

AGENDA

UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 5

Wednesday, 16 February 2005, 3:00 p.m.

Phoenix Room C, University Union

Presiding Officer: Sally Dresdow, Speaker

Parliamentarian: Professor Kenneth J. Fleurant

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. APPROVAL OF [MINUTES OF FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 4 DECEMBER 15, 2005](#)
(attached)

3. CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

4. REPORT ON PLAN 2008 - Presented by Michael Stearney, Assistant Dean of Enrollment and Academic Services

5. NEW BUSINESS –

- a. [2005-06 slate of nominees for faculty elective committees](#) (attached) - Presented by Forrest Baulieu, Chair of Committee on Committees and Nominations
- b. [Voting status of ex officio members on committees](#) (attached) - Presented by Greg Davis, Chair of the University Committee
- c. [General Education Council proposal for changes to the writing emphasis requirement](#) (attached) - Presented by Greg Davis, Chair of University Committee
- d. Requests for Future Senate Business

6. [PROVOST'S REPORT](#) - Presented by Provost Sue K. Hammersmith

7. UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE REPORT - Presented by Greg Davis, Chair

8. OPEN FORUM: Class Schedule Proposal

9. ADJOURNMENT

MINUTES 2004-2005

UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 4

Wednesday, December 15, 2004

Alumni Room AB, University Union

Presiding Office: Sally Dresdow (BUA-UC), Speaker

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

PRESENT: Greg Aldrete (HUS-UC), Scott Ashman (ED), Denise Bartell (HUD), Forrest Baulieu (ICS), Joy Benson (BUA), Peter Breznay (ICS), Gregory Davis (NAS-UC), Michael Draney (NAS), Sally Dresdow (BUA-UC), Scott Furlong (PEA-UC), Regan Gurung (HUD-UC), Sue Hammersmith (Provost, *ex officio*), Derek Jeffreys (HUS), Harvey Kaye (SCD), Michael Kraft (PEA), Mimi Kubsch (NUR), Judith Martin (Soc. Wk), Steven Meyer (NAS), Steve Muzatko (BUA), Tom Nesslein (URS), Debra Pearson (HUB), Tara Reed (NAS), Ellen Rosewall (COA), Bruce Shepard (Chancellor, *ex officio*), Christine Style (COA-UC), Bryan Vescio (HUS), David Voelker (HUS), William Witwer (COA).

NOT PRESENT: Angela Bauer (HUB), Andrew Fiala (HUS), Timothy Kaufman (ED), Rebecca Tout (COA).

REPRESENTATIVES: Rachel Abhold (Student Government Association), John Landrum (Academic Staff Representative).

GUESTS: Interim Dean Fergus Hughes, Scott Hildebrand (University Communication), Assistant Chancellor for Planning and Budget Dean Rodeheaver, Associate Dean of LAS Joyce Salisbury.

1. Call to Order. With a quorum present, Speaker Dresdow called the Senate to order at 3:30 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes of UW-Green Bay Faculty Senate Meeting No. 3, November 17, 2004.

The minutes were approved without change.

3. Chancellor's Report. Given the abbreviated meeting time, the Chancellor selected several brief items for comment: a) Budget: no news on this front and our campus will not take any action until we know what we are dealing with following the Governor's budget proposal; b) Campus Climate: the Chancellor and Provost met with the Campus Climate Committee and will be forwarding ideas regarding the UC and Senate to the UC for consideration; c) Academic calendar: he and the Provost will bring forward recommendations for improvement in the near future; d) Capitol campaign: looks to be a success particularly with respect to the sports center. Community support has been gratifying. The \$10.7 million campaign total at this point is by far the most the campus has ever raised by this campaign; e) Facilities: the sports center joins a list of successful remodeling projects, including the University Union project which is underway and the return of the 7th and 8th floors of CL to library use, which is next in line for funding.

4. Report on the Campus Master Plan. Presented by Assistant Chancellor for Planning and Budget Dean Rodeheaver. The original campus master plan had outlived its usefulness and no longer provided guidance, which made a new plan essential. Assistant Chancellor Rodeheaver showed images of proposed changes in circulation and parking patterns, basic campus infrastructure, transit and retail options, growth patterns, building projects and the arboretum. An on-line report on the Plan is available for all to consult at <http://www.uwgb.edu/pboffice/MasterPlan/>. Some of the major issues the plan addresses are parking, first impressions the campus makes for visitors, ease of circulation around the campus, working with the city to assure that mutual needs are met as both campus and community grow, alternative forms of student housing, integrating new building projects into the campus, consideration of the harmonious relation of the various parts of the campus. The plan attempts to preserve an academic core while facilitating vehicular navigation around it and pedestrian navigation within it. It also preserves the green space surrounding the campus and includes areas of green space within the core. One of the major recommendations is to open the lines of sight from the entrance into the center of the academic core.

No particular "architectural signature" is anticipated since the master plan does not deal with details such as design or materials. Instead it makes land use recommendations and seeks to establish the principles on which

future decisions should be made. A final draft will be available in the next few months.

5. New Business

a. Request for Future Senate Business. Senator Kaye proposed a joint session of the faculty and student senates to discuss issues such as general education and student engagement. Chancellor Shepard commended Senator Kaye for his role as faculty liaison to the Student Senate. There were no further requests.

6. Provost's Report. Provost Hammersmith's written report was previously distributed and is available at <http://www.uwgb.edu/provost/plans.htm>. An update from the Academic Affairs Planning Committee will be in the mail shortly.

7. University Committee Report. Presented by UC Chair Greg Davis. The UC continues to discuss issues of faculty development and workload following last month's Senate forum. The Committee hopes to suggest improvements based on the discussions and welcomes further comments and ideas. Senator Dresdow will be next year's UC chair. The UC has discussed the Provost's proposal for an international education council and expects to bring that to the Senate next month. In the coming weeks the UC will discuss a proposed change in general education writing emphasis that will make its way to the senate.

8. Open Forum on General Education. Senator Kubsch asked what plans exist for changing general education (hereafter, GE). At the request of the Speaker, Associate Dean Salisbury responded that there are no specific plans. Senator Draney suggested beginning with what is wrong with GE since you can't fix it without knowing what's broken. Senator Baulieu backs that up a step suggesting we can't know if the program is broken unless we know what it is supposed to do. Referring to reports of student dissatisfaction, Senator Meyer wanted to know what they were dissatisfied with. Student Senate Representative Abhold responded that students do not feel they are getting anything from GE, and that they fail to understand how GE relates to their majors. She believes a more interdisciplinary approach at the lower level would help students see how GE applies to them. Chancellor Shepard feels there is enough evidence of dissatisfaction among students and faculty alike for us to know that change is necessary. Senator Breznay, coming from an educational system where high schools are responsible for GE and universities for specialized learning, asked whether GE is remedial for us (especially for writing and math) or whether it has another purpose. Senator Kaye responded that our GE program should lead new students on campus to an understanding of our educational philosophy. As things stand, however, he can't see what it does beyond providing some sort of disciplinary course distribution. We do need to discuss what we want GE to accomplish. How do we have that conversation, though, knowing that we may not have the resources to do anything? He challenged the Chancellor to say that the next funding we seek will not be to move administration out of the top floors in the library but to underwrite GE reform.

Senator Jeffrey would like to avoid reinventing the wheel by considering existing GE models. Senator Martin sees a continuing need at the university level to challenge students to think beyond their high school experience. Senator Reed: GE exists not as a specialized experience but as an expectation that our graduates possess a breadth of knowledge and depth of thought. Senator Meyer: a good GE program gives students an understanding of the academic choices they have for specialization. Chancellor Shepard: GE is education that liberates us from the tyranny of our own experience. GE serves to provide breadth, different perspectives and academic skills. If interdisciplinary majors are, indeed, doing their job in all these areas, we might even discuss doing away with GE and expanding interdisciplinary programs. A level of discussion that radical might be useful on this campus. There are no constraints on what we can do.

Senator Davis spoke of his experience as a student here when we had Freshman Liberal Education Seminars. The seminars did not help him with his selection of a major but—even though he didn't care for them at the time—they did foster development of critical thinking skills and proved a valuable part of his education. He noted that there was also stronger interdisciplinary emphasis in majors at that time. GE must be more than a disciplinary sampler. Senator Jeffrey asked the Chancellor why he would consider abolishing GE. He finds it hard to imagine and believes the faculty have the responsibility to decide what students need to take early in their education. The Chancellor agreed that our faculty have the responsibility to consider these issues and made the suggestion to provoke a discussion he believes necessary. He has a model of GE: first year students should

experience hands on problem solving from multiple perspectives in team-taught courses. He believes we can keep the discussion going by bringing in colleagues from around the country who are dealing with GE seriously. He suggests not focusing on funding resources in this discussion.

In response to Senator Kraft, Provost Hammersmith pointed out that of those who graduate, 40% transferred here and many of those may have had their general education elsewhere. The Provost wondered whether the shape a GE program takes matters as much as the educational outcomes it produces. Senator Kaye proposed that GE should be an opportunity to teach what we enjoy. He imagines four different GE tracks where major programs decide what their own students need to complete their general education. Why not reconsider interdisciplinary majors in a way that incorporates general education? Give units the flexibility to propose what makes sense as general education for their students. Perhaps only those students who don't know what they will major in would require some all-campus GE program.

Speaker Dresdow asked whether Associate Dean Salisbury would share her observations. She replied that something needs to be done soon to reverse the decline in base scores. She would begin next fall with freshman seminars, preferring to try something new than to continue debating at the risk of changing nothing. Senator Kaye suggested a way to pay for such a seminar program: it would cost nothing if we balanced a spring semester of small seminars with three large lecture courses (one each for humanities, sciences and social sciences) in the fall. He believes there is no difference between 100 and 400 students when it comes to lectures. Fifteen faculty would be assigned to one lecture course and each of them would be responsible for one week for a full three credit equivalent. He is confident that each of us has a "damn good" one week in us. This would be fun and economically efficient for faculty and would liberate us to do a large number of small seminars in the spring. He agrees with Salisbury that there are ways to get this done quickly. Senator Rosewall would be interested in the opportunity to sit in on colleague lectures in such a team-taught seminar. Student Senate Representative Abhold liked the idea as well. Senator Jeffreys would welcome a discussion on this but would rather focus on guiding principles for such a course rather than what would be fun for the faculty. Kaye didn't want his remark to be misunderstood and said that he has long thought such a GE seminar should be built around citizenship.

Senator Furlong thinks it would not be bad to change GE every five years. Senator Aldrete agrees that change should be easier and wonders how to create a climate that accepts change more readily. If faculty are unwilling to change what they teach, GE will not evolve. He also tossed out another radical proposal—abolishing the current GE program and requiring two or three minors in different domains as a graduation requirement. Students would have a choice, and the knowledge would not be superficial.

Senator Pearson asked what practical steps are necessary to change the GE program. Professor Salisbury thought that if the learning outcomes were not modified, no formal approval would be necessary to try something new. If the whole curriculum were redone, the changes would need to come to the Senate.

9. Adjournment. At 5:00 p.m. the Speaker received a motion to adjourn.

Respectfully submitted,

Kenneth Fleurant, Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

Faculty Senate 2/16/04, New Business (5a)

FACULTY AND ACADEMIC STAFF GOVERNANCE OFFICE

February 16, 2005

TO: Voting Faculty

FROM: Kenneth Fleurant, Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

SUBJECT: **NOMINEES FOR 2005-06 FACULTY ELECTIVE COMMITTEES**

The Committee on Committees and Nominations has prepared the following slate of candidates for open 2005-06 faculty elective committee positions. Further nominations can be made by a petition of three voting faculty members. These nominations must have consent of the nominee and must be received by the Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff no later than February 25.

THIS IS NOT A BALLOT

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COUNCIL

5 tenured members: one from each voting district, plus one at-large member. **Continuing members:** William Shay (at-large NS), 2-year term; Robert Nagy (PS) and John Lyon (NS), both 1-year terms. **Retiring members:** Denise Scheberle (SS) and Victoria Goff (AH)

2 to be elected for 3-year term: 1 from AH and 1 from SS

Nominees: Gregory Aldrete, AH

Mark Everingham, SS

Jennifer Ham, AH

Anthony Galt, SS

-

PERSONNEL COUNCIL

5 tenured members: one from each voting district, plus one at-large member. **Continuing members:** Steve Dutch (at-large NS), 2-year term; Michael Hencheck (NS) and Patricia Ragan (PS), both 1 year terms. **Retiring members:** Jennifer Mokren (AH) Georjeanna Wilson-Doenges (SS)

2 to be elected for 3-year term: 1 from AH and 1 from SS

Nominees: Jeffrey Entwistle, AH

Thomas Nesslein, SS

E. Nicole Meyer, AH

William Niedzwiedz, SS

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE

6 tenured members: one from each voting district, plus two at-large members (with no more than 2 from a single voting district) **Continuing members:** Regun Gurung (at-large SS) and Christine Style (AH), both 2-year terms; Gregory Davis (NS) and Sally Dresdow (PS), both 1-year terms. **Retiring members:** Gregory Aldrete (at-large AH) and Scott Furlong (SS)

2 to be elected for 3-year term: 1 from SS and 1 from at-large

Nominees: Scott Furlong, SS

Forrest Baulieu, at-large, NS

Harvey Kaye, SS

Terence O'Grady, at-large, AH

-

Specification of Ex-officio voting status

52.02 MEMBERSHIP OF THE FACULTY SENATE

A. Ex Officio Members. The Chancellor, ~~and~~ Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, ~~and~~ **Academic Deans** shall be ex officio (**non-voting**) members.

LIBRARY AND INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

UWGB Faculty Senate Approved 11 December 1985

UWGB Faculty Senate Revised 16 March 1988, 18 April 1990, 16 September 1998

2. The Library and Instructional Technology Committee is advisory to the ~~Chief Information Officer and University Librarian~~ **Associate Provost for Information Services, the Director of the Cofrin Library,** and ~~the~~ Technology Council on policy matters pertaining to instructional technology and library automation. The ~~Chief Information Officer~~ **Associate Provost for Information Services** and ~~University Librarian~~ **the Director of the Cofrin Library** ~~is an~~ **are** ex officio (non-voting) members of the Committee.

HONORARY DEGREE COMMITTEE

UWGB Faculty Senate Approved 19 October 1988

University Committee Approved 14 December 1988 and 27 December 1989

Board of Regents Approved 8 September 1989

1. The Honorary Degree Committee is composed of the faculty members on the Awards and Recognitions Committee and the Chancellor. The President of the University of Wisconsin System is an ex officio (**voting**) member. The committee will elect its own chairperson at its first meeting.

Date of effect: Immediate

Faculty Senate, 2/16/05, New Business (5c)

University of Wisconsin-Green Bay

Department of Natural and Applied Sciences

2420 Nicolet Drive, Green Bay, Wisconsin 54311-7001

Memorandum

To: Gregory Davis, Chair, University Committee

From: Bob Howe, Chair, General Education Council

cc: General Education Council
Joyce Salisbury, Associate Dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences

Date: **8 February 2005**

Re: Revised General Education Writing Policy

Attached is a modified proposal for revising the Writing Emphasis Policy at UW-Green Bay based on our discussion at the 22 December University Committee meeting. The rationale for this change in UW-Green Bay's Writing Emphasis Policy can be presented to the Faculty Senate as follows:

During the past two years the General Education Council has sought to improve the Writing Emphasis Requirement at UW-Green Bay. A recommendation submitted by GEC Chair Jeff Entwistle in his 2003-2004 Academic Year Summary was revised by the 2004-2005 GEC; this proposal was modified further after comments by the University Committee on 22 December 2004.

This revised policy addresses two issues. First, the new policy places a greater emphasis on writing development by explicitly designating writing development (WD) courses and by encouraging students and instructors to use resources made available by the Writing Center, including UWGB's previously approved general writing standards. Second, the proposal aims to encourage more instructors to participate in the writing emphasis program by creating a second category of courses (WA or "writing advanced" courses), where the existing requirement for feedback before the end of the 4th week of classes is eliminated. This new category should have the effect of increasing the number of writing emphasis courses, thereby making it easier for students to fulfill the requirement.

We hope encourage the continued use and development of general campus-wide writing standards and writing-improvement resources like the Writing Center. In addition to the campus-wide standards, individual faculty members are encouraged to articulate their own specific writing expectations. A web site developed by the Writing Center provides additional resources for students who need help.

In order to implement the new policy, we propose that all current writing emphasis courses be automatically designated as WD courses. Instructors will then submit requests for designating new courses or re-classifying existing courses in either the WD or WA category.

Writing Requirement Policy (Revised 17 January 2005)

Purpose: The Writing Requirement is to provide all students with structured opportunities to practice and improve their writing skills across the curriculum. The Writing Requirement recognizes three levels for writing development: 1) Basic competency demonstrated by ACT scores or taking specific writing courses, 2) Practice in a developmental way that gives students feedback early and often throughout the class. These courses will be identified as WD (Writing Development). 3) Advanced practice in which students apply their writing skills to courses in their major or minor programs or in other upper level courses. These courses will be identified as WA (Writing Advanced).

Writing Standards: The UWGB Writing Policy and Criteria for Evaluating Writing will be made available at [URL] on the UWGB web site.

Requirement: Students must complete at least **four** Writing Courses prior to graduation. At least **one** must be a Writing Development course (identified in the Schedule of Classes by the abbreviation "WD" as part of the course listing), and at least **one** must be a Writing Advanced course (identified in the Schedule of Classes by the abbreviation "WA" as part of the course listing). Students who successfully complete four courses identified as

"WD" or "WA" (with a minimum of one from each category) will fulfill the UW-Green Bay Writing Requirement.

Required Assignments in WD courses:

1. Three or more "public discourse" writing assignments must be included as part of the course requirements. "Public discourse" means the work is written for someone other than the writer (i.e., journals and diaries are not considered to be "public discourse" assignments.) These assignments may include in-class work or essay exams as well as out-of-class work.
2. Public discourse writing assignments must **total a minimum of 2000 words** and must constitute at least **25%** of the grade for the course.
3. **One** public discourse assignment must be evaluated and returned to the student with feedback on the writing before the end of the **4th** week of class. (This allows students to seek help with their writing early in the course.) If appropriate, students will be referred to the UW-Green Bay Writing Center or web resources for additional help with writing development.

Required Assignments in WA courses:

1. Writing assignments must **total a minimum of 2500 words**.
2. Public discourse writing assignments (see definition above) must **total a minimum of 30%** of the grade for the course. These assignments may include both in-class and out-of-class work (including essay exams, papers, reviews, etc.) as long as some feedback on the writing is provided.

Class Size: All WD courses shall be capped at 45.

All WA courses shall be capped at 35.

Report to the Faculty Senate

February 16, 2005

Submitted by Sue K. Hammersmith, Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

University of Wisconsin-Green Bay

I. PLANNING AND BUDGET UPDATE

Summaries of the Governor's budget proposal and UWGB process for adjusting our strategic budget planning process are detailed on the Chancellors web page:

- Guidelines and principles are at <http://www.uwgb.edu/chancellor/remarks/guidelines.htm>
- Draft of supplemental budget process is at <http://www.uwgb.edu/chancellor/remarks/draftplan.htm>
- Guidelines pertaining to ongoing searches and open positions are at <http://www.uwgb.edu/chancellor/remarks/draftplan.htm>

Provost will meet this week with Senate Standing Committee on Planning and Budget, Academic Staff Committee, and Strategic Budgeting Committee.

Proposed budget adjustments are scheduled to be released for campus review, comment, and feedback at mid-March, followed by open forum presentation and discussion.

In Provost's Area:

- Direct classroom instruction will be protected.
- Reductions will not be across the board.
- Potential reductions will be evaluated in terms of their impact on critical functions, our students, and our faculty and staff.
- Options will be available for campuswide review, discussion, and feedback in mid-March.

II. GRADE INFLATION

New analysis by Debbie Furlong indicates that any "grade inflation" we've seen here at UWGB has been due primarily to rising academic qualifications of incoming students, trends toward full-time student status, and other demographic factors. In short, our students are doing better academically than they did ten years ago, but grade inflation doesn't appear to be the reason why.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue H.

Sue K. Hammersmith, Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

UWGB HIRING GUIDELINES, EFFECTIVE 2/11/05

2/17/05

Positions NOT Affected (follow regular position approval and recruitment process):

- Instructional Positions (Faculty and/or Instructional Academic Staff)
- Non-GPR Funded Positions

Positions Affected (detailed instructions in memo from Bruce Shepard dated 2/11/05)

- **All GPR-funded, non-instructional vacant positions, whether they already have been approved by the Position Review Committee or not.**

If candidates already have been scheduled for interviews: (A) Proceed with interviews, or (B) close search.

If the position already has been advertised, but no one is yet scheduled to interview: (A) Accept applications but tell candidates that due to current budget uncertainties the position will not be filled until authorization is received, or (B) close search.

If the position has not yet been approved by Position Review Committee, **and** filling the position is necessary to maintain health and safety and/or the statutorily required operations of the University, **and** there is no practical alternative to filling the position, submit a written justification to that effect, and submit it along with the standard Form A to request approval to fill the position.

Otherwise, new searches will not be authorized until budget reduction scenarios have been developed and it is assured that the vacant position in question will not be affected, either in a direct budget reduction or by a

potential layoff situation (in which a laid off employee may have the right to move into the vacant position in question).

If questions, refer to Chancellor Shepard's memo dated February 11, 2005, or contact HR (for classified and noninstructional positions) or the Provost (for instructional positions).

GOVERNOR'S BUDGET RECOMMENDATIONS

HIGHLIGHTS PERTAINING TO UWGB

(2/16/05)

Source of information: President Reilly's memo, "Governor's Budget Recommendations," dated February 8, 2005, to Board of Regents and Chancellors

The Governor's budget recommendations include the following:

- \$1,111,400 to implement Committee on Baccalaureate Expansion (COBE) initiatives
- Domestic partner benefits
- Elimination of 200 administrative positions. Plan must be submitted to Department of Administration by May 30, 2006. If plan is not approved by DOA, UW will lose position creation authority will be suspended until a plan is approved.
- Internal reallocation of \$65,000,000 within the UW System, from administrative costs.
- Creation of new faculty positions by July 1, 2006. Plan must be submitted to Department of Administration by August 1, 2006.
- Nonresident tuition remission will be allowed for non-US citizens who:
 - have graduated from a Wisconsin high school.
 - have been continuously present in Wisconsin for at least three years after beginning high school in Wisconsin
 - provide an affidavit that he/she will file an application for a US permanent resident visa as soon as eligible.

Net result for UWGB: reallocation of GPR budget from noninstructional to instructional activities and positions. Specific amounts to be determined.