

AGENDA

UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 4

Wednesday, 14 November 2001, 3:00 p.m.

ROSE HALL 250

Presiding Officer: John Lyon, Speaker

Parliamentarian: Professor Jerrold C. Rodesch

AUTOMATIC CONSENT

1. Minutes of UW-Green Bay Faculty Senate [Meeting No. 1, September 19](#); [Meeting No. 2, September 26](#); and [Meeting No. 3, October 17, 2001](#).

CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

ACTION ITEMS

1. [Resolution on the Granting of Degrees](#) (attached)
2. [Proposed Changes in Requirements for Honors](#) (attached). Presented by Professor David Littig

DISCUSSION ITEM

1. [Policy for Granting B.A. and B.S. Degrees](#) (attached). Presented by Professor David Littig

INFORMATION ITEMS

- 1 **Report of the Provost.** Presented by Interim Provost Carol Pollis
- 2 **University Committee Report.** Presented by Professor David Littig, Chair

NEW BUSINESS

ADJOURNMENT

MINUTES 2001-2002

UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 1

Wednesday, September 19, 2001

Phoenix Room C, University Union, 3:05 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

William Conley

Kevin Fermanich

Scott Furlong

Anthony Galt

Curt Heuer

Robert Howe

Andrew Kersten

Theodor Korithoski

Sylvia Kubsch

David Littig

John Lyon

Joseph Mannino

John Mariano

Brian Merkel

Jennifer Mokren

Robert Nagy

Illene Noppe

Gilbert Null

Carol Pollis

Kevin Roeder

William Shay

NOT PRESENT: Michael Hencheck, William Kuepper, and Dennis Lorenz

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

GUESTS: Interim Deans Cheryl Grosso and Jane Muhl, Associate Provost Timothy Sewall, and Professor Jeffrey Entwistle

By custom, the Speaker invited Senators to introduce themselves. They did so.

AUTOMATIC CONSENT

1. Approval of Minutes of UW-Green Bay Faculty Senate Meeting No. 8, May 9, 2000

The minutes were approved without change.

ACTION ITEMS

1. Election of the Faculty Deputy Speaker of the Senate for 2001-02

Senator Kubsch nominated Senator Noppe for the position of Deputy Speaker. There were no further nominations. She was elected by acclamation.

2. Recommendation on the 2001-03 Pay Plan

The pay plan resolution prepared by the University Committee had been discussed at the May meeting.

Senator Littig moved and Senator Furlong seconded a motion to adopt the resolution. Senator Galt asked for clarification of the second paragraph of the resolution. Speaker Lyon explained its intent to limit salary compression. Provost Pollis pointed out that unit leaders have already agreed to the principles of the resolution, in particular to the idea that merit distribution plans should not contribute to the problem of salary compression. Senator Shay wondered if the language of the resolution was not too strong in saying that plans “must not” exacerbate compression “in any way. “ Couldn’t units be challenged even for market-based adjustments which might contribute to compression? Why can’t units decide how to distribute these funds? Senator Carleton asked if the resolution represented a change. Lyon replied that while the first paragraph was consistent with past practice the second introduced a new policy. In the past some units have allocated merit money as flat sums rather than percentage of salary. This produces compression between ranks. Senator Galt thought the prohibition was too absolute. Carleton said that, with this sweeping language, even rewarding excellent junior faculty at the expense of less excellent senior faculty could be construed as compression. Lyon acknowledged that the language was imperfect. Senator Null asked for rewording.

Senator Abbott **moved**, seconded by Shay, **to strike the second paragraph**. Abbott explained that the units have already agreed to the principle of the paragraph. It is unnecessary. A more general policy statement requires further deliberation and greater clarity, particularly to define compression and to identify how and by whom units will be held accountable. **The amendment was adopted, 14 in favor, five opposed, with two abstentions.** Abbott and Galt agreed that the issue warranted further discussion. The Provost said that

Chancellor Perkins had left a memorandum for his successor outlining what had been done on the compression issue and what remained to be done. Compression is still very much on the institution's agenda.

The resolution, as amended, was adopted unanimously.

INFORMATION ITEMS

1. Report of the Provost

The Provost began by expressing thanks to Professor David Galaty and the panelists who took part in the teach-in on the events of September 11. More than 400 students attended. Genuinely interdisciplinary perspectives were offered.

She said she was delighted to back on campus to work with Interim Chancellor Kuepper, noting his absence to attend a meeting of the Building Commission in Madison. At that meeting we received approval of remodeling drawings for Laboratory Sciences and for our plans for additional dormitories.

We do not have complete information yet on our student body based on fall enrollments, but it is heartening to note that 51 percent of incoming students are in the first quartile of their high school graduating classes and 19 percent are in the top ten percent.

Our effort to respond to concerns and recommendations of the **Equality for Women** report is underway. The reassignment of Melissa Jackson, University Legal Counsel, to 50 percent time in that role and 50 percent as University Ombudsperson is a major first step. A job description is being prepared that will deal with potential conflicts of interest arising from her two roles. We should expect that in future we will rely more on advice from UW System attorneys. Appointments to a twelve member Chancellor's Advisory Council on Equality for Women are being made. Jackson will be its chair. That body should convene before October 1. We have prepared a draft of an implementation plan for each action recommended in the report. The Leadership Team will take responsibility for action steps within a five-year time line. The Advisory Council will report annually to the campus community on progress made. The Student Government Association will appoint a study group to look at options to meet childcare needs.

The **Learning Experience** initiative will need to be reexamined. The \$500,000 and eight FTE positions fall far short of the more than \$6 million we had sought. Draft recommendations for how to use radically reduced funding are now being reviewed. We have a small budget for a big, complex plan. We have to decide also what to do in redrafting our proposal for the 2003-05 biennial budget submission. UW System budget planning has clearly taken workforce development as a major theme. How can we connect the Learning Experience to System's priorities?

The **Campus Life 21** plan will also need to be reexamined. Its three components—Union expansion; Phoenix Sports Center expansion; an Events Center—have so far been treated as a single project costing about \$60 million (one-third from students whose fees would increase \$100 per year for four years; one-third from gifts; one-third from GPR). All three components are needed, but it may make sense to take a piece-meal approach in order to secure the needed approvals.

Searches for two Deans and a Provost need to begin soon. The Dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences position, following last year's failed search, is ready to go. The timing of this search may depend on when a Provost is in place to take part in the hiring decision. Our request for permission to recruit for the Provost position is before the Board of Regents. The Dean of Professional Studies and Outreach position poses a special problem. We have had many years of discussion about the possibility of AACSB accreditation for the Business Program. This is an appropriate time to do something. Professor Karl Zehms will lead in the preparation of a detailed financial plan (by October 20) showing the resources we would need to pursue AACSB accreditation of both graduate and undergraduate programs. A decision to move forward on accreditation will take place before we act on the Dean's position. Senator Carlton asked if consideration were being given to the creation of a separate College of

Business. No, said Pollis, that has not been discussed. It is not a requirement to obtain accreditation. However, if we were to seek accreditation we would need to look at the administrative arrangements for all of the professional programs. That might include designation of two professional Deans, including a Dean of Business, whether or not we decided to create a separate School or College. There are other possibilities. The institutional decision on accreditation is crucial.

Senator Heuer asked if we had been assessed a budget giveback. Yes, we had. It amounted to \$151,000. We drew on our contingency fund (two percent of budget) for this purpose; it did not impact any existing budget. Senator Galt asked about enrollment. We have a record this fall: 5546.

2. Annual Report of the University Committee 2000-01

Presented by Professor Jeffrey Entwistle, 2000-01 University Committee Chair

Professor Entwistle read his report to the Senate.

3. University Committee Report. Presented by Professor David Littig, Chair

The University Committee has reviewed changes in the Academic Probation and Suspension Policy as prepared by the Academic Actions Committee. The new policy will be clearer and more flexible. In addition, a faculty representative was chosen for the Chancellor's Advisory Council on Equality for Women. Professor Georgina Wilson-Doenges will represent the faculty as a whole and report to the faculty annually. On a related matter, there is concern among the faculty about the conflict of interest built into the joint position of Ombudsperson and University Legal Counsel. Moreover, some ask if the faculty shouldn't be able to designate a Faculty Advocate. The University Committee will continue to consider these issues.

The Committee is studying a number of **code changes**. Shared governance is sometimes subverted when uncodified bodies are established to undertake particular tasks. Moreover, our codified elected bodies do not have a clear enough accountability to the faculty through the University Committee and Senate. The Academic Affairs Council, General Education Council, and Graduate Faculty Board of Advisors report to the Provost or Deans, not the faculty. The Committee is preparing code changes to ensure clear lines of responsibility in the governance system.

Littig invited the Senate to study UWGB Chapter 50 and 52 to understand the areas of primary faculty authority.

Littig distributed copies of the recommendations of the **Learning Experience** Implementation Drafting Committee for the use of new funds as well as a summary of the major elements in the implementation plan. The University Committee and other faculty have a number of concerns about inadequate consultation and insufficient reflection in the process used to develop the recommendations. The proposal for heavy reliance on ad hoc instruction for general education and for replacement of faculty involved in the new student seminar pilot program seem especially questionable. The idea of the pilot program is itself a matter of controversy. Reliance on composition instructors as advisors for new students is also challenged by the University Committee. We should, moreover, develop a plan that will reach more than 400 students in a pilot program. There are alternatives for the use of new funding that have not been adequately considered. Additionally, because all planning for the Learning Experience has been based on the assumption of full funding, consideration might be given to abandoning the initiative altogether in light of the minimal dollars provided. The University Committee, however, reaffirms the Learning Experience plan and suggests that the money available be used to focus on one or two elements of the plan that would benefit a large number of students. But more extensive faculty discussion is necessary. The Committee seeks the Senate's advice.

Senator Howe said a special meeting would be useful. Senator Kersten asked that the documents distributed be put on-line; Littig said that this would be done immediately. Associate Provost Sewall pointed out that the principal document distributed is not the final version. He also said that the Learning Experience Review Committee has been specifically asked to consider alternative plans, so that Littig's comments are timely and

useful for this process. Bob Skorczewski said that the Academic Staff Committee had concerns similar to those of the University Committee.

Senator Furlong reminded the Senate that the draft recommendations were prepared under the assumption of a \$250,000 budget, rather than the \$500,000 received. Reliance on ad hocs was one consequence and not regarded as desirable in itself. While the document before the Senate is not entirely irrelevant, it is not in itself an adequate basis for decisions now. Senator Noppe supported Furlong's points. A wider discussion is needed. Several Senators asked for guidance on what specific matters would be considered at a special meeting of the Senate. Littig offered to provide necessary documents. Furlong and Pollis noted that we have considerable flexibility in expending the \$500,000 because of the manner in which the budget was actually adopted. We must account for our use of the funds, but they are not tied to any specific elements in the Learning Experience proposal.

A special meeting of the Senate will be held at 3:00 p.m. on September 26 to deal solely with Learning Experience plans and planning.

Littig announced that future business to be brought before the Senate will include changes in requirements for the awarding of Honors; a proposal to distinguish granting of Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science degrees; and recommendations for faculty compensation and salary compression.

As time for the meeting was expiring, Senator Kubsch **moved to extend the meeting ten minutes**, Senator Galt seconding. **It failed, seven in favor, six opposed, many not voting**, lacking the two-thirds vote required to suspend the rules.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned according to rule at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jerrold Rodesch,

Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

MINUTES 2000-2001

UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 2

Wednesday, September 26, 2001

Phoenix Room C, University Union, 3:05 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

William Conley

Kevin Fermanich

Scott Furlong

Anthony Galt

Curt Heuer

Robert Howe

Andrew Kersten

Sylvia Kubsch

William Kuepper

David Littig

Dennis Lorenz

John Lyon

John Mariano

Jennifer Mokren

Robert Nagy

Illene Noppe

Gilbert Null

Carol Pollis

Kevin Roeder

William Shay

NOT PRESENT: Michael Hencheck, Theodor Korithoski , Joseph Mannino, and Brian Merkel

REPRESENTATIVES: Nick Kohn, Student Government Association, and David Kieper, Academic Staff Committee

GUESTS: Vice Chancellor Tom Maki, Assistant Chancellor Rodeheaver, Interim Dean Cheryl Grosso, Associate Provost Timothy Sewall, Deborah Furlong, and Linda Peacock-Landrum

DISCUSSION ITEMS

The Learning Experience

At the invitation of Speaker Lyon, it was moved by Senator Abbott, seconded by Senator Littig, that the Senate act as a committee of the whole to undertake informal discussion. The motion passed without objection.

Littig said that this special meeting of the Senate was called to consider how to allocate the new \$500,000 base budget funding and 8 FTE positions. A clear faculty voice is needed in the decision-making process. The Learning Experience Review Committee has before it recommendations made last spring by the Implementation Committee. The Senate should speak to those recommendations and also identify which of the major Learning Experience components should be given priority. How can we best use a small amount of money in the short term for a long-term plan that requires a great deal more funding

Lyon asked that discussion begin by focusing on the recommendations of the Implementation Committee. Senator Furlong reminded the body that those recommendations were based on the assumption that we would have only \$250,000. Therefore, part of that plan is now obsolete. The committee was, however, guided by a principle that is relevant to current discussion and might be a starting point: a priority on hiring faculty to have "high impact student contact." Senator Noppe, who had served on the committee with Furlong, agreed. Lyon then asked that the discussion proceed with the **goal of identifying priorities**, noting the first three priorities of the Implementation Committee draft:

- High impact student contact
- Academic advising
- Reducing the backlog in General Education classes.

Senator Carleton said that it should be understood that academic advising is to be a faculty as well as an academic staff function. Furlong and Noppe agreed that was the intent.

Senator Galt reported that **Social Change and Development** was of two minds: some said that unless there were full funding the initiative should be abandoned; but others said that if priorities were to be established then the limited available money should go to faculty involvement in advising.

Senator Null reported that **Humanistic Studies** was more of a single mind that, absent full funding, we cannot be expected to carry out any particular part of the Learning Experience proposal and that therefore the money should go to hiring faculty to reduce class sizes in existing General Education courses. The connection between New Student Seminars (NSS) and General Education lacks clarity and the seminars don't warrant funding in the current circumstance. Noppe said that the NSS are intended to focus on competencies and not just be smaller versions of existing General Education courses. Nonetheless, they could satisfy existing requirements and therefore take some of the pressure off existing courses. Null asked what domains the NSS would satisfy. All of them, Furlong said; it would depend on the proposal of the faculty member offering the seminar subject to review by the General Education Council.

Senator Block recounted the discussion in the **Nursing** program, the conclusion of which was that all students, not a subset, ought to directly benefit from the new funding. Therefore, advising should be the first priority. Additionally, the NSS might be one-credit offerings which all faculty would participate in. If there were any money left over, it should be used to reduce General Education section sizes.

Senator Howe reported the discussion in **Natural and Applied Sciences**. Faculty elders reflected on reasons for the failure of the Liberal Education Seminars in the past. Freshmen are often not prepared for discussion-based instruction, they said. Additional stipends for faculty participating in the seminars create invidious distinctions, envy, and resentment. Of most evident value in the new proposal is faculty involvement in advising which should be accompanied by better coordination between units and the Academic Advising Office.

Carleton said that the **Academic Affairs Council** adopted a resolution calling for the money to be used to hire faculty, not ad hoc instructors. The Council felt that this should reduce class size in large introductory courses.

Null noted that the Humanistic Studies position was supported by the University Committee memorandum of September 21 lamenting our high student-faculty ratio. This problem is especially severe in General Education courses. Senator Aldrete added that the worst possible impression we make on freshmen is to put them in a class of 250 students. Reducing class size helps meet, indeed makes possible, most of the other objectives of the Learning Experience.

Nick Kohn spoke on behalf of the **Student Senate** which was very concerned about advising but also thought that the employment of NSS instructors (presumed to be faculty members) as academic advisors addressed the concern. Therefore, the Senate gave priority to the NSS, not least to lay a foundation for seeking full funding for the Learning Experience in the next budget cycle. Lowering General Education section sizes is fine, but it does not launch the Learning Experience, which is what

we need to do. Furlong agreed. Advising, yes. General Education, yes. But we need to show that we're doing something new. The NSS accomplish this. Moreover, the available money isn't enough to have any significant impact on General Education class size. What would be the point of cutting

classes of 250 to 225? Littig asked Kohn, what about students who couldn't get into NSS? Shouldn't we do something to impact all students? Kohn answered that over the course of an academic year there would be enough NSS available for all freshmen. Ultimately we should aim to get at all freshmen during their first semester. Howe, speaking for himself rather than his unit, said he supported the NSS. It is a great idea to have at least one small class for all freshmen. We should also note, he said, that the advising function is more than logistics. We need to provide meaningful career guidance.

Senator Kubsch reiterated Nursing's objection to the creation of a pilot program that wouldn't reach all students. The institution of a one-credit Introduction to College course during the first semester for all students would be much better than the NSS. Nursing also supported use of professional advisors in the Academic Advising Office, rather than faculty. The Office functions very well now even with limited staff.

Noppe said that we don't have enough money to develop a program with any integrity that will serve all students. We need to deliver on what we have promised. The advising component should not be seen as replacing the Academic Advising Office. Instead it provides an additional opportunity for students, allowing them to get to know a faculty member from day one.

Aldrete argued that the goals of reducing General Education section enrollments and developing the NSS are not incompatible if the NSS overlap General Education courses in content, ideally even be small enrollment versions of the courses. Furlong said that this was not precluded. Null thought that this idea and the Nursing proposal for one-credit seminars moved in the right direction, whereas an entirely new design of voluntary NSS did not. Senator Kersten worried that the state legislature would not be impressed by what we have done with the funding. Are we going to jeopardize the possibility of additional funding by going down this road? Furlong said that the legislature would not think much of simply adding more General Education sections. We need to do something that can have a measurable impact on retention.

Lyon offered a calculation that 45 NSS per semester absorbed 6.5 FTE faculty. We can, therefore, offer NSS for every new freshman with the funding available, but there would be little left over.

Kohn said that NSS were always linked to the General Education requirement. He added that, while the student agreement for a tuition increase to support the Learning Experience had been withdrawn when full funding was rejected, it is not out of the question that it could be restored in the next biennium. But the Learning Experience needs to begin. The NSS are important. A pilot program is ok.

Kubsch suggested that increased use of instructional academic staff in the NSS might make sense.

Littig reminded the body that **retention** was the key to selling our project to the legislature. Whatever we call it, whatever we do, needs to have a payoff in student retention. Howe objected. Retention as such should not be our goal. The Learning Experience, the best learning experience for students, should guide our effort, whatever

the impact on retention. Littig agreed, but thought that a good learning experience would have better retention as a consequence. Null wondered how the legislature would calculate the quality of the learning experience apart from retention. Abbott suggested that good advising and internships might well improve both the learning experience and retention, but these might have no effect on class size. Reducing General Education section size goes off in another direction altogether. Senator Fermanich pointed out that impressing the legislature for the next budget cycle was out of the question. We will have no outcome data available for program changes that will only begin next year. We are free to think outside the box. Lyon remarked in this vein that abolishing General Education would accomplish a number of things, including radical reduction in section sizes. Why not look at majors as the focus for improvement in the learning experience of students? Galt replied that extensive discussions over several years have concluded that the freshman experience was crucial. Major programs are not the issue.

Kersten asked if we conduct student exit surveys. Do students leave us because of big General Education sections or poor advising? Associate Provost Sewall said that we do survey graduating seniors. Kersten said that surveying the others, those who left, was important to understand retention. Deborah Furlong said that there are no regular surveys, but we did conduct one recently. One-third leave for academic reasons, poor performance and a lack of direction. Others transfer to programs elsewhere that are not available here or are perceived as better elsewhere. There are complaints too about the services we provide, including advising.

Fermanich asked if the **General Education** program is now obsolete. It apparently will undergo a major reevaluation. Senator Furlong said that the General Education Council was indeed about to begin a global review, at least partly based on discussions concerning the Learning Experience proposal. Noppe said that the impact of the proposal on General Education was an important element in the review. Howe said that we are talking about only 3-7 new faculty positions. How can we look at anything other than General Education? Carleton agreed and offered a concrete plan: hire six faculty for NSS/General Education and two Academic Staff for Internship Coordination/Advising. Noppe reminded him that the NSS instructors could also have an advising responsibility. Null repeated the Humanistic Studies proposal that all eight positions be assigned to faculty instruction to reduce General Education class size.

Abbott said he did not hear a consensus on priorities emerging from this discussion. An alternative approach might be to go to the units and ask them what they would do if they got a new position to further the aims of the Learning Experience. This could at least provide us with useful information. Kubsch said we didn't have time for such a process.

Aldrete commented on the **advising** function. It means knowing the student, not just giving packaged advice. That is why the use of faculty advisors based in the NSS is an especially good idea. Littig said that every faculty member should have an advising responsibility, but high impact first contact is our emphasis. Limited funds mean hard choices on priorities. Howe said that good advising means input from many sources. Assigning a single faculty member to each student is no guarantee of good advising. We should look at additional ways of giving freshmen access to faculty. Kohn said that freshmen report that they want "a faculty member" to help guide them. Their NSS instructor would be a good way to do this until they found their way to a major. Senator Heuer agreed with Howe. Students need to have places to touch base, but faculty also need to know when they can't provide the advice the students need and where the students could get help. Noppe said that the Faculty Development component of the Learning Experience included work on effective advising. Kersten thought that what was really important was faculty mentoring, a more informal advice-giving activity. Lyon said that perhaps we needed to transform the role and image of our faculty, of the expectations we have for faculty. Senator Morken contended that advising ought to be separated from the NSS. Mentoring should work automatically in small classes. Heuer thought that the release for advising granted to NSS instructors was unfair, especially with so many other workload issues unresolved. Howe said it was a bad idea to require NSS instructors to take on advising and the Introduction to College course as well. This is too complicated. Kubsch agreed. Block asked that we consider other models for faculty interaction with new students.

Galt was troubled by the proposal to use ad hoc instructors in General Education. We should instead try to integrate the NSS into General Education with faculty, with our best and most seasoned faculty. Ad hoc instructors are not always easy to find, and while many are excellent teachers, some are not.

Furlong answered that the Implementation Committee recommendation was based on a smaller budget, and the intention had been to increase teaching faculty. Lyon noted that there appeared to be wide support for giving freshman a small class experience, close contact with a faculty and thereby improve General Education. Null shared Galt's concern. It seemed to him backwards to use ad hoc instructors in existing General Education courses and new faculty in the NSS.

Fermanich asked if any action was going to be taken by the Senate. General Education? New Student Seminars? Lyon thought the question was whether we were going to make NSS or small General Education course available to every freshman. Abbott suggested some ordering of priorities. Littig said that we need to look at the issues more broadly and consider the size of the institution, the climate of the place.

Kubsch insisted that the basic issue remains, **a pilot study or an across-the-board experience for all. Abbott asked for a straw vote** on this. Furlong said that he interpreted this to mean that if we cannot offer NSS for all freshmen, we shouldn't do it at all. He thought, to the contrary, that we should be able to phase in elements of the Learning Experience based on partial funding; that is, not all students would immediately benefit. **Four voted for a pilot program, 11 for an across-the-board experience, three abstained.**

Who, Howe asked, will decide how to use the new funds and when? Provost Pollis answered that the Learning Experience Review Committee is considering the recommendations of the Implementation Committee. She initially expected to receive advice from this process by October 1, but it will be delayed. A recommendation will then go the Leadership Team, then to the Chancellor. We should be thinking about practical dates for faculty recruitment. We can put off recruitment until next year.

Null concluded that the Senate would not act on this matter now or later. Pollis said that Faculty Governance would act on any proposal within its purview, e.g., new required courses. Lyon said that the Senate has not been asked for approval of any plans. Null wanted to know what Humanistic Studies should do with its resolution. After general chuckling, he was advised to send it to Associate Provost Sewall, the chair of the Learning Experience Review Committee. Sewall said that the committee is looking at the feasibility of implementing each of the elements of the Learning Experience proposal. An alternative plan to that recommended by the Implementation Committee in May needs to be developed.

Noppe gave her sense of the afternoon's discussion, saying that, Senator Null excepted, there was general support for New Student Seminars to be made available all new freshmen.

The time for the meeting expiring, Littig **moved to suspend the rules to continue discussion for an additional five minutes.** Furlong seconded. **The motion failed, 9 in favor, 11 opposed.**

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned by rule at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jerrold Rodesch,

Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

MINUTES 2000-2001

UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 3

Wednesday, October 17, 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

William Conley

Kevin Fermanich

Scott Furlong

Anthony Galt

Curt Heuer

Robert Howe

Andrew Kersten

Sylvia Kubsch

William Kuepper

David Littig

John Lyon

John Mariano

Brian Merkel

Jennifer Mokren

Robert Nagy

Illene Noppe

Gilbert Null

Carol Pollis

William Shay

NOT PRESENT: James Coates, Michael Hencheck, Theodor Korithoski, Dennis Lorenz, Joseph Mannino, and Kevin Roeder

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

GUESTS: Associate Provost Timothy Sewall, Associate Dean Denise Scheberle, Professor Catherine Henze, and Randy Christopherson

CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

Interim Chancellor Kuepper offered remarks both general and specific in concluding his second term in office.

- The search for an Athletics Director continues. Finalists will be interviewed soon. In the same area, our newly-renamed Horizon Conference has delayed adding a tenth member.
- Construction of a new residence hall has begun, the first of three, one each fall for the next three years.
- The Campus Life for the 21st Century (CL21) project has been modified. The Events Center has attracted a great deal of attention, some of it critical. To pursue funding we have decided initially to focus on the additions to the Student Union and Sports Center.
- We have developed a policy for mail security because of widespread concerns in the light of recent events. Randy Christopherson, Director of Public Safety, is available to answer questions. Christopherson summarized the policy and invited questions.

The Chancellor said he felt entitled as a lame duck to speak about some general concerns for the institution. UW-Green Bay has a bright future. Over the next few years, however, as we deliberate about the Learning Experience initiative, we need to pay special attention to where we did well and where we did not do well in the most recent budget process and what that means for the next biennium. The initiatives of the UW System in the next biennium will focus on economic development. The question posed will be what the UW can do for the state, not the state for the UW. The Learning Experience needs to be seen in that perspective. It will likely be a tough, belt-tightening budget. We have the potential and the opportunity to play an important role in the economic development of this region. We have not done as much as we could have. If we want new resources we must look to this. There are no moral victories in the budget process. You either get more money or you don't.

Related to this is the issue of enrollment. How big should we be? Discussions in recent years have concluded that we should maintain or even reduce present enrollment. It is not, at least at the present time, a politically sound position to assert that we will not take more students. We have the physical capacity, the administrative infrastructure, and the regional need to be larger. We can and should be considerably larger. Can we get the resources for this? The institution needs to be dynamic to match the growth of the region.

Senator Abbott asked about the priority in decision-making about state funding being given to collaboration among educational institutions. Is going it alone an impossible strategy now? The Chancellor thought that cooperative ventures were a very good strategy and they should include partnerships with business and industry.

Speaker Lyon thanked Chancellor Kuepper for his service and the Senate conferred on him a hearty round of applause.

DISCUSSION ITEM

Changes in Requirements for Honors. Presented by Professor David Littig

Provost Pollis forward to the University Committee a recommendation from the Academic Affairs Council to establish different grade point averages for each honors rank. Previously the distinction between magna and summa cum laude was solely the completion of a senior honors project for the summa designation. The senior

honors project for degree honors would be eliminated. Such a project, together with cut-off grade point averages, will be required only for designation of honors in the major.

Senator Null pointed out that the language of the proposal appeared to require completion of a senior honors project as a prerequisite for enrolling in the senior honors project course. Littig and Speaker Lyon acknowledged a language problem. They will revise it. Senator Heuer also found inconsistent and confusing language in the Catalogue and the Timetable regarding prerequisites for honors or distinction projects. Care needs to be taken here as well. Senator Merkel said that there seems to be an assumption that an honors project is a one-semester experience. That is not enough in the sciences. Senator Galt offered a model used in Social Change and Development where students combine a semester of independent study with registration for the honors course in the following semester.

Littig inquired if information was available about how many students had taken advantage of the summa cum laude option under the present standards. Associate Dean Scheberle happened to have some data. In the last ten years, 579 students have graduated magna cum laude and missed summa designation because they did not complete an honors project. Littig wondered how well students had been informed of this opportunity. Senator Furlong worried that with the proposed changes we might be cutting off high honors possibilities for some very good students. He also asked how our honors grade point averages compare to those of other UW System institutions. Scheberle said that we fall in the middle range of requirements at UW System campuses. Galt asked if it is clear how the changes will affect student incentives to seek honors, particularly to undertake honors projects. We ought to avoid disincentives. Senator Abbott agreed with the concerns of Furlong and Galt. Honors solely dependent on numbers is not a good idea. Why not allow more discretion to faculty in approving honors in the major than is permitted with the proposed grade point averages?

INFORMATION ITEMS

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

The Academic Affairs Council has also proposed changes in the way to designate B.A. and B.S. degrees. At the present time we have no policy. Students decide on whatever basis appeals to them what degree they will receive. The new policy would have the faculties of each major determine what degree was to be granted. Default degrees in various areas are also indicated. There should be discussion at the unit level about procedures for this determination.

Senator Galt asked if distinctions had to be made. How about just a Baccalaureate degree? Senator Kubsch said that in Nursing the B.S. degree is required. Senator Null declared that the default designations were inconsistently worded and not useful for some majors. Senator Carleton, chair of the Academic Affairs Council, said that the changes before the Senate were really preliminary thoughts about the issue, not a proposal for action. He did not expect it to come forward in this form. Senator Aldrete asked that the default provision be eliminated; it is very important for the programs to decide for themselves. Bob Skorczewski wondered if there was a problem that this was a solution to. Carleton said yes. Current policy is haphazard, empty. Random, Littig said. A proposal will be brought for the Senate's action.

2. **Report of the Provost.** Presented by Interim Provost Carol Pollis

The Provost provided an update on the **Learning Experience initiative**. The Review Committee has two or three interpretation of the Implementation Committee report before it. The budget we have is different from the one on which initial planning was based. The Senate discussion of September 26 was helpful to the process. Some complicated decisions will have to be made. There will be ample time for discussion of the final recommendations, because it would be a mistake to move forward without broad faculty support. We need to do something significant with the new funding. We need to be able to tell the public what we have done to improve undergraduate education.

Searches for the Dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences and the Provost are going forward. Nominations for members of the search committees are almost complete. They will be forwarded to Chancellor Shepard who will

make the appointments.

The issue of **collaboration**, raised earlier by Senator Abbott, has been increasingly prominent in UW System deliberations over the last several years. One of the newest expressions of this is EGOLL—**Executive Group for On-Line Learning**—which was charged to set a strategic direction for UW System in identifying on-line opportunities that involve the efforts of more than a single campus. Its membership has eight chancellors and three members of the Board of Regents, a heavyweight committee. The EGOLL report was presented to the July Board of Regents meeting which accepted the recommendations. They encourage collaboration in on-line programs. They enjoin faculty at all UW System institutions to build on-line learning into every major. There has been debate over this, and the proposal is undergoing reconsideration, but the theme of collaboration is very strong.

3. **University Committee Report.** Presented by Professor David Littig, Chair

The University Committee joins with President Lyall in thanking all who contacted the Governor and Legislators in supporting the pay package that was recently adopted.

The Committee has met with the chairs of the Academic Affairs Council, the General Education Council, and the Graduate Faculty Board of Advisors to discuss how to better integrate their work with that of Senate. Faculty Governance is impeded by the current charges to these bodies. The University Committee expects to bring code changes before the Senate.

The Senate discussion on the Learning Experience funding was useful but failed to produce a consensus. Accordingly, the University Committee conducted a survey of units to elicit additional advice on priorities. When the responses are complete Littig will report the results.

Chancellor Kuepper commented on the pay plan. Regent President Smith was extremely important in getting it accepted. His role needs to be acknowledged also.

Senator Galt said that the unit survey on Learning Experience priorities was not helpful. Its wording stands in the way of getting a consensus. Littig admitted that some units had simply ignored the priorities presented in the survey.

Senator Null said that Littig had not reported on a recent discussion in the University Committee about granting of faculty status to Lecturers and the entitlements of that status. He hoped the Committee would place this on its agenda and work to clarify the policy. Littig said yes.

NEW BUSINESS

Senator Null attempted to move the resolution adopted by Humanistic Studies on **Learning Experience funding**. The resolution was out of order. Such an action must appear on the agenda.

Senator Kersten asked that the Senate or some appropriate body give attention to the recent **Health Insurance rate increases**. We should at least be provided information about the process of establishing benefits, how the decisions are made that can so radically affect our real incomes, and what we may expect in the future. Don't we have some leverage given the size the UW System? Provost Pollis said that there is a UW System Benefits Committee. We have a representative on it, Mary Fischer, our Human Resources Director. Bob Skorczewski said that the pay plan and benefits development processes are quite separate. Additionally, this is a system-level operation and matters like changing lists of physicians offered by local and regional health service providers are not negotiated locally. This is the world of HMOs, not a particularly good world. The Provost said it is a good idea to generate and disseminate better information. Senator Heuer said that it might help to be better informed, but our opinions are not very important. These are business decisions. Kersten thought we might have more power than we think. He cited actions in Minnesota and Ohio. Senator Furlong thought that the clout of the UW may be illusory because the HMOs are often not statewide, but regional. The issue may also be more a matter of

negotiation between faculty and staff and UW System than between UW System and the HMOs. Kersten insisted that we need to know more.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:38 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jerrold Rodesch

Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

Faculty Senate Action Item #1, 14 November 2001

RECOMMENDATION ON THE GRANTING OF DEGREES

(Implemented as a Faculty Senate Document #89-6, March 21, 1990--action to be taken in advance of each commencement exercise and in the following language--dated as appropriate):

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate of the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay, on behalf of the Faculty, recommends to the Chancellor and the Vice Chancellor of the University that the students certified by the Registrar of the University as having completed the requirements of their respective programs be granted their degrees at the fall 2001 Commencement.

Faculty Senate Action Item #2, 14 November 2001

CHANGES IN REQUIREMENTS FOR HONORS

A proposal to change criteria for honors designation is as follows:

Part A: Honors requirements for students who earn baccalaureate degrees are:

- Cum laude designation requires a cumulative grade point average from 3.5 to 3.749 [*unchanged*]
- Magna cum laude designation requires a cumulative grade point average of 3.75 to 3.849 [*unchanged*]
- Summa cum laude designation requires a cumulative grade point average of 3.85 or higher [*changes from 3.75 or higher; eliminates requirement of successful completion of a senior honors project (the xxx-484 course number is thus eliminated) in an interdisciplinary program*]

Part B: The cumulative grade point average must be achieved on the basis of a minimum of 60 regularly graded (not P/NC or audit) credits taken in-residence at UW-Green Bay. [eliminates a special provision for students with associate degrees from UW-Colleges]

If the above proposal is approved, then a further proposal is

Part C: *“The title of all xxx-478 courses be changed from ‘Distinction in the Major’ to ‘Honors in the Major’ and the prerequisite is a minimum GPA of 3.5 for all courses required for the major, and a minimum of 3.75 for all upper-level courses required for the major.”*

Faculty Senate Discussion Item #1, 14 November 2001

POLICY FOR GRANTING B.A. AND B.S. DEGREES

The Faculty Senate of University of Wisconsin-Green Bay endorses the following:

The faculty of each major shall transmit to the Faculty Senate for its approval the title of the degree to be awarded upon completion of each of their approved programs of study.

If the faculty of a major does not specify their choice of the degree to be awarded upon completion of one of their approved programs of study, the Registrar shall assign a B.A. to that program of study.

The faculty of a major may request permission from the Faculty Senate to allow its students a choice of the title of the degree with approval of their faculty advisor.

If a student completes the requirements for two or more majors, the student shall select one of the majors as his/her first major. The title of their degree shall be that of the first major.