

AGENDA**UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 2**

Wednesday, 16 October 2002, 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. 1, September 16, 2002](#) (attached)

CHANCELLOR'S REPORT**DISCUSSION ITEM**

1. [Report on the General Education Council](#)

[Report is on the Faculty and Academic Staff Governance Office website]

Presented by Professor John Lyon

INFORMATION ITEMS

1. [Code Revisions to UWGB 6.01 Complaints](#) (attached)

Requested by the Committee on Rights and Responsibilities. Presented by Professor John Lyon

1. [Report of the Provost](#). Presented by Provost Sue K. Hammersmith
2. [Report of the Director of Intercollegiate Athletics](#). Presented by Ken Bothof
3. [University Committee Report](#). Presented by Professor John Lyon, Chai

NEW BUSINESS**ADJOURNMENT**

MINUTES 2002-2003**UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 1**

Wednesday, September 18, 2002

Niagara Room BC, University Union, 3:00 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

Kevin Fermanich

Scott Furlong

Anthony Galt

Sue K. Hammersmith

Craig Hanke

Aeron Haynie

Michael Hencheck

Curt Heuer

Ray Hutchinson

Anne Kok

Sylvia Kubsch

William Lepley

Dennis Lorenz

John Lyon

John Mariano

James Marker

E. Nicole Meyer

Robert Nagy

Illene Noppe

Gilbert Null

Jennifer Popiel

Joyce Salisbury

Bruce Shepard

Linda Tabers-Kwak

Patricia Terry

NOT PRESENT: James Coates, and Richard Logan

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, Professors Jeffrey Entwistle, David Littig, and Brian Sutton, Director of Marketing and Media Relations Scott Hildebrand, Director of Outreach and Extension Jan Thornton, and Director of Donor and Alumni Relations Shane Kohl

The Speaker called the meeting to order, introduced herself and the new Dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences, Carol Blackshire-Belay, and invited the Senators to introduce themselves. They did.

AUTOMATIC CONSENT

1. Approval of Minutes of UW-Green Bay Faculty Senate Meeting No. 10, May 15, 2002

Senator Heuer requested a change on page four dealing with Supplies and Expenses allocations, adding the following change in bold: "There are differences among units, but there are acceptable reasons for the differences because of program differences. **The differences were not specified.**" So amended, the minutes were approved.

CHANCELLOR'S REMARKS

Chancellor Shepard recalled his own experiences in faculty governance and expressed his pleasure in the work of faculty senates. This year in particular he felt energized because he was now at home in the UW-Green Bay Senate and because of the support he had received here over the past year.

He offered information about the university's current situation and listed some agenda items for the coming year. Enrollments are on target, including a reduction of 200 students since fall 2001. We closed admissions earlier than ever because we had overshot our target last year. We had a significant increase in students of color. He asked for patience on the budget situation. The state has a large problem. We need to keep focused on the long term. Foremost, we must protect quality. As the budget is cut, access and/or cost will have to absorb the consequences of defending quality. The UW System is already the most efficient in the country. And UW-Green Bay's unacceptably high student-faculty ratio hardly leaves room for new efficiencies here. He and the Provost are committed to an open, inclusive, collegial budget process. This will be difficult to do in a time of uncertainty, probably less certainty next spring than last. The Chancellor's report, "Educating the Chancellor," contains a list of institutional agenda items. Most focus on academic matters. We need to set priorities.

The Chancellor thanked all for the great effort that has been put into planning the upcoming Inauguration Week. Inaugurations are about institutions, not individuals. This is an opportunity to showcase our strengths, achievements, and values. To market ourselves. The *Press-Gazette* editorial of today's date is an excellent statement on behalf of academic freedom. It is occasioned by the institutional celebration now underway, the installation of the "sifting and winnowing" plaque. We shouldn't shy from marketing ourselves, from letting the world know what we do very well. We are working on a focused and coherent marketing plan. Learning has to be at the center of the message, as well as our commitment to making connections of all kinds.

ACTION ITEMS

1. Election of the Deputy Speaker of the Faculty Senate for 2002-03

Senator Abbott nominated Senator Salisbury. There were no further nominations and Salisbury was elected by acclamation.

2. Faculty Status for Instructional Academic Staff (IAS)

Presented by Professor John Lyon who summarized last year's discussions about the University Committee's proposal to amend the code for the granting of faculty status to instructional academic staff (IAS). Instead of the present approval system to grant this status to individuals on the basis of their qualifications and appointments, faculty status would be linked to positions and titles. The purpose of the change is to increase expectations for IAS to participate in faculty governance. The changes would not be retroactive for current IAS who hold faculty status. The changes would be effective for hires beginning Fall 2003. Hiring units would establish whether positions carried faculty status at the time of appointment or reappointment. Associate Lecturers would not have faculty status; Lecturers and Senior Lecturers would.

Senator Galt asked if representation from units based on their size would be increased by IAS with faculty status. Yes, said Lyon, and this is also currently the case. Galt thought this problematic because it rewards units for hiring IAS rather than tenure-track faculty. Senator Popiel asked if expectations of service would now be clear and certain for Lecturers and Senior Lecturers. Yes. Senator Heuer asked if this meant performance and merit reviews would have

a service component. Yes. Professor Sutton, speaking from the audience, noted that the different Lecturer ranks have different salary ranges. Using the Associate Lecturer title would effectively cut the salary for IAS here. Would this become the standard, lowering compensation for an already exploited group of instructors?

The Chancellor asked if consideration had been given to de facto tenuring of instructors after six years of service as AAUP guidelines provide. We have said that Lecturers are not eligible for tenure because their responsibility is limited to instruction. What would be the effect of expanding the areas of their responsibility? Lyon indicated that this had not been considered.

Senator Kubsch moved, Senator Salisbury seconding, adoption of the University Committee proposal. Salisbury said that the Chancellor's concern had not been ignored, but the Committee was concerned that, in the past, faculty status had been automatically conferred. The proposed changes would emphasize faculty roles. Her own intent was to discourage hiring IAS and secure more faculty lines for instruction.

Senator Popiel was worried about exploitation of IAS. Their heavy teaching duties—a nine-course load—assumes no service expectations. Senator Heuer wondered how, with a nine-course load, there would be time for service. Professor Entwistle, speaking from the audience, said that in Communication and the Arts there was a service expectation for some IAS and the teaching load is decreased accordingly. Senator Null said that then IAS might have a seven-course load, plus service expectations, lack only the expectation for publication, and get paid a pittance. Exploitation is a real issue. Senator Lyon responded that all faculty status really required was attending faculty meetings, unless the units spelled out more elaborate duties at appointment time. Salisbury agreed. The focus is on the duties of the position.

Heuer said that his understanding was that the three Lecturer ranks did not constitute a career ladder. Lyon responded that at the time of reappointment an Associate Lecturer could be promoted to Lecturer. Because these were annual contracts, Senator Hutchinson said, the redefinition of duties and titles could also occur annually. Senator Abbott said that such changes would have to be justified. Senator Baulieu was concerned about voting rights. Unit sizes would be less stable. How would units be held accountable? Salisbury said that there is a rubber stamp process now. In future, units will need to make their case about the positions to the deans.

What about the issue of granting tenure by default? asked Senator Fermanich. The Chancellor said that AAUP rules provide for sixth-year up or out decisions, excluding a few categories like coaches. Part-time or full-time status may not be determinative. The guidelines have no legal standing, but they are used for AAUP institutional censures. Fermanich said that we have clear guidelines for faculty decisions within the sixth-year guidelines, but what about IAS? Abbott replied that our code explicitly excludes tenure for IAS. Associate Provost Sewall said that Lecturers have renewable contracts, annual or multiple years. Explicit statements in these contracts could exclude tenure. The Chancellor said that this doesn't wash with the AAUP; they don't want the tenure system undermined.

Professor Sutton spoke again about the personnel implications of the proposed policy. In at least two areas, Student Support Services and Composition, there are only Lecturers or ad hocs,

and no tenure-track faculty. Lecturer and Senior Lecturer ranks are used. To hire at Associate Lecturer rank would mean hiring at lower salaries to do what is now being done at the better-paid ranks.

Senator Hutchinson wanted to know why faculty status is granted at all. Senator Lyon said it was because curriculum development responsibilities are sometimes assigned, and course development and perhaps other service to units are desired. Senator Heuer said that in fact Lecturers were hired because funds to hire tenure-track faculty were unavailable. Tight budgets lead to exploitation.

Senator Salisbury said that the original code language making faculty status easily obtainable without significant responsibility reflected a time when there were few Lecturers. Now there are many and some want to double dip in Academic Staff and Faculty Development funds. The proposal will create a more responsible system. Professor Littig said that the proposal responds to a problem: units have given inadequate thought to conferring faculty status. It has become a random process. The University Committee simply stopped the process last year and worked out this new policy in the hope that units will give more thought to faculty status recommendations. The Committee was also responding to a UW System initiative to review the status of Instructional and Research Academic Staff.

Is this an attempt to close off faculty status? asked Senator Popiel. Salisbury said that units get to decide. Senator Abbott said that the change will not solve the problem of exploitation. Rather, it decentralizes the faculty status process: units and deans decide. There are to be no across-the-board criteria. Professor Sutton insisted that the change would have a much larger and exploitive effect, cutting compensation for a group of instructors, giving deans the power to lower the pay scale.

Senator Fermanich asked what the practices were at other UW System institutions. Diverse, said Abbott. UW-Madison needs to give faculty status to attract quality IAS, Littig added. Will this change affect our ability to compete for good Lecturers? asked Fermanich.

There was no further discussion. The vote was taken and the motion to adopt the University Committee proposal on faculty status passed 14 for, six opposed, with five abstentions, greater than the two-thirds majority required to amend the UWGB code.

INFORMATION ITEMS

1. Report of the General Education Council

Presented by Professor John Lyon. He summarized how the proposal to revise the General Education program developed. The Chancellor last December discussed with the chairs of the University Committee and General Education Council ideas for revising the program. The University Committee endorsed the study of different models. The present program seemed incoherent. The General Education Council was charged by the University Committee to develop a new program proposal. It did so, and the Senate and campus community now have the proposal before them. Lyon invited Senator Galt, who served on the General Education Council, to comment further on the proposal.

Galt said the proposal sought to create an ideal, without being utopian. The present General Education program is amorphous and fails to mirror the institutional mission. A better program needs to integrate many different elements, academic and social. And it needs a core. The proposal would reduce the General Education requirement to 30 credits. It has three tiers:

- A first contact seminar (small enrollment), Foundations of Inquiry, intended to provide a high-impact freshman experience of the sort envisioned in the Learning Experience proposal; it would be broadly interdisciplinary;

- A series of interdisciplinary lecture courses (large enrollment) in each of the domains providing broad introductions to them;
- Critical thinking and problem-solving courses (small enrollment) to apply interdisciplinary knowledge in particular domains to specific problems.

General Education Domain Committees would need to be created (re-created) to oversee the development of the second and third tiers. The other-culture, ethnic studies, and fine arts requirements are unchanged in this proposal.

To make a change as substantial as the one proposed requires a faculty consensus. There are many implications for resource allocation and program recruitment. Please, Galt asked, don't focus immediately on the details. The big questions need to be faced first. We should consider launching a pilot in Fall 2003, to serve about 200 students. Full implementation will have to be gradual because of resource constraints.

Lyon asked the Senate how to proceed. Should Senators carry the proposal to their constituencies and return for Senate action? Should there be a general faculty meeting or all-university forums to address the proposal? If the proposal is accepted, what will be the timeline for implementation and what faculty group will be responsible?

Senator Null said that the details needed to be considered, how it is to be implemented, what are the implications for resource allocation. Senator Baulieu agreed, but said that the general issues should be looked at first. For example, is General Education broken? Do we need a change? Galt said that there are two alternatives: refine the current program or go to a core program. Senator Popiel said that as many voices as possible need to be heard. All faculty need an opportunity for input at a general meeting. Baulieu applauded the General Education Council for its work. He thought that the discussion should begin in the Senate, so that some issues could be clarified before there was an all-faculty meeting. He was especially concerned that it be clear that no new workload be imposed. This principle was established for the Learning Experience proposal. It was based on the long history here of letting our idealism and commitment to interdisciplinarity impose greater burdens on ourselves. We should stop shooting ourselves in the foot. Galt said that there was no intention to add to workload.

Lyon asked for a straw vote on holding a Faculty Forum on the general education proposal before the next Senate meeting. Fifteen Senators supported the forum. None opposed.

2. Report of the Provost

Provost Hammersmith expressed her pleasure in being at UW-Green Bay and thanked all for the welcome given her. She applauded the General Education Council for its work, saying she appreciated how difficult a task revising general education is. She offered her agenda for the coming year. President Lyall's priorities should be noted:

- Restore lost faculty positions (over the last five years the UW System has lost 500 faculty positions; currently 40 percent of instruction is by non-tenure-track faculty);
- Improve student retention and graduation rates;
- Increase state budget support by \$1,000 per student to bring the UW System to the national average.

The Provost's priorities include:

- Get to know the campus better;
- Get action on the many studies that have accumulated here without action being taken;

- Establish coherence and follow-through in planning: planning has apparently centered on budget building; it needs to focus more on program planning and student success. Program reviews need to be used, not just filed. The NCA reports should be used. Action needs to be taken on campus life, enrollment management, diversity, gender equity, general education, and international education studies. Grants should be looked at as planning documents.
- Face some big questions on enrollment management: who do we want to admit, freshmen? Transfers from institutions in the region?
- Prepare to implement the new admissions standards;
- Fill the position of Dean of Professional Studies and Outreach;
- Outreach needs to be promoted to serve the Chancellor's goal that we become Green Bay's University of Wisconsin; Outreach may in future report directly to the Provost;
- Implement the collaborative Master of Social Work degree to be offered jointly by Green Bay and Oshkosh; final approval from the Board of Regents should come at its next meeting; it is being cited as a model for the UW System.

The Provost invited comments and suggestions from all. E-mail is fine.

Because the fixed time for the Senate's adjournment approached, the Speaker asked to extend the meeting for ten additional minutes. There was no objection.

3. University Committee Annual Report for 2001-02

Professor David Littig, University Committee Chairperson, 2001-02, read the Committee report.

As adjournment time again approached, the Speaker asked the body for five more minutes. There was no objection.

4. University Committee Report

University Committee Chair Lyon listed agenda items for the Committee, including:

- General Education proposal
- Advising
- Integrated Planning
- First-Year Experience
- Revisions to code for the Committee on Rights and Responsibilities and the Academic Affairs Council
- Search for a Dean of Professional Studies and Outreach
- Post-Tenure Review

- Ranking by Search and Screen Committees
- Student Retention and Graduate Rates
- Policy for Review of Articulation Agreements
- Faculty Representation to the Student Government Association
- Inequities in Supplies and Expenses Allocations
- Student Engagement

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:13 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jerrold Rodesch,

Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

Faculty Senate Information Item #1, 10/16/02

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.**

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 is 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.