

AGENDA

UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 7

Wednesday, 19 April 2006, 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. 6, March 15, 2005 [page 2]

3. CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

4. CONTINUING BUSINESS

- a. Proposed Global Studies Minor [page 8]

5. NEW BUSINESS

- a. Resolution on the Granting of Degrees [page 15]
- b. Discussion of General Education Council Proposal for Domain Committees [page 16]
- c. Discussion of General Education Council's General Education Plans [page 19]
- d. 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. 6
 Wednesday, March 15, 2006
 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), Joy Benson (BUA), Peter Breznay (ICS), Gregory Davis (NAS-UC), Sally Dresdow (BUA-UC), Clifton Ganyard (HUS), Alison Gates (COA), Cheryl Grosso (COA), Sue Hammersmith (Provost, *ex officio*), Derek Jeffreys (HUS), Andrew Kersten (alternate for Harvey Kaye, SCD), Michael Kraft (PEA), Mimi Kubsch (NUR), Judith Martin (SOCW), Daniel Meinhardt (HUB), Steven Meyer (alternate for John Katers, NAS), Terence O'Grady (COA-UC), Meir Russ (BUA), Bruce Shepard (Chancellor, *ex officio*), Christine Style (COA-UC), Brian Sutton (HUS), Kristin Vespia (HUD), David Voelker (HUS), Michael Zorn (NAS).

NOT PRESENT: Forrest Baulieu (ICS-UC), Francis Carleton (URS), Scott Furlong (PEA-UC), Victoria Goff (ICS), Mark Kiehn (EDU), Debra Pearson (HUB), Tara Reed (NAS), Rebecca Tout (COA) .

REPRESENTATIVES: Eric Mims (Student Government Association Representative).

GUESTS: Julio Alegria (visiting scholar), Sandra Deadman (Academic Advising), Dean Fritz Erickson, Associate Dean Regan Gurung, Scott Hildebrand (University Communications), Interim Dean Fergus Hughes, Associate Provost for Student Affairs Sue Keihn, Linda Peacock-Landrum (Career Services), Associate Provost Timothy Sewall, Robert Wenger (emeritus).

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

2. Approval of Minutes of UW-Green Bay Faculty Senate Meeting No. 5, February 15, 2006.

The minutes were approved without change by voice vote.

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

The arboretum has been overrun with deer, creating an ecological management problem and a dangerous situation for campus traffic. The city provides certified archers in such cases and the Chancellor intends to approve culling the herd unless people with concerns come forward with convincing arguments.

The Regents met last week and discussed the growth agenda. La Crosse presented their model, asking permission to unlink their tuition rates from System guidelines to allow the campus to grow without additional state dollars by raising tuition. The Regents were uncomfortable with allowing different tuition rates throughout the System. Our campus growth agenda, taking a different route, will be presented to the Regents when they meet here in April. The Regents also discussed UWS 7 and the issue they are calling "serious criminal misconduct" by faculty (a topic on today's Senate agenda). They also accepted the code changes to UWGB Chapter 6 (on complaints) passed by the Senate earlier this year.

Senator O'Grady asked what the Regents appear to be looking for in growth agendas since none of those presented to them thus far appear to really interest them. The threat of public and political reaction understandably affects their deliberations (e.g. over raising tuition on one campus). Access and diversity remain very important to the Regents. Some feel that keeping tuition low is the way to assure access. However, the data do not necessarily support that since most students are from "upper class" families. The way to expand access to others is through need-based financial aid, not necessarily reduced tuition across the board. Senator

O'Grady feels the Regents want growth without additional funding. The Chancellor sees no growth without funds to do so. Senator Meyer asked whether admissions have closed for next fall. No, they have not, and our campus will be the same size next year. Students are graduating in more timely fashion, which leaves admissions open somewhat longer.

4. Continuing Business.

a. Proposed Policy Regarding Procedures Followed in Response to Student Complaints Made against Faculty Members. UC Chair Dresdow presented a version of the policy revised to reflect comments at the last Senate meeting. Senator Meyer asked what "If the complaint remains unresolved" meant. Senator O'Grady responded that it means either that it was not resolved to the satisfaction of the student or the judgment by everyone else that nothing more can be done to resolve the issue. If the student is not satisfied with their meeting with instructor and unit chair, they have a right to take the complaint to the dean. Senator Breznay asked for clarification on what this policy changes. O'Grady responded that it does not change, but only clarifies, existing policy from the governance perspective. Student policy is already published on the Dean of Student's website. Student representative Mims reported that the Student Senate generally agrees that this is current policy. However, student senators would like to see a level for the Provost's intervention and they also have some concern that, on the whole, the policy is not good for instructors who might feel more inclined than they should to avoid even unjustified complaints against them. Senator Vespia asked what would happen if the budgetary unit chair were the person in the complaint. O'Grady responded that he assumed the chair would step aside in the complaint process whenever appropriate, in which case the complaint would go before the Dean. **Senator Breznay moved (with second) to accept the policy as presented:**

Policy Regarding Procedures Followed in Response to Student Academic Complaints Made Against Faculty Members

1. As indicated in the guidelines published by the Dean of Student's office, students who have complaints related to course grades, conduct of classes or other course matters should address those complaints first with the instructor of the course. A complaint may be presented via e-mail, letter or in person.

If the student is not satisfied with the resolution, the complaint can then be taken to the chairperson of the budgetary unit responsible for personnel decisions concerning the faculty member. If resolution is not achieved there, the student may then go to the appropriate academic dean.

2. If a student brings the complaint directly to the budgetary unit chair, the chair should re-direct the student to the relevant faculty member unless the chair determines that a productive dialogue between student and faculty member is unlikely. If the student brings the complaint to the chair of the disciplinary program, that chair should direct the student to the faculty member in question or, alternatively, to the budgetary unit chair. It is assumed that the budgetary unit chair will consult with the chair of the relevant disciplinary program in the investigation of the complaint.

At the point in which the budgetary unit chair is considering the student complaint, he/she must immediately inform the faculty member of the nature of the complaint and request that the faculty member respond to it. The budgetary unit chair will then attempt to mediate the situation by discussing the issue with both student and faculty member, either together or independently as the chair chooses. Both the student and the faculty member in question will be immediately informed of any decision made by the budgetary unit chair.

3. If the complaint remains unresolved after these discussions take place, the student has the option to bring it to the relevant dean. The dean will, after consulting with the relevant disciplinary and budgetary unit chairs and requesting a written statement from the student articulating the complaint and a written response from the faculty member against whom the complaint is made, attempt to resolve the situation. Both faculty member and student must be informed of the resultant outcome in a timely fashion.

There was no further debate and the motion passed 20-0-1.

b. Code Change to UWGB 3.08 4 (d) and 3.09 1. Second Reading, presented by UC Chair Dresdow who noted that there were no modifications of the first reading. **Senator Martin moved acceptance of the changes [in bold] as proposed:**

3.08 REVIEW PROCEDURES (Merit, Promotion, Renewal)

3.08.4.d – The faculty member shall be notified in writing **of the recommendation and reasons for the recommendation** by the committee or office making the recommendation within 20 days after each recommendation at each reviewing level. **The faculty member and Executive Committee members should receive a copy of the transmittal letter.**

UWGB 3.09 NONRENEWAL OF PROBATIONARY APPOINTMENTS

1. Statement of Reasons

In cases of a negative recommendation, if requested in writing by the faculty member within 10 days of the receipt of a decision, **a more detailed explanation of the reasons** will be provided in writing to the faculty member **within 10 days of the receipt of the request** by the chairperson of the interdisciplinary unit executive committee, the appropriate Dean(s), or the Chancellor, depending upon the level at which a decision was reached.

There was no further discussion and the **motion passed by the requisite two-thirds majority 19-0-2**. [Pending BOR approval.]

c. Resolution Regarding Proposed UWS Chapter 7, Wisconsin Administrative Code, Procedures for Dismissal of Faculty in Special Cases. Presented by UC Chair Dresdow who discussed results of System representative conversations with Regent Spector who offered one major clarification that representatives considered an improvement; namely, that if a faculty member is to be suspended from duties, formal charges would need to be filed by a district attorney, federal attorney or similar authority. Other portions of the chapter regarding, for example, the definition of serious criminal misconduct and an expectation of self incrimination remain problematic. The UC has brought a draft resolution to the Senate along with a longer position paper explaining the Senate’s concerns in greater detail. Dresdow read the resolution included in the agenda and recommended one change in the position paper (making item 3, item 1). She noted that the resolution is based largely on a similar resolution from UW-Platteville. If the Senate wishes to respond to this change in System administrative code, the deadline is April 6.

Senator Martin noted that Social Work faculty support the resolution. Senator Grosso commended the UC on its work on this issue. Following some discussion, **Senator Grosso moved (with second) adoption of the resolution as distributed and that the position paper (see agenda) be attached with item three becoming item one.**

Senator Breznay moved (with second) to amend the motion by beginning the resolution with : “Whereas, the Faculty Senate of the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay agrees with the broad sentiment expressed in UWS 7; however”. Following discussion of the wording of the amendment, **the amendment was accepted 19-0-2**. Discussion returned to the motion as amended:

Resolution concerning Proposed Chapter UWS 7, Wisconsin Administrative Code Procedures for Dismissal of Faculty in Special Cases

Whereas, the Faculty Senate of the University of Wisconsin Green Bay agrees with the broad sentiment expressed in UWS7; however

Whereas, the Proposed Chapter UWS 7, Wisconsin Administrative Code Procedures for Dismissal of Faculty in Special Cases contains several provisions that conceivably could be used to circumvent due process in a court of law; and

Whereas, a number of ambiguities exist in the proposed procedures, such as whose judgment shall be exerted, what constitutes credible information when deciding whether to proceed in a case against a faculty member, and who bears the burden of proof; and

Whereas, a faculty member could conceivably be terminated upon mere suspicion of having committed a crime; and

Whereas, as currently worded in UWS 7.06(1), a faculty member could conceivably be suspended without pay upon mere suspicion of having committed a crime; and

Whereas, shared governance has been consulted only in a pro forma fashion in development of the proposed procedures;

Therefore, be it resolved that the Faculty Senate of the University of Wisconsin Green Bay hereby declares its rejection of the proposed procedures as currently drafted. We urge the Board of Regents to make revisions to UWS 7 to address faculty concerns as outlined in the attached "University of Wisconsin Green Bay Faculty Senate Position Paper" dated March 8, 2006, before further action to approve UWS 7 is made.

Following additional brief discussion, **the motion as amended carried 20-0-2.**

5. New Business

a. Discussion of Proposed Global Studies Minor. Presented by UC Chair Dresdow who explained that the proposal was brought to the UC for transmittal to the Senate. The intent is that it return next month for action following today's discussion.

Senator Kersten asked leave to address the issue at some length. SCD's permanent senator, Harvey Kaye, asked Kersten to remind the Senate that, whenever this minor has surfaced in discussion he has said that the process has been flawed, a position with which the majority of SCD agrees. SCD does not want a veto in this matter, but would have preferred a collaborative and collegial process that would allow academic units to influence the proposal from its early stages. SCD has expertise in the area of global studies, having offered a global studies emphasis (currently to 10% of its majors) over the past 30 years with courses offered by over half its faculty. The unit supports global studies on this campus and has voted two resolutions, one supporting global studies and collaboration across the University, and the second disapproving a global studies minor "independent of existing budgetary units." Many SCD faculty feel they have been excluded from the process of creating a global studies minor. Faculty in other areas (history, anthropology and economics, among them) have also expressed that sentiment. As a result the present proposal "lacks intellectual credibility and violates the UWGB tradition of collegiality" in curriculum planning. The failure to include a campus economist with exceptional credentials in the global economy is shocking. This proposal represents ideas of only a few.

Senator Jeffreys strongly supports internationalizing the curriculum, but does agree that the proposal is flawed. The document fails to make clear an intellectual framework or organizational vision for a global studies minor. The lack of an economist is a major flaw, as is the absence of a real language requirement. Two years of language study ought to be required. He cannot support the current proposal unless changes are made to strengthen it. Senator Meyer suggested that a difference between what SCD offers and the proposed minor is that SCD only offers a global studies emphasis to majors. If students only wish to minor, this proposal makes that possible. Senator Kersten responded that he personally feels that global studies is better served by a minor housed in an interdisciplinary unit. Senator Grosso asked whether the disagreement that has arisen over this program might be related to academic differences between partisans of global studies and area studies. Kersten argued in favor of a variety of approaches to global studies.

Senator Sutton is surprised that the proposal fails to include German and French, the second language of global commerce, both of which are available on campus, while mentioning languages such as Farsi and Korean. He also asked whether people were, in fact, excluded from the developmental stages of this proposal. Senator Kersten responded that some feel they were excluded and that he as chair of SCD was not asked for

input until the proposal was already before the AAC, by which time it was too late for colleagues with a great deal of experience in global studies to influence the proposal. Senator Kubsch recalls that the global studies committee issued invitations to discuss the proposal very early in the process but that relatively few attended. For whatever reason, the lack of input from crucial colleagues has created a flawed proposal. Nursing would probably support a minor, but the course array and lack of language requirement would need to be addressed.

Provost Hammersmith believes students in any major should have the option of a global studies or international/area studies minor. Some faculty have expressed apprehension that a new minor would drain enrollment in the current major with international studies emphasis. That major emphasis has relatively few students, and her experience has been that a new minor generates interest that actually benefits existing majors. Evidence also indicates that existing global studies minors are interdisciplinary and go beyond what is offered in a social studies program. Student Government representative Mims announced that the Student Senate passed a resolution in support of the proposal. Students want more international studies and international relations opportunities beyond the SCD major emphasis and the international studies certificate. On a personal note, he believes his applications to graduate programs will suffer from the paucity of international studies courses available on our campus.

A good deal of discussion followed on whether such a minor is best housed within a budgetary unit or not. Senator Kersten said that reallocation of faculty is a practical problem best solved by housing the program in an existing budgetary unit. He would like to see all units have a global studies emphasis. Senator Breznay is hard pressed to reject the recommendation from the AAC. Senator Kraft believes that the proposed minor spans several units and should consequently be housed outside any specific unit, but he sees a problem if budgetary units are expected to provide the chair with a reassignment without having a say in the action. Senator Sutton suggested that the Women's Studies program hasn't created undue problems either in where it is housed or in how its chair is selected. Senator Martin asked what courses in the proposal exist and which might need additional funding. The Speaker understands that all courses in the proposal are currently available. If that is the case, representative Mims' concerns for the lack of international studies classes won't be resolved by this proposal.

Senator Vespia asks whether the AAC provided a rationale for its approval. UC Chair Dresdow highlighted several items from the AAC memo (no new courses required; this is a starting point and the minor can be expected to evolve and expand; they encourage a language requirement and capstone experience) and will provide a copy for the next meeting along with other letters of support. Senator Grosso asked whether the current international studies certificate would be eliminated if this proposal is accepted. The Provost understands that this is the intent.

b. Requests for Future Senate Business. There were no requests.

6. Provost's Report. Provost Hammersmith previously distributed a written report (see <http://www.uwgb.edu/provost/Report3.15.06.doc>) that includes information on the Comprehensive Program Review Task Force, the LAS Dean Search, Planning and Budgeting, and other items. The Provost introduced Julio Alegria, visiting international scholar from Peru sponsored by the St. Norbert/UW-Green Bay Visiting International Scholars Program. There is a growing interest in the National Student Exchange Program with ten student participants enrolling this semester, and the Provost encourages faculty to make students aware of the opportunity to study at the more than 160 US, US territory, and Canadian institutions in the program, including several Spanish and one French-speaking campus as well as historically black campuses.

7. University Committee Report. UC Chair Dresdow reported that the Committee is working with the Provost on a call for applicants for the Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff position that will be vacant after August 15. The UC is working on a Curriculum Planning and Procedures Guide which will come before the Senate in the fall.

8. Senate Forum. With only eight minutes remaining, the Speaker moved the forum to the next meeting.

9. Adjournment. The Speaker called for a motion to adjourn, which was made and approved at 4:52 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Kenneth Fleurant, Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

[Minutes amended and approved on 4/19/06]

January 23, 2006

To: Fritz Erickson, Dean of Professional and Graduate Studies
Fergus Hughes, Dean of Liberal Arts and Science

From: John M. Lyon, Chair, Academic Affairs Council

Subject: Global Studies Minor

On December 5, 2005 the Academic Affairs Council continued its review of the proposed interdisciplinary minor in Global Studies that was presented to the council in your October 4, 2005 memo. At this meeting the council only considered the concept of an interdisciplinary Global Studies minor and the curriculum that was proposed for this new minor. The council did not address the implied creation of a new faculty governance body to administer this minor. The reason for this decision lies with our interpretation of faculty code regarding the approval of new “faculty units”. In our consideration of the academic component of the proposed Global Studies minor we considered if the minor was appropriate for this campus, and the quality of the proposed program. After extensive discussion on the proposal the AAC passed unanimously the motion to: Recommend approval of the global studies minor proposal but that the proposal’s author consider suggestions to deal with some issues identified by the AAC.

In our consideration of the question if the proposed minor was appropriate for this campus we considered if such a program would provide an important area of study for our students and if this area of study was sufficiently unique from areas of study currently offered by the university to warrant the creation of a new program. For this part of our analysis we focused on the mission of the proposed program. The narrative of the proposal identified the mission of the program as the study of the “phenomena of globalization” and the impact that globalization has on “contemporary political, economic, social and environmental problems”. The council understands the mission of the proposed program is therefore to address current societal issues that are influenced by forces that are global in nature. Based upon this understanding of the mission of the proposed minor, the AAC believes that this program is both an important area of study for our students and is unique from those currently offered by the university. This position was supported by all of the respondents to the questionnaire distributed by the AAC to the budgetary units.

The AAC believes that the proposed curriculum for the Global Studies minor is satisfactory for the institution of this new program. The proposed curriculum is composed of a collection of approved courses that either currently meet the spirit of the Global Studies mission or will be modified to do so. No new courses have been presented as being required for the program. The AAC makes its recommendation for the approval of this curriculum with the understanding that this curriculum is only the starting point for the new program. The AAC expects that the curriculum will evolve and expand as additional courses that address the mission of the program are identified or developed. With this in mind, the AAC believes that the curriculum would be strengthened by the addition of a foreign language requirement and a capstone experience and we encourage the faculty empowered to oversee this program to consider adding these elements in the future.

The majority of the comments submitted to the AAC supported the proposed curriculum of the Global Studies minor. The exceptions were submitted by Professor Lockard of the History Program and Professor Kersten of the Social Change and Development unit. Professor Lockard expressed his displeasure with the lack of a history component in the proposed curriculum with his perceived exclusion of the history faculty from the final draft of the proposed curriculum. Professor Lockard also expresses the assumption that this proposed interdisciplinary minor will replace the International Studies certificate program and that elements of the certificate program have not been included in the proposed curriculum for the Global Studies minor. Professor Kersten expresses his concerns with respect to the overlap with the Global Studies track in the Social Change and Development major and with the exclusion of some SCD courses from the curriculum of the proposed minor. Professor Kersten also expressed the believe that the “authors of this Global Studies Minor Proposal should go back to all potentially affected or relevant Units and Programs and seek their input and approval before moving forward.”

Faculty Senate Continuing Business 5(a)
19 April 2006

The AAC considered these comments in our discussions. Of these comments we take issue with the position that every new program must receive the “input and approval” of “all potentially affected or relevant Units and Programs” before the new program proposal can be forwarded to faculty governance. The AAC believes that the institution of such a burden on new program development would effectively eliminate the activity on this campus. The AAC believes that faculty should be encourage to develop new and innovative programs and that the roles of AAC, UC and Faculty Senate are to determine if the new program is an appropriate addition to the universities programs of study. The AAC believes that “all potentially affected or relevant Units and Programs” should be heard in the review process but that they do not have veto authority in the process.

The AAC strongly agrees with Professor Lockard’s position that “boosting global and international studies at UWGB” is a “worthy goal”. But we do not view the proposed Global Studies minor as the sole or even the central avenue for the presentation of “global and international studies” at UWGB. The importance of understanding the global perspective of the social, political and environmental problems that today demand new solutions is too great to be relegated to single group of faculty. The AAC believes that the university as a whole should embrace the importance of this aspect of the education of our students and should integrate it throughout the curriculum. We also believe that the fate of the International Studies certificate program to be a separate issue and it was not included in our evaluation of this proposal.

The AAC considered the issue presented by Professor Kersten regarding the overlap between the proposed Global Studies minor and the Global Studies track in the SCD major and the validity of the position taken by the authors of the proposal that their minor represents a “different view of global studies”. The AAC believes that there is a significant difference between the focus and the curriculum of these two programs. The AAC finds only three upper level courses that are common to the Global Studies track in SCD and the proposed minor. In fact, a student could complete the proposed minor without taking any upper level courses that are part of the Global Studies track of the SCD major. We do not see why this proposed program should be considered as an educational alternative to students who are interested in the Global Studies track of SCD.

Some issues that the AAC identified that should be addressed by the proposal’s authors include:

The AAC believes that the proposed minor focus on the causes and consequences of the forces of globalization to be different from traditional programs focusing on global studies the distinction may not be clear to others. To better articulate this distinction the AAC identified possible remedies such as: a name change, a more clearly identified program mission statement, an advising plan to help interested students distinguish this program from the global studies track in SCD, and a list of student outcomes for those who would choose this minor.

The AAC believes that both a foreign language competency and a travel course experience would significantly increase the value of this program of study.

We view this proposed program as an important and appropriate area of study for this campus. We believe that it creates a new opportunity for faculty members from all areas of the campus to come together to provide a new educational opportunity for our students. We also hope that it provides opportunities for the development of new interdisciplinary scholarly collaborations between faculty members from different units. We further hope that the success of this program will encourage the development of new interdisciplinary collaborations among faculty members at UWGB.

UNIVERSITY of WISCONSIN

GREEN BAY

MEMO

DATE: 19 September 2005

TO: Fergus Hughes, Interim Dean of LAS

FROM: Gregory Davis, Chair of NAS

SUBJECT: Interdisciplinary Minor in Global Studies

During the 15 September meeting of the NAS faculty, a request by Mark Everingham (associate professor, Social Change and Development) to discuss a curricular proposal for an interdisciplinary minor in Global Studies was honored. Prior to the meeting all faculty of NAS had been provided with the August 2005 version of the proposal. It was also noted that several NAS members were listed in the proposal as willing participants as members of a Global Studies faculty – Kevin Fermanich, Steve Meyer, and Ganga Nair. All three of these individuals were present at the meeting.

The discussion can be summarized into two parts – specific questions and generally reaction. The specific questions that were raised included:

- Why is there a reassignment for the chair? One disciplinary program chair believed that the amount of work associated with overseeing the Global Studies minor (as proposed) either did not warrant a reassignment or others should be entitled to a larger reassignment.
- What could a student do with this minor? It seemed that the strongest selling point would be that a student with such a minor could be a better functioning member of an increasingly global world community.
- Is the list of courses to be offered in the minor open to other courses? It was suggested that there may be additional NAS courses that would be relevant to the minor – Energy and Society for example.

It was also questioned as to whether or not list of faculty participants open to others and why no new courses had been proposed for the minor.

In general NAS faculty members were supportive of a minor in global studies. However, it was not clear that the proposed minor was the optimal plan. Hence the following motion was proposed (and passed 24-0-1):

The faculty members of Natural and Applied Sciences endorse the creation of an interdisciplinary minor in Global Studies.

In support of the motion, it was felt that a Global Studies minor would be an attractive minor for science majors. It was also noted that the Global Studies emphasis of the Social Change and Development major was not accessible to science students whereas a minor would be. NAS would like to remain involved in the creation of such a minor and plan to continue offering courses that would be relevant to an interdisciplinary global studies minor (e.g., Env Sci 102 Introduction to Environmental Science, Env Sci 303 Conservation of Natural Resources, and Earth Sc 300 Global Climate Change)

cc: Secretary of the Faculty
 Mark Everingham
 Barbara Barnum

UNIVERSITY of WISCONSIN
GREEN BAY

Public and Environmental Affairs, MAC B310

2420 Nicolet Drive, Green Bay, Wisconsin 54311-7001

Phone (920) 465-2531 or 2533 Fax (920) 465-2791 E-mail: kraftm@uwgb.edu

To: Fergus Hughes, Interim Dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences

From: Michael Kraft, Chair, Political Science

Date: April 14, 2006

Re: Political Science Faculty Support for Proposed Interdisciplinary Minor in Global Studies

I am writing to express the support of the Political Science faculty for the proposed Interdisciplinary Minor in Global Studies. At our faculty meeting of September 14, 2005, we reviewed the curriculum for the proposed minor, which includes several courses in Political Science. The entire Political Science faculty was present and we were unanimous in our belief the proposed minor fills an important gap in campus program offerings and that the selection of Political Science courses within it is appropriate at this time.

Consideration of the proposed minor reminds us that we have a minimal offering within Political Science of courses in international affairs. We believe strongly that we should offer additional courses in the field and that doing so would create important opportunities for students to study global affairs. Accordingly, we will continue to make the case for a new faculty position in international relations and comparative politics that would substantially enhance our ability to contribute to the Global Studies minor as well as to serve the larger student body and our own majors and minors in Political Science.

We are nevertheless delighted to see our present course offerings included in the proposed minor. In particular, Political Science 100 (Global Politics and Society) is listed among the core courses from which students must select 3 credits, and Political Science 351 (Comparative Political Systems) and 360 (International Relations) are among the electives under the Global Democracy thematic category. There should be sufficient room in all of these courses to accommodate the expected student demand from the minor. Yet if the demand proves to be greater than what we now expect, we would consider expanding the number of sections offered each year to meet it. We may be able to do this in part through summer offerings of these courses.

We urge the campus bodies that act on curricular proposals to give their support to the proposed Global Studies minor.

Cc: Fritz Erickson, Dean of Professional and Graduate Studies
Sue Hammersmith, Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
Sally Dresdow, Chair, University Committee
Ken Fleurant, Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff
Political Science faculty

UNIVERSITY of WISCONSIN
GREEN BAY

Public and Environmental Affairs, MAC B310

2420 Nicolet Drive, Green Bay, Wisconsin 54311-7001

Phone (920) 465-2531 or 2533 Fax (920) 465-2791 E-mail: kraftm@uwgb.edu

To: Fergus Hughes, Dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences
From: Michael Kraft, Chair, Political Science
Date: April 14, 2006
Re: Proposed Minor in Global Studies

You asked for comment on several questions related to the proposed minor in Global Studies. I believe I responded already to most of these in my memo of September 15, reflecting the unanimous position of the Political Science faculty. However, for the benefit of the Academic Affairs Council, I'll respond to the five questions you posed.

1. The overall academic quality of the proposed interdisciplinary minor.

Only three Political Science courses are included in the proposed minor: Global Politics and Society 100, International Relations 360, and Comparative Political Systems 351. We believe these courses contribute to making the minor a stronger program academically than it would be without such a contribution. The Political Science faculty was unanimous in its belief that the proposed minor fills an important gap in campus academic offerings. Its quality appears to be consistent with other minors offered on the campus.

2. The impact the proposed program would have on the staffing needs of each program that has committed to contributing to the minor.

As we noted in the memo of September 15, we believe that sufficient room exists in the three courses to meet the expected demand. If there is one exception to this statement it would be for the introductory course Global Politics and Society 100, which is heavily enrolled already; it has come close to its cap of 120 in each recent semester. However, we have proposed that we be permitted to recruit a new member of the Political Science program in the area of comparative and international politics. The individual's teaching load would include one or more sections of this course, thus relieving the potential burden of having the Global Studies minor.

3. The projected number of students who would complete the proposed minor per academic year.

This is difficult for us to judge. We have 105 Political Science majors and 30 minors at present. A minor in Global Studies might attract several dozen students, or perhaps more, comparable to other interdisciplinary minor programs.

4. The projected impact that the proposed minor would have on the staffing needs of the current interdisciplinary programs due to potential changes in enrollment in these programs as a result of students opting to use the proposed Global Studies minor to fulfill their interdisciplinary studies graduation requirement.

The question is how the Global Studies minor would affect, for example, the current minors in Public Administration, Environmental Policy and Planning, Social Change and Development, or Urban and Regional Studies, to name those in the area of social sciences most directly affected. I don't think the proposed minor would significantly affect staffing needs in most cases. It is only where current courses are already filled to capacity that units would have to consider addition of more sections. It might also turn out that some decline in the number of other interdisciplinary minors would occur as the number of students opting for Global Studies increases. So the net impact could well be minimal.

It may be worth noting that some of the elective courses now listed, for example in Public and Environmental Affairs, may not continue in the future. These are offered as part of special topics or travel courses, which might change over time.

5. The proposed formation of a Global Studies faculty unit to oversee the proposed minor.

There should be such a faculty, and it should include representatives of each of the programs most directly affected by the new minor

September 2, 2005

Dear Dean Erickson,

I support offering a global studies minor at UW-Green Bay that will be available to all students, and I commend the developers for their proposal. A faculty member from nursing, Mimi Kubsch, attended a few planning meetings as well.

Faculty of the Professional Program in Nursing concluded that we would be interested in participating by offering a course on global health. Our special topics course, NURSING 492 Global Aspects of Health Care, is presently available only to registered nurses. We would be willing to modify the course to be relevant to the general student body.

I heartedly support the concept of a global studies minor, but have a number of reservations about the August 2005 Interdisciplinary Minor in Global Studies Curricular Proposal that was forwarded to me. First, the course distribution requirements (Global Studies Core Requirements) are puzzling, with some courses falling into many categories (i.e. Urban and Regional Studies/GEOG 300 Planning World Cities). It isn't clear how some courses fit into the specific categories. Second, issues of justice and ethics would likely be covered in all courses, but there are two categories that specifically have these terms in the titles. Third, it would be useful to coordinate this minor with the global studies area of emphasis offered by Social Change and Development. Fourth, it is unclear why one specific area course, SPANISH 358: Latin America Today, is included while other area courses, such as UR RE ST 392 Analysis of South Asia, are not included. Finally, it is unclear why some courses were not included at all such as NUT SCI 250 World Food and Population Issues.

It would be unlikely for students in the Professional Program in Nursing to choose this minor because of the credit requirements and the fact that these courses are not taught by distance education. However, Professional Program in Nursing students could pick individual courses. In my opinion, it would be excellent for a global studies or international studies minor to be available for all students at UW-Green Bay.

Sincerely,

Derryl Block

Cc: Interim Dean Fergus Hughes
Provost Sue Hammersmith
University Committee Chair Sally Dresdow
Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff Ken Fleurant
Professor Mark Everingham

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 spring 2006 Commencement.

**General Education Council's
Proposal for the Establishment of General Education Domains
Presented to UWGB Faculty Senate April 19, 2006**

Rationale

For more than a decade, faculty and staff have studied and debated changes to the General Education curriculum at UW-Green Bay. Despite widespread agreement that changes are needed, the General Education Program remains essentially the same as it was in 1979, perhaps even weakened as a result of the elimination of a senior seminar requirement.

Criticisms of the existing General Education Program include 1) lack of coherence, 2) lack of interdisciplinary focus, 3) inadequate assessment, and 4) inadequate student engagement. These issues have been addressed in different forums and by two or three unsuccessful proposals for general education reform during the past 15 years.

The General Education Council has approved a recommendation for a new approach to this issue. Rather than focus on the details and content of the General Education Program, we submit a proposal to change the *process* by which the program is assessed and improved. This proposal is aimed at increasing the sense of ownership in the program, providing a means for engaging more faculty in the General Education curriculum, and encouraging experimentation and innovation.

While some might characterize this proposal as nothing more than the creation of new faculty committees, it might also be considered a bold idea in the context of faculty governance in higher education. Most universities have an oversight structure similar to the existing General Education Council at UW-Green Bay. Representatives from different academic areas meet regularly to discuss policies and to review proposals for adding or deleting courses. The key feature of our proposal is development of a much broader structure for implementing general education. Responsibilities of the faculty domain committees will include program assessment, faculty development, and cultivation of new ideas in addition to the traditional tasks of curriculum design. With the ongoing demographic transition toward a younger, more diverse faculty at UW-Green Bay, we believe the time is right for a fundamental change in the General Education Program.

The motion passed by the General Education Council:

- The General Education Council will create 5 new "Domain Committees," designed to broaden faculty participation in development, oversight, and assessment of the UW-Green Bay General Education Program. Specific responsibilities of these committees will be to:
 1. Recommend curriculum changes to the General Education Council,
 2. Cultivate opportunities for faculty development and collaboration regarding general education,
 3. Periodically review learning outcomes in the academic area represented by the Domain Committee,
 4. Help insure that existing courses are appropriately aimed at these learning outcomes, and
 5. Oversee assessment of success in achieving the learning outcomes
- Each Domain Committee will consist of at least 3 faculty members, representing the units identified on the attached pages. Committee members will be expected to teach or have taught general education courses or have expertise that contributes to the work of the committee. Academic staff and student participation is encouraged.

- Elected members of the General Education Council will automatically be members of the most appropriate Domain Committee.
- The committees will meet at least twice annually, prior to the deadlines for development of the schedule of classes for the following semester.
- Changes approved by the domain committees will require GEC approval to be enacted.
- Changes broader in scope than a single domain (Interdisciplinary First-Year Seminars, for example, or changes in the General Education requirements for UWGB as a whole rather than for a single domain) will continue to fall under the purview of the GEC.
- Committee members will serve three-year terms and will be selected as follows:
 - a. For the Fine Arts domain, there will be one representative each from Art, Music, and Theatre. The chairs of each of these three disciplines will nominate one or more candidates to serve on the committee, and faculty in the discipline will vote to determine their committee representative. (Additional members may be added at the discretion of the chairs in the domain.)
 - b. For the Humanities, there will be one representative each from English, English Composition, History, Modern Languages, and Philosophy. The chairs or directors of each of these areas will nominate one or more candidates to serve on the committee, and faculty in the area will vote to determine their committee representative. (Additional members may be added at the discretion of the chairs and director in the domain.)
 - c. For the Social Sciences, there will be one representative each from Business Administration, Communication, Human Development, Public and Environmental Affairs, Social Change and Development, and Urban and Regional Studies. The chairs of each of these disciplines will nominate one or more candidates to serve on the committee, and faculty in their discipline will vote to determine their committee representative. An additional committee member should represent First Nations Studies, International Education, or Women's Studies, with the committee member's affiliation rotating among these three areas with each new three-year term. (Additional members may be added at the discretion of the chairs in the domain.)
 - d. For the Natural Sciences, there will be one representative from Computer Science and two representatives each from Environmental Sciences and from Human Biology. The chair of Computer Science will nominate one or more candidates to serve on the committee, and the chairs of Environmental Sciences and of Human Biology will nominate two or more candidates to serve on the committee. Faculty in each discipline will vote to determine their committee representatives. (Additional members may be added at the discretion of the chairs in the domain.)
 - e. For the Ethnic Studies and World Culture domain committee, there will be one representative from the Natural Sciences (alternating between NAS and HUB with each new three-year term), one from the Fine Arts, two from Humanistic Studies, two from the Social Sciences (alternating with each three-year term between one each from SCD and PEA and one each from HUD and URS), and one to be approved by the International Education Council. The appropriate chair (NAS, HUB, HUS, SCD, PEA, HUD, URS) will nominate at least the number of candidates needed for the committee, and members of the unit will elect their representatives. (Additional members may be added at the discretion of the chairs.)

General Education Domain Representation

I. Fine Arts

Art
Communication and the Arts
Music
Theatre

II. Humanities

English
English Composition
French
German
History
Humanistic Studies
Modern Languages
Philosophy
Spanish

III. Social Sciences

Accounting
Anthropology
Business Administration
Communication
Economics
Environmental Policy & Planning
First Nations Studies
Geography
Human Development
Information Sciences
International Education
Political Science
Psychology
Public Administration
Public & Environmental Affairs
Social Change and Development
Social Work
Sociology
Urban and Regional Studies
Women's Studies

IV. Natural Sciences

Biology
Chemistry
Computer Science
Earth Science
Environmental Sciences
Human Biology
Mathematics

V. Ethnic Studies and World Culture (broad based)

Natural Sciences (1 member)
Fine Arts (1 member)
Humanities (2 members)
Social Sciences (2 members)
One additional member to be approved
by the International Education Council

Assigned by Area of Specialization

Education
International Studies
Physical Education

**General Education Council Presents A
Proposal of Four Alternative Plans for General Education at UWGB
Presented to the Faculty Senate April 19, 2006**

Rationale

For more than a decade, faculty and staff have studied and debated changes to the General Education curriculum at UW-Green Bay. Despite widespread agreement that changes are needed, the General Education Program remains essentially the same as it was in 1979, perhaps even weakened as a result of the elimination of the senior seminar requirement.

Criticisms of the existing General Education Program include 1) lack of coherence, 2) lack of interdisciplinary focus, 3) inadequate assessment, and 4) inadequate student engagement. These issues have been addressed in different forums and by two or three unsuccessful proposals for general education reform during the past 15 years.

Given the difficulty in getting any single plan for General Education reform approved in a thumbs up/thumbs down vote, it has been suggested to the General Education Council on more than one occasion that it might be wise to provide the Faculty Senate with an array of plans, thus giving maximum options and possibilities for envisioning reform. The Faculty Senate might find a plan it approves from among the several submitted, or it might wish to combine elements from several plans, or it might prefer that UWGB remain with its current General Education requirements.

Accordingly, the General Education Council (GEC) has approved the idea of forwarding four plans to the Faculty Senate for the Senators' consideration. All four plans assume reform in the sense of creation of domain committees for general education, although most of them could be adopted without the idea of domain committees being enacted. Below is a capsule summary of ways the four plans differ from one another and from our current general education requirements:

Overview of Plans

Plan 1 has the advantages of maximum freedom and ease for the student in satisfying General Education requirements, as well as maximum freedom for the unit to experiment with course array in satisfying General Education requirements. On the other hand, one can argue that it's nothing more than a distribution requirement, and one might also envision some students taking some rather narrowly focused courses to satisfy what are supposed to be rather broad areas of knowledge.

Plan 2 is really simply what we have now, with the addition that domain committees and the GEC may wish to change some of what we have now. (Plan #2 originally involved noticeable changes from what we have now, but it got altered via amendments during the GEC's process of adopting this motion, and we probably didn't even notice that it ended up being simply the status quo plus domain committees.)

Plan #3 tries to allow students and units somewhat more flexibility in satisfying General Education requirements than is currently the case, but also seeks to expose students to a relatively wide array of disciplinary perspectives, as well as exposing them to an interdisciplinary perspective. It also seeks to combine General Education reform with the movement toward Interdisciplinary Freshman Seminars, although it doesn't require that all students take such seminars.

Plan #4 suggests no changes in requirements in most areas of General Education, with two exceptions:

- It suggests that the Catalogue should be revised to emphasize General Education courses as a means of helping students to acquire the knowledge and skills articulated in the General Education Learning Outcomes, rather than simply presenting the courses as a series of requirements to be satisfied/hoops to be jumped through;

- It in essence approves the Humanistic Studies plan for revising the list of courses satisfying the H-1, H-2, and H-3 requirements. The HUS plan involves a number of changes, with the most obvious one being that the H-1/H-2/H-3 lists would resemble lists in all other areas of General Education—three rather long lists of courses, with each list tied to a specific Gen Ed Learning Outcome, rather than only two courses to choose from for H-1 and only two for H-2, and no specific correlation of H-1, H-2, or H-3 with any one specific outcome from among the three Humanities Gen Ed Outcomes, as is the case currently.

The GEC also would encourage the Faculty Senate to consider “mixing and matching”—taking elements from one plan and adding them to elements from another plan, or deleting a certain element from a plan and adopting the rest. For one example among many possibilities, the Faculty Senate might like Plan #1 or Plan #4 with the addition of the Interdisciplinary Freshman Seminars material from Plan #3.

Proposal

In addition to recommending that a system of “domain committees” be created, the General Education Council recommends that the Faculty Senate strongly consider enacting one of the following four plans for revising general education requirements. For each of the four plans, the following items apply:

- The current number of prerequisite-free courses or student seats must be maintained. (Oversight of this should go to the domain committees.)
- The English Competency, Math Competency, Writing Emphasis, Ethnic Studies, and World Cultures requirements will remain as they are.
- Each domain should be evaluated and streamlined if need be. Greater coherence to General Education may be given by reducing options available for meeting the requirements through elimination of courses that do not adequately address the learning objectives.
- Units/areas not featured in current general education domains can be included on the basis of domain committee recommendations.

Below are the four plans the GEC recommends that the Faculty Senate strongly consider:

Plan #1.

- Students will be required to fulfill the following **General Education Breadth Requirement**:
 - a. 3 credits in the **Fine Arts**
 - b. 9 credits in the **Humanities**
 - c. 9 credits in the **Social Sciences**
 - d. 10-12 credits in the **Natural Sciences**
- Any course belonging to units representing these *General Education Domains* will be eligible.

Plan #2.

- Domain committees will specify a list of courses within each domain which satisfy the General Education Breadth Requirement for that domain. This will permit flexibility in the array of courses eligible for the general education program. Lists recommended by the domain committees will be subject to approval by the General Education Council. Students will be required to fulfill the following **General Education Breadth Requirement**:
 - a. 3 credits in the **Fine Arts**
 - b. 9 credits in the **Humanities**
 - c. 9 credits in the **Social Sciences**
 - d. 10-12 credits in the **Natural Sciences**

Plan #3.

- Students will be required to fulfill the following **General Education Breadth Requirement**:
 - a. 3 credits in the **Fine Arts**
 - b. 9 credits in the **Humanities**
 - c. 9 credits in the **Social Sciences**
 - d. 10-12 credits in the **Natural Sciences**
 - e. 3 credits of **Interdisciplinary Coursework**.
- Any course belonging to units representing these *General Education Domains* will be eligible.
- When more than one course is required from a Domain, courses must be from distinct disciplines.
- An **Interdisciplinary Requirement** will be fulfilled by completing any course offered by an interdisciplinary unit.
 - This course can only count for one area of general education (e.g., either satisfy Humanities or Interdisciplinarity).
 - New courses can be created especially for this category.
 - Interdisciplinary Courses may be *Interdisciplinary Freshman Seminars*.

Plan #4.

- We urge that the General Education portion of the University Catalog list the UWGB General Education Learning Outcomes one at a time, with the courses satisfying that outcome listed directly beneath the outcome and with the following requirements:
 - Students would be required to take at least one course from each list. For the outcome that students should have “An understanding of the social sciences, including major concepts of social, political, geographic, and economic structures,” students would be required to take two courses. Students who do not complete a laboratory course would be required to take a second course from any one of the three Natural Sciences Outcome lists.
 - The lists for the three Humanities learning outcomes should be as put forth in the 2004 proposal approved by Humanistic Studies for revising the Humanities general education requirements or, if Humanistic Studies revises those lists, as subsequently revised by HUS.
 - Thereafter, changes in the lists would be originated by the domain subcommittees and subject to the approval of the GEC.