

AGENDA**UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 8**

Wednesday, 16 April 2003, 3:00 p.m.

NIAGARA ROOMS AB, 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. 7, March 12, 2003](#) (attached)

CHANCELLOR'S REPORT**ACTION ITEM**

1. [Resolution on the Granting of Degrees](#) (attached)

DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. [Proposal for an Extended Degree Faculty](#) (attached) Presented by Professor John Lyon
2. [Faculty Pay Package](#) (attached) Presented by Professor John Lyon

INFORMATION ITEMS

1. [Report of the Provost](#) Presented by Provost Sue K. Hammersmith
2. [Strategic Budgeting and Budget-Building Committee \(SBBBC\)](#) Presented by Professor John Lyon
3. [University Committee Report](#) Presented by Professor John Lyon, Chair

NEW BUSINESS**ADJOURNMENT**

MINUTES 2002-2003**UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 7**

Wednesday, March 12, 2003

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

Kevin Fermanich

Scott Furlong

Sue Hammersmith

Craig Hanke

Aeron Haynie

Michael Hencheck

Curt Heuer

Ray Hutchison

Andrew Kersten

Anne Kok

Sylvia Kubsch

Richard Logan

Dennis Lorenz

John Lyon

John Mariano

James Marker

E. Nicole Meyer

Robert Nagy

Illene Noppe

Gilbert Null

Jennifer Popiel

Joyce Salisbury

W. Bruce Shepard

Linda Tabers-Kwak

Patricia Terry

NOT PRESENT: James Coates, and William Lepley

REPRESENTATIVES: Michael Knaus, Student Government Association, and Michael Schmitt, Academic Staff Committee

GUESTS: Dean Carol Blackshire-Belay, Interim Dean Jane Muhl, Interim Associate Dean Lloyd Noppe, Associate Provost Timothy Sewall, Assistant Chancellor Dean Rodeheaver, Director of the Extended Degree Program Dorothy Stepien, and Professor Karl Zehms

AUTOMATIC CONSENT

1. Approval of Minutes of UW-Green Bay Faculty Senate Meeting No. 6, February 19, 2003

The minutes were approved without change.

CHANCELLOR'S REMARKS

First, some good news. We will soon sign an agreement with St. Norbert College for an International Visiting Scholars Program. This collaboration will build on the Asian Scholars Program in which Professor Jack Day has played a leading role. The women's basketball program is on everyone's mind. It's not just a matter of winning games. Of the other universities among the top 25 teams nationally the average enrollment is 25,500, ours is 5,400, the average budget is \$890 million, ours is \$72 million. We are the only non-doctoral institution. This is an important message that he delivers in the community. We compete with the very best and not just in basketball, but also in the quality of our faculty and our students. Our freshman class has a higher high school GPA than St. Norbert's. The community needs to have this pointed out. We ourselves are sometimes not aware of how good we are. The Laboratory Sciences remodeling/expansion is on schedule. The university's capital campaign is still in its "silent" phase, but the response to it has been great.

And then there is the budget. The Chancellor had already brought the campus up to date in an e-mail, but he wanted to discuss the reduction planning process that is underway. Governance organizations will participate in the hearings, and the Strategic Budgeting Committee will play a key role. This is a difficult exercise. He is anxious to dispel the rumors that arise in these circumstances. One he had heard suggested that we might move to an eight-course teaching load. No. This would be "politically stupid," indeed "idiotic." We need to protect quality as a first commitment. Don't hesitate to ask him about such rumors.

Senator Kersten asked if President Lyall's recent remarks on public radio about a priority for access meant that quality was, perhaps, not the UW System's first commitment. The Chancellor responded that President Lyall recognizes the quality issue. She has been raising the issue of excessive reliance on adjunct instructors. She believes and has insisted in her public statements that university quality pays off for the state. The Governor spoke in Kaukauna the previous night and made a similar point, that Wisconsin is distinguished from the rest of the county by the quality of its university system. The legislature, however, cares only about access and tuition, and Lyall may well have been thinking of their concerns. Last year's suspension of admissions caused a strong

reaction in the legislature. Lyall and Regent President Guy Gottshalk will be at UWGB to hear testimony about the impact of budget cuts.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Strategic Budgeting at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay.

Presented by Professor John Lyon who referred to Senator Kersten's presentation at the previous Senate meeting and emphasized that we are in the midst of a budget-making process and that creating the Strategic Budgeting Committee is a way for the faculty to be involved in that process. Without it faculty governance will not be included. The University Committee and the Senate Planning and Budget Committee endorse the proposal. If the discussion indicates a favorable opinion in the Senate, the University Committee will seek immediate action. Lyon would serve as faculty representative on the Strategic Budgeting Committee this spring. There would be an election later this spring for a faculty member to serve for a full three-year term. This person would report to the Senate and University Committee and would serve on the Senate Budget and Planning Committee but would not be a member of the University Committee.

Senator Null said there were suspicions that a single faculty member with this much influence over the budget might privilege his or her program and areas of interest. Could there not be domain representatives? Senator Salisbury replied that the University Committee had discussed this and rejected the principle of representation. A single representative should take an all-university perspective and, in any event, would be accountable to the University Committee and the Senate. Domain representation would encourage parochial viewpoints. Speaker Noppe pointed out that the University Committee would nominate two candidates in part on the basis of their capacity to take an all-university perspective. Chancellor Shepard said that Null's concerns were important, but that the Strategic Budgeting Committee simply wouldn't work if it becomes an arena for competing special interests.

The contemplated budget process would have input at the unit and program level according to Senator Kersten. It would work its way up to the all-university decision-making level. Moreover, in entrusting faculty leadership in a University Committee we already expect an all-university perspective in faculty governance. Senator Kok thought that was not a good analogy because the University Committee is a faculty body and consists of domain representatives, and the Strategic Budgeting Committee isn't and doesn't. Null added that the faculty representative would have too large a role. It isn't plausible that we could find a platonic leader. We will end up with a czar. The Chancellor and Provost can have an all-university perspective. No faculty member is in their situation. This is not merely a matter of perception. Senator Abbott stated that the Strategic Budgeting Committee is not a decision-making body. Rather it makes recommendations and makes the budget-building process an open one. It promotes communication. Salisbury supported the proposed committee, saying that the faculty had not been at the budget table before and that now it would be. Senator Logan added his support, and Senator Popiel agreed that a single faculty representative made the most sense. It's a step forward.

Provost Hammersmith noted that the charge to the Strategic Budgeting Committee was left vague in places, including the process for consulting with faculty governance bodies. This first year for the committee requires a quick response, but the basis would be laid for more extensive governance involvement. Lyon said that the role of the faculty representative is really "honorary" and not controlling. The committee will not be a place for an advocate. It does not build budgets. It fosters communication, gives advice, makes comments. It does not control the process. Kersten thought the proposal brings real and important change. It's something to be tested. It's worth a shot. Null agreed that the faculty representative's role was not advocacy, but there is no safeguard against usurping such a position. Michael Knaus noted that the Student Government Association President is called on to speak for 5,500 students, a much larger number than a faculty representative would stand for. Moreover, as chair of the Strategic Budgeting Committee, the representative's role would be defined as presider more than participant.

Senator Popiel wanted to know, if not this proposal, what? Null replied that a larger committee with more faculty members would be better. Kok shares some of the concerns expressed but supported the proposal as a first step. Senator Marker thought that if the faculty representative served on the Senate Budget and Planning Committee that would be a sufficient safeguard.

Senator Salisbury moved to suspend the rules to change the proposal from a discussion item to an **ACTION ITEM**. The motion was seconded and adopted by a vote of 20 in favor and 5 opposed. She then moved adoption of the Strategic Planning Committee proposal as a pilot through the 2003-04 academic year. Discussion on the motion ensued.

Senator Logan said it would be impractical to increase faculty representation. Senator Kersten

thought that if members of the committee were seen as representing constituencies, then academic staff, students, classified employees and others could seek membership or increased membership. The proposal should be adopted as written. Senator Baulieu asked for clarification of the motion as a pilot project. Without objection, Salisbury's motion was amended to include reference to the Strategic Budgeting Committee as a pilot. Senator Furlong wondered how much we would learn in just one year. The Chancellor said that there are only interim solutions. Feedback from this new process will yield needed modifications.

The vote was called and the motion adopted by a vote of 25 in favor, none opposed, with one abstention.

INFORMATION ITEMS

1. Proposal for an Extended Degree Faculty Executive Committee

Presented by Professor John Lyon. The Academic Affairs Council initiated this discussion but has not yet reviewed the proposal. All other academic programs have faculty supervision. The Extended Degree program has a budget and is interdisciplinary in character, but it has no faculty lines. The draft proposal brought before the Senate has been reviewed by program Director Dottie Stepien and by the program Advisory Committee. Some changes in the draft will be made based on those reviews.

No code change is required. The proposal is a recommendation to the Provost. The Extended Degree executive committee will be modeled on the duties of the executive committees of the disciplines. It will not be responsible for budget matters, as faculty on the committee will also be members of other budgetary units. It will make recommendations on academic program issues and promotion and tenure reviews, and it will oversee the mission of the program. Its membership will be the tenured faculty who are assigned to the program in their letters of appointment, subject to their right to decline membership, and subject to the committee's nomination of additional members and approval of them by the Dean. The chair will be chosen by the committee. The Director's relationship to the program is unspecified. The committee will play a role in determining this. Extended Degree courses are also offered by other programs. This has become more common than was originally the case. The proposal Senate intends that the other academic programs continue their course ownership and supervision. The proposal seeks to extend faculty control over a degree-granting academic program. No such control now exists.

Senator Null asked why faculty membership on the committee is voluntary. Lyon replied that the discipline model is followed. Faculty do not have to belong to a discipline. The Provost wanted to know about the committee's role in curricular matters. While it is clear that, e.g., humanities courses still belong to the humanities faculty, what if in the future new courses without such obvious homes are created by the Extended Degree program in response to emerging student needs? Lyon said that the new committee would review curricular matters in this case with the usual referral to the Academic Affairs Council for approvals.

Senator Hutchison said the real issue is making Extended Degree courses available for credit to all students, including those enrolled in on-campus programs. The Academic Affairs Council was concerned about this

dissolution of the boundaries between Extended Degree and the other programs. Would creating an executive committee make this prospect more likely? Lyon declined to get involved in such a debate. The issue for him is providing faculty oversight for an existing, interdisciplinary degree-granting program. This is the only academic program without faculty supervision. Why not establish it? Senator Marker asked if personnel reviews would be required for all faculty who have taught in the program during the review period. Yes, said Lyon, the code provides for personnel recommendations from all programs in which a faculty member participates. What about program quality? who is responsible, Senator Heuer wanted to know. The executive committee, said Lyon. Senator Salisbury asked, why is there no committee? This is a faculty role, a faculty responsibility. The proposal simply corrects a past oversight.

Senator Null suggested language changes in the proposal. Lyon welcomed the suggestions and invited others.

2. Report of the Provost

Provost Hammersmith had already distributed a written report. She had received several questions. In particular, what is the extent of the budget reduction we are facing, and which positions will be cut because of it? UW System specified a number of positions to be reduced, based on current position authorizations. These can be vacant positions, administrative, faculty, academic staff, or classified positions. Using vacant positions to meet our reduction target is best when it makes functional sense. We will take a one-time \$356,000 cut in the coming fiscal year. The base budget reduction will be about \$1 million per year in the biennium. This is based on a 5 percent reduction exercise, but this will not be done on an across-the-board basis. We need to address some unfunded liabilities that had been funded with one-time money and some internal reallocations are necessary. The actual reduction may be closer to 3.5 percent. She invited additional questions, including by e-mail.

Senator Salisbury asked about position cuts. Will instruction be protected? She has heard that Liberal Arts and Sciences will lose six positions, which would likely impact instruction. Chancellor Shepard stated that no decisions have been made. The budget reduction exercise will lead to further hearings involving the new Strategic Budgeting Committee. We do need to identify 16.2 FTE positions (GPR funded) for elimination. We cannot protect instruction this year as we did last. In response to a question from Senator Heuer, the Provost said that 12.3 FTE positions will come from her area (i.e., excluding Business, Advancement, Athletics, the Chancellor's office). About 75 percent of all positions are in the Provost's area, the Chancellor noted. Why, Senator Hutchison asked, have we allocated the position cuts so specifically, especially given the course sections that Liberal Arts and Sciences would lose (35-40 by his estimate) in this exercise? The Provost shared his concern about losses in instruction. But a proposal is needed in order for the discussion to start.

Senator Popiel recalled that early in his tenure the Chancellor had said that our budget was top-heavy toward management compared to other campuses. The budget exercise doesn't seem to recognize this problem. The Chancellor said that had been the case, but last year's cut protected instruction 100 percent at the expense of Business and Finance, Student Affairs, Information Services, and his office (which took the biggest percentage cut). This has brought the budget for instruction back into line compared with other UW System comprehensive institutions. There is no fat in any area.

Senator Abbott asked the Provost about the candidates for Dean of Professional Studies and Outreach. Why are all credentialed in Education? Was this significant? No, she said. This was a throw of the dice. There was no design in this. The Provost spoke also about the Campus Diversity Plan Report to UW System Administration which she distributed to the Senate. She will limit distribution of such reports unless faculty leaders request wider distribution. She also addressed the earlier comment made by Senator Kersten about President Lyall's remarks on public radio. The President is emphasizing four points regarding budget reduction: trim administration; increase tuition; consolidate programs; and decrease access. The last is a last resort.

Senator Furlong reminded the Senate of the legislative budget hearing on campus last spring when the chair of the hearing committee asked why the universities were so passive. Why don't we speak up? UW System just rolls over. What can we do? The Chancellor said that faculties have a common weakness: we believe that legislators respond to facts and reason. In truth, they respond to public opinion, money, and pressure. In Oregon the faculty organized themselves politically. They raised money and hired a lobbyist. We need to talk about this.

Senator Hutchison thought that the local press had shown little awareness of our problems. We need to get the media here, the Chancellor said. Senator Popiel thought that diversity and other goals can't be met if the budget is cut. Connect the budget with our goals to get the media's attention.

3. University Committee Report

Presented by Professor John Lyon. He said the next business for the University Committee would be to search for a new Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff. The call will go out shortly.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no new business, the meeting adjourned at 4:43 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jerrold Rodesch,

Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

Faculty Senate Action Item #1, 4/16/03

RECOMMENDATION ON THE GRANTING OF DEGREES

(Implemented as a Faculty Senate Document #89-6, March 21, 1990--action to be taken in advance of each commencement exercise and in the following language--dated as appropriate):

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate of the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay, on behalf of the Faculty, recommends to the Chancellor and the Vice Chancellor of the University that the students certified by the Registrar of the University as having completed the requirements of their respective programs be granted their degrees at the spring 2003 Commencement.

Faculty Senate Discussion Item #1, 4/16/03

FACULTY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FOR THE EXTENDED DEGREE PROGRAM

WHEREAS, according to Chapter 36.09 (4) of the State of Wisconsin Statutes, the "faculty shall have the primary responsibility for academic and educational activities and faculty personnel matter;"

AND WHEREAS, the Extended Degree Program has no direct faculty oversight of its curriculum and personnel;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of the University Wisconsin Green Bay endorses the formation of a Faculty Executive Committee for the Extended Degree Program.

Faculty Senate Discussion Item #2, 4/16/03

2003-05

PAY PLAN RESOLUTION

Resolution:

The University Committee, in accordance with the University of Wisconsin Board of Regents guidelines, recommends to the Faculty Senate that Pay Plan dollars not distributed by the required 1/3 merit-market and 1/3 solid performance formulas be allocated according to unit merit judgments.