

AGENDA

UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 3

Wednesday, 18 October 2006, 3:00 p.m.

Phoenix Room C, University Union

Presiding Officer: Christine Style, Speaker

Parliamentarian: Professor Clifford F. Abbott

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 2, September 27, 2006 [page 2]

3. CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

4. CONTINUING BUSINESS

- a. Curriculum Planning and Procedures Guide [available as a 75 page pdf file at <http://www.uwgb.edu/Provost/Curriculum/Guidebook.pdf>];
- b. Global Studies Minor

5. NEW BUSINESS

- a. Code Change to Awards and Recognition Committee [page 4]
- b. Search and Screen Procedures for Administrative Appointments [page 6]
- c. Code Change for 3.09 – Nonrenewal of Probationary Appointments [page 7]
- d. Requests for Future Senate Business

6. PROVOST'S REPORT

7. UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE REPORT

Presented by Scott Furlong, Chair

8. ADJOURNMENT

MINUTES 2006-2007

UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 2

Wednesday, September 27, 2006
Phoenix Room C, University Union

Presiding Officer: Christine Style (COA-UC), Speaker

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

PRESENT: Derryl Block (NUR), Peter Breznay (ICS), Francis Carleton (URS), Sally Dresdow (BUA), Scott Furlong (PEA-UC), Clifton Ganyard (HUS), Alison Gates (COA), Cheryl Grosso (COA), Stefan Hall (HUS), Sue Hammersmith (Provost, *ex officio*), Tian-you Hu (NAS), Harvey Kaye (SCD), Mark Kiehn (EDU), Anne Kok (SOCW), Michael Kraft (PEA), Vladimir Kurenok (NAS alternate), Kaoime Malloy (COA), Daniel Meinhardt (HUB), Steven Meyer (NAS), Timothy Meyer (ICS), Terence O'Grady (COA-UC), Debra Pearson (HUB), Donna Ritch (HUB-UC), Kevin Roeder (SOCW-UC), Meir Russ (BUA), Bruce Shepard (Chancellor, *ex officio*), Brian Sutton (HUS), Kristin Vespia (HUD), Dean Von Dras (HUD-UC)

NOT PRESENT: Pao Lor (EDU)

REPRESENTATIVES: Paula Ganyard (Academic Staff Committee), Trista Seubert (Student Government)

GUESTS: Dean Fritz Erickson, Interim Dean Fergus Hughes, Associate Provost Timothy Sewall

1. Call to Order. With a quorum present, Speaker Style called the Senate to order at 3:08 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes of UW-Green Bay Faculty Senate Meeting No. 1, September 13, 2006. The minutes were approved with slight modification and no objection.

3. Continuing Business. University Committee Chair Furlong introduced the issue of how the Senate should respond to the Regents' proposal to add UWS 7 to its administrative code. That code currently has procedures for discipline and dismissal in UWS 4, but UWS 7 proposes an expedited process to be used in cases involving serious criminal misconduct--a process designed to be quicker and to allow suspension without pay in some cases. An attempt to coordinate the responses of the Faculty Senates across UW campuses by using the language of a single resolution to endorse the proposed UWS 7 seemed to be failing. The UW-Green Bay Senate rejected that resolution at its last meeting and asked the University Committee to bring forward an alternative. The UC's response was to offer two alternatives: one was to pass the resolution previously considered but to attach an explanatory letter urging specific changes; the other was to pass an endorsement of the UWS 7 proposal on the condition that specific changes be made. In both alternatives the specific changes were the same. **Senator Dresdow moved (second by Senator Ritch) the latter alternative (attachment #3).**

Debate on the motion continued for over an hour. It included questions of clarification (about the history of the proposal, the source for some of the background materials, about the actions of other campuses) and requests for interpretations (of the Regents' motivations and likely future actions, of the faculty representatives' intentions, of the legislature's intent and future actions, of legal opinions, of possible court actions). Several Senators tested the proposal with scenarios (of embezzlement, sexual assault, employees not doing their jobs). In general the arguments against the proposal focused on:

- confusing language (either because of vague generalities or because specific language changes resulted in awkward redundancies that might hide intent)
- fears of the loss of certain protections (due process, academic freedom, and tenure)

- legal status (differences between government and private employment, possible unconstitutionality, redundancies between UWS 7 and UWS 4, internal versus external, i.e., cops and courts, systems of justice).

Another thread in the debate dealt with political readings (is there a political advantage in supporting something you believe will be challenged and overturned in court; is there an advantage to the faculty's stake in shared governance with respect to the Regents or the Regents' interests with respect to the legislature; is there an advantage to a coordinated response across the UW-System as opposed to individual campus responses). **The motion was called and defeated (3-21-3).**

Senator Furlong then moved (Senator Dresdow seconded) the other alternative - the resolution defeated at the last meeting along with the letter (attachments #1 and #2). The discussion was less extensive and somewhat more emotional, but the vote was fairly decisive. **The motion was defeated (0-25-2).**

At least twice in the earlier debate, Senators made remarks that came close to offering alternative motions (Senator Breznay suggested a flat rejection of UWS 7 and a vote of no confidence if the proposal were enacted anyway; Senator Block suggested a letter to the Regents with a simple listing of concerns) but stopped short of offering formal action. At this point Senator Sutton was willing to offer an alternative. After some highly collaborative editorial work, which apparently distracted the Senate from noticing that it violated its own rules by going past its 5:00 p.m. deadline, the following motion was crafted:

The University of Wisconsin - Green Bay Faculty Senate, along with faculties at other UW campuses, recognizes the need to terminate the employment of those convicted of certain serious criminal offenses. However, we are concerned with the apparent absence of due process and possible unconstitutionality of the proposed UWS 7, particularly subsections .02 and .06. We welcome an alternative proposal which addresses our concerns.

This language was moved by Senator Sutton and seconded by Senator Grosso and passed by the Senate (23-0-4).

4. Adjournment. The Speaker immediately adjourned the meeting at 5:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Clifford Abbott, Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

PROPOSED CHANGE TO COMMITTEE ON AWARDS AND RECOGNITION

To ensure continuity, change one-year membership terms to staggered two-year terms.

Committee on Awards and Recognition

1. The Committee on Awards and Recognition is composed of four appointed faculty members, with no more than two from one domain voting district, three appointed Academic Staff members, one appointed Classified Support Staff member, and two appointed student members.
2. **Appointment to the committee shall be for a term of two years with the terms of faculty and academic staff staggered so as to ensure continuity of membership. Student members are appointed annually.**
3. The committee coordinates with the Provost/Vice Chancellor and Chancellor in nominating candidates for awards and recognitions.
4. The committee nominates for the following awards: Faculty Award for Excellence in Teaching; Faculty Award for Excellence in Scholarship; Academic Support Award for Excellence; University Award for Excellence in Institutional Development; University Award for Excellence in Community Outreach; University Award for Excellence in Collaborative Achievement; Classified Staff Award for Excellence
5. The committee advises the Chancellor as to candidates for non-academic awards.
6. The committee advises on matters of public events and aids in arranging commencements, honors convocations, and other convocations and public functions as requested by the Chancellor.
7. The committee recommends names for buildings and other physical facilities and features of the campus.

NOTE: The faculty members on the committee constitute the core of the Honorary Degree Committee.

Faculty Senate New Business 5(a)
18 October 2006

PROPOSED CHANGES TO SEARCH AND SCREEN PROCEDURES FOR ADMINISTRATIVE APPOINTMENTS

The procedure for selecting Vice Chancellors, academic deans, and any other institution-wide administrative position which affects a major portion of the academic activities of the University as determined from time to time by the Chancellor and the University Committee, will be as follows:

~~2-~~ **1.** The job description for the position shall be developed jointly by the Chancellor (or his/her designee) and the University Committee, and, if the position directly impacts their respective areas, the Academic Staff Committee and/or Student Association. [Section moved from 2nd page, #2]

~~4-~~ **2.** The Chancellor shall appoint a Search and Screen Committee normally consisting of no more than nine members whose composition and names of appointments shall include the participation of women, minorities, and other under-represented classes as follows:

- a. The Chancellor shall request that the Speaker of the Senate with the advice and consent of the University Committee provide a reasonable number of names of faculty members who would constitute a majority in the Search and Screen Committee.
- b. The Chancellor will request the Academic Staff Committee to submit a reasonable number of names from which two persons will be selected for membership on the Search and Screen Committee.
- c. The Chancellor will request the Student Association to submit the name of a student (or the names of two, if special circumstances warrant that two students serve) for membership on the Search and Screen Committee.
- d. The Chancellor in consultation with the University Committee may name one (or under special circumstances, two) at-large member(s) from the community.
- e. The Chairperson of the Search and Screen Committee will be chosen by members of the Search and Screen Committee.
- f. ~~The Chairperson of the Search and Screen Committee will be held accountable for the responsibility of appropriate consultation with the Special Assistant to the Chancellor for Affirmative Action and the Chancellor (or his/her designee) regarding the following approval stages:~~

- ~~1. Position Announcement and Recruitment Plan~~
- ~~2. Selection Criteria and Interview Format~~
- ~~3. Applicant Roster~~
- ~~4. Interview Pool~~
- ~~5. Final Candidate Pool~~

Faculty Senate New Business 5(b)
18 October 2006

~~g.~~ **f.** ~~The Special Assistant to the Chancellor for Affirmative Action~~ **A representative of the Human Resources Office** will serve as an *ex officio* non-voting member on all administrative search and screen committees.

~~2. The job description for the position shall be developed jointly by the Chancellor (or his/her designee) and the University Committee, and, if the position directly impacts their respective areas, the Academic Staff Committee and/or Student Association. [Section moved to #1.]~~

~~3. The Search and Screen Committee, using the job description, will, in consultation with the Special Assistant to the Chancellor for Affirmative Action, develop an announcement of the vacancy that meets affirmative action guidelines and will then publish that announcement in a manner that will elicit wide spread interest among potential candidates.~~

4. **3.** The Search and Screen Committee shall follow established procedures for unclassified searches.

5. **4.** The Search and Screen Committee shall be charged by the Chancellor or his/her designee to develop a list of three to five unranked candidates who would be acceptable for the position.

If none of the slate of candidates so recommended is acceptable to the Chancellor, President, or the Board of Regents, or if all acceptable candidates decline, the Search and Screen Committee may be requested to submit a new list of acceptable candidates, or ~~a new Search and Screen Committee will be appointed~~ **the search may be closed.**

The procedure for selecting a Chancellor will follow the Regent policy adopted on 3 November 1972 (Regent Resolution #325).

**UWGB Faculty Senate Document #87-18 Approved 18 May 1988
Revised, 18 January 1989**

PROPOSED CODE CHANGE TO UWGB 3.09

Changes bolded and crossed out in BLACK were previously approved by the Faculty Senate

Proposed Highlighted Additions and Deletions Crossed Out in BLUE:

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.

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 *with 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.**

Faculty Senate New Business 5(c)
18 October 2006