

AGENDA

UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 8

Wednesday, 10 May 2006, 3:00 p.m.

Niagara Rooms AB, 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. 7, April 19, 2006 [page 2]

3. CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

4. CONTINUING BUSINESS: Presented by Professor Sally Dresdow

- a. Discussion of General Education Council Proposal for Domain Committees [page 6]
- b. Discussion of General Education Council's General Education Plans [page 9]

5. NEW BUSINESS: Presented by Professor Sally Dresdow

- a. Election of Speaker for 2006-07
- b. Curriculum Planning and Procedures Guide [available as a 75 page pdf file at http://www.uwgb.edu/sofas/facGov/facsenate/agendas/Curriculum_Guide5-2-06.pdf]
- c. Discussion of First Nations Major [previously distributed at April Senate]
- d. Proposed Code Change to UWGB 3.09.2 [page 12]
- e. 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. 7
 Wednesday, April 19, 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), Forrest Baulieu (ICS-UC), Joy Benson (BUA), 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), Harvey Kaye (SCD), Michael Kraft (PEA), Mimi Kubsch (NUR), Kaoime Malloy (alternate for Rebecca Tout, COA), Judith Martin (SOCW), Daniel Meinhardt (HUB), Steven Meyer (alternate for John Katers, NAS), Terence O'Grady (COA-UC), Debra Pearson (HUB), Tara Reed (NAS), 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: Mark Kiehn (EDU).

REPRESENTATIVES: Lucy Arendt (Academic Staff Committee), Eric Mims (Student Government Association).

GUESTS: Dean Fritz Erickson, Mark Everingham (SCD), David Coury (HUS), Associate Dean Regan Gurung, Scott Hildebrand (University Communications), Interim Dean Fergus Hughes, Andrew Kersten (SCD), Kevin Fermanich (NAS), Associate Provost Timothy Sewall.

1. Call to Order. With a quorum present, Speaker Davis called the Senate to order at 3:04 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes of UW-Green Bay Faculty Senate Meeting No. 6, March 15, 2006.

The minutes were approved by voice vote with one change: On p. 6 as distributed, the words "with a reassignment, without having a say in the action" are added to the end of the sentence that originally read "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."

3. Chancellor's Report.

Chancellor Shepard reported on the following issues:

a. The deer culling has proceeded smoothly. Any concerns should be expressed to Assistant Chancellor Rodeheaver or Professor Bob Howe.

b. Former UW-Green Bay political science professor Martin Greenberg has accepted an invitation to speak at commencement.

c. The Regents meeting was a success surpassing all expectations. The presentation by community leaders was described by one Regent as "the best presentation to the Regents I have seen," and the Regents were all impressed by the extent of community support for our campus. Music faculty provided a spectacular evening performance. As the growth agenda moves forward, we would be considering adding a building about the size of MAC Hall.

d. The LAS Dean search was closed until next year. There has been a rather lengthy history of failed searches for this position (five since prior to his arrival). This is not unusual around the country, but the situation is cause for reflection. He is thinking out loud about "How we might grow our own" if outside

searches—which are generally best-- aren't working, and welcomes any and all ideas or suggestions for stabilizing this particularly important position.

4. Continuing Business.

a. Proposed Global Studies Minor. UC Chair Dresdow noted that, as requested at the last Senate meeting, letters of support for a new minor (at least those available in electronic format) were attached to the agenda. **Senator Carleton moved (with second) to support the proposal for an independent minor in global studies with two stipulations: a) that language expressing preference for a single foreign language be removed and b) that the executive committee for the new minor discuss involvement in the program with any and all interested faculty.** Carleton began the discussion on the motion by saying that the global studies minor should not be housed in SCD or any other unit. The proposal for this free-standing minor has been building for four years and many academic units, including SCD, have been involved. Responding to criticism last month that the proposal lacked intellectual coherence, Carleton defended the eclectic organization of the minor over a more unified one, and he foresees creative evolution of the minor over time. He addressed the argument for a 2-year language requirement by suggesting that, as good as the idea is, a 2-year requirement for a minor is impractical. And finally he countered the argument that economists were not included in the minor by noting that Larry Smith is a participating economist, and one other was initially included but decided not to continue. Participation has always been, and remains, voluntary.

Senator Kaye argued that SCD has not been consulted since the process began 3 or 4 years ago and that this was a major flaw in the process. Creating a minor such as the one that has been proposed without supporting resources is a cheap way for the University to appear globally concerned and it has lead to a terribly weak and embarrassing proposal. If the University is serious about global studies, we should invest in a major or make an important commitment to global studies in our general education program and not accept a minor created through a “corrupt” system.

The question of whether to house the minor in a unit or not permeated the debate. Several wish to see the minor available to all students not just those in a single unit, and others called Women's Studies an example of how free-standing degree programs can succeed. Some argued that there are no free programs and that minors such as this one should be housed in budgetary units where there are resources for chair reassignment and program development.

A second thread running through the debate concerned the academic integrity of the proposed minor.

A third thread questioned the process and whether or not it was flawed and, if it were, what, if anything, should be done about it—step back and reconsider or move forward and develop. It was noted that the process demonstrably included letters of support from around campus, a series of hearings and an AAC recommendation, UC consideration, and now Senate review. That is the established process. The AAC had considered the proposal, so why should the Senate duplicate the work of the committee responsible for reviewing the integrity of programs? As part of this thread, Senator Kaye wished to make it known that he faults the administration and not the global studies committee. The Provost and Chancellor each took strong exception to the allegation that the system that developed this proposal, or the administration, was corrupt, noting that the curricular approval process is a faculty responsibility.

As the various threads were being spun, Senator Meyer asked the Speaker to recognize Professor Everingham. Without opposition, Everingham said that a more perfect proposal would require resources that are beyond reach and that was, consequently, not a consideration. The proposal is eclectic, flexible and responsive to a campus need. He noted that Professor Lockard's History of the Modern World has always been included in the proposal and Professor Walters has two courses in the proposal, and both are SCD members, as he is himself. He hopes the Senate will allow the minor to get started so that an executive committee can be formed that will work on involving all who wish to be included.

The Provost urged the Senate to move forward in a way that might heal hurt feelings stemming from the process, in order to respond to a definite need for a cross-campus option for global studies. The minor's executive committee, if the Senate wishes, can be asked to develop statements of learning outcomes, address the role of economics in the minor, and explain the interdisciplinary nature of the coursework, or anything else the Senate wishes to suggest.

Senator Furlong asked for clarification how an executive committee would be selected. Confronted with momentary silence, the speaker asked the Secretary for an opinion, which was that the same process used to form the interdisciplinary studies executive committee (UC and Provost working together) could be used here. Following discussion of possible outcomes of the day's debate and parliamentary possibilities, **Professor Kaye moved to postpone further consideration of the motion on the floor. Senator Jeffreys seconded the motion and, with permission of the mover, added the stipulation to the motion that a committee be assembled to respond to concerns of the senate and return with a revised document in September.** The Speaker recognized the motion as negotiated between mover and seconder. Debate continued on the motion to postpone. Senator Kubsch and Senator Jeffreys expect the committee to address issues of substance and not spend time reviewing possible flaws in the previous process.

Senator Meyer moved (with second) to amend the motion by postponing further consideration until October rather than September. **The amendment passed 22 in favor with 4 abstentions.** The discussion returned to the motion to postpone. Senator Vespa summarized the issues in need of clarification as learning outcomes, theoretical grounding, the foreign language requirement, and the role of economics. There being no further discussion, the **motion to postpone further consideration of the motion before the Senate passed 20-5-1.** [Since the parliamentarian senses some potential confusion regarding this vote and since he won't be around to offer an opinion in October, he would like to make clear that it is Senator Carleton's motion that was postponed and that will again be before the Senate when it resumes discussion of the topic in October. Should the committee the Senate has directed be formed come forward with its own proposal, senators will have two principal options: amend the original proposal accordingly or vote it down in order to replace it with an alternate.]

5. New Business

a. Resolution on the Granting of Degrees. **UC Chair Dresdow moved (with second) the following resolution:**

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.

The resolution passed unanimously.

b) Discussion of General Education Council Proposal for Domain Committees. The Speaker deferred discussion until next meeting for lack of time, although Senator Sutton from the GEC was invited to introduce the two general education topics with a few comments. The domain committee proposal (b) is meant to bring oversight "closer to home." The second report (c) will present a series of options for General Education reform in an effort to avoid continuation of the pattern of rejected proposals that has gotten us nowhere.

c) Discussion of General Education Council's General Education Plans. The Speaker deferred discussion until next meeting for lack of time.

d) Requests for Future Senate Business. There were none.

6. Provost's Report.

Provost Hammersmith previously distributed a written report (see <http://www.uwgb.edu/provost/report4.19.06.pdf>).

7. University Committee Report. UC Chair Dresdow distributed information concerning a proposal for a First Nations Studies major that will be on the May Senate agenda. She reported that the committee drafting UWS 7 for the Regents took seriously the issues raised by Faculty Senates, and a vote on the chapter has been postponed. The UC intends to bring a draft outline of the curriculum approval process to the Senate in May.

8. Adjournment. The Speaker called for a motion to adjourn, which was made and approved at 4:51 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kenneth Fleurant, Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

**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.

Proposed Code Change to UWGB 3.09 2

The purpose of this change is to be clearer about the Reconsideration Procedure and bring UWGB code more into alignment with UWS 3.07.

2. Reconsideration Procedure

Every faculty member for whom a negative recommendation is made will have the right of reconsideration upon written request of the faculty member within 15 days of receipt of written reasons. The reconsideration review shall be held within 20 days of the written request for reconsideration. ~~The reconsideration committee or office will either be the interdisciplinary unit executive committee, the appropriate Dean(s), or the Chancellor, depending upon the level at which the decision was reached.~~

(a) The purpose of reconsideration of a non-renewal decision shall be to provide an opportunity to a fair and full reconsideration of the nonrenewal decision, and to ensure that all relevant material is considered.

1. The reconsideration committee or office will either be the interdisciplinary unit executive committee, the appropriate Dean(s), or the Chancellor, depending upon the level at which the decision was reached. **Such reconsideration shall include, but not be limited to, adequate notice of the time of reconsideration of the decision, an opportunity to respond to the written reasons and to present any written or oral evidence or arguments relevant to the decision, and written notification of the decision resulting from the reconsideration.**
2. Reconsideration is not a hearing, or an appeal, and shall be nonadversarial in nature.
3. The format and conditions will be as outlined for the original review--see UWGB 3.08(5). The faculty member will be notified in writing of the decision of the chairperson of the reconsideration committee, the appropriate Dean(s), or the Chancellor, within 20 days, with a copy to all levels of review within UWGB.
4. In the event that a reconsideration affirms the nonrenewal decision, the faculty member may appeal under the procedures specified in UWGB 3.10 **and UWS 3.08.**