

AGENDA

UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 6

Wednesday, 23 January 2002, 3:00 p.m.

Phoenix Room C, University Union

Presiding Officer: John Lyon, Speaker

Parliamentarian: Professor Jerrold C. Rodesch

AUTOMATIC CONSENT

1. [Minutes of UW-Green Bay Faculty Senate Meeting No. 5, December 12, 2001](#) (attached)

CHANCELLOR'S REPORT**ACTION ITEM**

1. [Proposed Policy Revision on Double Counting of Upper-Division Credits Required for Graduation \(attached\)](#). Presented by Professor David Littig

DISCUSSION ITEM

1. [Proposal on Admission Standards for New Freshmen \(attached\)](#). Presented by Professor David Littig

INFORMATION ITEMS

1. [Tenure and Due Process Resolution \(attached\)](#) Presented by Professor David Littig
2. **Report of the Provost** Presented by Interim Provost Carol Pollis
3. **University Committee Report** Presented by Professor David Littig, Chair

NEW BUSINESS**ADJOURNMENT**

MINUTES 2001-2002

UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 5

Wednesday, December 12, 2001

Phoenix Room C, University Union, 3:00 p.m.

Presiding Office: John Lyon, Speaker

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

PRESENT

Clifford Abbott

Greg Aldrete

Derryl Block

Francis Carleton

James Coates

Kevin Fermanich

Scott Furlong

Anthony Galt

Curt Heuer

Robert Howe

John Katers

Andrew Kersten

Sylvia Kubsch

David Littig

John Lyon

John Mariano

Jennifer Mokren

Robert Nagy

Illene Noppe

Gilbert Null

Carol Pollis

Kevin Roeder

William Shay

W. Bruce Shepard

NOT PRESENT: William Conley, Theodor Korithoski, Brian Merkel, Dennis Lorenz, Joseph Mannino

REPRESENTATIVES: Nick Kohn, Student Government Association, and Robert Skorczewski, Academic Staff Committee

GUESTS: Interim Deans Cheryl Grosso and Jane Muhl, Associate Provost Timothy Sewall, Assistant Dean for Enrollment Services Steven Neiheisel

AUTOMATIC CONSENT

1. Approval of Minutes of UW-Green Bay Faculty Senate Meeting No. 4, November 14, 2001

The minutes were approved without change.

CHANCELLOR'S REMARKS

The Chancellor thanked faculty in the programs he has met with to date for sharing ideas and concerns that contribute to his education about the university. These are not one-shot visits; he expects them to be on-going. Invite him back, he said. An agenda isn't necessary. Sitting with faculty is a vacation from the Chancellor's office and a reminder of what this enterprise is all about. He has also had an opportunity to come to classes of four different faculty members. And he was particularly impressed by and proud of the recent public forum on issues for students of color. The discussion was good and constructive and faculty attendance was good. The issues are important.

The Chancellor distributed three handouts. One was a presentation by Bill Cerbin of UW-La Crosse to the December meeting of the Board of Regents, "**Teaching and Learning for Understanding.**" The Chancellor found it a superb presentation and he was pleasantly surprised that the Regents were willing to consider matters of this seriousness and importance in higher education. Cerbin not only provides good insights into effective teaching, but he models what should be our own commitment to share ideas and experiences among peers.

The second handout provided by the **National Survey of Student Engagement** gives data for UW-Green Bay, including comparisons with other institutions. The information about students' engagement in the learning process shows that our seniors are doing well but our first-year students are not. This should remind us how important our planning to improve the first-year learning experience is. We are on the right track in our thinking.

The third handout provides a **statistical analysis of the UW-Green Bay GPR budget** in the 1999-2001 biennium within the UW System Comprehensive Cluster. Student enrollment accounts for almost the entire pattern of budget distribution among the institutions. These data show that for each student FTE an institution gets about \$5,000. UW-Green Bay is about \$1.2 million below expectation using this model. The situation will be worse in the current biennium because other institutions obtained economic development funding of about \$10,000 for each new FTE. The Chancellor has shared this information with President Lyall. An issue concerning internal allocations is also raised by this analysis. Looking only at instructional costs, the shortfall for UW-Green Bay is greater, about \$1.5 million. Decisions made in Green Bay account for about a quarter million dollars of the gap. Where are the funds going instead? He is not prepared to answer yet but is studying past allocation decisions.

The **current budget situation** poses some difficulties. The fiscal year began with the state taking about \$100,000 from us; an additional \$60,000 was subsequently assessed (a "lapse" of funding that substituted for a hiring

freeze) and then another \$38,000. UW System Administrative has so far protected the higher education budget, relative to other state agencies. It now appears that the state's budget problem is much greater than anticipated. A special session of the legislature will be called.

ACTION ITEMS

1. **Policy for Granting B.A. and B.S. Degrees** Presented by Professor David Littig

After Senator Littig summarized the main points of the proposal, which had been discussed at the previous meeting, Senator Furlong **moved adoption of the resolution** prepared by the University Committee, seconded by Senator Kersten. Littig said that the University Committee will request academic units to make their recommendations on degree designations in their programs, probably by a date in February, and the Senate will consider them as a batch. The **resolution was adopted by a voice vote**.

INFORMATION ITEMS

1. **Proposed Policy Revision on Double Counting of Upper-Division Credits Required for Graduation**

Presented by Professor David Littig

Current policy has been confusing to students, advisors and faculty. The proposal before the Senate seeks to clarify the policy. It contains two parts. The University Committee unanimously endorsed Part A. Part B, however, has three options, reflecting a division of opinion on the Committee. Part A eliminates any restriction on multiple counting of courses to satisfy requirements in major and minor programs. Part B addresses the question of a general requirement for upper-division course work for graduation. Option (a) provides for no minimum number of upper-division credits, allowing academic programs to specify any such requirements for their majors and minors. Option (b) requires that at least 30 of the 120 credits required for graduation carry an upper-division prefix. Option (c) differentiates among students with single majors (30 upper-division credits, with 24 in the major); students with a major and a minor (36 upper-division credits in the major and minor); and students with two majors (42 upper-division credits in the majors).

Senator Shay pointed out that Option (a), eliminating a minimum upper-division requirement, leaves a general requirement for majors in place, i.e., a minimum of 24 upper-division credits for a major. Senator Galt asked what was problem we were trying to fix. Littig said that eliminating the rules on double counting will simplify and clarify our requirements for the benefit of students. In addition—the probable source of this proposal—there were the limitations of PeopleSoft software standards. Galt found it useful to know what was driving our academic policies. Senator Howe thought the proposal made common sense. The double counting rule doesn't permit rational or fair acknowledgement of the programs students have actually completed. Senator Carleton objected that Part B's options didn't adequately provide for upper-division study. The standard was too low. It should be at least 40 credits. Senator Kubsch was concerned that high upper-division requirements would adversely affect the Nursing program which transfers in many UW College credits. Carleton said that an exemption could be provided for programs in exceptional circumstances, but one or two programs shouldn't drive all-university policy. Howe said that the high minimum might hurt students who had trouble settling on a major. We might penalize their explorations. Littig added that this goes to the very purpose of undergraduate education. Is it to get a strong, in-depth grounding in majors and minors, or is it principally an opportunity to explore?

Senator Abbott supported Option (a). Lower-division courses are not low quality courses. We shouldn't let numbers define our policies. That leads to arbitrariness. Let the programs decide what their students need. Senator Noppe thought that we need some control on lower-division credits. It is an issue of quality, because our lower-division courses are far too large. That's a meaningful difference. Furthermore, the proposal could lead to a perception of UW-Green Bay as a place where double and triple majors can be obtained with little effort. Senator Aldrete worried that Part A could lead to a dilution of major requirements and perhaps lead to a flurry of

cross-listing to attract students. Senator Furlong said that Option (c) should be dropped. It doesn't significantly change what we have now. Shay agreed; moreover it seemed to contradict the purpose of Part A. Furlong felt, additionally, that rather than dilute majors, a loosening of the rule would encourage programs to examine their majors and decide what really should be required for them.

Senator Kersten said that he understood the issues of principle involved in the proposal for change but wondered if PeopleSoft standards were overriding academic principles. Littig answered that PeopleSoft software does not allow double counting. Steven Neiheisel was asked to speak to this and he said that the PeopleSoft software, as delivered without customization, will permit us either not to double count (courses may be applied to only one program) or "to double count the entire catalogue," each course being available to be applied to all programs. This provided the "opportunity" to examine our current policy. The Chancellor offered his opinion that, while writing special code to accommodate our needs would be expensive, academic principles need to be the basis of our decision.

2. Proposal on Admission Standards for New Freshmen Presented by Professor David Littig

Senator Littig summarized the proposal to eliminate high school class rank as our basic admission criterion. The requirement for 17 units of high school academic coursework would be unchanged. Instead of class rank, a minimum high school grade point average and ACT score would be set (2.25 GPA; ACT 17), and admissions on this basis would be index-ranked according to 1) academic preparation (GPA, ACT); 2) academic challenge (AP courses, mathematics, foreign languages); 3) engagement (leadership and extracurricular activity); and 4) contribution to UW-Green Bay (target groups, interest/motivation). In addition, a priority admission standard would be set for automatic admission of students with a grade point average of 3.25 or an ACT of 23. Steven Neiheisel, Assistant Dean for Enrollment Services, elaborated on the proposal which had been developed by the Enrollment Management Committee. He noted that the new standards responded to the retention goals of the Learning Experience proposal. They focus on student characteristics that best fit our goals. We currently do not have an effective minimum standard, accepting students who, while they may be in the upper 45 percent of their high school class, may have ACTs of 13. Rank is the least reliable predictor of success in college. The new factors match research findings on retention.

Bob Skorczewski noted that there is a UW System policy on high school class rank as the basis for admitting students to take high school college-credit courses. Would this pose a problem? Neiheisel said he wasn't aware of this. Senator Heuer was concerned that the "contribution" factor in the admissions index seemed to focus chiefly on diversity. Shouldn't there be other elements in this such as music, athletics, fine arts, etc. Neiheisel said that "special talents" are definitely part of this. Senator Furlong asked if the new standard would move us away from rolling admissions for students outside the priority category. Possibly, eventually, said Neiheisel. Littig asked if we know how much our retention might be improved. Neiheisel said that there were projections, but he did not have the numbers with him. Heuer asked if we knew how many in the last class admitted might have been rejected by the new standards. Neiheisel said that there would be some effect but it would not be large. Last year, for the first time, our admission rate fell below 80 percent of applicants. Admissions and rejections are affected by our published standards so that projecting a number or percentage of admissions and rejections by new criteria is uncertain. Littig asked if we could establish an early admissions process with the new standards. Yes, said Neiheisel, we could do that if we wanted. Senator Howe was

impressed by what he regarded as a well-researched, sound proposal. It made him wonder why we had the current policy. Neiheisel said he wondered also. Littig thought there might be a public perception of reduced access in the new policy. Senator Carleton said that the new policy would be access neutral. Neiheisel agreed. It does not raise the bar. It focusses on retention.

3. Report of the Provost

The Provost reported on recent accomplishments in the Academic Affairs area as she had last month on the Student Affairs area. The academic deans have been notably effective in reaching out to clerical support staff and new faculty in, respectively, a luncheon with the deans (now a two-year-old tradition) and a new faculty reception (a brand new tradition). She also reported on the searches underway for a provost and academic dean.

These searches will be conducted simultaneously, as it turned out impractical to delay the dean search until a provost was appointed. A highly-qualified search consultant is assisting the recruiting effort for the provost. The search committees are very active, modeling their work on last year's chancellor search. The Provost encouraged faculty to participate in Commencement, a festive and joyous occasion, and to see our new Chancellor in action.

4. University Committee Report

University Committee Chair Littig reported on recent business of the Committee, including its review of position descriptions for the provost and dean searches, and its consideration of proposals to undertake global reviews of the General Education program and of our system of shared governance. The Senate will hear much more about the general education and governance reviews next semester. The University Committee is also engaged in discussions with the Academic Staff Committee about our institutional response to the UW System Working Group proposals on Instructional and Research Academic Staff. An important aspect of this will be an effort to clarify the role of Instructional Academic Staff and the meaning of "faculty status" granted to some of them. Salary compression and budget decisions will also be addressed in future joint committee meetings.

NEW BUSINESS

Nick Kohn reminded the Senate that the position of Faculty Representative to the Student Senate remains vacant. It's important to fill it. Littig said that it may be necessary to revise the faculty governance code to ensure that this is done. Senator Galt, who has served in the position, said that the role needs to be better defined. Senator Null, who has also served, supported an explicit provision in the code, including a definition of responsibilities.

Senator Carleton made a statement about his frustration with the merit process. With such a small salary fund, the merit process is onerous and unfair. At Bowling Green University, the merit-salary process is not used for a salary fund under 3 percent. We should try to change our policy. Speaker Lyon noted that Regent policy sets the rules.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jerrold Rodesch,

Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

Faculty Senate Action Item #1, 1/23/02

Proposal to Revise the Policy on Double Counting of Upper-level Credits and Establish a Minimum Number of Upper-level Credits

Background:

Current policy requires that:

- a. all student earn at least 120 credits to graduate
- b. all students have an interdisciplinary program (major or minor) or a professional major
- c. all majors require at least 24 upper-level credits

These policies will remain in effect.

Issue #1 Should double counting of courses be allowed?

Resolution #1

Whereas currently a program's minimum requirements are sensitive to what other programs a student may choose. There are constraints on double counting. The specific constraints, taken from page 21 of the current catalog are:

"3. Supporting credits/courses between a major(s) and a minor(s) may not be duplicated unless they exceed the minimum of six unduplicated credits for each major or minor.

"4. Within the minima, upper-level credits between a major and minor may not be double counted. The major requires 24 unduplicated upper-level credits. The minor requires 12 unduplicated upper-level credits. Upper-level credits in excess of 24 minimum for a major and 12 for a minor may be duplicated.

"5. Within the minima, six upper-level credits may be duplicated between majors.

"6. Supporting or upper-level courses/credits may not be duplicated between minors unless those credits are in excess of the minima."

Therefore, be it resolved that the above constraints on double counting are abolished so that for the purpose of satisfying course requirements for all major, minor, and certificate programs there shall be no restrictions on how any course can satisfy multiple requirements.

Issue #2 Should there be a minimum number of upper-level credits required for graduation?

Resolution #2

There shall be no minimum number of upper-level credits beyond what is required by a student's major(s) and minor(s).

Resolution #3

A minimum of 30 credits of upper-level credits is required for graduation.

Resolution #4

The minimum number of upper-level credits required for graduation with a single major shall be 30 credits, with a major/minor combination shall be 36 credits within that major/minor combination, and with two majors shall be 42 credits within those majors.

Faculty Senate Discussion Item #1, 1/23/02

UW-Green Bay University Committee Resolution to the Faculty Senate

Resolution: Admission standards to UW-Green Bay will be changed from its current criteria based upon applicants' high school class ranking to the following:

Minimum Standards

- The following minimum institutional standards must be met. Students below either of these standards will be denied admission.*
 - 17 high school units of college preparatory or academic coursework.
 - Minimum high school G.P.A. (cumulative) of 2.25 **and** an ACT score of 17.

Regular Admissions

- An index will be created based on the factors noted below; admit highest ranking indices based on established targets.
 - Academic achievement (High school G.P.A., test score)
 - Academic challenge (AP courses, Math level, foreign language)
 - Engagement (extra and co-curricular achievement and leadership)
 - Potential contribution to UW-Green Bay (institutional target groups, interest/motivation)

Priority Admissions

- Students with 17 high school units of college preparatory or academic coursework who are at or above designated academic standards as determined by the Assistant Dean of Enrollment Management will be admitted on a priority basis.**
- The academic standard for priority admission has been initially set as a high school G.P.A. of 3.25 **or** an ACT score of 23.

*Minimum institutional standards may be waived for students who qualify and participate in the E.O.P. program.

**Specific standards for G.P.A. and ACT are subject to change by the Assistant Dean for Enrollment Management based on the applicant pool and enrollment circumstances.

Faculty Senate Information Item #1, 1/23/02

Tenure and Due Process Resolution

BE IT RESOLVED that we, the Faculty Senate of the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay, reaffirms its commitment to the principles and practices of due process in all its functioning and respectfully asks for a similar reaffirmation and commitment to due process from its Chancellor, from the University of Wisconsin President, and from the University of Wisconsin System Board of Regents.

BE IT RESOLVED that we, the Faculty Senate of the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay, object to the Board of Regents' adoption of the Safransky decision as the standard of "just cause" and call upon the Board of Regents to restore the protection of tenure and of due process of faculty members in the University of Wisconsin System.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Regents and President of the University of Wisconsin System, to the Office of the Governor of the State of Wisconsin, and to the members of the Senate and Assembly of the State of Wisconsin.