed. Faculty continue to be, as they have always been, the sole arbiters and sole decision makers in all matters related to grades given in their classes.

Proposal Description

The essence of the proposal is to print, together with each graduating student’s Grade Point Average (GPA), the mean and median GPA (possibly even standard deviation) of the graduating class that a student belongs to, for each major and minor a student may be completing at graduation. The aim of this disclosure is to provide context to GPAs, given the high GPA differences between various majors, minors, programs and fields of study, with the natural and engineering sciences typically giving lower grades and building up to significantly lower GPAs than the humanities, social sciences, arts and professional studies. I also propose to conduct a thorough study of past mean and median GPAs of all majors and minors, going back to 10 years, to see if any unexpected trend shows up, such as unusually high or low mean or median GPAs e.g. for small majors or minors. As part of the study we should print out, with names and other identification removed, 100 randomly selected transcripts with the mean and median GPA printed on them, 10 randomly selected graduating students’ transcripts from each of the past 10 years, to see if adding the mean and median GPAs (and possibly standard deviations) indeed shows the expected contextual value of making GPAs comparable with a student’s peers, not with GPAs of students in totally unrelated fields, which tends to render GPA comparisons (and by extension the very concept of the GPA) practically meaningless. The study would be done by the Office of Institutional Research, and the evaluation of the 100 randomly selected anonymous transcripts by a study committee appointed by the Faculty Senate for this specific purpose and

reporting back to the Senate. The study should be done in the fastest practical time-frame, not necessarily delayed to a particular academic year. Instead, once the Office of Institutional Research and the Senate study committee took charge, they should strive to obtain the results and perform the analysis in the fastest possible manner, but not risking quality, and report back to the Senate at the earliest practical time.

Depending on the results of the study, the Senate would decide what minimum sample size would be required to print mean and median GPAs. For privacy concerns (which I disagree with, personally, grades and GPAs used to be publicized, and for a good reason, but that's another topic), a minimum of five (5) graduating students per major/minor would be required, on the proposition that with more than four students, it is not possible to successfully guess the GPAs of other students, knowing that of one student and the mean and median values.

To account for possible deviations in form of unusually high or low mean and median GPAs in small majors and minors, the overall (all graduating class-level) mean and median GPA would be also printed on transcripts, to provide a calibration point in case of such unusually high or low small-major/minor means and medians (if they exist – if not, this provision can be dropped).

Additionally, I propose a transitional opt-out period for currently enrolled students. The printing of the mean and median GPAs would be optional for currently enrolled students, allowing any student to opt out. The mandatory printing of means and medians would commence starting with the incoming freshman class of the 2011-2012 academic year. Allowing the opt-out choice to currently enrolled students pre-empts objections to the policy on the basis that current students started their studies at UWGB without knowing about the disclosure of mean and median GPAs on their transcripts.

The downside of the opt-out is that most likely only students whose GPA is higher than the mean and median of their graduating major and minor classes would choose to get the major/minor mean and median GPA printed on their transcripts. As a balancing measure, I propose that students who opt-out, would get a sentence printed on their transcripts to the effect that “At the request of this student, the mean and median GPAs of the graduating class(es) in the student’s major(s) and minor(s) are not printed on this transcript.”. (The sentence would be in singular if the student has a single major.)

I also propose gaining maximum media exposure and taking maximum advantage of the policy. In particular, the policy could be announced by the Chancellor at large press event, possibly at an all-faculty or even at an all-faculty and all-student convocation. (We should contact Princeton and ask their approach to the press and media releases of their grade deflation policies). We should invite the Dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences of Princeton University who initiated the policy there, Dr. Nancy Malkiel (if I am correct), as a sort of “keynote speaker”. During the press event and at every following opportunity, school officials, administrators, faculty and student body representatives should explain the driving concept behind the policy: we are more proud of the outcome of the education our students receive here than other schools, and we create more transparency and more faculty accountability. By doing so, the pressure, admittedly and intentionally, is made higher on our students to excel academically, and our grading standards are becoming more rigorous. As a result, our graduates, and our degrees, **are better** than those at other, comparable schools. This is an initiative for achieving new heights of academic excellence at a time of nationally declining academic standards, and at a time of nationally declining investment in higher education. **We are taking leadership in improving academic excellence.**

We should engage in an intensive and on-going media campaign pressing and repeating the same points about disclosure, transparency, accountability, academic excellence and how our policies

make our graduates better than the graduates of comparable schools without these policies. As part of this on-going, never ending media campaign, we should aim at achieving maximum exposure as the **only school in the nation that responds to, and takes up Princeton's challenge** regarding grading standards, and disclosures.

In addition, we should, following the example of Princeton University, attach a brochure to every transcript we send out that explains the policy, the intentions of the policy, and the effects of the policy to raise academic standards. The brochure should explain that whenever comparisons are made between UWGB GPAs and other school GPAs, due attention should be paid to our disclosure policies and the resulting stricter, more rigorous grading standards that make our graduates stand out.

I also propose that we make a concerted effort to communicate, first and foremost, to the student body what the new disclosure policy is aiming at. Students are likely to view the disclosure policy as a disadvantage to them, when their transcripts are compared with the transcripts of other students from other schools, where GPAs stand in isolation, without context. We first have to note, that only students with lower than mean and median GPAs can have any issue, because those with **better** GPAs than the major/minor mean and median stand only to gain (in a big way) from the policy. Secondly, we have to educate the student body that the new disclosure policy, intentionally, increases the peer pressure both on students, **and the faculty teaching them** to work harder, improve the outcome of the learning process and excel academically. Due to our publicity efforts, this increase in pressure to excel and the resulting more rigorous grading standards **will be well known** locally, statewide and nationally. As a result, degrees from UWGB will have an added **reputation and prestige** over other comparable schools, because **it will be well known that UWGB degrees and graduates are better than others**. This added advantage may very well counter-balance any short term perceived disadvantage for all graduates, not only for those with above-the-mean and above-the-median GPAs. In this connection I would add that in the 6 years since Princeton introduced their policies, their enrollments were at record highs, every year.

We should also emphasize at every opportunity the main rationale for the disclosure policy: to provide meaning and context to grades and GPAs. The basic scenario is the case of the hypothetical employer looking at two resumes and two traditional transcripts, one with a GPA of 3.7 and one with a GPA of 3.5., otherwise both applicants qualifying equally for a job. Without any further information, which candidate would the employer hire? It seems to be a no-brainer: the one with the higher GPA (3.7). Now imagine the same scenario but this time the potential employer also sees that the mean and median GPA in the graduating class of the 3.7 GPA student's major was 3.9, while the mean and median GPA in the graduating class in the 3.5 GPA student's major was 2.9. Which one would the employer choose now? All of a sudden, the student with the 3.7 GPA looks like a **below average** person in a field where obtaining a high GPA should not be too hard. On the other hand, the student with the 3.5 GPA now looks like a **way above average** person in a very difficult field, where obtaining this high a GPA must be very difficult. No doubt, any reasonable employer would choose, without hesitation, the student with the 3.5 GPA. This hypothetical scenario is intended to show how context can have a radical impact on the meaning and interpretation of the GPA, and should be promulgated and repeated to the student body and to the press at every opportunity.

In closing, I thought that naming this proposal the "UWGB Leadership in Academic Excellence Initiative" would make it a more attractive and more headline and publicity catching proposal.

My hope is that the Faculty Senate will debate the merit of the proposal, and decide appropriately if it indeed would usefully serve the purpose of positioning UWGB in a leadership role in American higher education once again.

Respectfully submitted,
Peter Breznay (ICS)

**Academic Affairs Council Report to Senate
January and February 2010**

AAC Members: Woo Jeon, Dennis Lorenz, Cristina Ortiz, Christine Style (chair), Tim Sewall (Administrative Liaison)

1. Mimi Kubsch requested to be removed from the AAC for spring 2010 due to the loss of her husband. The AAC will continue in spring with one less member.
2. The AAC, through SOFAS, requested that the CCN determine if the AAC could arrange a set weekly meeting time, as it is increasingly difficult to find a common time. The request is under consideration.
3. Curricular Forms under discussion:
 - a. The AAC is in discussion with the author of a CMF for new course: EDUC 301 Teaching Methods for Arts Integration.
4. The AAC approved the following Curricular Forms in January and February 2010:
 - a. Human Biology's proposal to eliminate HUM BIO 306 from the curriculum for Biology majors and minors was approved unanimously, 4-0-0.

5. Program Reviews:

- a. Education Program review questions have been sent to the Education chair and Tim Kaufman will come to the March 29, AAC meeting after a March 3 meeting time fell through.
- b. Interdisciplinary Studies Program review questions have been sent and the Interdisciplinary chair Denise Scheberle will come to the March 10 AAC meeting.
- c. Modern Languages Program Review questions are nearly ready to send to them.
- d. Music Program Review and Political Science Program review has been received and will be reviewed, Music first then Political Science.
- e. ES&P Masters Program review update: The AAC received a memo from Derryl Block, Dean of Professional Studies regarding the recent AAC review of the Graduate Program in Environmental Sciences and Policy. The memo clarified that all of the graduate programs have funding related issues and ES&P is the only graduate program with graduate assistantships and those have been cut.