

# AGENDA

## UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 3

Wednesday, 20 November 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. 2, October 16, 2002](#) (attached)

### ACTION ITEMS

1. [Resolution on the Granting of Degrees](#) (attached)
2. [Report of the General Education Council](#) (attached)

[The report can be found on the Faculty & Academic Staff Governance Office website]. Presented by Professor John Lyon

### DISCUSSION ITEM

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

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

### INFORMATION ITEMS

1. [Length of term on the Committee on Academic Actions](#) (attached). Presented by Professor John Lyon
2. [Report of the Provost](#). Presented by Provost Sue K. Hammersmith
3. [University Committee Report](#). Presented by Professor John Lyon, Chair

### NEW BUSINESS

### ADJOURNMENT

---

## MINUTES

### 2002-03 UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 2

Wednesday, October 16, 2002

Phoenix Room C, 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

James Coates

Kevin Fermanich

Scott Furlong

Anthony Galt

Sue Hammersmith

Craig Hanke

Aeron Haynie

Michael Hencheck

Curt Heuer

Ray Hutchinson

Anne Kok

Sylvia Kubsch

William Lepley

Richard Logan

Dennis Lorenz

John Lyon

John Mariano

James Marker

E. Nicole Meyer

Illene Noppe

Gilbert Null

Jennifer Popiel

Joyce Salisbury

W. Bruce Shepard

Linda Tabers-Kwak

Patricia Terry

NOT PRESENT: Robert Nagy

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, Interim Assistant Dean Lloyd Noppe, Professor Jeffrey Entwistle, Director of Intercollegiate Athletics Ken Bothof, and Coordinator of Assessment and Testing Lucy Arendt.

### **AUTOMATIC CONSENT**

#### **1. Approval of Minutes of UW-Green Bay Faculty Senate Meeting No. 1, September 18, 2002**

The minutes were approved with corrections to the list of members present.

### **CHANCELLOR'S REMARKS**

The Chancellor was pleasantly surprised by the recent Economic Summit because a report was presented that dealt seriously with the state's fiscal crisis. It offered recommendations on the state budget that were concrete, comprehensive and responsible. An increased and expanded sales tax along with some spending cuts would permit a balanced budget and a lowering of the income tax. Cuts specified for the UW System could be offset by greater authority to raise tuition. UW educational quality should be maintained in any event: if the resources aren't provided by the state either tuition rises and/or student access is reduced. Political leaders won't respond to these recommendations until after the election.

He also recalled his remarks at his installation in September, noting that some of them were addressed to President Lyall, in particular his proposal to deal with the underfunding of UW-Green Bay by increasing enrollment to 7,500 and funding the growth at levels that would improve our overall position. Lyall welcomed further development of the idea. She also asked if the growth could be drawn from northeast Wisconsin. Yes, said the Chancellor. Our plan will emphasize serving the region. It will use the improved retention that we have already registered, which has forced us to reduce freshman and transfer admissions. Simply returning to normal admission numbers would give us a start on growth. The plan will also propose improvement of partnerships with two-year institutions, expansion of existing programs and creation of new ones to serve regional student needs, and better response to the increasing diversity of the Brown County populations. Other steps are underway that will enhance our ability to serve students, including a revision of general education, new academic programs, improved advising and enrollment services, revised admissions standards, residence halls under construction, a capital campaign, a marketing plan, and a strategy of reengagement with the community. Our goal centers on full funding of new students on a per student basis comparable to that of other UW System institutions. We have a notable gap to close. New facilities will be needed. This is not for the short term. It is a ten-year plan. We will need regional support from both community and political leaders to achieve it. The door is open to us.

The Chancellor concluded by discussing a personnel matter that he believes is being widely discussed. A faculty member who recently retired believed he had not been treated fairly in the way the terms of his retirement were handled. The Chancellor wanted to make a general point that anyone leaving the university after dedicated years of service should feel good about how they had been treated. It is important for the university as well as for the

individual. The commitment to service we ask of faculty and staff depends upon a belief that they can rely on institutional support and fairness. This is a critical matter of perception. The Chancellor is working on a solution for this particular case and will use reserve funds if necessary.

## DISCUSSION ITEM

### 1. Report of the General Education Council: A Proposal for Reform of General Education

Presented by Professor John Lyon, who noted that the two forums sponsored by the University Committee for discussions on the general education proposal had yielded no consensus. He summarized questions and concerns that had been presented. What's wrong with the current program? There are nine learning outcomes now, which are addressed by a breadth requirement for 37-39 credits from 12 lists that contain 184 courses. This is hardly a program. Additionally, most courses are taught in a lecture format, which is inconsistent with most of the stated learning outcomes. The loose structure of the current requirement provides no coherent basis for hiring new faculty for general education. What should the general education program be? The proposal of the General Education Council is for a core model. A "coreless" model would encourage students to explore widely. Where would resources come from for the GEC proposal? How would the proposal affect transfer students? How will the proposal impact faculty in terms of new preparations and the efficient use of faculty expertise? Will the proposal simply recreate an earlier failed general education program?

Lyon invited the Senate to discuss the GEC core-program proposal in the Social Sciences, Humanities and Natural Sciences, which includes a first-year seminar. Current distribution requirements in the arts, ethnic studies and other cultures would be retained. The proposal would reduce general education credit requirements from 37-39 to 30. The proposal is still in outline form. Many details would need to be worked out before implementation.

Senator Heuer inquired how many people had attended the forums. Senator Abbott said about three dozen total. Lyon said 50. Senator Null said that not only were few faculty in attendance most who showed up were older, a problem. Null also said that he found in the GEC report egregiously false statements about empiricism and rationalism, which he felt he had a professional duty to have expunged from any document he was asked to vote on. Senator Galt pleaded that discussion and Senate action not focus on the report as such. More important would be a decision to continue working on a revision of general education, either the GEC proposal or some other model.

Senator Salisbury wanted to hear what had happened in unit discussions of the proposal. Various senators responded:

Senator Terry said that Natural and Applied Sciences agreed that changes in the general education program were needed, but the GEC proposal was not accepted. Senator Hencheck said that the concerns were about having a core program. Why can't a modified distribution requirement work? Transfer students will have serious problems with a core program. The current system doesn't connect to the stated learning outcomes in any measurable fashion. Will the GEC proposal do better? Perhaps we need to rethink the outcomes. They must be measurable. How do you do that with "critical thinking"?

Senator Galt reported that Social Change and Development reached no consensus. Some are excited by the freshman seminar. Others are concerned about lack of resources.

Senator Block said that Nursing worried about transfer students both coming and going. We would have some unusual sounding courses with this proposal. The Nursing faculty supports a move to smaller classes with more discussion.

Senator Lorenz said that Human Development agreed that general education needs to be reviewed, but the current proposal raises too many concerns. How would it be funded? How would faculty be assigned? What would happen in the next phase of developing the proposal? Disputes over details might produce gridlock.

Human Biology according to Senator Marker has similar concerns. Additionally, there were questions about the fate of current courses.

Senator Furlong summarized concerns in Public and Environmental Affairs that domain courses might be used in major programs. Would an integration of general education and major programs create problems? There was agreement that the current general education program needs attention and change.

Senator Baulieu said that Information and Computing Sciences feared that the proposal would add to an already excessive workload. ICS faculty are now overburdened to the point of being unable to participate in general education. Where would funding come for the new offerings? General education is broken, yes, but it's not clear what can be done.

Senator Heuer said that the Communication and the Arts faculty were fully occupied with the current general education requirement in the arts. That would be unchanged, and no resources were available for additional general education commitments.

In Urban and Regional Studies, Senator Hutchinson reported, there was almost unanimous support for the GEC proposal. There is a problem. This deals with it. Probably half the teaching assignments of this faculty are currently in general education.

John Rumpel said that the Student Senate had discussed the proposal and adopted a resolution of support for it, with reservations about: the feasibility of freshman seminars serving all the students that need them and the transferability of credits. In general, students like the core model and the reduction in general education credits.

Senator Galt said that in his unit and elsewhere there is great uncertainty about the relationship of various initiatives being considered for enrollment growth, general education, the freshman experience, and advising. The work of the GEC took place without a clear faculty consensus about general education and in the atmosphere of great concern about the state's fiscal crisis. We need to think globally about our situation.

Senator Logan spoke to the need for change in the general education program. Research shows that a coherent freshman experience makes a difference. General education that embodies a distinctive institutional commitment is effective. There is little evidence to support distribution models. We ended up with one by default; it was the easy way out. The GEC model is contingent on new resources. It is to be phased in over a long period. Where do we start? With a pilot project. We must decide: 1) do we want to change; 2) do we want a core model; and 3) do we begin with the freshman experience?

Senator Hutchinson said that the only real logic of the current general education program derives from a budget model in place some years ago which rewarded units based on their enrollments. The general education courses were created for that purpose. Rethinking general education shouldn't get tied up in details like transferability. We can in the social science area make significant improvements with current resources.

Senator Popiel thought that because of enrollment growth planning and other pressures on the institution this was not a good time to make a major change in general education. Senator Salisbury said she couldn't support a commitment to a new program for freshman absent new resources. Senator Null asked for a revised general education model that would require fewer resources. He referred to a Galt proposal and Senator Galt briefly explained what that was: abolish general education and require each student to complete an interdisciplinary major and two interdisciplinary minors, each in a different domain. He would not admit that it was a serious proposal.

Senator Fermanich suggested that resources may not be a real issue. We could change our array of courses to accommodate a new general education program in a way that wouldn't add to our burdens. Many courses could be eliminated. Could the University Committee provide a resource model?

Senator Abbott said he would have to vote against the GEC report. Instead he would hope that we could agree on a principle (apart from implementation details, resources, etc.) that could give us an aim for further development,

perhaps even a track to follow over the next decade. He imagined that different sets of general education requirements for different groups of students might be one way to go. The GEC proposal uses the domains to organize the curriculum; this invites a distribution requirement. We should instead begin with the UW-Green Bay mission: interdisciplinarity and problem-focus.

Senator Null said that the now-defunct Senior Seminars embodied Abbott's idea. They would be hard to beat in terms of concept and design. They were given up because of resource demands elsewhere in the institution. Senator Salisbury agreed, recalling that UW-System awarded UW-Green Bay a Center of Excellence in Interdisciplinary Education with the Senior Seminar program as the keystone. Her preference would be the Galt proposal with a Senior Seminar program. Galt replied that Senior Seminars were too late for our students and, moreover, that program died for other reasons than just resources. The students grumbled about the Senior Seminars, which were the remnant of a larger general education design and which in isolation no longer made sense to the students. Senator Haynie noted the lack of connection between large general education courses and the better-focussed study in major programs.

Senator Baulieu said he hoped that the Senate would be able to act on a statement of principles rather than attempt to resolve issues of detail now. Senator Logan asked that the Senate not rush to a vote. The GEC proposal is one model only, an example of a direction in which we could move. We have just begun the conversation. Senator Null thought that a much longer consideration is needed. Senator Hutchinson agreed that action would be inappropriate at this point.

## INFORMATION ITEMS

### 1. Code Revisions to UWGB 6.01 Complaints

Presented by Professor John Lyon. On the request of a faculty member, the University Committee reviewed the code and now proposes some changes to clarify the procedures for handling complaints. The Committee on Rights and Responsibilities has reviewed the proposed changes and regards them as a clarification of the procedures currently in use and do not involve any change in policy.

Senator Galt thought that the procedures appeared to formalize a complaint mechanism that in the past had involved more informal steps of discussion with chairs and deans. Senator Lorenz pointed out that this about conduct violating university rules, thereby distinguishing these complaints from other, lesser criticisms. The Chancellor thought that the code language is sufficiently broad that the distinction between formal and informal mechanisms probably does require some more explicit guidelines.

### 2. Report of the Provost

Provost Hammersmith informed the Senate of pending business:

- The search for the Dean of Professional and Graduate Studies has begun. Nominations for the search committee have been requested.
- The search for the Chair of Education has also begun.
- A considerable number of faculty searches are underway.
- A number of successful grant applications have been announced:
  - Professor Andrew Kersten has obtained a Department of Education grant for \$822,000 to provide summer seminars and historical materials for K-12 social studies teachers;
  - a NASA grant was approved for the Wisconsin Space Grant College and Fellowship Program administered through UW-Green Bay; they have

brought in more than \$1 million this year; we hope to see the Space Grant Consortium become more fully integrated into our academic programs.

A number of current activities exemplify the Chancellor's theme of enhanced outreach to the community. Throughout October at the Brown County Library, the Outreach Office in partnership with the Brown County Historical Society and St. Norbert College has been hosting a series of discussions focused on a year after 9/11. There is also a conference coming up sponsored by the Learning Partnership connecting the university and local school systems.

The Provost also announced that she has acceded to the request of the Speaker that coffee and cookies be provided at future Senate meetings.

### 3. Report of the Director of Intercollegiate Athletics

Ken Bothof spoke to the Senate about the academic success of our student athletes. He has been deeply impressed by their academic quality. We look particularly strong in comparison with student athletes at other Horizon League institutions and with students in general. UW-Green Bay graduates 44 percent of its students within six years, compared to 42 percent for Horizon League schools (we are third in the League behind two private institutions). 59 percent of our student athletes graduate in this time compared to 57 percent for the Horizon League (we are fourth in the League). Grade point averages tell a similar story, 3.09 overall for 232 student athletes with 13 getting 4.0s last semester. The women's basketball program has been in the top ten academically each of the last three years and was the national academic champion two years ago with a 3.481 GPA. The volleyball team was 15<sup>th</sup> in the country academically this past season. In addition to classroom performance, this last year our student athletes completed 1100 hours of community services in areas like hospice care, Girl and Boy Scouts, Special Olympics, and food pantries. These achievements are made possible by the effort of the entire institution. He concluded by thanking the faculty for their support for student athletes and for their willingness to accommodate their scheduling problems. He appreciated particularly the support provided by the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee and Professor Donna Ritch, Faculty Athletic Representative.

### 4. Report of the University Committee

University Committee Chair Lyon remarked on the Committee's busy schedule. It has named faculty candidates for the search committee for the Dean of Professional and Graduate Studies, pursued the proposal for revision of general education, and has identified its commitment for this year to review faculty development opportunities and identify ways to enhance them. Senator Salisbury added that the Senate Budget and Planning Committee has convened, elected Professor Kersten as its chair, and will be engaged in institutional strategic planning.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

Senator Furlong exhorted senators to attend the legislative forums that are being held on campus.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 4:48 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jerrold Rodesch,

Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

## 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 2002 Commencement.

---

Faculty Senate Action Item #2, 11/20/02

### General Education Reform

#### Resolution #1

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate endorses the report entitled "A Proposal for Reform of General Education at UW-Green Bay (Fall 2002)" and charges the General Education Council to work toward its implementation.

If Resolution #1 fails or is tabled, the following resolutions are intended to be submitted.

#### Resolution #2

Whereas the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay is committed to a distinctive academic plan characterized by strong interdisciplinary, problem-focused liberal education,

Be it resolved that providing students with an interdisciplinary approach to problem solving be the top priority of the general education program.

#### Resolution #3

Be it resolved that the General Education Council work toward providing freshmen with a core experience that introduces them to the University's select mission.

---

Faculty Senate Discussion Item #1, 11/20/02

## 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.

---

Faculty Senate Information Item #1, 11/02/02

## Committee on Academic Actions

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

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

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

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

Committee Chairperson.

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

