

AGENDA

UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 4

Wednesday, 14 December 2005, 3:00 p.m.

Phoenix Room C, University Union

Presiding Officer: Gregory Davis, Speaker

Parliamentarian: Professor Kenneth J. Fleurant

- 1. CALL TO ORDER**

- 2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 3, NOVEMBER 16, 2005** [page 2 attached]

- 3. CHANCELLOR'S REPORT**

- 4. CONTINUING BUSINESS**
 - a. Adding a grade of C/D

- 5. NEW BUSINESS**
 - a. Requests for Future Senate Business

- 6. PROVOST'S REPORT**

- 7. UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE REPORT**

Presented by Sally Dresdow, Chair

- 8. ADJOURNMENT**

MINUTES 2005-2006
UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 3

Wednesday, November 16, 2005
 Phoenix Room C, University Union

Presiding Office: Gregory Davis (NAS-UC), Speaker

Parliamentarian: Kenneth J. Fleurant, Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

PRESENT: Scott Ashman (ED), Forrest Baulieu (ICS-UC), Joy Benson (BUA), Derryl Block (NUR alternate for Mimi Kubsch), Peter Breznay (ICS), Francis Carleton (URS), Gregory Davis (NAS-UC), Sally Dresdow (BUA-UC), Scott Furlong (PEA-UC), Clifton Ganyard (HUS), Alison Gates (COA), Victoria Goff (ICS), Cheryl Grosso (COA), Sue Hammersmith (Provost, *ex officio*), Derek Jeffreys (HUS), John Katers (NAS), Mark Kiehn (EDU), Harvey Kaye (SCD), Michael Kraft (PEA), Judith Martin (SOCW), Daniel Meinhardt (HUB), Steven Meyer (alternate for Tara Reed, NAS), Terence O'Grady (COA-UC), Debra Pearson (HUB), Meir Russ (BUA), Bruce Shepard (Chancellor, *ex officio*), Christine Style (COA-UC), Brian Sutton (HUS), Rebecca Tout (COA), Kristin Vespia (HUD), David Voelker (HUS),.

NOT PRESENT: Michael Zorn (NAS)

REPRESENTATIVES: Lucy Arendt (Academic Staff Representative), Adam Warpinski (Student Government Association Representative).

GUESTS: Dean Fritz Erickson, Associate Dean Regan Gurung, Scott Hildebrand (University Communications), Robert Howe (NAS), Interim Dean Fergus Hughes, Associate Provost Timothy Sewall.

1. Call to Order. With a quorum present, Speaker Davis called the Senate to order at 3:05 p.m. The speaker noted that Steven Meyer is seated as an alternate for Senator Reed (NAS); and Derryl Block for Senator Kubsch (NUR).

2. Approval of Minutes of UW-Green Bay Faculty Senate Meeting No. 2, October 19, 2005.

Following a request for clarification by Senator Kaye (*viz.* that currently only freestanding minors need Senate approval), the minutes were approved without change by voice vote.

3. Chancellor's Report. Chancellor Shepard reported on the following issues:

1. The budgetary situation at the Weidner Center continues to be worrisome. A task force will consider adjustments to the Center's operations. A "return to the Weidner's roots" approach may mean scheduling 12-15 shows, and, perhaps, a dozen University performances per year.

2. We need to remain alert and attentive to state representatives' recent interest in governance, stemming from concerns about back-up appointments and contract settlements. There are signs of a lack of understanding of how university governance works and we need to be ready to defend the philosophy that strong governance is the key to strong institutions. The legislature has requested a fiscal office audit of all University personnel procedures, and the report can be expected by spring.

3. Accreditation review preparation is underway in advance of the HLC/NCA on-site visit in November 2007. It generally takes 18-24 months to prepare. The Provost will soon announce the steering committee that will lead the process. The accrediting team will be particularly interested in reviewing areas of deficiency noted in the previous visit (e.g. general education and its connection to the interdisciplinary mission; assessment and

how it is used to improve the curriculum; and other activities). Now is the time to put into place measures to address those issues.

4. Some salary adjustment funds will be available in coming years and decisions will need to be made on how to use them. In the past such monies have been used to address inequities resulting from promotions in years when budget constraints did not permit meaningful adjustments. Those have now been resolved and the UC has begun discussing new needs to address (salary compression, for example). Ideas for using these adjustment funds may be forwarded to the UC.

Some conversation regarding the Weidner Center ensued.

4. Continuing Business.

a. Code change to Chapter 6 regarding complaints and grievances (second reading). UC Chair Dresdow noted a slight change in wording of the UC proposal presented for first reading at the last Senate meeting. The proposed addition, intended to clarify possible ambiguities in code, now reads “**Any complaint against a faculty member substantial enough to bring about action under the provisions of UWS 6.01 or UWGB 6, including those for which the level of intended penalty is the placement of a letter of reprimand in the faculty member's personnel file, must be adjudicated according to the procedures outlined below.**” The UC carefully checked UW System code (Chapter 6) and found nothing contrary to the proposed language. **Senator Grosso moved (with second) to accept the proposed change**, saying that she believes it is good to bring clarity such as this proposal provides to sensitive issues in code. This does not represent a change in the substance of current code. Senator Carleton believes the new wording would help keep incidents such as one that happened recently from reoccurring. The Provost wished to be clear that some kinds of complaints follow different procedures. For example sexual harassment complaints are referred to the affirmative action officer or legal counsel. There was no additional discussion. Being a code change, the voted required two-thirds majority, and the **motion passed unanimously (29-0-0)**, and is accepted subject to the Chancellor’s and Board of Regents’ approval.

5. New Business

a. Resolution on the Granting of Degrees. **Senator Meyer moved (with second) a resolution to approve granting of degrees to students who finish all requirements in time for December commencement. The motion passed unanimously.**

b. Report from the Senate Committee on Planning and Budget. Presented by committee chair Joy Benson. This year’s committee is active and involved. They have met regularly for discussions with the Provost, were invited to meet with the Academic Affairs Planning Committee regarding planning for the 2006-07 cycle, and questioned division heads about their preliminary strategic planes. The Committee wants to be proactive and has identified three ongoing activities for its attention:

1. Develop links with administration and other campus groups to strengthen the Senate committee’s role in all phases of strategic and budget planning;

2. Review and recommend revisions in current planning and budget processes to assure proactive faculty involvement;

3. Identify the opportunities and challenges associated with campus growth. They intend to present the Senate with a report identifying alternative models of growth that would benefit the university community while highlighting the impact of increased enrollment and discussing ways to build on the campus’s liberal education model in the interest of a multi-culture learning environment. The committee welcomes comments on campus priorities, how these priorities fit the campus strategic and budget planning process, and how the Senate Committee on Planning and Budget can help.

c. Discussion of Future Directions for General Education. Introduced by UC Chair Dresdow. The UC recently met with the chair of the General Education Committee and Associate Dean Gurung to discuss where we might go with general education, a subject that keeps surfacing without ever moving forward. The GEC is interested in the sense of the Senate before renewing its efforts to improve general education. In November, 2002 the Senate reaffirmed "... UWGB's "distinctive academic plan characterized by strong interdisciplinary, problem-focused liberal education" and assigned 'the top priority of the general education program' to 'an interdisciplinary approach to problem solving.'" The UC and GEC would like today's discussion to focus on two questions: "Do we still affirm that resolution and, if so, what are the practical applications of that position?" The last accreditation review team expressed concerns about our general education plan that need to be addressed for their return visit in less than two years.

In response to a request from the floor to hear from members of the GEC, Senator Sutton said that the GEC spent a great deal of time putting together the last plan for reforming general education and found the proposal pretty much "dead on arrival" in the Senate, which wasn't the first time that had happened. Before taking the better part of a year to develop another elaborate plan, the GEC would like to get a sense of what might stand a chance of passing. The committee doesn't want to give the Senate only what it wants, but would like to avoid spending time on proposals that clearly will not pass. The GEC currently is considering several proposals and is considering bringing forward multiple proposals it considers to be worthy of consideration to avoid a "thumbs up, thumbs down" situation. They include, for example: 1) Have those teaching general education belong to a GE program as well as their budgetary unit; 2) Build more interdisciplinary courses in each GE area, creating a shorter, more interdisciplinary list of GE courses; 3) Use some of the ideas from the bachelor of applied science articulation, e.g., creating a new domain with a body of interdisciplinary courses from which students would choose. Associate Dean Gurung challenged the Senate to decide whether it was sufficient to assume that interdisciplinary education was being taken care of by the academic programs. Senator Sutton also mentioned a proposal for 12 skills credits and 12 explicitly interdisciplinary content credits. In its discussions the GEC keeps coming back to a) a faculty specifically dedicated to teaching and overseeing general education and b) a first year general education seminar. The question that the GEC needs answered: Does the fact that UW-Green Bay is interdisciplinary mean that general education has to be interdisciplinary or can the interdisciplinarity come in interdisciplinary majors and minors?

Senator O'Grady agreed the Senate needs to focus the day's discussion on whether a student's choice of general education courses should be limited to interdisciplinary courses or whether disciplinary courses have a role to play as well. The many other important issues need to be discussed, but at another time. The Chancellor agreed, adding it isn't always clear to what extent we live up to our interdisciplinary goals—in our academic units or in general education. At the same time he believes interdisciplinary courses can exist alongside disciplinary skills and breadth courses in a GE program.

In response to a question about the meaning of interdisciplinary, Senator Sutton said one way to make the distinction between disciplinary and interdisciplinary courses is by whether they have an interdisciplinary unit prefix or a disciplinary unit prefix. Senator Block offered the opinion that general education need not be composed uniquely of interdisciplinary courses. Senator Carleton also sees the benefit of disciplinary courses such as the introduction to American politics in a general education.

Senator Martin asked what the barriers to changing GE are. Senator Kaye believes the answer to be historically specific—reservations about returning to the old interdisciplinary Liberal Education Seminar structure. Budgetary insufficiency has also been responsible for killing proposals such as the Learning Experience. He believes that a third of the faculty is satisfied with the status quo in GE, a third would like to

change (without agreeing on what that would mean), and a third is indifferent. Tying this discussion to a recent report on student engagement, Senator Kaye said that GE should in some way be about getting students involved in their education. He doesn't feel that they are, and he fails to sense any excitement on their part, especially at the lower level. In part it may be due to heavy job commitments, but something has gone wrong with general education that has influenced their level of engagement. The Chancellor suggested another barrier and a way around it: our educational system fosters periodic tumultuous change. There is, however, no reason why more modest changes can't be tried to see how they work. UC Chair Dresdow asked whether some of the reluctance to change relates to the fact that something like 85% of GE courses also belong to majors and there is fear that those courses will suffer if they don't also pull students from the GE pool.

A question arose about finding resources to build general education. Senator Davis suggested that majors could be asked to cut back requirements to free up resources for general education. It becomes a question of priorities. Senator Grosso returned discussion to whether GE needs to be totally interdisciplinary, favoring a mix as long as the disciplinary courses are ones without prerequisites. Defining interdisciplinary courses as those with interdisciplinary program numbers won't work since those courses are not consistently interdisciplinary in fact. The Provost added that statistics show that of the top dozen most heavily enrolled majors, only one is interdisciplinary. We say we are interdisciplinary but such statistics may indicate we are less so than we would like to think.

Conversation moved back to student engagement. Senator Katers sees higher enrollments leading to less individualized teaching, leading in turn to loss of interest and reduced engagement. The Provost said the NESSE survey shows we are doing well in some areas of student engagement and poorly in others. But something can be done to address those areas.

Senator Sutton tried again to focus discussion on what the GEC needs to know. Senator O'Grady, in turn, tried to focus the Senate on one aspect that would help the GEC: whether mastery of subject matter is more important than exposure to techniques and processes. Senator Breznay asked the Speaker to give the floor to student government representative Warpinski who said that it is not clear to students, especially to freshmen and sophomores, why they are being asked to take GE courses. They need to know why courses in the GE program are important to their education.

Attempts to focus the discussion did not seem to work. The following threads made up the remainder of the discussion (parenthetical numbers refer to the approximate number of times the thread was mentioned from this point in the discussion):

--content vs. process based general education (4). Teaching creative thinking is important but knowing subject matter is essential too. Problem solving is a skill that is important to impart to students, but it is equally important to disciplines. Returning to a problem-solving approach could once again revolutionize general education. Problem-solving exercises such as "is one idea as good as another?" also carry risks.

--interdisciplinary vs. disciplinary general education (8). Senator Voelker suggested that interdisciplinarity may represent a more advanced approach to issues that may not be appropriate for general education. Senator Tout favored disciplinary breadth and discovery in GE over interdisciplinary goals. The Provost suggested that a disciplinary foundation may be necessary before interdisciplinarity becomes meaningful. There should be some interdisciplinary component to GE. A common issue (global warming, globalization, religion in politics, e.g.) seen from various disciplinary perspectives would be a valuable direction for general education. Such problem-solving exercises need to involve multiple perspectives. We educate experts in disciplines and good citizens in general education by fostering critical thinking on important world issues.

--practical considerations in general education reform (4). Majors will suffer if courses are not allowed to count as GE. A general education program should be designed in terms of outcomes. The market must also be taken into account, and if there is no market for GE courses it won't work in spite of the proposal. If students are resentful about taking GE, it is because we haven't explained it well.

Expressing hope that the GEC will find this discussion helpful, the Chair moved to the next item of business.

d. Requests for Future Senate Business.

Senator Meyer asked whether there is a policy in place regarding students called to active duty in mid-semester. If not he would like this discussed. The Provost replied that there is a System policy. It will be distributed.

Senator Vespia asked about the status of the new calendar proposals. UC Chair Dresdow replied that the issue will be back on the UC agenda soon and then return to the Senate.

Senator Goff asked whether it would be possible to define interdisciplinarity in writing. Chair Dresdow said the question would be placed on the UC agenda.

6. Provost's Report. Provost Hammersmith previously distributed a written report (see <http://www.uwgb.edu/provost/Report11.16.05.pdf>). She also distributed a document entitled "Proposed HLC/NCA Institutional Self-Study Process." The first item of business in the accreditation process will be the appointment of an assessment steering committee coordinated by Associate Provost Tim Sewall. That committee will be looking for faculty to serve on various subcommittees or working groups. The Provost complimented the Senate on the interesting discussion of general education. The Speaker asked where the LAS Dean search stands. Review of applications began on November 11.

7. University Committee Report. The UC has:

- Met with the Chancellor about how to best use additional funds in the faculty pay package in the coming years;
- Met with the Provost regarding her proposed program review to guide future programmatic decisions;
- Begun to discuss NESSE data on student engagement, in particular deciding which areas of the survey are specifically important for our campus to address.

Regarding this last item, Senator Kaye asked why our survey results look so different from those of other campuses. That's not yet clear Chair Dresdow said. The Provost added that poor showing in student engagement doesn't related to work since, contrary to what many believe, our students work less than the average within the System. However, students without declared majors appear to be drifting and uninvolved. Senator Grosso asked for more information on the Provost's committee to review academic programs. Chair Dresdow said the intent was to review recent 5 year plans and new program reviews to help make programmatic decisions and decide where we want to go as an institution. The intent is to make this part of an ongoing strategic planning process. Plans are still rather general.

8. Adjournment. The Speaker called for a motion to adjourn, which was made and approved at 4:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Kenneth Fleurant, Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff