

UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 2

Wednesday, October 15, 2008

Rose Hall 220, 3:30 p.m. **[NOTE: NEW LOCATION]**

Presiding Officer: Illene Noppe, Speaker

Parliamentarian: Clifford F. Abbott

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 1, September 17, 2008 [page 2]

3. CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

4. NEW BUSINESS

- a. Proposal to Develop Faculty Senate Caucuses [page 5]
Presented by Illene Noppe
- b. Requests for future business

5. PROVOST'S REPORT

6. UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE REPORT

Presented by Steven Meyer, Chair

7. FORUM: Requirement for all students to complete an interdisciplinary major or minor [page 7]

8. ADJOURNMENT

MINUTES 2008-2009

UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 1

Wednesday, September 17, 2008

University Union 103

Presiding Officer: Illene Noppe, Speaker of the Senate

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

PRESENT: Scott Ashmann (EDU), Andrew Austin (SCD), Peter Breznay (ICS), Kathleen Burns (HUD), Matthew Dornbush (NAS), Susan Gallagher-Lepak (NUR), Stefan Hall (HUS), William Laatsch (Interim Provost, *ex officio*), Catherine Henze (HUS), Curt Heuer (AVD), Steve Kimball (EDU), John Lyon (NAS), Kaoime Malloy (AVD alternate), Michael McIntire (NAS alternate), Randall Meder (AVD), Daniel Meinhardt (HUB), Steven Meyer (NAS-UC), Thomas Nesslein (URS), Illene Noppe (HUD-UC), Uwe Pott (HUB), Laura Riddle (AVD-UC), Meir Russ (BUA-UC), Marilyn Sagrillo (BUA alternate), Jolanda Sallmann (SOCW), John Stoll (PEA), Brian Sutton (HUS-UC), David Ward (Interim Chancellor, *ex officio*), David Voelker (HUS), Dean VonDras (HUD-UC), Jill White (HUD)

NOT PRESENT: Tim Meyer (ICS)

REPRESENTATIVES: Katrina Hrivnak (Academic Staff Committee), Jamie Froh (Student Government)

GUESTS: Associate Provost Tim Sewall, Dean Scott Furlong, Dean Fritz Erickson, Associate Provost Jan Thornton, Vice Chancellor Tom Maki

1. Call to Order. With a quorum present, Speaker Noppe called the Senate to order at 3:37 p.m., and after preliminary welcoming remarks, had the senators introduce themselves.

2. Approval of Minutes of UW-Green Bay Faculty Senate Meeting No. 9, May 13, 2008. On a motion by Senator Steve Meyer (second by Senator Dan Meinhardt) the minutes were **approved by voice vote**.

3. Chancellor's Report. Interim Chancellor Ward identified his top priority as improving faculty/staff compensation. He explained how the back loading of previously-approved pay raises in last spring's budget repair bill (legislature's fault) had led to some confusion in people's appointment letters. He also reiterated his decision to allocate the Chancellor's discretionary 10% of this year's pay plan to the pool on money available for unit merit decisions. He then talked about four ways in which he was focusing on keeping the campus moving ahead:

1. Enrollment planning - how do we meet enrollment goals given demographic changes in the college age population.
2. Three initiatives announced at convocation: internationalizing the university; an institute (or center) on entrepreneurship and innovation; and an institute on environmental management and business
3. Fostering community and alumni support
4. The Growth Agenda - here the Chancellor distributed three handouts illustrating how he has been making the case to legislators and business leaders for the next phase of the Growth Agenda.

The Chancellor then invited questions and got them from half a dozen senators: could there be “per FTE” numbers on the handouts (yes); how does the Legislature view the demographic changes in the student age population (northeast Wisconsin remains underrepresented in percent of population that graduates from college - the Chancellor will be bringing deans of two-year campuses and many high school superintendents to visit this campus); should we be spending more on advertising (the Chancellor thinks we ought to, but we need to be economical); will student services suffer in the Growth Agenda (we have a solid base now that could handle some economies of scale); do we still aim for 7500 students (yes); how did we choose that number (it may or may not be realistic, but we get no growth at all without some number); what is the “New North” (it is a private initiative of the northeast quarter of Wisconsin for economic development and has enlisted the cooperation of most of public education in its efforts).

4. New Business.

a. Election of Senate Deputy Speaker for 2008-09. Senator Steve Meyer (second by Senator Henze) nominated Senator Riddle. There were no further nominations and **Senator Riddle was unanimously elected Deputy Speaker** by voice vote.

b. Requests for future business. Speaker Noppe asked for items for future business and received none.

5. Provost's Report. The Provost elaborated on the changing local demographics (growth in minorities and the disadvantaged and adults but not in traditional college-age people) and the need for the University to adapt. He then announced three task forces that had been created. One headed by Jan Thornton on adult education and part time students; another headed by the academic Deans on marketing the University (we still have problems communicating our identity to outsiders); and a third headed by Mike Stearney on improving enrollment management techniques in a competitive environment. He also announced that renovations are planned for Rose and Wood Halls and that Heidi Fencil of the new faculty development office will be paying special attention to distance education possibilities. The Provost then stood for questions and got one about possibilities of increasing international students (there are issues there but yes, we are looking at it).

6. University Committee Annual Report for 2007-2008. The retiring (but not very) Chair of last year's UC supplemented the written report with a list of issues of past and continuing interest for this year's UC: the curriculum planning guide, the program review process, administrator evaluation, unit alignment, understanding interdisciplinarity, the planning and budget aspects of shared governance, summer session payments, teaching effectiveness, and campus morale.

7. University Committee Report. UC Chair Meyer began his report by thanking the previous speaker for stealing his thunder and then listed some additional topics the UC is currently discussing: the requirement that students take an interdisciplinary program, some Committee of Six concerns with the process of selecting named professors, the possible amalgamation of Chapters 3 and 51 in Code, and some vacancies on the Sustainability Council.

8. Open Forum. The Speaker launched the topic of finding ways of empowering the Senate and increasing the engagement of senators. About half of the senators contributed ideas and they tended to focus on two questions: whether the environment we meet in could be improved; and whether senators have enough knowledge, access, and opportunity to discuss issues that come before the Senate.

On the environment issue people talked about the choice of room (it should be small enough so we can hear everyone and see each other and read name tags and airy but not cavernous and without sound distractions, although windows might be good), the use of technology (some display formats might help attention, but people were divided on clickers), and the level of formality (people wanted their first names back on name tags). On the knowledge, access, and opportunity issue, people considered whether tenure should be a requirement for serving on the Senate (most spoke against this but invoked the need for a balance between senior experience and youthful vigor - several people noted that the Senate is one of the few places pre-tenured people can learn about wider issues of the University); whether some sort of caucus system could provide discussions by smaller groups before considerations by the full Senate; how the UC should be communicating and supplying information to senators (links on the agenda to background material, supplying the agenda early enough so groups of senators could meet before the full Senate); whether we need more opportunities for discussion rather than action (expanded use of the open forum part of the Senate meetings); and whether individuals should be bringing issues before the Senate apart from the UC setting the agenda.

Jamie Froh, representative from student government, also suggested a joint meeting at some point with student government.

9. Adjournment. The Open Forum continued until 5 p.m. at which point a **motion to extend the meeting by ten minutes (Senator Heuer with second by Senator Russ) failed** and the meeting adjourned by Senate House Rules.

Respectfully submitted,

Clifford Abbott, Secretary of the Faculty and Academic

UW-Green Bay University Committee Fall 2008 Proposal to Develop Faculty Senate Caucuses

Introduction:

The Open Forum of the Faculty Senate meeting of September 17, 2008, considered the question of how to foster participation and Senator engagement in the faculty governance process. The UC would like to see our Senators better informed about the issues on the Senate agenda, more likely to freely discuss controversial issues, and more invested in decisions regarding the curriculum and academic policies of the University. In order to achieve these goals, this document proposes that the Senate be organized into caucuses that would typically meet once a month for the first 30 minutes of the Senate meeting, to discuss the issues on the agenda.

Implementation of Caucus Structure:

The thirty Senators shall be divided into at least four groups. These groups should have both tenured and pre-tenured representatives, and be members from different units. Two possible grouping schemes are proposed below.

Possible Caucus Arrangement 1:

This arrangement would group Senators according to the four voting districts (Arts & Humanities; Social Sciences; Natural Sciences; Professional Studies). The advantage of grouping this way is that Senators will bring a common vantage point to the issues that are discussed. With this arrangement, for the 2008-2009 academic year, three of the four groups have seven Senators (including UC members); AH has a total of nine. Each of the four groups has at least one pre-tenured faculty member.

Possible Caucus Arrangement 2:

This arrangement affords greater cross-fertilization of ideas across units. There would be five caucuses with 6 Senators. Group membership would initially be determined via random assignment, with not more than three Senators from the same domain. The final groups would be adjusted so that pre-tenured faculty (N = 9) would be represented in each group.

Inclusion of Additional Caucus Members

In order to get broader campus input, caucuses may include representatives from Student Government and Academic staff.

Process:

Prior to the regularly scheduled agenda items of the Faculty Senate, caucuses would meet for the first thirty minutes of the Senate meeting. *This change in procedure would require for the Senate to vote to amend the Faculty Senate House Rules to allow for the possibility of caucuses.* Although it is anticipated that most Senate meetings would have “caucus issues” on the agenda, there may be times when that is not the case and thus caucuses would not have to meet. Within each caucus, major themes and concerns that emerge from the discussion of the issues should be recorded. A designated representative of the caucus would then be required to present a summary of the discussion at the beginning of the discussion of the agenda item.

Evaluation:

In order to determine if the new system of caucusing is a successful way to promote Senator involvement, a brief survey will be administered to all Senate participants at the end of the Spring 2009 semester.

Proposal to Eliminate the Graduation Requirement of
Either an Interdisciplinary Major or an Interdisciplinary Minor--Reasons
Brian Sutton

1. *Many students now take a minor that they don't particularly want, in order to satisfy the current rule.* A university is justified in requiring certain kinds of general education courses, as well as in requiring certain courses of those student majoring or minoring in a particular area. But I question whether a university can justify requiring students to minor in an area the students wouldn't choose under ordinary circumstances. The requirement is especially questionable because in some cases, the unwanted interdisciplinary minor is the reason the student takes five years, rather than four, to graduate.

2. *For most students, the current rule doesn't make a UWGB education interdisciplinary in ways that distinguish us from other universities.* The interdisciplinary area with the most UWGB students majoring or minoring in it is Business Administration; another of the leading interdisciplinary areas is Elementary Education; and Environmental Science, Nursing and Social Work all have substantial numbers in their programs. While UWGB is undoubtedly justified in classifying these as interdisciplinary programs, our having these programs doesn't distinguish us from most other institutions, institutions which make no special claims to interdisciplinarity and which do not have a similar rule regarding an interdisciplinary major or minor.

Even in cases where our interdisciplinary area has no counterpart among most other institutions of our size, many of the courses *within* the interdisciplinary area would be considered disciplinary courses at other institutions. Many of our Human Development courses would fit rather comfortably with Psychology departments at most universities; many of our Human Biology courses would be Biology courses elsewhere; the most heavily enrolled Humanistic Studies courses, Foundations of Western Culture I and II, are essentially identical to the "Western Civ" surveys offered in most universities' History programs. In short, the interdisciplinary major/minor requirement doesn't cause most UWGB students' interdisciplinary experiences to be much different from those of students at other institutions—other than the fact, already mentioned, that some of our students must satisfy a minor they really have no desire to pursue, sometimes staying in college for an additional year as a result.

3. *UWGB, as it is today, is not a uniquely interdisciplinary institution, and it is counterproductive for us to pretend otherwise.* UWGB bears little resemblance to what it was in its early years, when it literally didn't have traditional departments and traditional disciplines, and when students' majors had exotic names like Analysis and Synthesis. Gradually, the unique elements of a UWGB education—the exotically-named majors and minors, the interdisciplinary seminars required of all first-year students and all seniors, and so forth—have been eliminated, perhaps for good reason in many cases.

My home unit provides an example of how things have changed. When Humanistic Studies reformed the Humanities portion of the General Education requirements a couple of years ago, the reform put more humanities general education into traditional disciplinary courses, less into interdisciplinary courses with a Humanistic Studies prefix. Admittedly, this change resulted partly from resource issues, as it is easier for the unit to support disciplinary general education courses which can also satisfy requirements for the disciplinary majors and minors. But the primary reason for the change was that as older faculty retired and new ones took their places, it became increasingly difficult to find faculty members willing to devote part of their teaching load to interdisciplinary courses rather than to courses in their areas of specialization. The Humanities change eliminated almost the last interdisciplinary-course requirement from our general education. UWGB's current general education requirements are exactly what our recently-departed chancellor once called them: distribution requirements.

At the same time that UWGB has moved away from interdisciplinary courses, most disciplines nationwide have become increasingly interdisciplinary in their approaches. For example, fifty years ago, my own area of English was dominated by “New Criticism,” an approach focusing exclusively, almost obsessively, on purely literary elements of the text itself. Today, we routinely bring concepts from history, psychology, theatre, sociology, music, gender studies, cultural studies, and an array of other disciplines into the equation when we examine literary texts in a classroom. Many other disciplines have broadened their approaches in analogous ways. Thus, the distinction between disciplines and interdisciplinary areas becomes increasingly arbitrary. UWGB puts itself into an untenable position by maintaining, for example, that Education is interdisciplinary, while Theatre (which involves literature in the script, public speaking in the performance, dance and music in many productions, art, design, and engineering in the sets, costumes and lighting, psychology in the actors’ character analysis, etc.) is not interdisciplinary.

Finally, let me add that if UWGB were truly a uniquely interdisciplinary institution, our students when asked about why they chose UWGB or our graduates when asked about the advantages of our education might at least occasionally mention our interdisciplinary approach (they almost never do), and our faculty might agree as to what we mean by “interdisciplinary education” (we don’t, and we freely admit it whenever the subject comes up for discussion).

4. *In tough economic times for our university, the interdisciplinary major/minor rule creates financial burdens and an unequal playing field.* Over the years I have heard many faculty members and administrators acknowledge one way UWGB is unique: we face unusual staffing problems because the school is committed to not only the usual array of disciplinary majors and minors of a school our size, but also to a second layer of interdisciplinary majors and minors. Quite simply, compared to other schools our size, we must staff far more programs.

Not surprisingly, then, as state support for higher education in Wisconsin gradually erodes, we often face painful decisions about programs and positions. Within the fairly recent past, for example, we have discontinued the Physics major, and we have chosen not to hire a new faculty member in French when a faculty member in that discipline retired, so that now we have only a single faculty member for that major. In the near future, we’ll need to decide whether or not we can hire enough faculty members for a viable program in Teaching English as a Second Language. The number of majors and minors in these programs plays a large role in these decisions. But while students never major or minor in a discipline unless they *want* to, some minor in an interdisciplinary area because they *have* to. Given that enrollment numbers, and numbers of majors and minors, play an important role in difficult programmatic and personnel decisions, perhaps the interdisciplinary areas should not have this built-in advantage over the disciplines.

If the interdisciplinary major/minor requirement truly helped most UWGB students to experience a uniquely interdisciplinary education, then it might well be worth maintaining despite the difficulties it creates. But because the current requirement doesn’t have the positive effects we wish it had, its negative effects are sufficient that we should strongly consider eliminating the requirement.

Responses to “*Proposal to Eliminate the Graduate Requirement of Either an Interdisciplinary Major or an Interdisciplinary Minor*”

Illene Noppe
9-24-08

1. Our students need 120 credits to graduate. With good advising, they should be able to take an interdisciplinary minor that would complement and enhance their major. Part of good advising involves really listening to what they want. We also need to more carefully explain why the interdisciplinary requirement exists. Many of our students have no idea. Hopefully the Freshman Seminar program will begin early socialization in this regard.
2. I agree. We need to come up with a set of guidelines that would help to determine what makes a major interdisciplinary. We should, perhaps, look back at the early days of UWGB for verbiage. As for Human Development, I strongly object to the assertion that our courses fit into psychology. Our department has worked very hard to distinguish ourselves from psychology and to truly reflect an interdisciplinary approach. It is imperative that we not bring preconceived notions to judging the structure of majors outside of our field!
3. I agree that UWGB is not wholly (I would not use the term uniquely) interdisciplinary, and I have always objected to the cookie cutter approach to higher education. Rather than throw out the concept, perhaps we need to strength the interdisciplinary components of the “disciplinary” majors and minors. We were cutting edge once, and now many institutions are following the lead—I would hate to have us step backward in time when academia is recognizing that education needs to be moving more towards interdisciplinarity.
4. UWGB has grown with our community, and as we become more global and service oriented in the local economy, interdisciplinarity should become more important, not less! This is a marketing issue, and should not drive our academic policies.

Report to the Faculty Senate from the Academic Affairs Council

October 2008

The Academic Affairs Council has recently approved the following actions:

New courses approved:

Social Work 734 Field Research Consultation

Human Development 400 Advanced Developmental Research

Human Development 198 First Year Seminar – How We Live: American
Cities and Suburbs

Spanish 465 Special Topics

A change in title from Earth Science to Geoscience for the disciplinary major and minor