

AGENDA

UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 4

Wednesday, 11 December 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. 3, November 20, 2002](#) (attached)

CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

1. PowerPoint Presentation to President Lyall

Presented by Chancellor Shepard and Debbie Furlong, Director of Institutional Research

ACTION ITEM

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

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

DISCUSSION ITEM

1. [Length of Term on the Committee on Academic Actions](#) (attached)

Presented by Professor John Lyon

INFORMATION ITEMS

1. Report of the Provost Presented by Provost Sue K. Hammersmith
2. University Committee Report Presented by Professor John Lyon, Chair

NEW BUSINESS

ADJOURNMENT

MINUTES

UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 3

Wednesday, November 20, 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

Robert Nagy

Illene Noppe

Gilbert Null

Jennifer Popiel

Joyce Salisbury

Linda Tabers-Kwak

NOT PRESENT: Bruce Shepard and Patricia Terry

REPRESENTATIVES: John Rumpel, Student Government Association

GUESTS: Dean Carol Blackshire-Belay, Interim Dean Jane Muhl, Associate Provost Timothy Sewall

AUTOMATIC CONSENT

1. Approval of Minutes of UW-Green Bay Faculty Senate Meeting No. 2, October 16, 2002

The minutes were approved without change.

ACTION ITEMS

1. Resolution on the Granting of Degrees

Senator Furlong moved and Senator Lyon seconded a resolution to grant degrees to the students who have completed their programs in time for the Winter 2001 Commencement. The motion passed unanimously.

2. Report of the General Education Council

Presented by Professor John Lyon who thanked the General Education Council for its hard work in developing a proposal to revise the General Education program. He explained that the University Committee had prepared three resolutions. If the first were to be adopted, the other resolutions would be unnecessary. If the first were defeated, the others would be a way of moving forward on revision of General Education requirements.

Senator Abbott moved, Senator Salisbury seconding, adoption of "A Proposal for Reform of General Education" as submitted by the GEC. There was no discussion. Senator Logan asked for a vote. There being no objection, the motion was put and defeated in a voice vote.

Abbott then moved, seconded by Senator Null, adoption of a reaffirmation of UWGB's "distinctive academic plan characterized by strong interdisciplinary, problem-focused liberal education" and assignment of "the top priority of the general education program" to "an interdisciplinary approach to problem solving." Senator Logan said he appreciated the intention of the resolution but could not support it unless it were amended to read "an interdisciplinary approach to problem solving grounded in the breadth of the liberal arts and sciences." Senator Salisbury pointed out that the resolution added nothing new to our General Education principles. It rather gives a

different emphasis to what is already there. Senator Furlong then wondered if the resolution would have no effect, that there would be nothing to be implemented. Salisbury thought the GEC could decide what, if anything, further should be done on the basis of this sense of the Senate. Abbott said that the resolution was valuable because it lined up General Education with our mission. This is a recognized foundation for successful programs. It should help the GEC. Senator Galt supported Logan's suggested amendment to the resolution. Logan then moved it and Galt seconded. The amendment was adopted without objection and the amended resolution carried by voice vote.

Senator Furlong moved and Senator Logan seconded a third resolution to provide "freshmen with a core experience that introduces them to the University's select mission." Senator Null reported on a discussion in Humanistic Studies that was unfavorable to the motion. We face serious budget constraints. This proposal is resource-intensive. Moreover, he is unpersuaded by the idea that there is a core content suitable for every student. It's not worth the resources. Perhaps, Senator Kubsch suggested, that "core" could be deleted. Senator Abbott said that the core idea is very important. It is meant to contrast with the distribution requirement and the current complaint about General Education that it is incoherent. Senator Hencheck said the experience could mean a course or courses. Senator Galt said he didn't know what "experience" meant, that the GEC, having worked a long time on this, was not receiving a clear charge from the Senate's deliberation. He also corrected Null's impression that a "core" referred to "content." It doesn't. Null thanked Galt for the reality check but thought the resource issue remained, and it was unclear what the Senate was being asked to endorse. Senator Heuer also thought the resolution was far too vague.

Senator Lorenz recalled his experience elsewhere in a good program with an introductory course for freshmen that required writing, discussion, and critical thinking. It had a student-faculty ratio of 10 or 12 to 1. This was a positive experience but it was very faculty intensive. Senator Hencheck said that a no vote would not prevent the GEC from considering the issues raised by the resolution. Senator Galt agreed with others who thought the resolution too vague. It invites a further waste of time. Moreover, a freshman core experience appears to mean something like the freshman seminars, and that was the most expensive part of the GEC proposal, one that depended upon reduction of required credits in the rest of the program. This singling out of the freshman experience would be unworkable.

Provost Hammersmith said that she would not vote on the resolution because she believed it was a faculty responsibility, but she thought that "core experience" could mean several very different things. Why not give the GEC time to work on the resolution that had previously been adopted, get faculty to bring problem-focused interdisciplinary approaches to their freshman classes, perhaps make course linkages, and consider other ways to bring more coherence to the General Education program without making unacceptable demands on institutional resources? Galt

responded that this was a possibility for the GEC. Another would be to pare down the current list of courses according to criteria like interdisciplinarity. There are other possibilities, but the GEC must take note of what has happened to its last efforts. He would find it hard to support a vague charge to the GEC to expend more energy on reform. Senator Abbott spoke in praise of vagueness. It is implicit in the very concept of interdisciplinarity. We are simply unable to reach consensus on any other basis. We can't come up with a top-down global proposal. But if we can't compel an outcome, we can enable the GEC to move ahead and to give individual faculty encouragement to take initiatives.

Senator Salisbury agreed that bottom-up reform is best, but she will vote against the resolution. Vagueness is ok, but this is too specific in singling out a freshman core experience. Senator Kok supported this. Focusing on freshmen ignores the situation of transfer students in professional programs. Senator Null said that the concern about transfers had also been raised in the Humanistic Studies discussion. If a consensus to move ahead is needed, then the resolution passed should be adequate. This is a significant consensus. Senator Galt agreed with Salisbury that the resolution being debated is too restrictive. For example, the GEC might want to take action to improve domain arrangements and get better distribution requirements. Why not mandate this? Maybe more vagueness is needed at this point. Senator Lyon said that it was the intention of the University Committee to give the GEC an opening for further reform. Support both of these resolutions to enable this, even if they cannot be fully implemented in the near future. Senator Furlong pointed out that the resolution passed was easy. It provides

the "what." The "how" is harder. He cares about freshmen; we need to do a better job for them. Let's get our commitment on the table. Salisbury said she shared his concern for freshmen, but the General Education program may not be the vehicle to improve our efforts for them. Null pleaded for someone to explain what a "core experience" was. No one spoke up.

Senator Heuer asked what body besides the GEC might receive proposals. Salisbury and Furlong responded, the First-Year Experience Committee, an appointed committee, which is charged to report to the Student Affairs Committee. Heuer then moved an amendment to substitute "First-Year Experience Committee" for "General Education Council," Furlong seconding. Senator Fermanich said he thought that General Education reform is important and needed. Senator Lyon spoke against the amendment. The intent of the resolution is to empower the GEC. Senator Popiel also thought the amendment a bad idea. We want an educational experience, one that comes within the purview of the GEC. The vote was called. The amendment failed in a voice vote. Senator Baulieu spoke for the resolution. He liked the generality of its principles. It provides a useful direction for further deliberation by the GEC, although it gives them a loosely-defined task, and it comes after the Senate's rejection of their substantial proposal for change.

The vote was taken. The resolution was defeated by a vote of 12 in favor, 14 opposed, with one abstention.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Code Revisions to UWGB 6.01 Complaints

Presented by Professor John Lyon. He invited comments and questions regarding the University Committee's proposal (as reviewed and modified by the Committee on Rights and

Responsibilities) for changes in code dealing with complaints. Senator Heuer asked if, under paragraph 7, anyone may request that members of the CRR be disqualified for hearing a case. Yes. Senator Galt said that the language of paragraph 1 was redundant. Yes, replied Lyon; the intent is to emphasize the point. Senator Meyer found the proposals troubling because they appear to respond to issues in a specific case that had come before the CRR, but paragraph 7 was particularly contentious. Its vagueness invites challenges. Lyon pointed out that the CRR decides whether the requests to disqualify are justified. Senator Popiel asked if the new code simply states what is already being done or introduces new rules and procedures. Senator Lorenz said that the CRR had to deal with a case for which the code did not provide adequate guidance. The new language would have helped. Senator Null was concerned that complaints that now go to chairs would be directed to the Chancellor. No, Lyon replied, this is a different kind of complaint. The complainer decides the seriousness of the charge of misconduct. Senator Salisbury said that the problem involves distinguishing "complaints" from "Complaints." Meyer was concerned that 7 (a) could lead to endless quests for documentation and evidence. No, Lorenz said, the CRR decides this. Senator Haynie asked how students learn of complaint procedures. The Student Handbook, said Lyon. Senator Coates inquired about paragraph 7 (f). Who determines the relevance of witness testimony? The CRR, by implication, according to Lyon. Senator Baulieu thought that there was no ambiguity; in any event this is old language, not part of the changes being offered. Null asked that the University Committee consider whether "relative" be changed to "relevant" in 7 (a). Several Senators disagreed.

INFORMATION ITEMS

1. Length of Terms for the Committee on Academic Actions

Presented by Professor John Lyon. The change, to increase terms on the Committee on Academic Actions from one to two years, comes from the CAA which desires to ensure continuity from year to year. The Committee on Committees and Nominations supports the change. Senator Bradfield expressed concern about unlimited terms, there being no limit on the number of consecutive terms. Lyon said that discussion will occur at the next Senate meeting.

2. Report of the Provost

Provost Hammersmith said that the Search Committee for the Dean of Professional Programs and Graduate Studies has been formed. The faculty members are Professors Derryl Block, Timothy Kaufman, Anne Kok, Judy Martin, Marilyn Sagrillo, and John Stoll. In addition, Michael Marinetti and Jan Thornton will serve along with a student and two community members.

The budget and planning process this year involves preparing for cuts. A 5 percent reduction of state support (102 and 115 funds) for the UW is being discussed. Two-thirds of revenues come from federal aid, tuition, grants, etc. The Chancellor has been lobbying in Madison that UW System cuts not be across-the-board because this would disproportionately hurt smaller institutions. President Lyall and the Board of Regents understand this. The UW System is lobbying for tuition flexibility. The 5 percent reduction could be offset by a tuition increase of \$250 per year in the comprehensive institutions. We won't know until late spring whether this will be approved. Our budget planning is going ahead on the assumption that current funding levels will be maintained. We have not frozen hiring although this could happen later in the year.

We expect no increases, and a contingency planning exercise is underway to make cuts if that should prove necessary. UW System will be able to tell legislators exactly what the consequences of cuts will be. We hope to plan more systematically for student needs next year. Already one week into registration 50 course sections are closed. Senator Galt reported that at a meeting of UW System library representatives large state cuts were mentioned. What might our hit be? Perhaps \$1.5 million for UWGB the Provost replied. Over the last ten years the UW System has lost \$100 million in state funding. Legislators need to know our plight. Senator Hutchinson asked how faculty will be involved in discussions about budget. The Provost said that the Senate Budget and Planning Committee is already involved and will continue to be. Department chairs will also be involved. It won't be a clandestine operation.

The Provost summarized planned expenditures of Learning Experience funding. The initial \$500,000 had been cut to \$250,000, and now is down to \$211,000. This is base budget money, but in a worst case budget scenario this would be used for a give-back. Additionally, the money became available only in October, so this year's expenditure will target one-time projects to meet Learning Experience goals. The funding was given to us to:

- 1) increase access by enrolling 200 more students at the state average support per faculty member (meaning ten additional faculty members, but we were not given permission for this);
- 2) support a revision of General Education (this has not been done; perhaps in future); and
- 3) enhance student retention and the undergraduate experience (improving advising, the freshman experience, and problem-solving learning, including internships and service learning).

Two task forces were already working on the third category when the funding arrived; their work seemed most appropriate to support with spending in this fiscal year: Academic Advising Committee and First-Year Experience Committee. She distributed a plan for spending about \$148,000 and discussed each item. The Chancellor has asked for proposals by January for the uncommitted funds of about \$60,000.

She acknowledged lively disagreement on the subject. She expects that in future the institution will never again be in the position of receiving new funding without a spending plan in place. Planning needs to be more proactive. We need contingency planning for increases as well as cuts. In opening the floor to questions and comments, she reminded the body that the new funding approved for us was not to reduce class size.

Senator Heuer requested that the Provost not refer to budget units as departments. "Department" is not a clear term at this institution. Senator Noppe asked if the planned expenditures can be changed. Can the faculty propose changes? The projects don't fit the Learning Experience as she understood it, as it had been discussed at last year's general faculty meeting. The Provost stated again that the purposes of the Learning Experience as approved in Madison must be addressed in our expenditures. The faculty meeting last year lacked a consensus. Indeed, the meeting showed an institution in disarray. Our proposal to the Legislature was ignored and the \$500,000 treated as ours to use for whatever purpose we wanted. Senator Lyon said that the legislation funding

the Learning Experience included language that it was "to meet unmet needs." The Provost said that UW System Administration did not have this understanding.

The time for the Senate meeting nearing expiration, Speaker Noppe asked for a motion to suspend the rules to permit a five-minute addition. It passed by the necessary two-thirds vote.

Senator Null asked that the Provost provide documentation to clarify discussion about the purposes of the Legislative proposal. The Provost said she would do so, distributing UW System Administration instructions. Senator Abbott asked if General Education was included and if this was a means of directing funds toward instruction. Perhaps by January? Yes, she said, but let's look at the UW System language. Remember it is for one-time spending this year. Senator Galt said that the General Education Council did ask for funds last spring. He also told the Provost that she should know that the spending proposal as drafted has caused anger among the faculty. The Provost said she was aware of the faculty response. Additionally, Galt said, student retention is already improving. Why do we need to hire an expert? Senator Hutchinson objected to the Provost's characterization of the faculty meeting last year. The faculty was not muddled. Its position was clear: all the funding should go to support instruction. The Provost said she had read the minutes. She wanted to make it clear that no decision had been made not to use the funds for faculty positions. For the money that arrived this October one-time use makes most sense. Given the budget situation it is unwise to hire faculty with funding that we may lose. Moreover, she did not call the faculty muddled, does not think it was and apologized if she gave that impression. The institution was in disarray. There was no plan for hiring new faculty.

ADJOURNMENT

The Senate adjourned by rule at 5:05 p.m., the remaining agenda items, the University Committee Report and New Business, left unaddressed.

Respectfully submitted,

Jerrold Rodesch, Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

Faculty Document #02-3, Approved, 11/20/02

GENERAL EDUCATION REFORM

Resolution Adopted

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.

Faculty Senate Action Item #1, 12/11/02

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 Discussion Item #1, 12/11/02

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~~ 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~~ 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~~ 3 above. Such recommendations are submitted to the Faculty Senate via the University

Committee Chairperson.

~~4-5~~ 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.

