

AGENDA

UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 5

Wednesday, 21 January 2004, 3:00 p.m.

PHOENIX ROOM C, University Union

Presiding Officer: Illene Noppe, Speaker

Parliamentarian: Professor Kenneth J. Fleurant

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. APPROVAL OF [MINUTES OF FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 4,](#)

DECEMBER 10, 2003 (ATTACHED)

3. CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

4. CONTINUING BUSINESS:

- a. [Faculty Status for Lecturers: Resolutions](#) [attached].

Presented by Professor Clifford Abbott, Chair, University Committee

5. NEW BUSINESS:

- a. [Code Change for Open Meetings \(first reading\)](#). [attached]

Presented by Professor Clifford Abbott.

- b. [Creating a Campus Climate Committee](#). [attached]

Presented by Professor Clifford Abbott

- c. [Allowing Alternate Senators \(first reading\)](#). [attached]

Presented by Professor Clifford Abbott

- d. [Requests for Future Senate Business](#)

6. [PROVOST'S REPORT](#). Presented by Provost Sue K. Hammersmith

7. UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE REPORT. Presented by Professor Clifford Abbott**8. ADJOURNMENT**

MINUTES 2003-2004

UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 4

Wednesday, December 10, 2003

Phoenix Room C, University Union, (quorum present, meeting called to order at 3:01 p.m.)

Presiding Office: Illene Noppe (HUD-UC), Speaker

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

PRESENT: Clifford Abbott (ICS-UC), Greg Aldrete (HUS-UC), Denise Bartell (HUD), Forrest Baulieu (ICS), Derryl Block (NUR), M. Jan Bradfield (COA), Peter Breznay (ICS), Gregory Davis (NAS-UC), Sally Dresdow (BUA-UC), Aeron Haynie (HUS), Michael Hencheck (NAS), Timothy Kaufman (ED), Harvey Kaye (SCD), Michael Kraft (PEA), William Lepley (BUA), Richard Logan (HUD-UC), Steven Meyer (NAS), Steve Muzatko (BUA), Tom Nesslein (URS), Illene Noppe (HUD-UC), Gilbert Null (HUS), Ellen Rosewall (COA), Bruce Shepard (Chancellor), Linda Tabers-Kwak (ED), Patricia Terry (NAS), Bryan Vescio (HUS), William Witwer (COA).

NOT PRESENT: Sue Hammersmith (Provost), Craig Hanke (HUB), Anne Kok (Soc. Wk),

REPRESENTATIVES: Mike Schmitt (Academic Staff Committee), Sarah Tebon (Student Government)

GUEST: Dean Carol Blackshire-Belay

AUTOMATIC CONSENT

1. Approval of Minutes of UW-Green Bay Faculty Senate Meeting No. 3, November 19, 2003

The minutes were approved without change.

Senator Kaye raised a point of order to confirm that a quorum was present. Sixteen members were present at the opening gavel, constituting a quorum.

CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

Best wishes for the holiday season and for a refreshing break spent with family and friends. Public Safety has been in the news recently, and recent event show that they do a good job of keeping the campus community informed as soon as something happens. This is the best way to keep rumors in check. Should rumors begin,

don't hesitate to call the Director of Public Safety, Randy Christopherson, or the Chancellor. The circulation of accurate information is essential. Recent exciting national and international events on our campus made important contributions to the community: General Wesley Clark visited; an International Scholars program began in cooperation with St. Norbert College; the International Social Justice Seminar was highly successful. Issues on the Chancellor's mind of late: Diversity--we've made more progress retaining students of color than faculty or staff of color in recent years. Campus climate, gender and power relationship issues remain concerns. Do people feel they can speak freely and openly on important matters? Is this a place people enjoy coming to work each day? Change must come not from the Chancellor but from a general willingness to engage important issues as a community.

ACTION ITEM

1. Faculty Status for Lecturers. Presented by University Committee Chair, Clifford Abbott. Following the discussion at the November Senate meeting, the UC modified its proposed version of 51.12. That version was previously distributed along with the version passed by the Senate (September 2002) but never implemented.

Abbott clarified linkages between pay levels and ranks of Academic Staff. Each rank has a minimum level of pay associate with it but there is not necessarily a maximum. Therefore, it is theoretically possible to increase salary of a teaching academic staff member without promotion in rank. Where an individual's salary falls below the minimum, however, promotion in rank will result in an automatic pay increase.

Senator Logan moved approval (with second) of the University Committee's proposal to amend 51.12.

Senator Kaye expressed reservations about granting faculty status to lecturers for three reasons: 1. High numbers of lecturers with faculty status can determine results of unit elections. 2. Lecturers with faculty status could also make curricular decisions. 3. There is a danger of expanding the number of teaching academic staff at the expense of tenure-track positions. He is uncomfortable with major decisions being made by people whose renewal depends on a unit chair's decision, and he feels that faculty status should be reserved for tenure-track faculty. Having said this, Kaye realizes that removing faculty status is not under consideration. Senator Null asks what the effect of a negative vote would be on this section of code—would the previous Senate action prevail? Abbott explained that administration did not fully approve the Senate changes of September 2002. The current version is an effort to accommodate the interests of the Provost. If today's motion is defeated, it is likely to mean that negotiations for changing 51.12 will continue. While he agrees with some of Senator Kaye's concerns, he doesn't see them as reasons to vote against this proposal since it is meant to put decisions on granting faculty status in the hands of Executive Committees. Senator Logan reminded the Senate that the entire issue of faculty status is not on the agenda but could be revisited at a later date. The Speaker asked, somewhat in vain, that discussion be limited to the proposal. Senator Haynie does not see representation of those who teach here as a bad. Senator Kaye responded that long-term teaching academic staff positions do not protect anyone, but represent a disadvantage by precluding any eventual protection of tenure.

Senator Bradfield requested further clarification of the effect of a negative vote. The Speaker ruled that without administrative approval, last year's Senate action is nullified, and a negative vote today would leave the previous version (the one still part of the current handbook) in place. At the request of Senator Kaye, the Secretary read that version.

The motion as presented received 18 votes in favor, 3 votes against with 5 abstentions. Before the Speaker could announce the vote, there was some parliamentary discussion about the number needed to pass. The Parliamentarian read code that requires that amendments to codification "carry by a two-thirds majority of the Faculty Senate." Depending on whether the two *ex officio* members count toward the total or not, a two-thirds vote was either 19 or 20. With 18 votes, a motion would fail in either case. Senator Abbott requested a recount, which the Speaker ruled in order (with the welcome parliamentary expertise of the Chancellor who pointed out that re-voting is in order since the Speaker had not yet announced the outcome.) Senator Kaye objected to voting again without first getting further information on the number of instructional academic staff on campus to better inform the vote. **The vote resulted in 18 votes in favor, 5 votes against and 3 abstentions.** [There were 26 Senators present; one having left earlier, so all votes were counted]. **The motion failed.**

Senator Davis suggested that the closeness of the vote probably means that the proposal needs to be reconsidered. No formal motion to do so forthcoming, discussion of the issue concluded.

2. House Rules for the Senate. Presented by UC Chair Abbott. The proposal returns in the same form it had at last month's discussion. Abbott acknowledged that the UC did consider Senator Kaye's request that Senate proxies be allowed, but said that, since current code disallows proxies in the Senate, that code would first need to be changed before becoming a House rule. **A motion was made to adopt the House Rules as presented.**

Given the previous parliamentary discussion, Senator Logan felt some thought needs to be given to deciding whether *ex officio* members count toward quorum and membership totals and whether current code means a two-thirds vote of the Senate membership, or of those present at the meeting and voting (which is his conviction). There being no further discussion, **the motion passed unanimously, 26 in favor with no negative votes or abstentions.**

DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Student-led Courses. UC Chair Abbott presented the topic for discussion without any particular recommendation from the UC at this point. It stems from a question brought to the UC about whether these courses should continue to be included in the catalog. The UC was divided on the issue of eliminating the student-led course option. Statistics show that the option is not frequently used. There have been no instances since 1999, and over the last 25 years there have been about twenty. The discussion was animated and basically revolved around three points: A- *The need for information* (Where are the guidelines the Catalog mentions? How are courses proposed and approved? How are they graded? What is the role (what are the responsibilities) of the faculty adviser or supervisor?) B- *Functional concerns* (Thought needed on questions of accountability and confidentiality. What are the ramifications of a student leader bailing out? Should faculty advisers be compensated or should these courses be treated like independent studies? Peer grading is problematic.) C- *The value of student-led courses* (Students interested in this option are frequently highly motivated and shouldn't be discouraged. Why would we want to give up one of our earliest campus legacies?)

Senator Null commented that the student-led course form "speaks to us from 30 years ago" of a certain academic "looseness" and "trust in faculty." The question for us is whether we have become too uncomfortable with this approach and wish to deny it, or whether we regret that we are no longer a place like the one that gave rise to such expressions, and wish to reaffirm those roots. Others, including the Chancellor, returned periodically to this theme. If the idea of student-led courses is a good one, find out why the option is not often used, and find a way to make it work well. Discussion will continue at a later meeting.

INFORMATION ITEMS

1. Report of the Provost (written report distributed). The Provost was in Madison.

2. University Committee Report. Presented by UC Chair Clifford Abbott, who outlined some of the issues before the UC that may come to the Senate in the near future: 1) Open meeting laws and changes in our code that may be necessary to conform to the law. The UC has advised the Personnel Council not to use its right (according to State law) to go into closed session until inconsistencies between state law and our code can be studied. We need a better sense of what is allowed, what is not and, within the scope of the law, what parameters we wish to adopt for meetings, particularly where personnel reviews are involved. 2) The Provost has asked for information on mechanisms and procedures by which curriculum is set and changed. 3) A proposal has come forward to change admission requirements by requiring the writing sample that is an option with the ACT. This is currently before the Student Affairs Committee. 4) Discussion and debate regarding consequences of Board of Regents policy on credit transfer from Technical Colleges to UW campuses. 5) System Faculty Representatives are interested in determining whether there is a point at which the number of instructional academic staff as a proportion of tenure-track faculty becomes unhealthy for an institution. Currently before the Senate Committee on Planning and Budget. 6) The UC is planning to get together next semester with the Academic Staff Committee and the Student Government Committee to talk about shared concerns and ways to strengthen governance on campus.

OPEN FORUM

1. Faculty advocacy, ombudsperson, and campus climate. Senator Hencheck reports feedback from his unit indicating support for an advocacy committee able to intervene before matters come to a grievance--as long as individuals feel that the process is safe and confidential. Senator Null asked to hear from Chancellor Shepard regarding the dual roles of ombudsperson and University Counsel. The Chancellor obliged: An ombudsperson is someone "who helps people find their way through the labyrinth of regulations," not an advocate. A lawyer should be an appropriate person to help in this manner. Advocacy and how that is achieved is a separate question. Line officers of the University should be the ones with an advocacy roll since they have the power to effect change. Although there is always a potential for conflict of interest when legal counsel and ombudsperson are the same, he has not found that to be the case in actual practice. Whenever there is a case that had potential for conflict, Melissa Jackson stepped out. If necessary, the Chancellor would then deal with lawyers in Madison rather than risk potential conflict for campus Counsel. A bigger question is "How much does the *perception* that there might be a conflict of interest limit willingness to use the ombudsperson?" He doesn't have an answer to that question but knows that we don't have the resources to appoint a new administrator to handle this role. If there is a conflict of interest problem limiting the role of the ombudsperson (again, not an advocate) we can abolish that role. If that happens, we should not create a new position but should rely on the administrators we have to do their jobs.

Senator Null expressed surprise at the distinction between advocate and ombudsperson, stating that there is little doubt that the Senate originally intended both functions—at first understood as an advocate for women, subsequently expanded to gender-neutral advocacy. Senator Abbott brought the mentoring system into the discussion, wishing to know whether the sense is prevalent that there has been a breakdown in the system. He and others mentioned the fear of legal liabilities associated with mentoring. Null suggested that the system is, indeed, in trouble because we have tried to institutionalize a relationship that is best when it develops organically as part of the life of the institution. Speaker Noppe points out that organic mentoring in the not too distant past more frequently happened between males, leaving female faculty adrift in the system. Formalizing the mentoring system was an effort to redress the situation. Senator Rosewall believes that, if the ombudsperson does not meet the need for advocacy, we need to identify someone who can, whether it is via mentoring, a committee or takes some other shape.

NEW BUSINESS

There being no further business, the Senate adjourned at 4:49 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kenneth Fleurant, Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

Faculty Senate Continuing Business (a), 1/21/04

RESOLUTIONS ON

LECTURERS WITH FACULTY STATUS

- A. Resolved that the Faculty Senate direct the University Committee to propose changes to 51.12 that specify three ranks for instructional academic staff: associate lecturer, lecturer (no prefix), and senior lecturer.
- B. Resolved that the Faculty Senate direct the University Committee to propose changes to 51.12 so that faculty status is linked to specific ranks.
- C. Resolved that the Faculty Senate direct the University Committee to propose changes to 51.12 so that faculty status is linked to responsibilities in a position job description.
- D. Resolved that the Faculty Senate direct the University Committee to retain in any changes to 51.12 that granting faculty status requires the approval of the University Committee.
- E. Resolved that the Faculty Senate direct the University Committee to grandfather current positions in any proposed changes to 51.

Faculty Senate New Business (a), 1/21/04

CODE CHANGE FOR OPEN MEETINGS

Existing language in UWGB 3.08 (5) (a) and (b)

5. Conduct of the Review for Promotion and Renewal at all Ranks

- a. Review (whether required or by request) by interdisciplinary unit executive committees, by the Personnel Council, by the interdisciplinary unit professorial committees, or by the Committee of Six Full Professors, shall be open unless the faculty member under consideration requests a closed review.
- b. The faculty member under consideration shall be notified in writing 20 days (25 days if by first class mail) prior to the date of review of the time and place of the review session and that he/she has the right to request that the review be closed.

Proposed change in UWGB 3.08 (5) (a) and (b)

5. Conduct of the Review for Promotion and Renewal at all Ranks

- a. Review (whether required or by request) by executive committees, by the Personnel Council, by the interdisciplinary unit professorial committees, or by the Committee of Six Full Professors, shall be open unless the reviewing committee, in accordance with state law and proper notification,

authorizes a closed review. The faculty member under consideration has the right to attend reviews, whether open or closed.

b. The faculty member under consideration shall be notified in writing 20 days (25 days if by first class mail) prior to the date of review of the time and place of the review session.

Faculty Senate New Business (b), 1/21/04

CREATING A CAMPUS CLIMATE COMMITTEE

Proposal:

To create a committee reporting to the Faculty Senate, called the Campus Climate Committee, with equal faculty and academic staff representation (three members each) charged to find ways of improving campus climate. This committee shall:

- a. consider the various mechanisms for improving climate, as well as assisting individuals;
- b. pilot those that are feasible over a year's time;
- c. evaluate the results;
- d. and report back to the Senate.

The problem

The need for improving campus climate is not solidly or specifically documented but the anecdotal evidence is persistent and points to either a lack of, or ignorance of, ways to redress perceived injustices short of formal grievances and lawsuits. The assumption is that providing well known and effective methods of redress will improve the campus climate. The current use of an ombudsperson is limited by definition to the dispensing of legal and procedural advice. Advocacy is not within the definition.

Rationale

Institutional climate depends on institutional culture and there may not be any single best way to effect cultural change. UW-Green Bay has a prouder history of studying itself and proposing change than actually achieving planned change. It may be time to take a multiplicity of smaller steps and adjust as needed rather than to continue to seek the optimal solution.

Possible mechanisms

The University Committee has considered the following six mechanisms along with their strengths and weaknesses.

Ombudsperson - This mechanism is currently in place in the person of Melissa Jackson, the University's legal counsel. Her legal training makes her an excellent source of information and explanation of rules, policies, and procedures, and many people have been bringing concerns to her as the ombudsperson. Many, however, perceive her dual role as a conflict of interest and although it is claimed that there are ways in place to resolve the conflict

of interest, a perceived partiality may be preventing others from using this mechanism. Were any other person to serve in the role of ombudsperson, there may inevitably be questions of knowledge, trust, and limits to advocacy.

EAP model - This mechanism identifies a network of individuals with experience at this institution who are willing to advise and advocate for persons seeking redress. The advantages over a single ombudsperson are the distributed load of work and the freedom to advocate. The disadvantages are finding and possibly training willing individuals.

External help - The possibility of bringing in an external mediator/investigator has the advantage of impartiality and the disadvantage of being unfamiliar with our institution. Cost may also be an issue unless some reciprocal arrangement can be made with another institution or network.

Survey - This has the possibility of documenting and evaluating the need for change in other mechanisms. The prime disadvantage is that it is very easy to do bad and wasteful surveys. It takes some expertise and effort to do well.

Mentoring - Existing mentoring experiences are a source of information not currently being tapped for insights into climate issues. Mentoring, freely chosen and offered, can be a terrific boost for individual and institutional climate, but assigned mentoring can create vested interests in not complaining about the relationship or in holding the relationship accountable for more than it can deliver.

Advocacy committee - The Campus Climate Committee could offer itself (or some other group) as an advocacy committee that invites individuals to bring their concerns to the committee. The advantage of a committee is that trust, advice, expertise, and problem-solving are distributed in a group rather than a single individual. The disadvantage is that the workload is unknown and the more people involved the harder it is to assure confidentiality.

Faculty Senate New Business (c), 1/21/04

ALLOWING ALTERNATE SENATORS

Current Codification

52.03 B. 4.

The district may not send proxies to any senate meeting to replace its elected senator.

52.03 B. 2.

The academic budgetary unit chairperson shall call a meeting to elect senate representatives for vacant positions in November of each academic year.

Current House Rules for the Faculty Senate

#6 Proxy, absences, subs

Senators may be replaced as per 52.05 for the remainder of their terms, but if a Senator cannot make a particular meeting, there shall be no voting by proxy or substitution as per 52.03 B. 4.

Proposed Codification

52.03 B. 4.

A district may elect an alternate for any of its senators and the alternate may attend and vote at Senate meetings that the regular senator is unable to attend.

52.03 B. 2

The academic budgetary unit chairperson shall call a meeting to elect senate representatives, and alternates, for vacant positions in November of each academic year.

Proposed House Rules for the Faculty Senate

#6 Senators may be replaced as per 52.05 for the remainder of their terms. If a Senator cannot make a particular meeting, there shall be no voting by proxy, but a duly elected alternate may attend and vote as per [proposed] 52.03 B. 4.

Date of effect: Senate elections of November 2004

Report to the Faculty Senate

Submitted by Sue K. Hammersmith, Provost

University of Wisconsin-Green Bay

January 21, 2004

I. ACADEMIC AFFAIRS PLANNING COMMITTEE

I am delighted to be able to announce the membership of the new Academic Affairs Planning Committee, except for the student representative who is yet to be appointed. The following colleagues have agreed to serve on this committee:

Faculty:

Phil Clampitt (Information and Computing Sciences)

Sally Dresdow (Business Administration)

Pat Ragan (Education)

Denise Scheberle (Public and Environmental Affairs)

Academic Staff:

Diana Borrero-Lowe (American Intercultural Center)

Leanne Hansen (Cofrin Library)

Andy Speth (Learning Technology Center)

Mike Stearny (Student Development)

Student: (to be determined)

Division Heads:

Sue Hammersmith (Provost/Vice Chancellor) – chair

Carol Blackshire-Belay (Liberal Arts and Sciences)

Fritz Erickson (Professional and Graduate Studies)

Sue Keihn (Student Affairs)

Kathy Pletcher (Information Services)

Jan Thornton (Outreach and Extension)

Additional appointment for staff/consultation support:

Lucy Arendt (Assessment Services)

I am grateful to all who agreed to serve in this capacity. We will keep the Faculty Senate apprised of our work on an ongoing basis.

II. COMMENCEMENT

Thanks to all faculty and academic staff who participated in our mid-year Commencement last month. The event was wonderful, and Wisconsin poet laureate Ellen Kort gave a commencement address that I will actually remember!

As we debrief from our December Commencement and begin planning the upcoming 2004 Spring Commencement, we would welcome any suggestions or criticisms you may

have and will use campus input for continuous improvement in this event. Please give any comments, criticisms, or suggestions to Sue Hammersmith, Tim Sewall, or your dean.

III. FACULTY SEARCHES

Many faculty searches are underway, and I am eager to see the results of your efforts this year. The first unit to bring a faculty search to fruition this year was Business Administration, which succeeded in hiring a new Marketing faculty member. Later this semester, all the faculty and units who participated in the new faculty hiring process this year will be invited to provide their feedback and suggestions, so that the process may be further improved, as needed, before the coming year's hiring season arrives.

IV. PT. SABLE ROOM RESERVED

The heating system for the Pt. Sable Room is now up and running again! Each day from 11:30 AM until 1:30 PM, that room will be reserved for faculty and staff. Free coffee and tea will be available in that room while supplies last. I encourage faculty and staff to utilize this space to relax, to share fellowship and collegial conversation with their colleagues, or to gather for discussion or specific topics or issues. This usage will be evaluated at the end of the semester as to how this gathering place (or others) can best be used to nurture collegial relations and discussion among faculty and staff from all across our institution

Respectfully submitted,

Sue K. Hammersmith, Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs