

# AGENDA

## UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 4

Wednesday, 10 December 2003, 3:00 p.m.

**NIAGARA ROOM BC**, University Union

Presiding Officer: Illene Noppe, Speaker

Parliamentarian: Professor Kenneth J. Fleurant

### AUTOMATIC CONSENT

1. [Approval of minutes of UW-Green Bay Faculty Senate Meeting No. 3, November 19, 2003](#) (attached)

### CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

#### ACTION ITEMS

1. [Faculty Status for Lecturers](#) (attached) Presented by Professor Clifford Abbott
2. [House Rules for the Senate](#) (attached) Presented by Professor Clifford Abbott

#### DISCUSSION ITEM

1. [Student-Led Courses](#) (attached) Presented by Professor Clifford Abbott

#### INFORMATION ITEMS

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

#### OPEN FORUM

1. Faculty advocacy, ombudsperson, and campus climate

#### NEW BUSINESS

**ADJOURNMENT****MINUTES 2003-2004****UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 3**

Wednesday, November 19, 2003

Phoenix Room C, University Union, (quorum present, meeting called to order at 3:03 p.m.)

Presiding Office: Illene Noppe (HUD-UC), Speaker

Parliamentarian: Kenneth J. Fleurant, Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

**PRESENT:** Clifford Abbott (ICS-UC), Greg Aldrete (HUS-UC), Denise Bartell (HUD), Forrest Baulieu (ICS), M. Jan Bradfield (COA), Peter Breznay (ICS), Gregory Davis (NAS-UC), Sally Dresdow (BUA-UC), Sue Hammersmith (Provost), Craig Hanke (HUB), Michael Hencheck (NAS), Aeron Haynie (HUS), Timothy Kaufman (EDU), Harvey Kaye (SCD), Anne Kok (Soc. Wk), Michael Kraft (PEA), William Lepley (BUA), Steven Meyer (NAS), Steve Muzatko (BUA), Tom Nesslein (URS), Gilbert Null (HUS), Ellen Rosewall (COA), Linda Tabers-Kwak (EDU), Patricia Terry (NAS), Bryan Vescio (HUS), William Witwer (COA).

**NOT PRESENT:** Derryl Block (NUR), Richard Logan (HUD-UC), Bruce Shepard (Chancellor).

**REPRESENTATIVES:** Mike Schmitt (Academic Staff Committee), Matthew Voigt (Student Government)

**GUESTS:** Dean Carol Blackshire-Belay, Dean Fritz Erickson, Associate Provost Timothy Sewall, Associate Dean Joyce Salisbury, Ken Bothof (Director of Intercollegiate Athletics).

**AUTOMATIC CONSENT**1. Approval of Minutes of UW-Green Bay Faculty Senate Meeting No. 2, October 15, 2003

The minutes were approved without change.

**ACTION ITEM**

1. Resolution on the Granting of Degrees. Senator Davis moved a resolution to approve granting of degrees to students who finish all requirements in time for December commencement. **The motion passed unanimously.**

**DISCUSSION ITEMS**

1. Faculty Status for Lecturers. Senator Abbott explained that the proposed language to modify Chapter 51.12 regarding faculty status for lecturers is a modified version of a code change passed by the Senate in September 2002, but never implemented. In that version the Senate intended to link faculty status to a position rather than consider it as a reward for good performance. Decisions about what positions would carry faculty status and what the responsibilities of those positions would be were left to the unit. Three ranks were created: associate lecturer, lecturer, and senior lecturer, the latter two carrying *de facto* faculty status. If a unit hired someone without faculty status it would consequently be at the associate lecturer rank. The Provost had questions about this that led to further discussion with the UC and to the current proposal. The revised text presented today

differs from the 2002 text in that it allows use of the no-prefix lecturer title with or without faculty status, leaving the decision about which was more appropriate to the hiring unit.

The UC recognizes the need for the Senate to further improve the language of the proposal. One change that the UC would like to make, since it was intended but escaped the editing process, is to state that faculty status for the no-prefix lecturer is granted on the **recommendation of** rather than at the discretion of the hiring unit. Some other areas in need of attention before the text is finalized include: The revisions inadvertently wiped out all mention in code of the requirement that a position be at least half time to carry faculty status. To say that faculty status is "a condition of an appointment" is ambiguous, as it is to state that faculty status is for "the duration of the...appointment." The intent is not to have faculty status automatically carry over with each renewal. Before opening the floor to discussion, Abbott noted that the recommended changes do not represent the entirety of 51.12 and the end of that section is left intact as follows:

"Members of the academic staff who have been given faculty status have employment rights under the rules and policies concerning academic staff. In addition, they shall be counted in Faculty voting districts, and have the right to vote for and serve on faculty committees, including the Faculty Senate, when not excluded by the non-tenured nature of their appointments."

Some points of the discussion that ensued: Senator Null asked why faculty status for senior lecturers is not to be decided by the unit as it will be for lecturers without prefix. Senior title means a better pay scale. Shouldn't the unit decide who merits promotion? Senator Bradfield asked whether faculty status included governance responsibilities. Abbott: the UC's belief is that the hiring unit is in the best position to make decisions on responsibilities at the time of the appointment. Title and responsibilities should be part of the position description. Senator Kaye expressed opposition to giving faculty status to lecturers because there are too many questions that have never been adequately resolved, not the least of which is allowing part-timers to vote for department chairs. Senator Bradfield asked if the same degree qualifications apply for lecturers as for tenure-track faculty. Speaker Noppe mentioned System guidelines requiring similar expertise but not necessarily specific degrees. Some question arose about hiring lecturers outside budgetary units and the ramifications thereof. Response: this warrants investigation. The Provost explained why she asked the UC and the Senate to look at this again: the version passed last year took away hiring flexibility at the lecturer level. The associate title sounds like "teaching assistant" and might not attract the best candidates. The title of lecturer offers the freedom of attracting strong candidates without having to give faculty status. Again, the question arose whether this should hold true for senior lecturer as well. Senator Hencheck theorized about possible abuses whereby an expansionist unit might give faculty status to lecturers in order to increase its Senate representation. The Speaker responded that a unit that did that would also increase the number of part-timers voting for its chair, thus creating a check on any expansionist tendency. Senator Bradfield referred to a recent debate about qualifications of technical college teachers and expressed concern that the lecturer title opens the door to hiring teachers without terminal degrees and appropriate qualifications. Speaker's response: aren't units who file position descriptions for lecturer positions in control of that? Lecturer positions are also subject to review by the administrative Position Review Committee. The Speaker clarified that the text intends to require reaffirmation of faculty status with each contract renewal.

## 2. Senate Procedures: Current Constraints and Alternatives and

3. House Rules for the Senate were combined (without objection) for purposes of discussion. The UC drafted the proposal for house rules following last month's Senate discussion.

Discussion: Senator Kaye expressed concern that the proposed rules disallow proxies for absent senators, especially onerous for units such as his with just one senator. This has been part of code for so long that nobody recalls why, and Kaye suggests that it is time to change that situation, suggesting that the old code predates the change from voting division to academic unit representation in the Senate. He requests that the UC revisit the question. Senator Kok asked about #5 (no automatic consent items) and Abbott responded that in actuality the Senate has always given its consent to minutes and this rule just made that clear. The meaning of "new business" arose in light of the state open meeting law. New business topics will be clearly identified to meet the law and the

rubric will be used for business presented to the Senate for the first time. After that it will be called "continuing" business and the system is meant to respect the law while expediting conduct of Senate business. Senator Breznay would like a provision added for rapid dissemination of resolutions and other business with time urgency rather than waiting for minutes to be approved.

## INFORMATION ITEMS

1. Report on Campus Athletics by Ken Bothof, Director of Intercollegiate Athletics. Our student athletes do extremely well and are fine representatives of our campus. The Horizon League is made up of nine colleges. They have set four platforms. The three of greatest interest to the Senators are:

*a. Athletic achievement.* This year has been the best season every in volley ball; last year women's basketball had its best season ever and is currently seeking its sixth league title in a row; men's and women's swimming are picked to finish first following second place finishes last year; women's soccer had its best season, finishing second in the league. Men's basketball is rebuilding and prospects are good for a much better year this year.

*b. Academic Achievement:* 147 of 235 student athletes had better than 3.0 GPAs last semester. 41% achieved academic honors, including 16 with 4.0 averages. Two sports programs finished in the top 15 in the nation academically.

*c. Community Service:* Student athletes have done more than 2700 hours of community service this year in such areas as food pantries and hospices.

Director Bothof expressed thanks for campus support of our student athletes and received comments from several senators on the strong academic abilities and personal qualities of student athletes on our campus. UC Chair Abbott asked about connections between Intercollegiate Athletics and Physical Education. A couple years ago the two were split. Formerly the athletic director also chaired PE. Now it is an academic unit chaired by Dan Mc Iver. The main connection is that some coaches also teach Physical Education courses.

2. Provost's Report. Distributed and attached. Provost Hammersmith supplemented the written report:

The four parts of the Regent's proposed plan for Technical College transfer courses won't have a great effect on us since they largely represent our current practice.

Faculty are encouraged to use the faculty/staff lounge for informal academic discussions.

As soon as groups reviewing the Academic Affairs Planning Process respond to the draft, it will be widely circulated on campus for further input. The process calls for broad representation in the planning process leading to a campus-wide perspective on academic and budgetary planning. Plans are for a SWAT analysis this spring along with a scan of the external environment (demographic and economic factors, etc.) and units will be asked "to take a shot at" a brief, preliminary 3-year plan (statement of where they would like to go in the next three years and what the big issues are— without budget requests at this time.) The planning committee will discuss those reports during the summer and refine an academic plan to present next fall for use when we get to the budget-building stage next year. This will be a continuing process.

The NE Wisconsin Educational Resource Alliance has great potential and has already sponsored activities and cooperative efforts that contribute to higher education while providing a stronger voice for education in NE Wisconsin.

Senator Kok asked the Provost to clarify the difference between the SBBBC and other budget mechanisms. The Strategic Budgeting and Budget-Building Committee (SBBBC) is charged with developing a planning process using input from all campus areas and governance groups, and followed in such a way as to improve connections between budgeting and planning.

3. University Committee Report. UC Chair Abbott outlined issues the UC has been working on: Faculty Status, Senate procedures, the SBBBC, Tech College transfer, campus technology issues, the open meeting law. On the last point, the UC has been studying a possible conflict between our code and state law with respect to closed meetings of the Personnel Council. Language attempting to straighten this out will eventually come to the Senate after the UC receives legal advice on the matter. Another current issue of increasing concern around the state: the ratio of teaching academic staff to tenure-track faculty. It is difficult to know what is a healthy balance. The Senate Committee on Planning and Budget is currently reviewing this and the issue may come to the Senate soon.

### OPEN FORUM

1. The final item of the UC report is the subject of the open forum, faculty advocacy, ombudsperson, and campus climate. Abbot provided a bit of history: The issue stems from a report several years ago on equality for women that led to creation of an advisory committee to the Chancellor on women's equality and an ombudsperson (Melissa Jackson) to monitor problems. Some concern was raised about possible conflict of interest in making University Counsel the ombudsperson for faculty and staff concerns. After the first year, Melissa Jackson reported on the significant extent and range of consultations she has had (over 70) and the Chancellor decided he was happy with the arrangement, making the point that you can't expect an ombudsperson to be an advocate. (It is unclear whether the original report on the Status of Women wanted the ombudsperson to have an advocacy role, added Abbott parenthetically.) The Chancellor also decided there was no real conflict of interest, suggesting that System Counsel was available in those cases where the ombudsperson needed to advise opposing parties. The Chancellor was unconvinced that any significant number of problems failed to reach the ombudsperson, and was reluctant to use any more resources on this. The UC's response: they remain anxious about potential conflict of interest. Anecdotal evidence makes the Committee suspect that a fair number of people experiencing problems remain reluctant to go to the ombudsperson because they see that individual as a representative of the Chancellor. The UC also perceives a need for somebody or some agency to solve problems and do more than just explain to individuals what their constraints and options are, which seems to be the working definition of the current ombudsperson position. UC proposes creation of a new committee to which people with concerns and problems could turn, believing that a committee could be of more help than an individual. The Committee could possibly have the ability to help negotiate solutions to problems. The UC sent their proposal to various committees and the University lawyer for feedback, a sample of which includes: The Academic Staff Committee was "wildly in support" of having a committee empowered to do more than explain rules handle problems before they become formal grievances; the Committee on Rights and Responsibilities and the Committee on Committees and Nominations were not enthusiastic about the idea, both reluctant to proliferate committees and convinced that there are alternatives along the lines of the Employee Assistance Program. Abbott pointed out that the EAP generally serves people with life problems outside of work (although these may impinge on their work). The UC is thinking rather of people for whom the work environment **is** in some way the problem. There are many different ways these problems are handled around System. The end result of all this is a quandary that has led to this open forum in search of advice and ideas such as the following:

Null: The Equality of Women Report also recommended a mentoring program that was extended to all faculty. One result is that we are now seeing mentors being blamed in cases of unsuccessful tenure reviews. We are in dire need of a committee to handle such concerns. Is this what the UC has in mind?

Abbott: Mentoring is part of the issue but to what extent is unclear. The UC is not entirely satisfied with how it has been implemented. Some discussion followed on the presence or lack thereof of mentoring guidelines and training. The Provost's office does distribute a set of mentoring guidelines.

Hencheck: Would like to take this back to his unit and return to the Senate with suggestions.

Abbott: That would be great. The UC is bogged down on the issue after believing it had a solution which did not receive enough support to confirm their convictions. The hope is that this open forum will help and the forum is likely to continue next month.

Hammersmith: Would this committee serve all employees?

Abbott: Intent is to serve faculty and academic staff. There is no mechanism to invoke governance for classified staff. The ASC is supportive. It is unclear where students stand in this.

Breznay: Could this committee serve groups (as opposed to individuals) with concerns?

Abbott: Yes. It could serve individuals and identify patterns of problems on campus.

Davis: Perhaps a survey on campus climate would be useful to determine the extent of problems and concerns.

Bradfield: It doesn't hurt to have more than one route to solutions. The ombudsperson is being used and should perhaps be left in place alongside a new committee.

Rosewall: Who determines when there is a conflict of interest for the ombudsperson?

Abbott: His understanding is that it is her call.

Kraft: Flip side of this issue is that an effort to solve the problem could actually increase adversarial relations.

Baulieu: He has also heard of people reluctant to go to ombudsperson. Even if there is a perception of a problem with the ombudsman, there is a problem. Not clear why two functions of counsel and ombudsperson had to be combined even if only a potential of conflict exists. It is fraught with problems.

Hammersmith: Clarified the way it works: whoever talks to the ombudsperson first is the one she can help. Once approached with a problem, she is ineligible to even discuss it with a potential opposite party, including administration.

Null and Baulieu: Expressed strong misgivings about that situation. The word "absurd" was heard at one point.

Rosewall: Further clarification is needed to distinguish advocacy and ombudsperson roles.

Abbott (as comments began to slow): The UC thinks there is a problem but doesn't have a handle on the solution. It is interested in receiving suggestions and continuing the dialog before proceeding.

Hammersmith: Input is good, but a survey isn't needed to know that there are concerns. Something needs doing. Perhaps there is no single right answer or best model but even imperfect steps to relieve any frustration people feel should be considered.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

The Provost offers a copy of the entire Technical College transfer document to all askers. There being no further business, the Senate adjourned at 4:56 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Kenneth Fleurant, Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

---

Faculty Senate, 12/10/2003, Action Item #1

# Code Change

## Faculty Status for Lecturers

### Version passed by Faculty Senate September 2002

51.12 Faculty Status. **Within the guidelines from UW-System, the hiring interdisciplinary unit executive committee sets the distinctions among the ranks of lecturers and specifies responsibilities at the time of (re)appointment. The distinctions will include that: associate lecturers do not have faculty status; the ranks of lecturer (no-prefix) and senior lecturer require teaching appointments of at least half time and do have faculty status. Faculty status for teaching academic staff is thus a condition of an appointment to the rank of lecturer (no-prefix) or senior lecturer. Faculty status is conferred for the duration of the lecturer's appointment. Lecturers of any rank are appointed by the appropriate Dean(s) on the affirmative recommendation of the appropriate interdisciplinary unit executive committee (see 51.10 A).**

### Proposed version December 2003

51.12 Faculty Status. Within the guidelines from UW-System, the hiring interdisciplinary unit executive committee sets the distinctions among the **three** ranks of lecturers (**associate lecturer, lecturer [no prefix], and senior lecturer**) and specifies responsibilities at the time of (re)appointment. The distinctions will include that: associate lecturers do not have faculty status; the ranks of lecturer (no-prefix) ~~and senior lecturer require with a~~ teaching appointments of at least half time ~~and do~~ **may have faculty status upon the recommendation of the hiring interdisciplinary executive committee; and the rank of senior lecturer has faculty status.** Faculty status, **and its attendant responsibilities**, for teaching academic staff ~~is may thus be~~ a condition of an appointment to the rank of lecturer (no-prefix) and shall be a condition of an appointment to the rank of senior lecturer. Faculty status is conferred for the duration of the lecturer's appointment **and may be renewed with reappointment.** Lecturers of any rank are appointed by the appropriate Dean(s) on the affirmative recommendation of the appropriate interdisciplinary unit executive committee (see 51.10 A).

The above change shall be effective upon approval by the Chancellor and the Board of Regents and shall not require the demotion of any individuals currently holding the rank of senior lecturer.

---

Faculty Senate, 12/10/2003, Action Item #2

# House Rules for the Faculty Senate

## 1. Meeting notification

Notification of Faculty Senate meetings shall be in accord with the state requirements of Wisconsin's open meetings law. An agenda must be available at least 24 hours before the meeting. No actions may be taken at the meeting that are not listed on the agenda as planned or possible actions.

## 2. Preparation of agenda

Preparation of the agenda is the responsibility of Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff, Speaker of the Senate, University Committee, and the Chancellor (52.07 B. 1.). Items for future agendas may come from: items introduced in a Senate meeting during New Business (52.06 F.); petitions from ten percent of the Faculty (52.08 B.); or requests from individual faculty members through a senator (52.08 B.) or through the University Committee.

## 3. Parliamentary procedure

Parliamentary procedure shall be governed by Robert's Rules or the Standard Code.

## 4. Quorum definition

A majority of Senate members, not counting ex-officio members, shall constitute a quorum.

## 5. Automatic consent

There shall be no "automatic consent" items on the Senate agenda, although there may be items such as the approval of minutes that are automatically included on the agenda.

## 6. Proxy, absences, subs

Senators may be replaced as per (52.05) for the remainder of their terms, but if a Senator cannot make a particular meeting, there shall be no voting by proxy or substitution as per (52.03 B. 4).

## 7. Speaking recognition and limits

The Speaker of the Senate must recognize all those who speak at a Senate meeting and may limit participation in the interests of full discussion. Robert's Rules suggest recognizing people who have not yet spoken before giving the floor to someone who has already spoken and that ten minutes is a reasonable limit for holding the floor.

## 8. Disposition of approved motions

Actions taken by the Senate shall be sent to the Chancellor for implementation. Resolutions calling for action should include a date of effectiveness.

## 9. Policy on first and second readings

Proposals to change codification or make significant policy change shall come before a meeting of the Senate for discussion prior to any action taken at a subsequent meeting.

## 10. New business

New Business may include: discussion items intended to be enacted at the next meeting (first readings of proposals); discussion items not intended for action; items (except code changes and significant policy changes) for immediate action; and proposing items for future consideration.

11. Open forum

An Open Forum is an opportunity for any member of the Senate to pose a question or raise an issue and an opportunity for other members to react. No motions may be enacted during an Open Forum.

11. Order of business

The categories of business before the Senate shall have the following order:

Call to Order; Approval of the Minutes; Chancellor's Report; Continuing Business; New Business; Provost's Report; University Committee Report; Open Forum; Adjournment.

12. Adjournment procedure

Adjournment happens automatically at 5:00 p.m. unless the meeting is extended by a two-thirds vote.

Faculty Senate, 12/10/03, Discussion Item #1

December 4, 2003

PROPOSAL FORM FOR STUDENT-LED COURSES

To be used only for courses offered under 281/481 authorization.

NOTE: use the tab key to get to shaded areas that are to be filled in.

Proposal for course in (concentration or collateral):

Name(s) of student(s) proposing course:

Course Number (must be a 281/481):

Course Title

Credits:

Before completing this form, you should be familiar with the guidelines under which student-led courses are offered. Copies are available in concentration or collateral offices and in Student Advising Office. Basic information on how to go about proposing courses can be found in the Timetable. If you would like assistance in developing and proposing a student-led course, feel free to consult the Individualized Learning Program Office where a file of past experiences in student-led courses at UW-Green Bay and elsewhere is maintained. You may be able to draw on the experience of others to develop and lead your course and avoid some of the pitfalls which some have encountered.

The information requested on this form is meant to help you organize and present your ideas most effectively. Please write your proposal carefully since it is important for proper evaluation of your application. You will be advised of the decision when your proposal has been evaluated by the concentration or collateral you have submitted it to.

Please have your faculty advisor read this entire form and fill out his/her part of it. Then return it to the sponsoring concentration or collateral.

I. COURSE INFORMATION - Answer the following questions, including any additional information you think appropriate.

A. Student leader information:

Name	Year	Concentration	Address	Phone

B. Name(s) of advisor(s):

C. Course Description:

1. Write an outline of the course, indicating as specifically as you can at this time a weekly syllabus including specific material to be covered, required and suggested readings, audiovisual materials you would like to use, possible guest speakers to be sought, etc. (This outline is, of course, tentative and you will have the opportunity to modify it, in conjunction with your advisor, as your ideas develop before class actually begins. Once class has started, additional changes are also possible by mutual agreement of student leaders and faculty advisors.)
2. Give a general bibliography and a list of other resources you consider relevant to your course.
3. Explain how you plan to lead the course or how you expect the class to be run. What will procedures be for decision making such as assignment and approval of individual or group projects, grading, etc.? (If you would feel more comfortable, you may ask to offer your course pass/no credit.)

II. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

- A. What in your background constitutes helpful preparation for leading this course? (Include other seminars, courses, experience, etc., you have had.)
- B. Why would you like to see this course offered? What goals do you have?
- C. Do you have an estimate of how many students want this course offered? If you have a list of names of those who would possibly or probably sign up, please attach (no commitment to actually register is implied or intended by these signatures).
- D. Do you feel enrollment should be limited?  
If yes, to how many?
- E. Do you want any prerequisites for admission to your course?
- F. Have you checked to see whether your course material is substantially duplicated in any other course presently offered or catalogued at UW-Green Bay?  
If there is any potential conflict, explain how your course differs in content.
- G. Please indicate if you anticipate needing any of the following items. (This is not a firm commitment on either your part or ours. It is intended as a general guide. All expenses must be negotiated with concentration chairperson after course is accepted.)

1. Copying:

If yes, approximate number of pages:

2. Movies, slides, to be rented or purchased from outside sources:

Estimated cost:

3. Any other equipment?

4. Other expenditures?

5. What items do you feel are indispensable for your course?

### III. FACULTY ADVISOR AGREEMENT - (To be completed by Advisor)

Please consult guidelines for student-led courses (available in concentration and collateral offices) to determine your responsibilities, and read student's proposal before signing.

Please comment briefly on course proposal and give your assessment (if possible) of student's ability to lead this course. and agree to be faculty advisor for this course. **You are now ready to print for signatures.**

Faculty signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

### IV. CONCENTRATION OR COLLATERAL ACTION

Signature of Chairperson: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

last updated: 10/16/00

## *Report to the Faculty Senate*

*Submitted by Sue K. Hammersmith, Provost*

*University of Wisconsin-Green Bay*

*December 10, 2003*

### **i. Academic Affairs Planning PROCESS**

A copy of the Academic Affairs Planning Process document is being released campus-wide today. I will be working with the University Committee, the Academic Staff Committee, and Associated Student Government to identify faculty, staff, and student members of the new Planning Committee. I am grateful to the many committees and groups who have worked with me to develop this document, and I look forward to working with the new committee in the months ahead. Following distribution of the document, I will schedule an open forum for anyone who has questions, comments to offer me, or interest in further discussion of the process or related issues.

### **II. INTERNATIONAL SOCIAL JUSTICE SYMPOSIUM**

I was delighted with the International Social Justice Symposium held on campus this week, and I'd like to publicly commend all those who planned and participated in it. This symposium was co-sponsored by UW-Green Bay and St. Norbert College, and it marks the continued commitment of both campuses' leadership to work together to enhance the intellectual environment of both institutions. I hope this marks the first of many symposia or conferences on contemporary issues that we can enjoy together on this campus over the years ahead.

### **III. ENROLLMENT UPDATE**

More students have registered for Spring Semester than had done so a year ago. Our Admissions Office is reporting increases in the number of students who have applied for admission next year. Both undergraduate and graduate figures are strong.

### **IV. BEST WISHES**

I regret that I will have to miss this last Senate meeting of 2003. I wish all of you a rich and relaxing holiday break. If you travel, go safely. Have a wonderful break, and may we enjoy a rewarding year together in 2004!

