

AGENDA

UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 3

Wednesday, November 14, 2007, 3:00 p.m.

Alumni Rooms AB, University Union

Presiding Officer: Kevin Roeder, Speaker

Parliamentarian: Professor Clifford F. Abbott

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 2, October 17, 2007 [page 2]

3. CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

4. CONTINUING BUSINESS

- a. Code Changes to UWGB Chapter 53 and Chapter 54 (second reading) [page 5]
Presented by Professor Dean VonDras

5. NEW BUSINESS

- a. Resolution on the Granting of Degrees [page 8]
- b. Requests for future business

6. PROVOST'S REPORT

7. COMMITTEE REPORTS

- a. Senate Committee on Planning and Budget
Presented by Professor Timothy Meyer

8. UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE REPORT

Presented by Professor Dean VonDras, Chair

9. ADJOURNMENT

MINUTES 2007-2008
UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 2

Wednesday, October 17, 2007
Phoenix Room C, University Union

Presiding Officer: Kevin Roeder (SOCW-UC), Speaker
Parliamentarian: Clifford Abbott, Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

PRESENT: Lucy Arendt (BUA), Scott Ashmann (EDU), Kathleen Burns (HUD), Matthew Dornbush (NAS), Stefan Hall (HUS), Sue Hammersmith (Provost, *ex officio*), Catherine Henze (HUS), Curt Heuer (AVD), Tian-you Hu (NAS), Ann Kok (SOCW), Vladimir Kurenok (NAS), Pao Lor (EDU), Kaoime Malloy (AVD), Daniel Meinhardt (HUB), Steven Meyer (NAS-UC), Tim Meyer (ICS), Kim Nielsen (SCD), Illene Noppe (HUD-UC), Terence O'Grady (AVD-UC), Debra Pearson (HUB), Laura Riddle (AVD-UC), Ellen Rosewall (AVD), Meir Russ (BUA), Denise Scheberle (PEA), David Voelker (HUS), Dean VonDras (HUD-UC), Jill White (HUD)

NOT PRESENT: Susan Gallagher-Lepak (NUR), Thomas Nesslein (URS), Bruce Shepard (Chancellor, *ex officio*)

REPRESENTATIVES: Ricky Staley (Student Government)

GUESTS: Associate Provost Tim Sewall, Dean Fritz Erikson, Professor Steve Dutch, Assistant Chancellor Steve Swan

1. Call to Order. With a quorum present, Speaker Roeder called the Senate to order at 3:05 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes of UW-Green Bay Faculty Senate Meeting No. 1, September 19, 2007. On a motion by Senator Steve Meyer (second by Senator O'Grady) the minutes were approved unanimously.

3. Chancellor's Report. The Chancellor being somewhere in the skies over the heartland, his report was given by a tag team of Provost Hammersmith and Assistant Chancellor Swan. The Provost reported on the state budget, details of which are likely to change by the time these minutes are written, and even more likely to have changed by the time they are approved. The Chancellor will be communicating our options through a later e-mail. Assistant Chancellor Swan talked about the capital campaign, trends, and the general process of cultivating relationships with potential donors. Aside from the successes for building projects, he pointed to support for an endowed chair, three professorships, graduate assistants, student scholarships, and faculty development funds. When asked about a closing date for the campaign, he said the date was not set but he guessed about a couple of years more would do it.

4. New Business

a. Code Changes to Chapter 54 (first reading). University Chair VonDras provided background and identified the intent of the change in three parts:

- to clarify the relation of the Academic Affairs Council and the General Education Council to the Faculty and the Faculty Senate
- to clarify that the intent of "recommendation" in the current language should really be approval
- to lay out a process of appeal of AAC decisions.

The Senators came up with several questions: why is there not an appeal process for decisions by the General Education Council; what happens to curricular modifications the AAC typically does not see; shouldn't the word "recommendation" in the last sentence of 54.03 A(2) be changed to "decision" to be consistent (probably yes); what decision latitude is left for the Deans and Provost (not much); will the Senate end up reviewing every course proposal (no); and how frequently might the appeal process be used (rarely)? The Provost offered her opinion that this was a good change. The issue will return, probably slightly revised, for a second reading and vote at the next Senate meeting.

b. Requests for future business. There were none.

5. Provost's Report A written version had been circulated earlier. The Provost called attention to two attachments. One listed a slightly revised version of the general education humanities requirements passed by the Senate last spring. The revisions were fairly modest and done in consultation with the GEC and HUS chair. The Provost has now approved the changes. The other attachment was from the annual report of the Institutional Assessment Committee on the evaluation of teaching. This was provided not at this point as an action item, but as possible background material for the Open Forum later in the meeting. There were no questions from Senators.

6. University Committee Report UC Chair VonDras noted the following items that the UC has been working on:

- the code change brought before the Senate today
- the approval of faculty status for Sherri Urcavich
- discussions with Randy Christopherson on campus safety and traffic patterns
- providing specific charges to the Faculty Senate Committee on Planning and Budget
 - the Chair (John Katers) and other members shall represent the UC Chair on the University Planning Committee
 - the FSPBC shall represent the Senate in discussing the budget and planning process with the administration
 - the FSPBC shall represent the Senate in understanding the impact of the Growth Initiative on general education programs across campus
 - the FSPBC shall be involved in the university web page which communicates budget information to the larger community
 - the FSPBC shall provide a monthly report to the Faculty Senate.
- discussion of assessing teaching
- responding to UW-System inquiries about sick leave issues

7. Open Forum The issue was the CCQ as a method of evaluating teaching effectiveness. The following are some points made during the discussion. The CCQ does not encourage comments as the HUS instrument does, and without those comments it is difficult for instructors to learn how to improve teaching. The aspiration to have a single standard for the diversity of courses may not be reasonable. Students may not understand the function of the CCQ and may not be taking it seriously. Faculty may not understand the function of the CCQ and may be giving it too much weight. We may not be making the CCQ data relative to our expectations for different courses. There is little agreement on what the CCQ is actually measuring either in its specific questions or overall. It measures popularity. It may be measuring first impressions. A lot of research supports a gender bias against women in such standardized forms. It is not clear the ratings are judging the course or the instructor. The Speaker invited comments from the representative from student government, Ricky Staley, who offered that students generally don't take the forms very seriously unless they feel passionate (either negatively or positively) about a course and they generally don't like standardized forms. Personalized questions are more likely to get more serious responses. The Speaker also invited Professor Dutch, chair of the Institutional Assessment Committee, to comment. He revealed the Committee's

plan to pilot an instrument developed at Rutgers. He shared the Committee's thinking that standardized forms are blunt instruments that need to be supplemented with other evidence such as course materials, student comments, and collegial visits to the classroom.

9. Adjournment Speaker Roeder wrapped up the meeting without objection and adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

Note: Two items were distributed by the Provost's office to the Senators. They were not part of the agenda and were not mentioned during the meeting. One was a page of information about the upcoming visit from the Higher Learning Commission as part of the University's reaccreditation efforts. The other was a draft report entitled "The Voluntary System of Accountability" from several national organizations of public universities.

Respectfully submitted,

Clifford Abbott
Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

PROPOSED CODE CHANGES

FACULTY HANDBOOK, CHAPTER 53 AND 54

Please note that the proposed changes are marked by strikethroughs and bold font.

53.11 GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

A. General Education Programs. General Education Programs consist of those courses and programs developed to satisfy or support the Breadth, Ethnic Studies, Other Culture, and All-University Proficiency Requirements.

B. Associate Provost for Academic Affairs. The Associate Provost for Academic Affairs is appointed by the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs using the codified Search and Screen Procedures for Administrative Appointments. The Associate Provost is a member of the Office of the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

C. Faculty. The General Education faculty includes all members of the Faculty of the University. For purposes of governance of General Education, the faculty includes four groups: the Humanities and Fine Arts Domain, which includes Humanistic Studies, ~~Communication and the Arts~~ **Arts and Visual Design**, half from Information and Computing Science; the Natural Sciences Domain, which includes Human Biology, Natural and Applied Sciences, and half from Information and Computing Science; the Social Sciences Domain, which includes Human Development, Social Change and Development, Urban and Regional Studies, and Public and Environmental Affairs; the Professional Programs, which include Business Administration, Education, Nursing, Physical Education, and Social Work. For purposes of General Education governance, faculty members may vote in each group to which they belong by these definitions.

D. General Education Council. The General Education Council will advise ~~the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and the appropriate Dean(s) through the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs~~ **the Faculty Senate** on all matters pertaining to General Education, including but not limited to courses appropriate to the General Education Curriculum.

E. Curriculum Review. Course proposals to fulfill General Education requirements will be approved by interdisciplinary units in the usual manner. Such units may collaborate in any manner they see fit in developing course proposals. The Council shall determine and regularly review the suitability of any course for adoption or continuation as a General Education course, and so advise the ~~Provost/Vice Chancellor and appropriate Dean(s) through the Associate Provost~~ **Faculty Senate**. **The Faculty Senate will publish all curricular decisions made by the General Education Council in the minutes of its monthly meetings and forward them along with copies of all official Academic Affairs Council correspondence to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.**

In a case where the General Education Council does not approve a course for adoption or continuation as a General Education course, the initiator of that course may ask the General Education Council for reconsideration of the decision, providing new arguments or supplementary evidence in support of the claim or making appropriate modifications in the proposal to meet the General Education Council's published objections. If this initial appeal fails to produce a satisfactory conclusion in the view of the initiator, a second appeal to the University Committee is possible. In such cases the University Committee may investigate the appeal themselves or establish an ad hoc committee to do so. If the University Committee chooses to overturn the second no approval decision, the results of that deliberation will be reported to the Senate, published in the Senate minutes and forwarded to the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

All new courses shall be submitted to the Academic Affairs Council for its normal review.

Faculty Senate Continuing Business 4(a)
14 November 2007

UWGB CHAPTER 54 UNIVERSITY COUNCILS

54.01 UNIVERSITY COUNCILS DEFINED

~~The Academic Affairs Council, Personnel Council, and General Education Council are~~ **is a University-wide Faculty councils** which advises the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and, as appropriate, the Dean(s). ~~either directly or through duly appointed Associate Deans on matters of all University concern.~~

The Academic Affairs Council and General Education Council are Faculty councils reporting to and working with the Faculty Senate and its executive committee, the University Committee.

54.03 FUNCTIONS OF THE COUNCILS

A. Academic Affairs Council

1. Upon request of the appropriate Dean(s), the Academic Affairs Council shall ~~provide the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs with its recommendation on the approval~~ **approve or disapprove** of all new programs or of modification to existing programs (majors and/or minors), and of all new credit courses or modifications to existing credit courses at both the undergraduate and graduate levels ~~and provide this information to the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.~~
2. The Academic Affairs Council shall have the responsibility and authority for review of all credit courses and all academic programs at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. **Its official response, including its decision, shall be forwarded to the Faculty Senate through the University Committee. The Faculty Senate will publish all curricular decisions made by the Academic Affairs Council in the minutes of its monthly meetings and forward them along with copies of all official Academic Affairs Council correspondence to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.**

In a case where the Academic Affairs Council does not approve a new course or program, the initiator of that new course or program may ask the Academic Affairs Council for reconsideration of the decision, providing new arguments or supplementary evidence in support of the claim or making appropriate modifications in the proposal to meet the Academic Affairs Council's published objections. If this initial appeal fails to produce a satisfactory conclusion in the view of the initiator, a second appeal to the University Committee is possible. In such cases the University Committee may investigate the appeal themselves or establish an ad hoc committee to do so. If the University Committee chooses to overturn the second no approval decision, the results of that deliberation will be reported to the Senate, published in the Senate minutes and forwarded to the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

3. The Academic Affairs Council shall have the responsibility for examining the interrelationships among program areas in the University and for overseeing for the faculty the total academic plan and its various programs and components. This examining and overseeing function shall include, but not be limited to, the reviewing of course titles and content for duplication, and the monitoring of records pertaining to enrollments in lower division courses, upper division courses, the graduate program, and career and adult education courses. The final decision of the Council shall be forwarded to ~~the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs for his/her action.~~ **the Faculty Senate through the University Committee. The Faculty Senate will publish all curricular decisions of the Academic Affairs Council in the minutes of its monthly meetings and forward them along with copies of all official Academic Affairs Council correspondence to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.**
4. On its own initiative, or upon request of the University Committee, the Academic Affairs Council may advise the Faculty Senate about issues of educational policy and implementation that fall within the jurisdiction of the Faculty.

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

B. Personnel Council

1. The appropriate Dean(s) shall seek the advice of the Personnel Council whenever a candidate for appointment or promotion is to receive tenure.
2. The Council shall develop written criteria to be used in providing its advice.
3. While serving on the Personnel Council, a member shall not take part in the deliberations or voting on a candidate for promotion in any review body other than the Personnel Council.
4. On its own initiative, or upon the request of the University Committee, the Personnel Council may advise the Faculty Senate about issues of personnel policy and implementation that fall within the jurisdiction of the Faculty.

C. General Education Council

1. The General Education Council shall provide advice to the Faculty Senate and its executive committee, the University Committee ~~Vice Chancellor, Associate Deans, and Deans.~~
2. The General Education Council may establish sub-committees for each General Education program component without an otherwise established governance or administrative structure. Such sub-committees will have delegated responsibilities for curriculum development and regular course review.
3. Changes in General Education requirements may be initiated by the General Education Council, after consultation with the faculty groups and sub-committees affected, and are subject to approval by the Faculty Senate.

The General Education Council will advise the Faculty Senate on all matters pertaining to General Education, including but not limited to courses appropriate to the General Education Curriculum (See 53.11 D and 53.11 E).

4. On its own initiative, or upon the request of the University Committee, the General Education Council may advise the Faculty Senate about issues of General Education requirements that fall within the jurisdiction of the Faculty.

54.04 JOINT FUNCTION OF THE COUNCILS

- A. When appropriate, the Councils will meet jointly to consider matters of mutual interest.
- B. On their own initiative, or upon request, the joint Councils may advise on educational policy and its implementation.

54.05 AMENDMENTS

Amendments of this chapter are under the jurisdiction of the Faculty and must carry by a two-thirds majority of the Faculty Senate.

RECOMMENDATION ON THE GRANTING OF DEGREES

(Implemented as a Faculty Senate Document #89-6, March 21, 1990--action to be taken in advance of each commencement exercise and in the following language--dated as appropriate):

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate of the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay, on behalf of the Faculty, recommends to the Chancellor and the Vice Chancellor of the University that the students certified by the Registrar of the University as having completed the requirements of their respective programs be granted their degrees at the fall 2007 Commencement.

Faculty Senate New Business 5(a)
14 November 2007