

# AGENDA

## **UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 5**

Wednesday, January 25, 2012

Alumni Rooms AB, 3:00 p.m.

Presiding Officer: Derek Jeffrey, Speaker

Parliamentarian: Clifford Abbott

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

### **2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 4**

**December 7, 2011** [page 2]

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

### **4. OLD BUSINESS**

- a. Code Change for Graduate Programs [page 6]  
Presented by Tim Sewall
- b. Revised Declaration of Major/Program Policy [page 8]  
Presented by Darrel Renier, Academic Actions Committee
- c. Code Change on tenured faculty merit reviews [page 9]  
Presented by Michael Draney, UC Chair
- d. Proposal to Create a New Interdisciplinary (budgetary) Unit in Theatre/Dance [page 14]  
Presented by Michael Draney, UC Chair [background page 10]
- e. Proposal to Create a New Interdisciplinary (budgetary) Unit in Music [page 17]  
Presented by Michael Draney, UC Chair [background page 10]

### **5. NEW BUSINESS**

- a. Proposal for a Joint Committee on Legislative Affairs  
Presented by Michael Draney, UC Chair [page 21]
- b. Conversion of Library and Instructional Technology Committee to a Joint Committee  
Presented by Michael Draney, UC Chair [page 22]
- c. Conversion of Awards and Recognition Committee to a Joint Committee  
Presented by Michael Draney, UC Chair [page 23]
- d. Requests for future business

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

### **7. OTHER REPORTS**

- a. Academic Affairs Council Report [page 24]
- b. University Committee Report - Presented by Michael Draney
- c. Student Government Report - Presented by Heba Mohammad

### **8. ADJOURNMENT**

**MINUTES 2011-2012**  
**UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 4**  
Wednesday, December 7, 2011  
Phoenix Room C, University Union

Presiding Officer: Derek Jeffreys, Speaker of the Senate

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

PRESENT: Lucy Arendt (BUA), Andrew Austin (DJS), Kimberly Baker (HUB), Forrest Baulieu (ICS alternate), David Dolan (NAS-UC), Michael Draney (NAS-UC), Jorge Estevez (NAS), Victoria Goff (ICS), Thomas Harden (Chancellor, *ex officio*), Doreen Higgins (SOWORK), Ray Hutchison (URS-UC), Derek Jeffreys (HUS-UC), Tim Kaufman (EDU-UC), Mark Kiehn (EDUC), Karen Lieuallen (EDUC), Kaoime Malloy (AVD), Christopher Martin (HUS), Ryan Martin (HUD), Jennifer Mokren (AVD), Amanda Nelson (HUB), Cristina Ortiz (HUS), Adam Parillo (URS), Alma Rodriguez Estrada (NAS), Courtney Sherman (AVD), John Stoll (PEA), Mussie Teclezion (BUA), Bryan Vescio (HUS-UC), Julia Wallace (Provost, *ex officio*)

REPRESENTATIVES: Heba Mohammad (student government), Kelly Kramp (academic staff)

NOT PRESENT: Franklin Chen (NAS), Heidi Sherman (HUS), Christine Smith (HUD), Christine Vandenhouten (NURS).

GUESTS: Scott Furlong, Tim Sewall, Linda Parins, Kevin Collins, Laura Riddle, Jeff Benzow, Michael Ingraham, Steve Meyer, Uwe Pott, Scott Ashmann, Amanda Hruska, Darrel Renier

**1. Call to Order.** Speaker Jeffreys brought the meeting to order just after 3:00 p.m.

**2. Approval of Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting No. 3, November 16, 2011.** Speaker Jeffreys asked for any corrections and, hearing none, accepted the minutes.

**3. Chancellor's Report.** Noting the full agenda, the Chancellor decided to pass on his report.

**4. Old Business.**

a. UW-Green Bay Policy on Post-Retirement Employment (second reading). The Provost presented the policy, unchanged from the first reading. There were two questions: one about when the policy would go into effect and how it might change current arrangements with ad hoc employees and the other about a possible wording change. **Senator Baulieu (Senator Goff second) moved adoption of the policy and without amendment or discussion the Senate voted its approval (20-2-1).**

**5. New Business.**

a. Memorial Resolution for Professor Emeritus Thomas Van Koevering. Professor Scott Ashmann, after noting that Professor Van Koevering had been his advisor and that he now held the position Professor Van Koevering had held, read the resolution. It will be added to the

collection of such resolutions.

b. Code Change for Graduate Programs (first reading). Tim Sewall presented this Code change largely as a housekeeping matter to help Code catch up with some changes in administrative positions affecting graduate programs. Ever helpful, several senators suggested modifications to ensure the language reflected the intent. One was to insert language in section 53.12 E (1) to ensure that the two at-large members of the Board of Advisors are tenured and members of the graduate faculty. The other was to align the term of chairperson (section 53.12 C (1)) with other chairing positions as a 1 to 5 year term depending on agreement between the executive committee and appropriate dean. The University Committee was asked to make such modifications in the second reading of this Code change.

c. Revised Declaration of Major/Program Policy (first reading). Darrel Renier presented the policy change on behalf of the Committee on Academic Actions. He explained that the proposal was not to change the intent of the policy but to clarify its communication to students. Instead of specifying the deadline by which a student must have filed an academic plan as a total of earned and in progress credits, the change would define the deadline just in terms of earned credits (45). One senator suggested that “completed credits” might be even clearer than “earned credits.” Other questions from senators largely took advantage of Mr. Renier’s presence to pump him for information about the advising process and speculation about what goes on in students’ minds. The Chair of the University Committee reported that the UC had its own suggestion for a change, i.e. to replace the current policy’s opening sentence “All students are encouraged to declare a major as early as possible in their undergraduate career” with the alternative “All students are encouraged to discuss major program interests and declaration of major procedures with faculty representatives as soon as they have made a career decision or have met additional program entrance requirements.” Several senators expressed appreciation of the intent but hoped some judicious editing might make that sentence appear less like committee-constructed verbiage.

d. Code Change on Tenured Faculty Merit Reviews (first reading). UC Chair Draney presented this proposal to allow units to do merit reviews less frequently for tenured faculty. Discussion was vigorous and extensive (35 comments from recognized speakers - senators and guests). The principal argument for the change was that the merit process is currently onerous for the value it provides and so making the process less frequent reduces the burden. Senators offered both support and rebuttal to the degree of burden and the value received, but the discussion developed a number of related issues. One was how reviews done less frequently would affect our public image and whether that ought to matter. Another was whether the two main motivations for doing the reviews (providing performance feedback and setting merit raises) ought to be decoupled. A third was whether the variation across units (size of units, involvement of multiple programs, use of subcommittees or chair evaluation, handling of appeals, voting and consensus) meant a university-wide response or unit-specific responses would be more appropriate. Along the way there were comments on the historical changes in our policy, the differences between competitive and collaborative evaluation, general tendencies of merit grade inflation and small discriminations, and the lack of fit between certain kinds of scholarship and reviewing timelines. One final issue was whether the proposed Code change was the right solution to the problems the senators discussed and whether the UC could explore alternatives.

e. and f. Proposals to Create New Interdisciplinary (budgetary) Units in Theatre/Dance and Music (first reading). These two proposals are separate but Dean Furlong presented them together for discussion purposes since the proposals are to carve two new units from the current Arts and Visual Design unit. The Dean's remarks were minimal, noting the history of AVD and how the two proposals had already been reviewed by a joint meeting of the Personnel Council and the Academic Affairs Council. He then stood for questions and got a couple dozen argumentative comments both from senators and, as invited by the Speaker, from members of the proposed units among the guests.

The discussion began with challenges and defenses of the interdisciplinarity of the proposed units. Attention was called to the proposal's written defense of the interdisciplinarity of Theatre/Dance. This was written last year and included the word "perspectives," a word explicitly rejected by the Senate earlier this fall as a substitute for interdisciplinarity. Members of Theatre responded that they thought they could make the case for their interdisciplinarity without that word. Music, on the other hand, did not put up an argument that its new unit would be interdisciplinary. Their argument was that Music instead was a professional program with a separate accreditation and ought to be entitled to the same status Social Work and Education have.

From here the discussion expanded to whether the new units would be setting precedents for new kinds of units and whether the idea of defining interdisciplinary units both by their budgetary/administrative status and by their intellectual grounding as having "faculty members from diverse disciplines, but with a shared problem orientation" (Code 53.01 A) is or should be maintained. The Dean clarified that the proposals were only to create interdisciplinary units, not interdisciplinary programs, although Theatre/Dance has signaled its intention to create such a program later on. The discussion wandered a bit (probably more in the forest than the desert) until there was a call to consider making changes in the constraints on our administrative units before creating the new units.

g. Requests for future business. No doubt feeling the fullness of the faculty's energy, the Speaker passed on this item.

**6. Provost's Report.** The Provost had been called away during the meeting and thus unavailable for a report.

## **7. Other Reports.**

a. Academic Affairs Council Report. This was attached to the agenda.

b. University Committee Report. The UC Chair delivered the report on what the UC has been discussing. In addition to the items on today's agenda, that includes an effort to increase the transparency of the budget and planning process, a proposed change in the enrollment policy for Adult Degree to open their courses to all students, and the work of the Committee on Workload and Compensation. That last group has three subcommittees working on: compensation; the cost of being an employee; and work-life balance. Daycare plays a role in the work of all three of these subgroups.

c. Faculty Rep Report. Dave Dolan reported that the faculty reps met with President Reilly on efforts to ameliorate the budget lapse. The President says that Senate resolutions against the lapse are helpful to that effort. Work on two other issues is progressing - 9 over 12 pay (still alive but costly) and more flexibility in handling the May multiples (likely). A proposal to use a Health Savings Account for pretax costs for health insurance is possible.

d. Student Government Report. Heba Mohammad reported progress in Student Government's sustainability project (likely to be solar panels in residence life) and a recently-held open forum on childcare issues. A faculty survey is being planned on that issue.

**8. Adjournment.** Speaker Jeffreys adjourned the meeting at 4:57.

## Proposal to Change Code for Graduate Program

Proposal is to eliminate struck-through sections and add boldface sections:

### UWGB 53.12 GRADUATE PROGRAM

A. Graduate Degree Programs: Membership. The faculty of a graduate program shall consist of those UW-Green Bay faculty members holding professorial rank and Lecturers with faculty status who have been appointed to that program by the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs on recommendation of the ~~Dean of Professional and Graduate Studies~~ and **appropriate Dean** and the graduate program executive committee. A faculty member may have a split appointment or assignment with another graduate program but may vote in only one program.

### B. Executive Committee: Membership and Functions

1. A graduate degree program executive committee shall consist of all tenured members of a graduate degree program. The executive committee shall consist of no fewer than three members. When there are fewer than three qualified members in a graduate degree program to form an executive committee, the qualified members shall, in consultation with the ~~Dean of Professional and Graduate Studies~~ **appropriate Dean**, designate the remaining members from graduate faculty whose academic training and experience relate to the graduate degree program.

2. Graduate degree program executive committees have the responsibility to make recommendations concerning appointments, curriculum, and other matters related to the graduate degree program which are transmitted to the ~~Dean of Professional and Graduate Studies~~ **appropriate Dean** and to the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

### C. Chairperson: Selection

1. The chairperson shall be elected by a simple majority of members of a graduate degree program ~~with the approval of the Dean of Professional and Graduate Studies~~ **usually** for a term of three years. **In circumstances where both the Executive Committee and the Dean are in agreement, the term of appointment may be set for one to five years.** There is no limit to the number of terms that a chairperson may serve. The vote shall be by written ballot at a graduate degree program meeting with the results to be counted and announced immediately at said meeting. The results of the election shall be transmitted to the ~~Dean of Professional and Graduate Studies~~ **appropriate Dean** for approval. Removal of the chairperson by the ~~Dean of Professional and Graduate Studies~~ **appropriate Dean** during the term of office normally shall take place following a vote of no confidence. A vote to determine confidence in the chairperson may be held at any time upon petition of fifty percent of the faculty of a graduate degree program or on the request of the ~~Dean of Professional and Graduate Studies~~ **appropriate Dean**.

### D. Chairperson: Duties

1. Serves as the official channel of communication for all matters affecting graduate studies as a whole at UW-Green Bay, between the program and other academic units, the Chancellor, Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the appropriate Dean(s), the Associate ~~Dean~~ **Provost for Academic Affairs/Director** of Graduate Studies ~~and Research~~, and other University officials and units.

2. Calls meetings of the graduate program faculty and its executive committee and presides over the meetings. The chairperson shall also call a meeting at the request of any two members of the program. Each program shall meet at least once every semester.

3. Has charge of all official correspondence of the graduate program and of all program matters included in the graduate catalog or other University publications.

4. Determines that all necessary records of faculty activities within a graduate program are properly recorded.

5. ~~Reports~~ **Communicates** to the Associate **Provost for Academic Affairs/Director** ~~Dean~~ of Graduate Studies ~~and Research~~ regarding the activities and needs of the program.

6. Submits, ~~through the Associate Dean~~, new courses, major revisions of existing courses, and deletions of courses proposed by the graduate program for action by the appropriate interdisciplinary unit, **appropriate dean**, the Graduate Faculty Board of Advisors, Academic Affairs Council, and the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

7. Acts as the chief executive officer of the graduate program.

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

1. The Board of Advisors **is elected from among the tenured members of the graduate faculty and** consists of ~~voting members of the graduate faculty [as defined in 53.12 (A)] holding the tenured associate or full professor ranks. T~~ 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, *ex-officio*, also serve as voting members of the Board. **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, ~~the a graduate student union shall elect one of its members each year be selected by the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs/Director of Graduate Studies to sit without vote on~~ **serve as a nonvoting member of** the Board for a one-year term.

2. The Committee on Committees and Nomination 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.

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 Old Business 4(a)**

## **Proposal to change policy on Declaration of Major**

11 November 2011, Academic Affairs Committee (Steve Meyer, Chair)

### Current Policy:

All students are encouraged to declare a major as early as possible in their undergraduate career. The University requires all students to declare a major by the time they have earned 36 credits. Additionally, all students are required to have a complete academic plan (e.g., interdisciplinary major or minor, area of emphasis) on file with the Registrar's Office by the time they have a total of 62 credits earned and in progress. The academic plan form is available online at <http://www.uwgb.edu/registrar>.

### Proposed Change:

All students are encouraged to discuss a major with faculty representatives as early as possible in their undergraduate career. All students are required to have a complete academic plan (e.g., interdisciplinary major or minor, area of emphasis) on file with the Registrar's Office by the time they have a total of 45 credits earned. The academic plan form is available online at <http://www.uwgb.edu/registrar>.

### Rationale for Change:

By examining our current policy more closely you will notice that 62 credits earned and in progress is essentially the same as 45 credits earned. A student could be enrolled in 47 credits and have a declaration hold placed upon his/her account if enrolled in 15 credits. This frequently confuses students. They notice the number of earned credits they have but do not take into account the number of in progress credits. Other reasons for the change include:

- Clearly defines the policy to students.
- Increase connectedness to campus and faculty because a change would force students to examine major/minor options through earlier correspondence.
- Better predication of course section needs because students will be entering the “pipeline” to a major.
- Email distribution lists will be more accurate with the in-progress annotation eliminated.
- Better management of course with prerequisites for major declaration (Music, Art, Human Development). Students may enter majors sooner than later.
- 45 credits will not impede professional majors such as Business, Communications and Education.
- May have notable impact on retention as it would target sophomores caught in “limbo” between choosing a major and General Education completion.
- Helps with NCAA eligibility process.

**Faculty Senate Old Business 4(b)**

## Proposal to change Code regarding Merit Reviews

Proposal is to eliminate struck-through sections and add boldface sections:

### UWGB 3.10 REVIEW PROCEDURES (MERIT, PROMOTION, RENEWAL)

#### 1. Merit Review Procedures for all Faculty

- a. The performance of each tenured faculty member shall be reviewed ~~annually or biennially (every second year)~~ **at least once every five years** by the faculty member's interdisciplinary unit executive committee. Non-tenured faculty will be reviewed annually by the executive committee, or the review may be combined with a retention review in a given year. The review shall be of the faculty member's performance from the beginning of one appointment period to the beginning of the next appointment period. The results of the review shall be communicated to the faculty member by his/her chairperson within 30 days of the completion of the review.

Rationale for Change: University of Wisconsin System Regents Policy calls for tenured faculty review at least once every five years (Regent Policy Documents, 20-9-1). Our proposed change allows maximal latitude for units to make their own decisions about merit review periodicity within the Wisconsin System framework. We propose decreasing the frequency with which tenured faculty are reviewed at UW-Green Bay (at least in units that wish to make the change) because assembling, evaluating, and reporting on faculty merit using evidentiary files consumes a great deal of faculty time. The proposal makes no change to the current annual reviews of non-tenured faculty.

A longer record of merit may prove to be more representative of a faculty member's long-term productivity than a two-year record, because it will better integrate the normal cycle of high and low productivity years that characterizes much scholarly activity. The university's need for more frequent reporting of faculty activities and accomplishments could be cited as a reason for continuing the two-year merit review cycle. However, we feel that even the current system of assembling and evaluating large evidentiary files is not an efficient way to provide the information that the institution needs for promotional and related uses. Other, more efficient mechanisms for reporting faculty activities and accomplishments need to be developed.

**Faculty Senate Old Business 4(c)**

# **Proposal to Create Interdisciplinary Units in Theatre/Dance and in Music**

## **Arts and Visual Design History**

The evolution of programs associated originally with the academic unit Communication Action has led to the current request to recognize the Music and Theatre areas as separate and distinct Administrative Units. The history of the Unit is one of increasing independence of its programs. The chronicle below outlines the curricular actions that have been taken as a result of various administrative directives, student demand for programs, changing times, and decisions made by other Units and faculty.

### **Communication Action: Unit title when UWGB began.**

Original structure included all of the programs listed below and the interdisciplinary major in Women's Studies.

### **Communication and the Arts: name changed in 1978.**

- Aesthetic Awareness: interdisciplinary major emphasis and minor emphasis
- Arts Awareness interdisciplinary minor emphasis
- Art: Disciplinary major and minor
- Broad-field Communications: interdisciplinary major emphasis and minor emphasis
- Communication Processes: Disciplinary major and minor
- Environmental Design: inter-concentration interdisciplinary emphasis
- Graphic Communication: interdisciplinary major emphasis and minor emphasis
- Music: Disciplinary major and minor
- Science Communication: inter-concentration interdisciplinary emphasis
- Theatre: Disciplinary major and minor

UWGB begins to refer to some programs as Disciplinary: 1986.

### **Communication and the Arts: Budget Distribution**

Since the early 1980s, the main COA S&E budget is divided at the beginning of each fiscal year into the following categories: AVD Administrative, Art, Music, and Theatre. The Administrative portion of the budget includes lines to cover expenses shared by all AVD faculty such as telephone, postage, duplicating, faculty development, and office supplies. It also includes a line for the Design Arts program. The disciplines of Art, Music, and Theatre are allotted a certain amount at the beginning of each fiscal year and the Chair of each discipline is responsible for determining how it will be used for their programs. Additionally, there is a Performing Arts budget that is split between the Music and Theatre programs. This budget line was always split 35% & 65% to Music and Theatre respectively. After years of difficulties, Interim Dean Hughes finally gave the Music and Theatre programs separate budget numbers. For decades, the only oversight of the Performing Arts budget provided by the Unit Chair was to ensure that it was not over spent.

### **Communication and the Arts: early 1990s**

- Graphic Communication changed to Integrated Communication (major emphasis only, minor continues as Graphic Communication): 1994
- Musical Theatre added as interdisciplinary major emphasis: 1992

### **Communication and the Arts: late 1990s**

- Communication Processes program and many of the faculty moved to Information and Computing Sciences: 1996. Communication Processes became an interdisciplinary major in 2000

### **Comprehensive Program Evaluation (CAPE): 1995-1996**

The Arts section of the CAPE report states, "I would like to preface this document with thoughts about the relationship of the programs throughout Communication and the Arts (COA) and the related disciplines. These are perhaps the most interdisciplinary disciplines I have ever come across."

The CAPE recommendations included under "Areas of Concern: 1. *Relationship of emphases within Communication and the Arts and Communication Processes and student demand for emphases.* The Committee believes that Communication and the Arts must examine its curriculum and several areas of emphasis to achieve greater clarity of mission and learning outcomes, reduce potential duplication or overlap, and lower the number of credits required for some emphases. The Committee sees a particular need for COA, in conjunction with Communication Processes, to investigate the possibility of a streamlining and/or reorganizing COA emphases in integrated communications, broad-field communications and science communication and to determine the enrollment demand that exists for each."

As a result of the above recommendations the following programmatic changes were made.

- Integrated Communication changed to Communication Arts: 1997
- Aesthetic Awareness major emphasis dropped: 1997
- Broad-Field Communications major emphasis dropped: 1997
- Communication Processes program and many of the faculty moved to Information Sciences to form Information and Computing Sciences
- Musical Theatre major changed to disciplinary emphasis within the Theatre program: 1997. CAPE recommended examination of majors with more than 50 credits, the Musical Theatre emphasis was 81. The music and theatre faculty could not agree on a satisfactory curriculum of fewer credits and as a result the Theatre program determined it was going to be a part of their program.
- Science Communication emphasis dropped: 1998; emphasis was previously dropped by Natural and Applied Sciences.
- Performing Arts budget "pay back" was eliminated.

### **Comprehensive Academic Program Evaluation II (CAPE II): 1997**

- Music discipline received an additional faculty FTE for voice instruction
- Remaining faculty FTE, with the exception of one FTE, moved to ICS (Goff, Abbott, and Matter).

### **Communication and the Arts:**

- Aesthetic Awareness minor dropped: 1999
- Arts & Society interdisciplinary minor added: 2000
- Arts Management interdisciplinary minor added: 2000

### **Communication and the Arts:**

- Arts & Society minor emphasis dropped: 2004
- Environmental Design dropped as major emphasis by Urban and Regional Studies: 2006

### **Arts and Visual Design: name changed in 2008**

In 2007 Communication Processes changed their name to Communications. As a result of that decision and the past 15 years of changes to the COA curriculum, COA became AVD.

- Arts Management: new interdisciplinary major: 2008
- Communication Arts changed to Design Arts: 2007. As a result of URS dropping the Environmental Design emphasis, the new Design Arts program offers students a choice in upper level core courses to focus on Graphic Communication or Environmental Design.
- Design Arts becomes interdisciplinary major: 2008 (no longer emphasis)

### **Support documentation**

AVD currently houses Art, Arts Management, Design Arts, Music and Theatre. The AVD faculty propose a restructuring of our unit into three budgetary units: AVD (containing Art, Arts Management, and Design Arts), and stand alone units in Music and Theatre & Dance. This structure will benefit both students and faculty, as detailed in the rationales spelled out below under Budget, Curriculum, Personnel, Advocacy, Reporting and Student Learning Experience.

#### **Budget:**

AVD currently has a budget that is divided among the disciplines and Design Arts. The budget has been split this way for several years. A portion of the budget is administrative, which is used for copying, mailing, phone lines, office supplies and discretionary funds administered by the AVD chair. A split of the unit would create very little difference in the budget, other than dividing up the administrative portion of the budget. It will most likely create more work for the Academic Department Associate who will have more budgets to reconcile, however, after the initial set up of new individual budgets the additional work will be minimal.

#### **Curriculum:**

A split of AVD/Music/Theatre would not require any curricular changes. The courses that are currently AVD courses could remain listed as AVD courses, or those interdisciplinary courses could be moved to the discipline where they most appropriately fit.

#### **Personnel:**

There are 27 tenured or tenure track faculty, six academic staff and one classified staff member in AVD. The large number of faculty in our unit makes the review process cumbersome and every other year when we do a review of all faculty it is a huge time commitment. The burdensome nature of reviews in our unit is a contributing factor in the decision to split the unit. In addition, the current structure requires reviewing colleagues in a number of very different disciplines with dissimilar criteria, where Unit Executive Committee members often have no expertise. After a

split the units would be reviewing much smaller numbers of faculty, thus giving each unit more time to conduct other important business related to the running of the unit.

There are two academic staff members whose regular duties include work for both the Music and Theatre programs. Neither of their positions would change. There is also a Music faculty member who teaches a small portion of her load for the Theatre program, whose load will not change either. The Music and Theatre programs will continue to have shared staff and facilities.

#### Advocacy:

Advocacy is a large reason for reorganizing the unit, as many AVD faculty believe they'll be better able to advocate for the needs of their program as individual units. The programs within AVD each have unique needs, and different systems of operations. Even though the programs are all within the "arts" they have very different facilities, capital equipment, and how they use those facilities and equipment. Although Music and Theatre are both "Performing Arts," the laboratories, rehearsal and production processes, use of guest artists, and need to generate substantial income for annual production costs differ significantly. Another example is the way in which unmet needs are funded. Currently when a piece of capital equipment is needed it gets placed on the Lab Mod list along with all of the other items in AVD. It may only be ranked second in Theatre for example, but may be ranked as tenth on the list of AVD priorities due to the large number of requests within the unit and the competing requests from other disciplines.

#### Reporting:

The reporting lines would be the only significant change were AVD to split up. Instead of all information, forms, changes, etc. being routed through the AVD chair, the Music Unit and Theatre Units would report directly to the Dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences, the same as all of the other LAS units.

#### Student Learning Experience:

Faculty in AVD have some of the highest student contact hours on campus. Art faculty, for example, who teach three studio courses a semester are in class for 13.5 hours per week, while faculty in other areas of campus who are teaching three lecture courses are in class for eight hours a week. While Music faculty have applied lessons with individual students up to 23 hours per week in addition to the ensembles and lecture courses they conduct/teach and Theatre faculty have a production component of their teaching load averaging well over 200 contact hours per semester. In addition to the time spent in class, the faculty do all of the things that other faculty on campus are expected to do, such as individualized instruction (independent studies, internships, research projects, senior show supervision, Honors in the Major projects, etc.) advising, grading, course prep and writing recommendation letters, and they also have a studio space and capital equipment to maintain. This is significant because if AVD reorganizes into three separate units, the time that was previously spent on administrative work for a large and cumbersome unit could be better spent on the teaching related activities. Faculty will have more time for individualized instruction, working on the recruitment and retention of students, taking part in faculty development activities, and advocating to strengthen the academic program. A reorganization of AVD will have a positive impact on the overall student learning experience.

Conclusion: In sum, the current size of the unit constitutes an "anti-economy of scale," in which the number and complexity of budgets, facilities, curricula, personnel, and needs undermines the faculty's ability to efficiently deliver instruction and develop programs.

# **New Unit in Theatre and Dance**

## **Reporting-**

The Theatre and Dance Chair will report directly to the Dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences.

## **Personnel-**

### **Faculty**

Professor Jeffrey Entwistle

Professor Laura Riddle

Associate Professor R. Michael Ingraham

Associate Professor Kaoime Malloy

Associate Professor John Mariano

Assistant Professor Courtney Sherman - joint appointment with Music

Lecturer Denise Carlson-Gardner

### **Staff**

Assistant Technical Director David Cook

Academic Department Associate Janet Gomez

Senior Administrative Specialist Linda Parins

### **Administrative Responsibility-**

Current and projected (post reorganization) administrative reassignments for AVD. The credit and summer salary totals remain the same.

### **Current**

AVD Chair – 12 credits & 2/9th summer salary

AVD Vice Chair – 3 credits & 1/9th summer salary

Art Chair - 6 credits Music Chair- 6 credits Theatre Chair – 3 credits

Theatre Managing Director- 3 credits

Design Arts Coordinator- 3 credits

Arts Management Coordinator- 3 credits

### **After the split**

AVD Chair – 9 credits & 1/9th summer salary

Art Chair - 6 credits

Music Chair- 9 credits & 1/9th summer salary

Theatre Chair – 6 credits & 1/9th summer salary

Theatre Managing Director- 3 credits

Design Arts Coordinator- 3 credits

Arts Management Coordinator- 3 credits

The Theatre and Dance chair will be responsible for all administrative work associated with the unit. This work includes, but is not limited to:

Administrative -The chair holds regular meetings with the executive committee of the unit. The unit chair acts as an advocate for the unit. The chair answers all requests from the Dean and Associate Dean

of LAS regarding Timetable, seats for General Education, and summer and winterim courses, as well as attending all LAS Unit Chairs meetings. The chair works with the Dean to allocate office space, CIT to upgrade or maintain computer workstations, and the ADA to order keys, nameplates, etc. for new employees.

**Budget-**The chair submits budget requests to the Dean of LAS, maintains the unit budgets including Supplies and Equipment Budget, Performing Arts Budget, two 136 Accounts, a 233 Account, LTE Budget, Special Course Fee Budget, LAB Mod Proposals, One-time Funds, End of year spending and any other special requests. The chair signs off on all travel requests, use of fleet vehicles and payments to individuals.

**Personnel -**The chair administers the review and promotion processes for all faculty and staff in the unit, including shared review of David Cook, Janet Gomez and Linda Parins. The chair maintains credit loads for faculty and signs timesheets for staff. The chair makes provisional instruction requests to the Dean and submits ad hoc requests as needed.

**Curriculum -**The chair fills out forms, provides documentation and signs off on all curricular change forms for the unit, maintains catalog copy and works with the registrar to insure all information related to the academic program is correct. The chair approves all independent studies and internships.

**Facilities -**The chair has oversight responsibility for facilities and equipment modernization and maintenance. The chair coordinates the performance calendar with the WCPA staff, the Music Chair and the appropriate faculty and staff.

### **Interdisciplinarity-**

"Performance studies will be presented as an interdisciplinary practice which, on the one hand, can be applied as a method with which to interrogate and understand social and cultural processes, incorporating modes of enquiry related to such fields as ethnography, psychoanalysis, philosophy, politics and geography. On the other it encompasses 'performance' as a vital artistic phenomenon – taking a whole range of singular and hybrid forms- which has a direct correlation with contemporary everyday life and which offers, *in itself*, a means of cultural critique"

Reinvention Center for Undergraduate Research, Oxford Brooks, UK

In addressing the UW-Green Bay select mission of providing students with an interdisciplinary, problem focused educational experience, interdisciplinary programs may be structured with faculty/scholars from an array of academic fields or perspectives intended to address social, scientific, or cultural "problems of the day." That type of interdisciplinary structure is perfectly aligned with the Production program in Theatre and Dance. Our "problem" is the collaborative creation and presentation of theatrical productions that will resonate with our audience. Each academic year the Theatre program selects four diverse Mainstage productions to be fully realized as live performances for an audience comprised of members of the Green Bay and University communities. It is our creative problem to develop for each production an original solution to questions regarding playwright intent, content, style, theme and meaning for both theatre artists and audiences. Interdisciplinary curriculum at UW Green Bay has also been successfully addressed through the team teaching of interdisciplinary curriculum. Problem focused team teaching and learning is practiced with the realization of each Theatre production.

As an interdisciplinary collaborative art form, the study of Theatre is further enhanced by its presence within a liberal arts curriculum where virtually every subject studied will come to bear in the individuals' understanding of the myriad of concepts encountered in Theatre classes, if not directly applicable to a specific production. Working theatre artists at their best should be well-educated

individuals capable of critical and creative thinking and human insight that allow a theatrical production to communicate with an audience on many levels of understanding and meaning. Our colleagues throughout the campus have been generous collaborators, contributing scholarly research and expertise as well as motivation and resources for ambitious projects that relate to the needs of the larger Green Bay Community such as *The Wit Collaborative*.

Core class work in Theatre includes specific competencies and knowledge that emphasize the theatre literary cannon and the role of theatre in society throughout human history. All majors are guided through the progressive development of skills in script analysis, performance technique and character analysis, scenery and costume construction, dance technique and basic concepts of design. The development of strong skills in communication (written, oral, interpersonal and visual) is an integral part of the ongoing education that will enable students to apply their skills in an interdisciplinary collaborative production format. The production related curriculum is structured to increase the level of student involvement and responsibility throughout their time in the program with additional opportunities for motivated students to model the process in student directed and designed productions and staged readings guided by faculty mentors.

Robert L. Benedetti author of *The Director at Work* observes, "Every show, every cast, theatre and audience presents a different set of problems; solutions to these problems may work in one instance but not in another." The play is the start, the spine or foundation for a show, but it is not a set of instructions for its presentation. By continuing to work professionally and enlisting the services and talents of guest artists, we continue to experiment with the very nature of our creative process. Projects can vary greatly in approach and presentation as we seek to explore possibilities that best serve the play.

In order to fully realize a production that can be shared with a specific audience at this specific time, many diverse questions need to be answered. Answers must be found to address content, theme, message and style. Determining the motivation of the playwright is critically important, as is determining the motivation of each character in the play. Decisions must be made regarding tempo, dynamics and physical relationships. How the performance space is to be configured and used and its relationship to the audience must be carefully considered along with the impact of line, color, texture and mass on the final product. Each character's social status, personality and function in the play is considered when determining how he or she is to be attired. The quality of light, its composition and changes must be well thought-out, along with the aural contents of the performance environment.

Determining the answers to the script's questions is merely a start. The realization of the objects that bring those answers to life requires additional artisans and crafts people, with specific skills that include drafting, engineering, carpentry, painting, cutting, draping, patterning, stitching, sculpting and metal work. The entire production process is coordinated by collaborators who concentrate on the logistics of the endeavor. Resource management, budget, workflow, scheduling, communication, training, risk assessment and audience services are a few of the areas that require oversight. All the people involved in the production process, including the audience, actively contribute to a unique live event and shared experience.

**Faculty Senate Old Business 4(d)**

# New Unit in Music

## Reporting

The Music chair will report directly to the Dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences.

## Personnel

### Faculty

Professor Cheryl Grosso  
 Associate Professor Kevin Collins  
 Associate Professor Mark Kiehn\*\*  
 Associate Professor Sarah Meredith Livingston  
 Associate Professor John Salerno  
 Assistant Professor Adam Gaines\*  
 Assistant Professor Eric Hansen\*  
 Assistant Professor Michelle McQuade Dewhirst  
 Assistant Professor Randy Meder\*  
 Assistant Professor David Severtson  
 Assistant Professor Courtney Sherman

### Staff

Assistant Technical Director David Cook  
 Academic Department Associate Janet Gomez Senior  
 Administrative Specialist Linda Parins

\*Faculty who are being reviewed for promotion this academic year.

\*\*Faculty with non-voting status in the new Unit.

## Administrative Structure

Current and projected (post reorganization) administrative reassignments for AVD. The credit and summer salary totals remain the same.

<b>Current</b>	<b>9-month</b>	<b>Summer</b>	<b>Projected</b>	<b>9-month</b>	<b>Summer</b>
AVO Chair	12 credits	2/9 <sup>th</sup> salary	AVO Chair	9 credits	salary
AVO Vice Chair	3 credits	1/9 <sup>th</sup> salary			
Art Chair	6 credits		Art Chair	6 credits	
<b>Music Chair</b>	<b>6 credits</b>		<b>Music Chair</b>	<b>9 credits</b>	<b>1/9th salary</b>
Theatre Chair	3 credits		Theatre Chair	6 credits	1/9th salary
Theatre Managing Director	3 credits		Theatre Managing Director	3 credits	
Design Arts Coordinator	3 credits		Design Arts Coordinator	3 credits	
Arts Management Coordinator	3 credits		Arts Management Coordinator	3 credits	
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>39 credits</b>	<b>3/9 ths</b>		<b>39 credits</b>	<b>3/9 ths</b>

## Responsibilities of Music Unit Chair

### Administrative

- Function as the chief executive of the Unit and is responsible for all administrative work associated with the unit as defined in the Faculty Handbook.

- Serve as the official channel of communication for all matters affecting the Unit with University administrators and other officials or Units and represents the Unit at LAS Chairs meetings.
- Call meetings of the Unit and of the Executive Committee and preside over meetings.
- Has charge of all official correspondence of the Music Unit in matters of administrative mandates.
- Representative to National Association of Schools of Music including attendance at meetings, ensures compliance with ethical, operational, and curricular standards, completes annual HEADS report, and leads re-accreditation team.
- Representative to Association of Wisconsin College and University Music Administrators (AWCUMA): attend meetings as needed, respond to calls for shared information, and report relevant issues to the music faculty and Dean as appropriate.
- Submit through the appropriate channels proposed curricular changes.
- Manages facilities and equipment including lab modernization and remodeling projects.
- Public relations contact for prospective students and their parents, transfer students, the general public and local media and liaison with outside organizations.
- Agent for conflict resolution at the Unit level.
- Program representative for Campus Preview Days.
- Develop and coordinate recruiting activities for the Discipline and monitor and assess efforts and marketing approaches
- Has charge of all official correspondence of program in matters regarding catalog copy, SIS reports, web site information, and recruiting publications.
- Work with Scholarship and Admissions Coordinator to monitor and assess efforts and results.
- The chair works with the Dean to allocate office space, CIT to upgrade or maintain computer workstations, and the ADA to order keys, nameplates, etc. for new employees.

### **Budget**

- Submits annual budget request to the Dean of LAS.
- Develops and maintains the Unit budgets including Supplies and Equipment Budget, Performing Arts Budget, Weidner Center Usage Budget, three 136 Accounts, Music Fest Budget, Special Course Fee Budget, LAB Mod Proposals, One-time Funds, End of year spending and any other special requests.
- Approval of all travel requests, use of fleet vehicles and payments to individuals.

### **Personnel**

- Has charge of all official correspondence of the Music Unit in matters of personnel proceedings.
- Develops and assigns faculty loads, including ad hoc instructors.
- The chair administers the review and promotion processes for all in the unit.
- The Music chair will coordinate with the Theatre chair the shared reviews of Assistant Technical Director (David Cook) and Senior Administrative Specialist (Linda Parins).
- The Music chair will coordinate with the AVD and Theatre chairs the shared review of Program Assistant (Janet Gomez).
- The chair makes provisional instruction requests to the Dean and submits ad hoc requests to hire ad hoc faculty as needed.

### **Curriculum**

- Coordinates timetable and monitors course periodicity in consultation with the Chair of Education.
- Provides documentation and signs off on all curricular change forms for the unit.
- Maintains catalog copy and works with the registrar to insure all information on SIS related to the 8 emphases within the academic program are correct.

- Approves all independent studies and internships.
- Provides adequate seats for General Education students.
- Solicits and coordinates with the Associate Dean of LAS summer course work.

### **Facilities & Equipment**

- Responsible for all official correspondence about facilities utilized by the music program.
- Responsible to communicate facility and equipment needs to the administration and coordinate maintenance and repairs.
- Coordinate the annual performance calendar with the WPAC staff and Theatre chair.

### **Interdisciplinarity**

The question of how the new unit will be interdisciplinary has been asked by members of AVO, the Dean, and the AAC and the Personnel Council. While problem solving and critical thinking are essential criteria in music courses, students must also be knowledgeable about world history and other arts to effectively interpret and teach musical styles that are centuries old. The new unit in Music would like to be considered a professional program. The music program's professional degree, the Bachelor of Music, is at the heart of our program. The University recognizes this and in the undergraduate catalog is listed as one of the three professional degrees that comprise a professional degree program. Please refer to: <http://www.uwgb.edu/catalog/undrgrad/components.htm>

The music program is accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM), which includes an accredited professional degree: the Bachelor of Music degree. This degree was approved more than 15 years ago by the campus and the UW System. Music is the only arts program at UW Green Bay that has a professional degree and one of only three undergraduate professional degrees offered at UW Green Bay; the other two are the BSN and BSW. NASM requires that, "students enrolled in professional undergraduate degrees in music are expected to develop the knowledge, skills concepts, and sensitivities essential to the professional life of the musician. To fulfill various professional responsibilities, the musician must exhibit not only technical competence, but also broad knowledge of music and music literature, the ability to integrate musical knowledge and skills, sensitivity to musical styles, and an insight into the role of music in intellectual and cultural life. Upon completion of any specific professional undergraduate degree program: 1. Students must demonstrate achievement of professional, entry-level competence in the major area, including significant technical mastery, capability to produce work and solve professional problems independently, and a coherent set of artistic/intellectual goals that are evident in their work. A senior project of presentation in the major area is required in many concentrations, and strongly recommended for all others. 2. Students are expected to have the ability to form and defend value judgments about music, and to communicate musical ideas, concepts, and requirements to professionals and laypersons related to the practice of the major field."

Much like the Business Administration program housing a disciplinary program in Accounting, the Music program, in addition to offering a professional degree program, also offers the Bachelor of Arts degree for students seeking a non-professional degree. Students pursuing the B.A. with a major in music must also complete a minor, much like students in the Business and Education majors and, in addition, are required by NASM to complete 66 credits outside of music. Much like the faculty of UW Green Bay's other professional programs, the faculty in the music program have terminal degrees in the same general field with different areas of specialty.

The music program goes through the reaccreditation process every 10 years by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM). The next on-site reaccreditation visit is scheduled for fall 2012. The music program is preparing its self-study report for reaccreditation this year, 2011-2012.

**AAC/PC joint meeting to review forms K from AVD Minutes May 4, 2011**

Attending: AAC members Steve Dutch(chair), Christine Style, Dennis Lorenz, Mimi Kubsch, Woo Jeon, Tim Sewall. PC Members Alison Gates (chair), Craig Hanke, Andrew Kersten, Robert Nagy. (Excused, Dean VonDras, Personnel Council)

A motion was made by Prof. Style, seconded by Prof. Nagy to approve the Form K to establish a new unit in Theatre.

Discussion followed. The joint committees agreed that it would be in the best interest of Theatre to have very clearly defined understanding with the Dean of reporting, faculty lines, and administrative responsibility as they move from a Program to a Budgetary Unit. Assoc. Provost Sewall also recommends that the proposal be amended to include a list of the Founding Members of the new unit, and an articulation of the role of the Unit Chair (including course release, summer stipends, etc.) before going to Senate. Dr. Kersten indicated that detail on how the shared academic staff positions would operate is also an area where further explanation would be beneficial. Dr. Lorenz raised a question of economies of scale- what would be lost to AVD. Prof. Style and Prof. Gates assured him that AVD was aware that it would lose Theatre's resources with the loss of Theatre, but since at this point so few of those physical or financial resources are shared within the current structure of AVD, we assume it to be a zero-sum loss in the end.

The vote was called and the Joint Councils passed the motion to approve Form K, Establishment of a new Unit in Theater unanimously.

A motion was then made by Prof. Kersten, seconded by Prof. Kubsch to approve the Form K to establish a new unit in Music.

Discussion followed. Prof. Dutch felt the proposal from Music was the weaker of the two proposals, though he conceded that the restructuring of the current AVD unit into three was very sensible. The Music proposal did not make as strong a case for interdisciplinarity in the eyes of the Joint Councils- presumably because they do not have the same technical component as Theatre, are less likely to engage in psychological analysis of characters, and engage in less obvious text analyses. Gates and Style argued that the Music Faculty may not agree with that analysis of their pedagogy and the Joint Councils did agree that further information from Music would be very helpful; a clarification of how Music sees itself as a Unit would be in order. A review of the faculty in Music yielded some discussion of the formation of the new Executive Committee as currently Music only has 4 tenured members, and Mark Kiehn would very likely have to be encouraged to serve as a guest member until another Music faculty is tenured. Some personnel changes were suggested: the adding of Professor Rosewall was discussed, and rejected as providing enough interdisciplinarity to make the question moot. Prof. Dutch briefly pondered the merging of Music and Dance, but Prof. Sewall and the representatives from AVD indicated that was not a viable option. It was agreed that Music should answer very specifically the same questions asked of Theatre in terms of faculty lines, administrative structure, the transition of Program to Unit Chair, as well as the issue of how their curriculum is seen in light of interdisciplinarity. A vote was called, and the motion passed: 8 yes (Hanke, Gates, Style, Kersten, Nagy, Lorenz, Kubsch, Jeon) and one no (Dutch).

Thus concluded the business of the Joint Councils and the Personnel Council members were adjourned.

**Faculty Senate Old Business 4(e)**

# **Proposal to Eliminate Academic Staff Legislative Committee and Faculty Senate Standing Legislative Affairs Committee and Create a Joint Committee on Legislative Affairs**

## **From Academic Staff Handbook**

### **Article IV E. ~~Legislative Committee~~**

- ~~1) Membership—The Academic Staff Legislative Committee, hereafter referred to as the Legislative Committee, shall consist of three Academic Staff members appointed by the Academic Staff Committee. The Leadership and Involvement Committee shall present candidates to the Academic Staff Committee for available positions and shall strive for broad representation of the campus community when preparing the slate of candidates.~~
- ~~2) Appointment—The members serve staggered two-year terms.~~
- ~~3) Responsibilities—
  - a) To monitor legislative and Board of Regents activities which may affect the university at large and the academic staff in particular.
  - b) To monitor the progression of legislative and/or Board of Regents policies of specific concern to academic staff and recommend appropriate action to the Committee.
  - c) To collaborate as appropriate with the University government affairs officer to assist in the advancement of legislative agendas of benefit to UW Green Bay and the UW System.~~

## **From Faculty Handbook**

### **~~Faculty Senate Standing Legislative Affairs Committee~~**

- ~~1. The Legislative Affairs Committee is composed of two members of the Faculty Senate and one non-Senator, all appointed by the University Committee.~~
- ~~2. The Committee shall monitor actions of the Legislature as they pertain to concerns of our faculty and meet, as appropriate, with legislators for the purpose of seeking and providing relevant information of interest to the Faculty.~~
- ~~3. The Committee will work in concert with the parallel bodies of the Academic Staff and Student Government as well as work closely with and advise the Administration in its dealings with the Legislature.~~

## **Proposed Language for Both Handbooks**

### **Joint Committee on Legislative Affairs**

1. Membership - The Legislative Joint Committee is composed of three members of the Academic Staff, selected by the Academic Staff Committee on the recommendation of the Academic Staff Leadership and Involvement Committee, and three members of the Faculty, appointed by the University Committee on the recommendation of the Committee on Committees and Nominations. Two of the Faculty members must be members of the Faculty Senate and one must be a non-Senator. The University's Legislative liaison serves as an *ex officio* voting member.
2. Terms - Members of the Legislative Joint Committee serve two-year staggered terms.
3. Responsibilities -
  - a. To monitor legislative and Board of Regents activities of concern to faculty and staff.
  - b. To advise and collaborate with Administration efforts to advance the interests of UW-Green Bay and its faculty and staff.
  - c. To report as appropriate to governance bodies and annually to the university through the SOFAS office.

**Faculty Senate New Business 5(a)**

## **Proposal to Convert the Library and Instructional Technology Committee to a Joint Governance Committee**

Current language (below) in the Faculty Handbook for this committee would be unchanged. Only its status would change from an elected faculty committee to a joint governance committee.

### 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 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.
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. The Associate Provost for Information Services and the Director of the Cofrin Library are *ex officio* (non-voting) members of the Committee.
3. The Committee represents the Faculty and Academic Staff in making recommendations on policy matters pertaining to all units which are under the direction of the Chief Information Officer and University Librarian.

**Faculty Senate New Business 5(b)**

## **Proposal to Convert the Committee on Awards and Recognition to a Joint Governance Committee**

Current language (below) in the Faculty Handbook for this committee would be unchanged. Only its status would change from an elected faculty committee to a joint governance committee.

### 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 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 5(c)**

## **Report to the Faculty Senate of the Academic Affairs Council**

Two curricular actions were considered

1. CLAS 70 eliminated some minor typographical errors in catalog copy in the Philosophy major. Kaoime Malloy moved approval, Woo Jeon seconded, and the motion passed 5-0.
2. Creation of PEA 407, Service in the Public Sector. Kaoime Malloy moved approval, Mimi Kubsch seconded, and the motion passed 5-0.

Steve Dutch moved to approve the suggested UWGB definition of a credit hour and Mimi Kubsch seconded. After extensive discussion, the motion **failed** by a vote of 0 aye, 5 nay.

Principal problems noted were:

- The document is confusing and poorly written. There is no such thing as “a semester of credit.” A credit represents approximately 45 hours of academic work, which may be performed over 15 weeks during a regular semester, or as little as four weeks during the summer session, or even a few days in the case of a field trip travel course or a language immersion course.
- The statements on graduate and undergraduate credit are confusing. Why have two paragraphs on graduate credit, stating slightly different things? We suggest that the phrase “undergraduate or graduate credit” be changed simply to “undergraduate credit,” and that the next paragraph emphasize that graduate credits are expected to require a higher level of academic rigor than undergraduate credits. A graduate student might easily take less time to complete an advanced assignment than an undergraduate might take to complete a much simpler one.
- The examples providing specific examples of work load, and the requirement to state anticipated work load on syllabi, were described as “a lawsuit waiting to happen.” Two major potential problems with providing quantitative statements are:
  - Students might interpret an explicit statement of anticipated work load as a guarantee that work load will not exceed that amount.
  - Students might interpret an explicit statement of anticipated work load as a guarantee that performing the stated number of hours of work will result in a specific grade.
- The paragraph “All grades for academic work must be based on the quality of the work submitted, not on hours of effort” is an ill-defined standard. It would be better to say that grades are based on meeting the course standards, and that hours of effort do not guarantee any particular grade. Some students can meet the standards of a course with fewer than two hours of outside study per week, whereas others require more.
- In some courses, for example, the performing arts, it is simply impossible to specify an anticipated work load. When preparing a theater production, the work is done when it is done. An ambitious or technically novel production may not permit any statement of anticipated work load beyond “a lot.”

- The Council noted that the Federal standards include the generally accepted work load for a credit hour and provide a good degree of flexibility in interpretation. The attempt to go beyond that wording strikes the Council as possibly limiting flexibility for no clearly defined reason.

Steve Dutch then moved, and Dean VonDras seconded, the following motion: “The Academic Affairs Council endorses the Federal definition of a credit, and recommends that the Federal standard be quoted whenever there is a need for an explicit definition of a credit.” The motion passed 5 aye, 0 nay.