

AGENDA

UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 5

Wednesday, 22 January 2003, 3:00 p.m.

PHOENIX ROOM C, University Union

Presiding Officer: Illene Noppe, Speaker

Parliamentarian: Professor Jerrold C. Rodesch

AUTOMATIC CONSENT

[1. Approval of minutes of UW-Green Bay Faculty Senate Meeting No. 4, December 11, 2002](#) (attached)

CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

INFORMATION ITEMS

1. [Report of the Provost](#). Presented by Provost Sue K. Hammersmith
2. [University Committee Report](#). Presented by Professor John Lyon, Chair

NEW BUSINESS

ADJOURNMENT

MINUTES

2002-03W-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 4

Wednesday, December 11, 2002

Phoenix Room C, University Union, 3:10 p.m.

Presiding Office: Illene Noppe, Speaker

Parliamentarian: Jerrold Rodesch, Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

PRESENT

Clifford Abbott

Forrest Baulieu

Derryl Block

M. Jan Bradfield

James Coates

Kevin Fermanich

Scott Furlong

Sue Hammersmith

Craig Hanke

Aeron Haynie

Michael Hencheck

Curt Heuer

Anne Kok

William Lepley

Richard Logan

Dennis Lorenz

John Lyon

John Mariano

James Marker

Robert Nagy

Illene Noppe

Gilbert Null

Joyce Salisbury

W. Bruce Shepard

Linda Tabers-Kwak

NOT PRESENT: Anthony Galt, Sylvia Kubsch, Ray Hutchinson, E. Nicole Meyer, Jennifer Popiel, and Patricia Terry

REPRESENTATIVES: John Rumpel, Student Government Association, and Michael Schmitt, Academic Staff Committee

GUESTS: Dean Carol Blackshire-Belay, Interim Dean Jane Muhl, Associate Provost Timothy Sewall, Director of Institutional Research Debbie Furlong, and Associate Dean Lloyd Noppe

AUTOMATIC CONSENT

1. Approval of Minutes of UW-Green Bay Faculty Senate Meeting No. 3, November 20, 2002

The minutes were approved without change.

CHANCELLOR'S REMARKS

Chancellor Shepard gave a reduced version of a presentation he made to UW System President Lyall in October. The presentation offered a summary view of UW-Green Bay's position and aspirations based on consultations with community leaders and university constituencies during his first year here. Lyall had invited the presentation after the Chancellor, at his inauguration, proposed increasing campus enrollment to 7,500. Lyall specifically asked if such growth would come from the region, indicating an unwillingness to target an out-of-state clientele which was reflected in UW System Administration's earlier lack of enthusiasm for the Learning Experience proposal. The Chancellor, working with his staff, produced the outline of a plan which was to go forward only if Lyall gave it a green light. In the event, she gave a "bright green light." The responsibility is now ours to fill in the details. The plan presented to Lyall was general, based on a set of assumptions. It must not only be developed in detail but it must become a campus-wide initiative. Top-down planning will not work. He summarized the following points from the presentation:

- Affirmation of the Green Bay Idea: we use multiple perspectives to engage in practical problem solving. Connect learning to life. Connect campus and community. We can measure our success by people seeking us out when they have needs and issues. We don't have the resources and capacity to do this today, and this leads to our rationale for growth. We need to build on our strengths and on our distinctive academic plan. As a public institution we should not restrict access as we have had to do. This is the third largest and most rapidly growing region in the state. The historically low college participation rate for the region will change, and our responsibilities will expand accordingly. Outreach and graduate programs should grow, although we will remain primarily an undergraduate institution. Ideas are driving the new economy. We do not now have the platform currently to serve the needs of the region.
- Parity funding for UW-Green Bay: we need to grow and we need to be funded at a level that supports us adequately. Looking at current funding and adjusting for institutional size, UW-Green Bay is \$3.7 million below funding comparable to that of other UW comprehensive institutions. There are three ways to reach parity: a) we could shrink enrollment; b) we could obtain the \$3.7 million without changes in FTE enrollments; or c) we could grow to about 6,200 FTE (about 7,500 head count) with full funding. Neither (a) nor (b) is politically feasible (the Learning Experience showed this). Parity funding means making up the \$3.7 million while we grow, with additional funding for the growth.
- Assumptions for growth: Quality comes first; there will be no unfunded growth. Growth will come from northeastern Wisconsin. There are obvious sources for growth: admit freshman applicants and transfers that we now turn away; improve retention; increase the metro area college participation rate; serve diverse regional populations; increase transfer students by improved advising for them; add graduate enrollment; provide more off-site delivery of instruction; strengthen and add programs that have unmet demand. Decisions about strengthening and adding programs are critical. This needs to be a focus of further planning. Student choices of which colleges to attend are more and more driven by program availability. We need to understand regional needs. And we need a regional political coalition to make our case. We need to do this in partnership with other public institutions. UW-Oshkosh and we are already involved in significant political collaboration.

The Chancellor also provided President Lyall with a list of activities in progress that demonstrate our commitment to this vision, including:

- general education revision
- new admissions policies
- enhanced first-year experience
- improved residence and student-life programming
- new facilities
- revision of the campus master plan
- academic program additions (e.g., MSW)
- establishment of a Community Diversity Council (leading to the Phuture Phoenix program)
- building partnerships in the community
- improvement of internal communication and cohesion on campus
- establishment of a new leadership team
- capital campaign
- marketing plan
- reengagement with alumni
- improved media relations

In sum, we propose to grow to about 7,500 students in ten years. The proposed funding will bring us to real parity within the UW System. New facilities will include bringing to fruition projects already in the pipeline and, in addition, expansion and remodeling of Student Services, facilities for child care, and a new classroom/office building larger than Mary Ann Cofrin Hall. We face hard times at the moment, but we need to know where we want to go. Otherwise we will bounce from one crisis to another without solving the long-term problem of underfunding of UW-Green Bay. Thinking long-term is essential. The Chancellor quoted Dwight Eisenhower: "Plans are nothing. Planning is everything."

Director of Institutional Research Debbie Furlong reviewed the planning model used for the Chancellor's presentation. She identified the numbers used to project student growth based on: admission of new freshmen and transfers to meet historical demands; increased Brown County college participation rate, including recruitment of students from an increasingly diverse population; increased collaboration with two-year colleges and other regional institutions; meeting student demand for Education and Business programs; adding certification and graduate programs; and improving freshman retention. The funding model used UW-Stevens Point's cost-per-student as a target for parity. The model generated a projected need for 68,000 Assigned Square Feet of new office and classroom space, somewhat larger than Mary Ann Cofrin Hall. The Chancellor said he wanted to make clear that this was a planning model only (using very conservative assumptions) and was not the plan itself. The plan remained to be worked out.

Furlong said that the student-faculty ratio was not part of the model. The Chancellor said that while the student-faculty ratio is not a politically effective way of framing the issue, the proposal deals with it. After the full ten-year implementation we would have grown by about 2,200 FTE students and would be getting about \$17-18

million in additional state support and tuition. This gives us the capacity to deal with the problem of student-faculty ratio.

Senator Noppe asked where students we had turned away went. Furlong said it depended on the student. The UW System is experiencing unprecedented application growth. The UW Colleges closed admissions last year for the first time ever. The Chancellor said we don't really know what happens to the applicants we didn't accept. The region we serve has the lowest level of college-educated population in the state. This should change. We are not the only UW System institution that wants to grow. UW-Milwaukee will be particularly aggressive.

Senator Abbott asked about the master plan. Are more than facilities involved? The Chancellor said that it is basically a map of planned facilities but also includes decisions about locations and functions that require a great deal of information. We currently have a master plan, prepared long ago, for a projected 22,000 students. It has everything imaginable, including a football stadium and a planetarium on the bay. There is risk in developing a new plan that must go through a complicated bureaucratic process, but we really lack coherent guidelines. This will be a long and difficult process and we will have to talk and think through a great deal. He invited advice.

ACTION ITEMS

1. Code Revision to UWGB 6.01 Complaints

Presented by Professor John Lyon. He noted a change in language in the University Committee's distributed proposal in 7 (a) to "any other documentation ~~relative to the case~~ **relevant to the complaint.**"

Senator Salisbury moved and Senator Abbott seconded adoption of the proposal as altered. There was no discussion. The motion carried by voice vote.

DISCUSSION ITEM

1. Length of Term on the Committee on Academic Actions

Presented by Professor John Lyon. The University Committee's recommendation to increase terms from one to two years was presented without change.

Senator Heuer moved suspension of the rules to permit action on this item. Senator Furlong seconded. The vote to suspend was 23 in favor and one opposed, carrying by more than the required two-thirds. Senator Salisbury moved adoption of the proposal, Heuer seconding. There was no discussion. The motion carried unanimously.

INFORMATION ITEMS

1. Report of the Provost

Provost Hammersmith remarked that she had never before witnessed a unanimous vote in a faculty senate. The Chancellor interrupted to say he was sufficiently impressed by this evidence of positive faculty thinking that he wondered if his colleagues might also want to endorse a salary increase for him.

Recovering from this, the Provost went on to comment on a number of items of general interest:

- A survey of UW System graduates showed that UW-Green Bay's were more likely than others to have worked collaboratively on assignments and to acknowledge that the institution helped them succeed academically. However, they were less likely to have used electronic media for assignments, to have improved their skills in working with information technology, or to have engaged in serious conversations with other students who differed from them in religious beliefs, political aspirations, or personal values. Lucy Arendt, UW-Green Bay Coordinator of Assessment and Testing, told her that these results fit with other survey data about our students. The Provost has requested a report from Arendt.

- The Board of Regents has adopted a rule to be effective in Fall 2004 adding a surcharge to tuition for students who have completed more than 165 undergraduate credit hours. UW-Green Bay currently has 75 students in this category, most in Secondary Education. The Chancellor noted that campuses will control implementation of the rule and can make exceptions.
- Recommendations concerning childcare will be presented for review early next year.

2. University Committee Report

Chair Lyon expressed enthusiasm for his rare opportunity to report on University Committee activities. It has been occupied with:

- General Education initiatives
- Learning Experience funding
- a policy for replacement of Personnel Council members recused from particular cases (representation from domains will be maintained and, to avoid politics, selecting by seniority from among the eligible replacement faculty)
- a proposal for an increased role for the Graduate Faculty Board of Advisors (the Senate will hear in detail about this in the spring)
- the Chancellor's Discretionary Salary Fund (the Board of Regents guidelines specify one-third for merit/market; one-third for solid performance; and one-third to address these and other compensation needs; ten percent of the total pay package is reserved for the Chancellor's use); the Chancellor interjected that he will meet with appropriate governance bodies and will respond to UW System in spring about his plan to distribute the funds.
- the formation of Citizens for Higher Education, a statewide group to speak on behalf of public higher education in Wisconsin; the group is looking for members and Lyon has an ample supply of membership forms. Senator Null asked what the money—a suggested \$100 per member—will be used for. The Chancellor reported that the group had formed in response to legislators claiming they had not felt political pressure from the UW advocates. It will lobby for the UW and has signed on former governors and others outside the UW to do this.

NEW BUSINESS

Senator Abbott asked to speak to a concern. The proposal for growth is troubling given the institution's lack of experience with planned growth in its academic programs. He wondered if the faculty could have an effective role, especially in light of its failure to deal with the General Education proposal before the Senate this fall. How can the faculty engage this? It is not a good idea to turn it all over to administrators.

The Provost appreciated his point. Moreover, whether we grow or not we need to do a better job of academic planning. We have a technology plan. We will get a master plan. But how do we identify where to grow academically? Existing programs? New ones? Graduate programs? We need to project implications for staffing across the university. Growing one program has an impact on others. We have the outline for a ten-year plan, but we have no date for year one. This is going to be a long process.

The Chancellor noted that we don't do a good job of program budgeting and strategic planning in general. This is a priority for him and for the Provost. Improvement is needed.

Senator Heuer asked if growth is really needed. We still need to ask why before we ask how. Abbott called upon all to look at growth from multiple perspectives. Community leaders can speak. Academic units can speak. But

how can the faculty speak as a faculty? Have the faculty the skills to do this? Is there adequate faculty/administration collaboration?

Chancellor Shepard said the issue was how and to what extent we can direct growth. Students choose programs. We have to respond to their needs. There are limits on our zone of control. We need to talk this through.

Senator Fermanich wondered how the current five-year academic program review and planning process will fit into this grander planning design.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:27 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jerrold Rodesch, Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

[Minutes amended and approved on 1/22/03]

Faculty Senate Document #02-04, *Approved as Amended*, 11 December 2002

CODE REVISIONS TO UWGB 6.01 COMPLAINTS

UWGB 6.01 Complaints

Complaints are allegations by the administration, students, faculty members, academic staff members, classified staff members, or members of the public concerning conduct by a faculty member which violates university rules or which adversely affects the faculty member's performance of his/her obligation to the university, but which are not serious enough to warrant dismissal under UWGB Chapter 4.

1. Complaints shall be in writing to the Chancellor or to his/her office, describing specifically the alleged misconduct. **The misconduct must be clearly delineated in the complaint.**
2. The Chancellor shall notify the faculty member who is the subject of the complaint in writing of the specific allegations, the identity of the person or party who made the complaint, and his/her disposition of the complaint.
3. **The faculty member who is the subject of the complaint will have the opportunity to respond to the Chancellor about the complaint in writing.**
4. The Chancellor may recommend an informal discussion and settlement of the complaint before reviewing and taking action. The informal discussion and settlement route shall follow the upward levels of supervision and employment: department or administrative unit, dean. If the complaint is not settled by this route, it shall be returned to the Chancellor.
5. If the Chancellor deems the complaint substantial, he/she may refer the complaint to the Committee on Rights and Responsibilities for a hearing.
6. The Committee on Rights and Responsibilities is authorized and shall hold a hearing on a complaint at the request of the Chancellor, or at the request of the faculty member concerned if the Chancellor invokes a disciplinary action without requesting a hearing. This request must be made in writing, addressed to the chair of the hearing body within 20 days after receipt of notice of the Chancellor's disciplinary action.

7. The hearing shall be conducted by the Committee on Rights and Responsibilities within 20 days following receipt of the request, except this time limit may be extended by mutual written consent of the parties, or by order of the hearing body. **No member of the hearing body who participated in the allegations contained in the complaint or who is a potential witness for or against the faculty member who is the subject of the complaint shall serve on the Committee.**

The hearing body may, on motion of either party, disqualify any one of its members for cause by a majority vote. If one or more members disqualify themselves or are disqualified, the University Committee will select a number of other faculty members equal to the number who have been disqualified to serve on the hearing body for the purpose of that case only.

a. The Committee on Rights and Responsibilities shall receive a copy of the specific allegation, the identity of the person or party who made the complaint, the Chancellor's disposition of the complaint, **and any other documentation [relative to the case...amended to read] relevant to the complaint.**

b. The faculty member will be given notice of the hearing at least 10 days prior to the hearing.

c. All faculty members have the right to due process and the rights and privileges of academic freedom. This policy shall be observed in determining if the complaint is substantial and provides sufficient grounds for disciplinary action.

d. The burden of proof of the existence of misconduct shall be on the person or party making the complaint.

e. The hearing body may call witnesses **and shall** have access to documentary evidence upon which the complaint it based.

f. The faculty member may be assisted or represented by a person of his/her choice, at his/her expense. The faculty member has the right to testify on his/her own behalf and may present witnesses but there shall be no direct or cross-examination of the witnesses. Members of the Committee on Rights and Responsibilities may question any witnesses concerning matters relevant to the inquiry.

8. After the hearing, the Committee on Rights and Responsibilities shall recommend to the Chancellor: dismissal of the complaint, or invocation of specific disciplinary actions, or modification of the disciplinary action imposed by the Chancellor.

9. The decision of the Chancellor on the recommendation of the Committee on Rights and Responsibilities, or on the grievance in the absence of a recommendation from the Committee on Rights and Responsibilities, shall be final, except that upon appeal by the faculty member, the Board **of Regents**, at its option, may grant a review of the case.

10. The faculty member shall not again be investigated or penalized for the same alleged misconduct after a final decision on a previous complaint.

Faculty Senate Document #02-05, Discussion Item Moved to Action Item,

Approved 11 December 2002

Committee on Academic Actions

1. The Committee on Academic Actions is composed of four appointed faculty members, with no more than two from a domain voting district, and three students. The Registrar and Director of Advising are ex officio non-voting members. The students sit with faculty on the committee except where a student involved requests exclusion of student membership.

2. Faculty appointment to the committee shall be for a term of two years, with the terms of members staggered so as to ensure continuity of membership. A member shall be eligible for reappointment for consecutive terms. Student representatives are appointed annually and, when possible, continuity is encouraged.

~~2-3~~. The Committee advises the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and coordinates with the Registrar on registration policies, on drop-add policies, on the grading system, and on the academic standing of students including the identification, review, and resolution of transfer issues and problems.

~~3-4~~. The Committee represents the faculty in initiating recommendations or taking action on recommendations from outside of the committee concerning policy changes for matters listed in item ~~2 3~~ above. Such recommendations are submitted to the Faculty Senate via the University

Committee Chairperson.

~~4-5~~. The Committee is responsible for preparing the academic calendar and represents the Faculty in the scheduling of academic events and activities, such as commencement and convocation.