

AGENDA

UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 7

Wednesday, 20 February 2002, 3:00 p.m.

Phoenix Room C, University Union

Presiding Officer: John Lyon, Speaker

Parliamentarian: Professor Jerrold C. Rodesch

AUTOMATIC CONSENT

1. [Minutes of UW-Green Bay Faculty Senate Meeting No. 6, January 23, 2002](#) (attached)

CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

ACTION ITEMS

1. [2002-03 Slate of Nominees for the Faculty Elective Committees](#) (attached). Presented by Professor Georjeanna Wilson-Doenges, Chair of the Committee on Committees and Nominations.
2. [Proposal on Admission Standards for New Freshmen](#) (attached). Presented by Professor David Littig

DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. [Tenure and Due Process Resolution](#) (attached). Presented by Professor David Littig
2. **Designation of B.A. and B.S. Degrees for Majors of Academic Programs.** Presented by Professor David Littig

INFORMATION ITEMS

1. **Master of Social Work Degree** (print your copy from the Faculty and Academic Staff Governance Office Home Page). Presented by Interim Dean Jane Muhl
2. **Report of the Provost.** Presented by Interim Provost Carol Pollis
3. **University Committee Report.** Presented by Professor David Littig, Chair

NEW BUSINESS

ADJOURNMENT

MINUTES 2001-2002

UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 6

Wednesday, January 23, 2002

Phoenix Room C, University Union, 3:00 p.m.

Presiding Office: John Lyon, Speaker

Parliamentarian: Jerrold Rodesch, Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

PRESENT

Clifford Abbott

Greg Aldrete

Derryl Block

Francis Carleton

James Coates

William Conley

Kevin Fermanich

Scott Furlong

Anthony Galt

Curt Heuer

Robert Howe

John Katers

Andrew Kersten

Theodor Korithoski

Sylvia Kubsch

David Littig

Dennis Lorenz

John Lyon

John Mariano

Brian Merkel

Jennifer Mokren

Robert Nagy

Illene Noppe

Gilbert Null

Carol Pollis

Kevin Roeder

William Shay

W. Bruce Shepard

NOT PRESENT: Joseph Mannino

REPRESENTATIVES: Nick Kohn, Student Government Association, and Kari Jo Grant, Academic Staff Committee

GUESTS: Interim Deans Cheryl Grosso and Jane Muhl, Associate Provost Timothy Sewall, Julie Curro, Shane Kohl, Suzette Pfeifer, and Steven Neiheisel

AUTOMATIC CONSENT

1. **Approval of Minutes of UW-Green Bay Faculty Senate Meeting No. 5, December 12, 2001.** The minutes were approved without change.

CHANCELLOR'S REMARKS

The Chancellor announced that planning has begun for a **capital campaign** with a tentative target of \$30 million. In this "silent phase" we will attempt to identify our needs, conduct a feasibility study, and try to line up 40-50 percent of donations prior to a public announcement. He has called on the University Advancement Office to stretch for this ambitious objective. We now have an endowment of \$10 million, neither an embarrassment nor anything to brag about. We are going to try to get major commitments for scholarships, named professorships, and other academic priorities. Input from the campus is necessary to identify these priorities so that we can match donor desires to our needs. We know that donors like to give for buildings, and we won't always be successful in finding matches for academic projects. However, unless the feasibility study changes our minds, no more than half the funds will go to brick and mortar.

The **Campus Life for the 21st Century** initiative is a related matter. The big Events Center is off the table because it was creating enemies and would undermine fund raising. We do need a facility for commencements, concerts, athletic events, etc., but we have scaled back to more modest dimensions. A \$60 million project is now a \$30 million project, with \$15 million to come from student fees, \$7.5 million from the state, and \$7.5 million from the capital campaign. This should buy our way into the state construction budget because we will cover 75 percent of the costs. Otherwise, through normal processes, it could take us 20 years. Additional elements in the initiative include Union expansion (\$5 million: \$4 million from students, \$1 million from the Book Store) and the Sports Center, which is our facilities eyesore and a serious recruitment disadvantage because students come from high schools with better facilities. We are authorized to plan the Union project in this biennium and hope to obtain approval to break ground for the Union in the next, with the Sports Center targeted for the biennium after.

We need to think about **the budget** for the next biennium as well as deal with the problems we face right now. Our initial proposal to UW System for 2003-2005 is to develop initiatives that are part of the Learning Experience, which will be repackaged for the next budget cycle. Issues in the current biennium are obviously more pressing. In this fiscal year UW System has already suffered a series of "lapses" (read cuts) totaling \$4.2 million and will need to cut an additional \$5.8 million before the year's end, totaling \$10 million for 2001-02. In taking our share of this loss we have used up our reserves. Normally the reserves are allocated to equipment replacement, meeting unanticipated demands for course sections, etc. We won't be able to do these. We also considered canceling searches but decided not to. This would have destabilized programs. Ironically we are also planning on how to use the \$500,000 we got for the Learning Experience. The Deans are preparing suggestions for this, emphasizing innovation in undergraduate instruction and giving particular attention to the General Education program. We need flexibility in using these monies to determine what approaches will eventually work best.

Budget cuts will continue next year. The Governor's plan calls for a further reduction of \$30 million for the UW System. The biennial arithmetic adds up to a total cut of \$50 million for the biennium. Modest tuition increases can partly offset this. About \$36 million will be added to the UW budget in the second year of the biennium for the Economic Stimulus package. This will actually yield a budget gain of \$6 million with additional tuition monies producing a total of \$10 million in new funds. UW System decisions on how to allocate this money are still pending. This will affect how we spend our Learning Experience appropriation. The net cut for the UW is only \$10 million, which means we fare relatively well under the Governor's plan. However, there is no assurance that the Governor's plan will be adopted. The final budget adjustment may be quite different.

Senator Carleton asked if we have discretion on how to spend the Learning Experience \$500,000. We don't know yet, the Chancellor replied. Senator Abbott asked if planning for the next biennium included developing the Learning Experience as currently envisioned and funded, or going after Economic Stimulus funding, or packaging the Learning Experience as an Economic Stimulus proposal. Yes, all of the above, the Chancellor said. But we don't have a clear reading on budget prospects. President Lyall has supported our efforts to improve undergraduate education, and we are aiming at new funding of \$1.5 million for the first year of the next biennium and \$3.5 million in the second. This will be tied to our commitments to increase retention, improve our problem-focussed education, and show how our programs serve Economic Stimulus goals. Improved retention would mean that we will have 400-500 additional FTE students. At \$9,000 per FTE in the new funding compared to our present \$5,200 per FTE our situation would be markedly bettered.

ACTION ITEMS

1. **Proposed Policy Revision on Double Counting of Upper-Division Credits Required for Graduation.** Presented by Professor David Littig

Speaker Lyon noted that this item was moved to action on the agenda to permit inclusion of the changes in the next catalogue. Senator Littig said the University Committee drafted a two-part resolution in response to the Senate's earlier discussion. Senator Howe **moved adoption of the first resolution**, seconded by Senator

Furlong, to abolish "constraints on double counting...so that for the purpose of satisfying course requirements for all major, minor, and certificate programs there shall be no restriction on how any course can satisfy multiple requirements." Senator Abbott spoke in support of the resolution. The resolution was brought to a vote and **unanimously adopted**. Furlong then asked if the action would be retroactive for students currently enrolled. Steven Neiheisel was invited to respond and said that liberalized requirements could be effective immediately whereas more restrictive ones would constrain only those admitted under a new catalogue. Speaker Lyon observed that, if the Chancellor chose to implement the new policy immediately, no one would object.

Littig presented the second resolution with three options. He opened the matter to the Senate to choose among them. Senator Galt **moved that "there shall be no minimum number of upper-level credits beyond what is required by a student's major(s) and minor(s)."** Senator Block seconded. Galt explained that his motion was simply to put the matter before the body and that he intended to vote against it. We should, he said, discourage too many lower level credits and encourage more upper-level credits. Senator Abbott agreed, but said the operative word was "encourage," not require, and therefore he would support the resolution. Senator Null agreed with Galt's position and said that we need to signal this belief with some number, preferably one larger than 30. Encouragement, yes, but a minimum requirement too. Littig mentioned that our students are already taking 50-60 upper-level credits. The resolution sends a poor message and doesn't reflect reality. Senator Howe said he was waffling. He leaned toward a requirement but was attracted by the idea of students taking many lower-level courses, sampling a diversity of subjects, which surely reflects our interdisciplinary values. Senator Fermanich worried that there might be pathways for students to accumulate double majors and majors and minors with very few upper-level credits now that the double-counting rule was abolished. Senator Furlong thought that lowering all-university requirements could stimulate units to take greater care to assure the adequacy of major and minor programs. Senator Aldrete insisted that there is value in a requirement of more than 30 upper-level credits. Courses at that level really do embody different kinds of learning in different kinds of assignments. Senator Conley agreed with Null's earlier statement. More than 30 credits are needed. Furlong was concerned that we

might get too many students in upper-level courses, making it harder to achieve the purposes of advanced study. Block asked why there was distrust of unit decision-making. Surely that is the level to decide these issues. In particular, a requirement for more than 30 upper-level credits would seriously affect the **Nursing program**. Senator Carleton rejoined that other areas of academic policy are not handled at the unit level, such as General Education. We have a collective, institutional responsibility for these issues. Senator Merkel said that in this case units know best what serves their students. Null thought it wasn't a unit issue. Dean Muhl interjected that Nursing is a unique program because of its relationship to the two-year Technical Colleges. A number of the courses transferred in would have an upper-level designation here but cannot within that system. Senator Heuer noted that the Registrar can record such transfer credits as upper-level if our departments certify its appropriateness. Muhl said that Nursing has no equivalents to the kind of courses Heuer has in mind. It's a unique program. Null and Littig agreed, but said that an exception made for Nursing shouldn't affect general all-university policy.

Furlong pointed out that we have never had a university-wide, upper-level course requirement. People speaking against the resolution are asking for a new requirement. Why? Carleton asked what the impact of a requirement would be on Extended Degree. Provost Pollis thought none. Dean Grosso thought maybe some. Senator Lorenz spoke for the resolution, thinking there no reason to take choice from students. Senator Shay also supported the resolution, saying it maintains the status quo. Senator Noppe said that we can't keep the status quo because we have eliminated double counting. It is not unreasonable in this new circumstance to set a minimum of 30 upper-level credits. This kind of guidance for students is valuable. Abbot said that while this is true it should be accomplished by advising in individual programs. Let's make the policy simple. Littig noted that students are taking upper-level courses without a requirement. We are unlikely to affect student behavior by any new policy. Aldrete observed that much time was being spent on an issue that will affect few students, so why not set a requirement to establish a basic quality control, a minimum standard for what a UW-Green Bay degree means? Null said that the entire matter might be resolved through an alternative approach: require an interdisciplinary major and a disciplinary minor for all students. Howe also spoke up on behalf of simplicity, but thought that option three was simple enough and sent a message that upper-level study meant something.

The resolution passed, 14 in favor, 11 opposed, with two abstentions.

DISCUSSION ITEM

1. **Proposal on Admission Standards for New Freshmen.** Presented by Professor David Littig

The proposal having been discussed previously by the Senate, Littig invited early action if no objections were forthcoming. He summarized main points in the proposal, including the new minimum standards, the indexing of various factors to rank students for admission, and the distinction between regular and priority admissions. Senator Furlong wanted to know about the index factors: are they weighted or equal? Steven Neiheisel replied that they were weighted, academic factors having the highest value. Senator Galt asked if the new admissions process would be more labor intensive. Neiheisel hoped not, because the index could be automated and the priority admissions criteria would produce automatic decisions. Senator Lorenz asked who assigns weights to the regular admission criteria. A committee? A single person? Will target groups be advantaged? Neiheisel said that the Enrollment Management Committee will discuss the application of admissions criteria and the admissions process, and target groups must meet minimum standards. Galt pressed the issue and asked if a committee existed to make individual admissions decisions. No, said Neiheisel, except for applicants who were wait-listed or who appeal decisions. Senator Roeder asked how transfer students would be affected. Neiheisel said that the proposal concerns freshman admissions only. The criteria and process for transfers are under review. Senator Heuer returned to the question of weighting. What are the weights? Neiheisel was not able to provide specific numbers. Senator Howe asked if priority standards could be altered, made significantly lower. Neiheisel replied that published admission standards can't be frequently changed, at most every two years. We need to inform high schools of our standards well in advance. Senator Aldrete asked how many high school students have GPAs below 2.25, ACTs below 17. Neiheisel said that the numbers match our current students' records. Senator Block expressed concern about the vagueness of the proposed regular admission standard. How can one vote on a weighting system that is not specified. Neiheisel said that the Enrollment Management Committee is a

responsible body taking part in the development of the index and that extensive data from national studies about college success factors will be available to guide decisions.

INFORMATION ITEMS

1. **Tenure and Due Process Resolution** Presented by Professor David Littig

The issue concerns procedures used for the recent dismissal of a tenured professor at UW-Superior. Many UW System institutions have passed resolutions objecting to new standards adopted by the Board of Regents in the Marder case and calling upon the Board and others to reaffirm their commitment to the tenure system and due process for faculty members. The University Committee now brings forward a similar resolution. Littig Senate pointed out several issues arising from the Marder case: Chancellors are responsible to investigate allegations made against faculty members, not to accept them as submitted; the recommendations of a faculty review body were ignored; when the case came before the Board of Regents *ex parte* communications occurred without the knowledge of Marder or his attorneys; principles from the Safransky decision to terminate a tenured non-academic employee were invoked by the Board of Regents in making its decision, applying new and vague standards to faculty tenure rights and potentially undermining the meaning of academic tenure.

2. **Report of the Provost.** Provost Pollis announced that:

- **Interim Dean Jane Muhl** has agreed to continue in her position for another year, much to the benefit of the institution in providing administrative continuity and giving us time to study the needs of our professional programs.
- The **searches for** other administrative positions—**Provost and Dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences**—continue. More than 30 applications have been received for each.
- The University Committee is preparing a charge to the General Education Council for a very important review of our **General Education Program**.

3. **University Committee Report**

Senator Littig summarized items currently before the University Committee:

- The charge to the General Education Council for the review cited by the Provost.
- Meeting with the Academic Staff Committee to discuss our institutional response (due by May 1) to a UW System Report on Instructional and Research Academic Staff. The procedure for and significance of conferring Faculty Status on Instructional Academic Staff are the key issues for us.
- A review of the Tenure Document has been requested by the Provost. We need to clarify expectations for tenure and provide guidelines on when tenure should be sought.
- Post-Tenure Review also needs clarification: What is its purpose? What are the expected outcomes?

OTHER BUSINESS

Senator Kubsch reported on the recent serious illness of Senator Mannino and invited all to visit him at St. Vincent Hospital.

ADJOURNMENT

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

Respectfully submitted,

Jerrold Rodesch, Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

Faculty Senate Document #01-5, Approved as Amended, 23 January 2002

Proposal to Revise the Policy on Double Counting of Upper-level Credits and Establish a Minimum Number of Upper-level Credits

Background:

Current policy requires that:

- a. all student earn at least 120 credits to graduate
- b. all students have an interdisciplinary program (major or minor) or a professional major
- c. all majors require at least 24 upper-level credits

These policies will remain in effect.

Issue #1 Should double counting of courses be allowed?

Resolution #1

Whereas currently a program's minimum requirements are sensitive to what other programs a student may choose. There are constraints on double counting. The specific constraints, taken from page 21 of the current catalog are:

"3. Supporting credits/courses between a major(s) and a minor(s) may not be duplicated unless they exceed the minimum of six unduplicated credits for each major or minor.

"4. Within the minima, upper-level credits between a major and minor may not be double counted. The major requires 24 unduplicated upper-level credits. The minor requires 12 unduplicated upper-level credits. Upper-level credits in excess of 24 minimum for a major and 12 for a minor may be duplicated.

"5. Within the minima, six upper-level credits may be duplicated between majors.

"6. Supporting or upper-level courses/credits may not be duplicated between minors unless those credits are in excess of the minima."

Therefore, be it resolved that the above constraints on double counting are abolished so that for the purpose of satisfying course requirements for all major, minor, and certificate programs there shall be no restrictions on how any course can satisfy multiple requirements.

Issue #2 Should there be a minimum number of upper-level credits required for graduation?

Resolution #2

There shall be no minimum number of upper-level credits beyond what is required by a student's major(s) and minor(s).

Resolution #3

~~A minimum of 30 credits of upper-level credits is required for graduation.~~

Resolution #4

~~The minimum number of upper-level credits required for graduation with a single major shall be 30 credits, with a major/minor combination shall be 36 credits within that major/minor combination, and with two majors shall be 42 credits within those majors.~~

-

Faculty Senate Action Item #1, 02/20/2002

February 18, 2002

TO: Voting Faculty

FROM: Jerrold C. Rodesch, Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

SUBJECT: NOMINEES FOR 2002-03 FACULTY ELECTIVE COMMITTEES

The Committee on Committees and Nominations has prepared the following slate of candidates for open 2002-03 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 28**.

THIS IS NOT A BALLOT

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COUNCIL

5 tenured members: one from each voting district, plus one at-large member.

* **Continuing members:** Joan Thron (at-large PS), 2-year term; Robert Howe (NS) and Judith Martin (PS), both 1-year terms

* **Outgoing members:** Francis Carleton (SS) and Brian Sutton (AH)

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

Nominees: Kevin Collins, AH Mark Everingham, SS

Victoria Goff, AH Tracy Luchetta, SS

PERSONNEL COUNCIL

5 **tenured** members: one from each voting district, plus one at-large member.

* **Continuing members:** Lloyd Noppe (at-large SS), 2-year term; Warren Johnson (NS) and Peter Smith (PS), both 1-year terms;

* **Outgoing member:** William Laatsch (SS) and Peter Kellogg (AH)

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

Nominees: Laura Riddle, AH Ismail Shariff, SS
 Scott Wright, AH Georjeanna Wilson-Doenges, SS

GENERAL EDUCATION COUNCIL

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:** Anthony Galt (SS), 2-year term; Ronald Starkey (NS) and Christine Style (at-large AH), both 1-year terms

* **2-Year Replacement term:** Greg Aldrete (AH) on sabbatical 2002-03

* **Outgoing members:** John Harris (PS) and Richard Logan (at-large, SS)

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

1 to be elected for 2-year replacement term: from AH

Nominees: James Doering, PS Forrest Baulieu, at-large, NS
 Marilyn Sagrillo, PS James Marker, at-large, NS

Jeff Entwistle, AH, 2-year replacement

Peter Kellogg, AH, 2-year replacement

COMMITTEE OF SIX FULL PROFESSORS

6 **tenured, full Professors:** one from each of the voting district, plus two at-large members (with no more than 2 from a single voting district).

* **Continuing members:** William Conley (PS) and Craig Lockard (at-large, SS), both 2-year terms; Clifford Abbott (AH) and Ronald Stieglitz (NS), both 1-year terms

* **Outgoing members:** Fergus Hughes (SS) and Joyce Salisbury (at-large, AH)

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

Nominees: Anthony Galt, SS V. M. Ganga Nair, at-large, NS

Michael Kraft, SS Anjani Mehra, at-large, NS

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:** Clifford Abbott (AH) and Illene Noppe (at-large, SS); both 2-year terms; Mimi Kubsch (PS) and John Lyon (NS), both 1-year terms

* **Outgoing members:** David Littig (SS) and Joseph Mannino (at-large, NS)

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

Nominees: Richard Logan, SS Joyce Salisbury, at-large, AH

Larry Smith, SS Sandra Stokes, at-large, PS

COMMITTEE ON RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

5 tenured members: one from voting district, plus one at-large. Members may serve up to three consecutive terms.

Continuing members: Robert Nagy (PS) and Donna Ritch (NS), 2-year terms; Ken Fleurant (AH), 1-year term

Outgoing members: Dennis Lorenz (SS) and Sylvia Kubsch (at-large, PS)

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

Nominees: Dennis Lorenz, SS James Doering, at-large, PS

Tracy Luchetta, SS Victoria Goff, at-large, AH

Terence O'Grady, at-large, AH

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES AND NOMINATIONS

5 members of professional rank: one from each voting district, plus one at-large member. No member is eligible for more than **one** consecutive term.

Continuing members: Kenneth Fleurant (AH), 2-year term; Joseph Mannino (NS) and Alla Wilson (PS), both 1-year terms

Outgoing members: Georjeanna Wilson-Doenges (SS) and Sally Dresdow (at-large, PS)

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

Nominees: Fergus Hughes, SS Kari Beth Krieger, at-large, NS
 Larry Smith, SS Mimi Kubsch, at-large, PS
 Anjani Mehra, at-large, NS
 E. Nicole Meyer, at-large, AH

GRADUATE FACULTY BOARD OF ADVISORS

5 **tenured** members: 2 members at-large **elected by Graduate Faculty only**. No more than one member from any one graduate program on the Board. No member is eligible for more than **one** consecutive term.

* **Continuing member:** Gregory Davis (at-large), 1-year term

* **Outgoing member:** Barbara Law (at-large), 1-year replacement term

1 to be elected for 3-year term: at-large from graduate faculty

Nominees: Barbara Law, at-large
 Robert Nagy, at-large

LIBRARY AND INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

4 faculty members: one from each of the 4 voting districts

* **Continuing members:** M. Jan Bradfield (AH) and Marilyn Sagrillo (PS) both 1-year terms

* **Outgoing members:** Thomas Nesslein (SS) and James Marker (NS)

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

Nominees: Debra Pearson, NS Troy Abel, SS
 Ron Starkey, NS Craig Lockard, SS

STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

4 faculty members: one from each of the 4 voting district

* **Continuing members:** Patricia Ragan (PS), 2-year term; Scott Wright (AH), 1-year term;

* **Outgoing members:** Debra Pearson (NS) and Marcelo Cruz (SS)

2 to be appointed for 3-year term: 1 from NS and 1 from SS

Nominees: Tian-you Hu, NS Dan Von Dras, SS

Faculty Senate Action Item #2, 2/20/2002

PROPOSAL ON ADMISSION STANDARDS FOR NEW FRESHMEN

UW-Green Bay University Committee Resolution to the Faculty Senate

Resolution: Admission standards to UW-Green Bay will be changed from its current criteria based upon applicants' high school class ranking to the following:

Minimum Standards

- The following minimum institutional standards must be met. Students below either of these standards will be denied admission.*
 - 17 high school units of college preparatory or academic coursework.
 - Minimum high school G.P.A. (cumulative) of 2.25 **and** an ACT score of 17.

Regular Admissions

- An index will be created based on the factors noted below; admit highest ranking indices based on established targets.
 - Academic achievement (High school G.P.A., test score)
 - Academic challenge (AP courses, Math level, foreign language)
 - Engagement (extra and co-curricular achievement and leadership)
 - Potential contribution to UW-Green Bay (institutional target groups, interest/motivation)

Priority Admissions

- Students with 17 high school units of college preparatory or academic coursework who are at or above designated academic standards as determined by the Assistant Dean of Enrollment Management will be admitted on a priority basis.**
- The academic standard for priority admission has been initially set as a high school G.P.A. of 3.25 **or** an ACT score of 23.

*Minimum institutional standards may be waived for students who qualify and participate in the E.O.P. program.

**Specific standards for G.P.A. and ACT are subject to change by the Assistant Dean for Enrollment Management based on the applicant pool and enrollment circumstances.

Faculty Senate Discussion Item #1, 2/20/2002

Tenure and Due Process Resolution

BE IT RESOLVED that we, the Faculty Senate of the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay, reaffirms its commitment to the principles and practices of due process in all its functioning and respectfully asks for a similar reaffirmation and commitment to due process from its Chancellor, from the University of Wisconsin President, and from the University of Wisconsin System Board of Regents.

BE IT RESOLVED that we, the Faculty Senate of the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay, object to the Board of Regents' adoption of the Safransky decision as the standard of "just cause" and call upon the Board of Regents to restore the protection of tenure and of due process of faculty members in the University of Wisconsin System.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Regents and President of the University of Wisconsin System, to the Office of the Governor of the State of Wisconsin, and to the members of the Senate and Assembly of the State of Wisconsin.