

AGENDA

UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 7

Wednesday, 27 April 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. 6, MARCH 23, 2005](#) (attached)

3. CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

4. NEW BUSINESS – Presented by Gregory Davis, University Committee Chair

- a. [Resolution on Granting Degrees](#) [attached]
- b. Election of Speaker of the Senate for 2005-06
- c. [Continuation of the Campus Climate Committee](#) [attached]
- d. [Proposal by General Education Council for Natural Science requirements](#) [attached]
- e. Requests for Future Senate Business

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

6. UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE REPORT- Presented by Professor Gregory Davis, Chair

7. OPEN FORUM: Senate Reports

8. ADJOURNMENT

MINUTES 2004-2005

UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 6

Wednesday, March 23, 2005

Phoenix Room C, 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), Sally Dresdow (BUA-UC), Scott Furlong (PEA-UC), Regan Gurung (HUD-UC), Sue Hammersmith (Provost, *ex officio*), Derek Jeffreys (HUS), Timothy Kaufman (ED), 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), Michael Zorn (NAS).

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

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

GUESTS: Lucy Arendt (BUA), Interim Dean Fergus Hughes, Dean Fritz Erickson, Associate Dean Joyce Salisbury, Associate Provost Timothy Sewall, Brian Sutton (HUS), Jane Swan (Academic Advising), Representatives of Student Government: Mitch Bruckert, Jim Brochtrup, Katie Gassenhuber, Andrew Mertig, Adam Ruechel, Joe Smith, Adam Warpinski, Jonathan Virant.

1. Call to Order. With a quorum present, Speaker Dresdow called the Senate to order at 3:02 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes of UW-Green Bay Faculty Senate Meeting No. 5, February 16, 2004.

The minutes were approved without change.

3. Chancellor's Report. Following the Governor's proposed budget cut, we must emphasize need to pursue catch up compensation for Faculty and Staff. On the budget process: After placing information on the web and presenting a plan to the campus community, administration is in the feedback phase. The two greatest areas of concern thus far have been reductions in graduate assistantships and in the Institute for Learning Partnerships where cuts will affect the half-time director's position but not the program. The focus has been on reducing the base budget by the required \$605,000. Cuts have not yet been finalized. The budget is due in Madison on April 15.

Senator Kaye asked whether the University could save money by temporarily increasing the number of full-year sabbaticals offered at 65% of salary. The Chancellor appreciates the suggestion and will consider it, but is not sure it would work since the salary savings are usually used for replacements.

Senator Breznay noted that the Provost's statement at a Senate Budget Committee meeting that cuts wouldn't be made across the board does not seem to have materialized. System Chancellors share the frustration surrounding across-the-board cuts. When legislators say they want to cut administration, they are thinking of System, and yet campuses are forced to cut in areas like graduate assistants and the Institute for Learning Partnerships. The concern is that legislators may not see System getting smaller and will want to cut even more. This concern has been forcefully communicated to the System President.

4. Continuing Business—Presented by Gregory Davis, University Committee Chair.

a. Voting status of *ex officio* members on committees, second reading. Senator Davis noted that the UC modified the proposal as a result of last month's discussion and is providing two possible alternatives for *ex officio* status in the Senate. The first simply clarifies the non-voting status on the Senate of the Provost and the Chancellor. The second would make the Deans, the Provost and the Chancellor non-voting members of the Senate. The proposal concerning other committee membership remains unchanged from the last meeting. Davis asked Ken Fleurant to clarify the history of the first proposal. The Chancellor and Provost used to be voting members of the Senate. Last year the UC interpreted *ex officio* as meaning non-voting unless otherwise stated. As SOFAS, Fleurant expressed his concern to the UC that the University risks losing sight of such interpretations, and he recommended making the changes clear in code itself where they would not get lost. This is especially important in this instance since the common interpretation of *ex officio* (membership with full

privileges by virtue of one's position) is contrary to the UC interpretation. Since there are few places remaining in code where voting status is not yet explicit, this should be an easy bit of housekeeping. He expressed hope that the more controversial alternative (adding the Deans as non-voting members) would not get in the way of making these sensible clarifications. He takes full responsibility for suggesting that the UC add the Deans to the proposal, and believes it an idea that merits discussion. Our campus is part of the original University of Wisconsin (Madison, Milwaukee, Green Bay and Parkside) and the tradition on those four campuses favors reducing the sharp lines of distinction between the interests of faculty and administration. As Parliamentarian, he suggests taking up the second alternative (including the Deans) first. If that fails, the first proposal with the minor clarification of code could be considered.

Senator Gurung moved (with second) to approve the second alternative. Senator Kaye, speaking first to principle, believes the inclusion of Deans on the Senate undermines the autonomy and the integrity of the Senate. In terms of practice, the inclusion of additional administrators reduces the faculty voice. Having four administrative voices when units like his have only one voice is disproportionate and unfair. It is also a waste of expensive time to have administrators on the Senate. The Senate can call them to the table on occasion as required. The Senate should be composed of faculty representing units, deliberating on issues for which faculty have responsibility. Basic Sociology demonstrates that the very presence of Deans can have an impact on Senate deliberations. Senator Breznay recognizes that Deans are often present since Senate meetings are open. However he believes their inclusion in debate would diminish the faculty voice. Senator Jeffreys is also concerned that the inclusion of Deans would reduce faculty autonomy, and that non-tenured senators might hesitate to express themselves if Deans were at the table. Senator Gurung reiterated that the latter concern is rendered moot by the customary presence of the Deans, but suggested that if there is concern about senators not speaking out, that should be a separate subject for a future discussion. In some ways the Deans are more closely involved with issues of importance to the Senate than the Chancellor and Provost. The Chancellor is concerned about suggestions of junior faculty being intimidated, but in his experience they are more intimidated by senior colleagues who control personnel decisions than by Deans, and he agrees with Professor Gurung that it isn't germane to the motion. Collegial governance works best when voices important to the debate can be heard. It is in that spirit that the Cabinet recently extended an invitation for the UC Chair to join in its deliberations. Senator Rosewall is less concerned that adding Deans contributes to intimidation than she is that adding them dilutes the faculty voice. Senator Kaye added that the Senate is, by nature, often a place for argument—civil as it may be—as well as discussion, and junior faculty would not be comfortable arguing with Deans.

Senator Pearson asked whether, as things currently stand, the Deans are excluded from closed meetings. The Parliamentarian responded that, indeed, a closed session would exclude non members, including the Deans. Senator Pearson felt it best to defeat the motion to add the Deans to the Senate so that it would remain possible to exclude them when truly contentious issues arose. The Parliamentarian clarified that State statutes do not allow for closed meetings simply because an issue is contentious. **The vote on the motion failed to carry, 0 in favor, 25 opposed, with 2 abstentions.**

Senator Davis then moved (with second) to add "non-voting" to 52.02 (A) so as to read: A. Ex Officio Members. The Chancellor and Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs shall be ex officio (non-voting) members.

The Senate feeling that there had been sufficient debate on the issue, **voted to approve the motion 23 in favor, 3 opposed, with one abstention.**

Senator Benson moved (with second) acceptance of proposed changes to the description of the Library and Instructional Technology Committee. Hearing no discussion, the Speaker called for a vote. **The motion passed 25 in favor, none opposed, with 2 abstentions.**

Senator Rosewall moved (with second) acceptance of the proposed change in the description of the Honorary Degree Committee. The Speaker explained that System policy reserves membership on honorary degree selection committees for the President of the UW System even if the President is unlikely to participate. The Speaker also clarified in response to a question that the Provost is not on that committee. **The motion passed 23 in favor, none opposed, 3 abstentions,** with one senator momentarily out of the room.

b. General Education Council proposal for changes to the writing emphasis requirement. The policy document returns without modification following last month's meeting. **Senator Baulieu moved acceptance (with second).** Senator Kubsch questioned whether such a proposal would improve writing skills, and she recommended that it be returned to committee for redrafting. Whether WA (writing advanced) or WD (writing development) courses, what is expected (more than just a written word count) needs to be spelled out. Student Representative Abhold urged faculty to come up with a better proposal, and Senators Bartell and Benson, while recognizing the need to improve writing courses, spoke against the proposal under consideration. **The motion failed 0 in favor, 26 opposed with one abstention.**

Senator Kaye and Baulieu suggested we do what we can to prevent this vote from being misconstrued as satisfaction with the writing requirement currently in place.

5. New Business

a. Requests for Future Senate Business. Senator Baulieu asked the UC to consider whether diplomas ought to indicate the student's major.

6. Provost's Report. Provost Hammersmith distributed a written report at the meeting (attached). The bulk of the report addresses the Governor's budget proposal. Comments are welcome in person or via e-mail. The Provost also called attention to several nice bits of faculty news to look for in her report regarding Professors Ganyard, Christensen and Hutchinson.

7. University Committee Report. UC Chair Davis reported on four major topics of recent discussion: 1. The course schedule proposal of the Campus Climate Committee has occupied much of their time. The UC has expressed a number of concerns about the model (viability, alternate schedules, how the university hours would actually be used, whether a schedule change is needed to accomplish the goals). The Senate charge to the Climate Committee will expire soon, so the Senate will need to take up the continuation of the CCC, its charge and membership, at the next Senate meeting.

2. Considerable discussion of General Education (including writing emphasis).

3. Faculty development. Although this was initially given high priority, the UC has not made the progress on the topic it had hoped to make. Recent discussions centered on enhancing sabbaticals, encouraging applications.

4. The UC is close to presenting a draft of a campus curriculum approval processes.

Senator Kaye inquired about the status of the CCC schedule change proposal. Chair Davis said there is presently no formal motion to bring to the Senate. The UC awaits CCC responses to its questions. Speaker Dresdow noted that there is no question on the UC about the value of a common meeting time, only about the best format for one.

8. Open Forum: Joint discussion of mutual interests with Student Senate and the Academic Staff Committee. With apologies of the scribe who was unable to digest the names of student senators as they introduced themselves, names of all discussants will, in the interests of simplicity, be generic. The discussion was fast paced with many brief comments which will be collapsed and collated to provide a sense of the conversation rather than a running account.

Topic: Writing emphasis.

Students: There is little debate about the need for writing practice in more courses, but there is confusion about why certain courses are WE while others, sometimes with even more writing required, are not. Some students would be more motivated writing in their areas of interest.

Faculty: Is it enough to have writing assignments or is faculty feedback important to students?

Students: For the exceptional, highly motivated student, significant practice may be enough. However, most students expect feedback and feel that the failure to provide it indicates a lack of respect for their efforts.

Faculty: Many teachers do provide feedback whether or not their class is labeled WE. Perhaps we need to ask whether the WE program has actually changed practice, even to the point of asking whether dropping the WE label would make any pedagogical difference.

Students: WE strikes some students as a continuation of high school.

Faculty: Is there a point at which students no longer feel that way?

Students: When they take the first small class which requires them to think and express their ideas.

Faculty: In addition to the higher level of college material, there should be less hand holding. However, some faculty expect less from students than they used to, and school is not as hard as it used to be.

Students: Research shows that the Millennial Generation now reaching college age needs and expects some hand holding and requires more guidance and direction. Others disagree and feel students want to take only courses that interest them.

The topic at this point has broadened to include all general education

Faculty: The chief enemy of educators is provincialism, which is precisely why they need to stand in the way of students desires to just take what they think they are interested in. At the same time we need to recognize that, because of the exigencies of the world they are about to join, students feel forced to study what they are already good at in order to succeed and get a job. That is not the ideal of liberal education that faculty support. Abandoning a centralized GE and WE model could mean abandoning our commitment to liberal education and to writing.

Students: One complaint about our GE program is the difficulty getting the courses needed to graduate. Taking a required arts course, for example, means waiting until all art majors and minors have had a chance to enroll.

Faculty: Ready access to GE and WE courses is essential. Ways have to be found to reduce course congestion in GE courses (online courses?). Higher course enrollment is one way of coping with the problem. What do students think of large classes?

Topic: large vs. small classes in general

Students: There appeared to be two common threads: small classes are very important since they are the best motivators to pursue further study and they are where mentoring relationships develop. One student has even noticed that the teaching style of a teacher changed from a large class to a small one. This made him realize how much he missed in large sections. Students feel less intimidated in small classes in which everyone is more likely to participate and there are fewer absences.

Faculty: At what point does class size change the nature of the course.

Students: Whether a class is 150 or 250, there is no difference. But when a small class gets above 35 there is a noticeable difference. An important point has been reached when the teacher can no longer interact with students and grade on an individual basis, when teachers can't be expected to remember student names (a number that varied between 35 and 60). Class size becomes important to students when they realize that classes with better

personal interaction with teachers lead to better grades. What the ideal number might be is hard to say, but the difference between 35 and 65 is like night and day.

Faculty: A large class of high quality lectures can be better than a small class of chit-chat. Good students find the good teachers whether in large or small classes.

Students: And yet interaction is important since education is more than absorbing facts. One student said it was a small class that helped her become a more confident student, an advantage that carried over into her large classes.

Faculty: Students need to learn from faculty not their peers. Perhaps a mix of class types is needed.

A Senator who is at the end of his term encouraged the Senate to continue this kind of valuable dialogue with students on a regular basis.

9. Adjournment. The mandatory adjournment hour having been reached without motion to extend, the meeting automatically ended at 5:00 p.m..

Respectfully submitted,

Kenneth Fleurant, Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

Faculty Senate Document #04-06, Approved 3/23/05

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, 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, 23 March 2005

2. The Library and Instructional Technology Committee is advisory to the **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 **Associate Provost for Information Services and the Director of the Cofrin Library** 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

UWGB Faculty Senate Amended 23 March 2006

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 New Business (4a), 4/27/05

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 2005 Commencement.

Faculty Senate New Business(4c), 4/27/05

Campus Climate Committee

Year-End Report – April, 2005

Introduction

During the Spring, 2004 semester, the Campus Climate Committee (CCC) was proposed by the University Committee to the Faculty Senate to help improve the climate for all employees at UW-Green Bay. The original charge to the committee was to

- a. consider the various mechanisms for improving climate, as well as assisting individuals;
- b. pilot those that are feasible over a year's time;
- c. evaluate the results;

d. and report back to the Senate."

Once it was approved by the Committee on Committees and Nominations, the University Committee appointed Lucy Arendt, Lecturer, Business Administration; Anne Buttke, Director, University Union; William Laatsch, Professor, Urban and Regional Studies; Illene Noppe, Professor, Human Development; Robert Skorczewski, Coordinator, Credit Outreach and Director of the Downtown Learning Center; and Georjeanna Wilson-Doenges, Associate Professor, Urban and Regional Studies to the CCC. Grant Winslow, Program Coordinator of Student Life took over Anne Buttke's position subsequent to her retirement in October, 2004. Illene Noppe was elected Chair during the first meeting on May 21, 2004.

1. We agreed that the Campus Climate Committee should include a representative from Classified and Unrepresented staff. Mary Ann Rose, Program Assistant, Counseling and Health Center, graciously agreed to attend our meetings as a guest. The University Committee approved the change in Campus Climate Committee membership on September 9, 2004.
2. The members of the Campus Climate Committee were unanimous in their desire to focus on actionable changes during our year of tenure. We committed our focus on realistic change that will hopefully make a contribution to a positive campus climate.
3. Our committee decided to adhere to the principle of inclusivity. Thus, we agreed that a positive campus climate that engenders good morale is feasible only if the entire campus community (i.e., students, faculty, classified staff, nonclassified staff, and administration) is involved.
4. The Campus Climate Committee was created as a *carte blanche*; it quickly became apparent to us that across the campus, people had different ideas as to what a Campus Climate Committee does and what it could accomplish in a year's time. Given the open nature of the task, members of the Campus Climate Committee decided that our focus would be toward promoting an environment that made UW-Green Bay a place where people felt empowered, appreciated, and contributing meaningfully to the common goal of educating our students. We therefore began our meetings by delimiting the essential elements of a positive campus climate. The CCC identified the six key elements as:
 - Respect
 - Communication
 - Shared Experiences and Values
 - Support
 - Trust
 - Recognition

The CCC also specified that its unit of analysis would be campus wide, rather than dyadic or at the department level. Thus, in its year of existence, the CCC determined that it would not focus upon mechanisms of grievance resolution, but rather be involved in identifying and promoting a positive relationship environment for all members of the campus community. In the spirit of open communication, we also posted all information stemming from this committee on the SOFAS web site. The mission of the CCC was therefore identified as:

Promote a positive relationship environment through a mutually shared vision, where people in the UW-Green Bay campus community can develop both professionally and personally, feel like they have a valued role in the functioning of the University, respect the roles of their colleagues, and feel recognized for their actions.

5. At each meeting, one of the elements of a positive campus climate has been discussed. The discussions involved identification of what are the needs, what presently is lacking on our campus, and what could be done to improve the specific target issue. Out of these deliberations, members of the Campus Climate Committee felt that the following issues were of immediate concern:

- Campus climate has been affected by the entrenchment of a number of "fiefdoms" whereby paths of communication are obstructed. We believe that the creation of an All-University Congress could be a starting point for representation of all campus groups to discuss issues in an open format.
- We have discussed with Chancellor Shepard and Provost Hammersmith the need for a designated on-campus alternate to Ombudsperson Melissa Jackson when the Ombudsperson is unavailable because of her prior involvement in her capacity as University Counsel. Dan Spielmann had been designated as fulfilling this position, but more faculty and staff need to be informed about the channels that are available to them should they need advocacy.
- A mature organization loses some of its shared vision if shared experiences are not accessible. Everyone on campus is woefully lacking in shared time to attend many of the wonderful on-campus activities. We need more opportunities to develop and engage in meaningful, productive shared experiences. The Campus Climate Committee thus determined that in addition to an analysis of campus climate issues, we would try to move forward a proposal that would create All-University Hours for campus meetings and events.

Course Scheduling Proposal

Beginning in November, we began working on a proposal to modify course scheduling so as to free up two hours per week for common meeting times. We learned that this is practiced on many different campuses throughout the United States. We found a scheduling model, adopted by Syracuse University, that would create these hours, while simultaneously shortening the semester's length and altering class meeting times. We have generated several ideas for how the University Hours might be used, and the benefits that could be derived from shared meeting times. We have enlisted the help of Mike Herrity, Registrar, in creating several simulations that map our current schedule onto the Syracuse model. For some, it has not been obvious how this proposal can affect campus climate, but we remain committed to the idea that freeing up times in schedules and arranging for common times for the entire campus to meet would open the door to possible climate change. We hope to forward the final version of this proposal, along with Mike Herrity's analysis, to the UC yet this semester.

Evaluation of the Campus Climate Committee

We have learned a number of very valuable lessons during this past year of intensive work. We are largely all-inclusive, with the exception of student representation, and each of us learned much about what life on campus is like for our fellow colleagues who have job descriptions vastly different from our own. We have learned how important shared visions and common experiences are to promoting collegiality on campus. We have been an active group. From the beginning, we decided that despite the one year limitation for our work, we would do more than just present an analysis of campus climate problems and potential ways to fix these. Thus, we have tried to effect some change this year with our course scheduling proposal. It was through this process that we, as a group, came to realize that a significant contributor to low morale and frustration on campus emerges from an inability for members of the campus community to effect change on an institutional level. Many creative initiatives are supported at the individual level, but systemic problems at the Institutional level more often than not lead to creative and innovative ideas withering away. We all recognize that budgetary problems do not help, but the failing for movement forward also comes from a campus leadership that has confusing reporting lines and appears reluctant to publicly attach its support to specific ideas emerging from campus governance groups. Although we acknowledge that campus leadership has been willing to meet with campus groups to discuss issues and promote better communication, there also is a need for a top-down approach that can support the bottom-up approach that it so broadly applauds, particularly for ideas that are not universally popular. In addition, we find that our colleagues – faculty and staff – seem unwilling to take risks and experiment with courses, programs, and academic initiatives, losing sight of the greater good of the evolution of the University. Thus, it may be the CCC – as presently charged by the Faculty Senate and UC – may experience significant difficulties in improving our campus climate if the underlying resistance from administration and faculty governance groups towards change is not addressed. The current members of the Campus Climate Committee remain interested in moving the course scheduling proposal forward, and would be happy to continue working with the University Committee (and Senate). It is our recommendation that should the Campus Climate Committee be continued, its focus first must be on identifying the obstacles for change on campus, the means to remove the obstacles, methods for

negotiating change, and processes for clarifying reporting and communication lines between and among administration and governance so that initiatives and ideas are facilitated, and not stymied. In addition, representation on any CCC should be inclusive, reflecting the committee's primary emphasis on creating an inclusive campus climate, and thereby consist of faculty, academic staff, classified staff, and student representatives.

Faculty Senate New Business(4d), 4/27/05

PROPOSED

Natural Sciences Requirement: 10-12 credits

All students must take an HB-1 course and an NPS-1 course.

If a student takes a lab course (BIOLOGY 202 or NPS-1 w/lab), the NS Requirement is fulfilled by taking one course from the HB-1 category, one from the NPS-1 category, and one from either the HB-2 or NPS-2 category (10-12 credits total).

If a student does not take a lab course, the NS Requirement is fulfilled by taking one course from each of the four categories (12 credits total).

Human Biology

HB-1

- * BIOLOGY 202 Principles of Biology I w/lab (4 cr)
- * HUM BIOL 102 Introduction to Human Biology

HB-2

- * ANTHRO/ HUM BIOL 364 Human Variability
- * HUM BIOL 205 Biotechnology and Human Values
- * HUM BIOL 206 Fertility, Reproduction and Family Planning
- * HUM BIOL 217 Human Disease and Society
- * HUM BIOL 310 Human Genetics
- * HUM BIOL 331 Science and Religion: Spirit of Inquiry
- * NUT SCI 242 Food and Nutritional Health
- * NUT SCI 250 World Food and Population Issues
- * NUT SCI 300 Human Nutrition
- * NUT SCI 302 Nutrition and Culture

Natural and Physical Sciences

NPS-1

- * CHEM 108 General Chemistry w/lab (5 cr)
- * CHEM 211 Principles of Chemistry I w/lab (5 cr)
- * EARTH SC 102 Introduction to Earth Science
- * EARTH SC 202 Physical Geology w/lab (4 cr)
- * EARTH SC/ GEOG 222 Ocean of Air: Weather and Climate
- * PHYSICS 103 Fundamentals of Physics I w/lab (5 cr)
- * PHYSICS 180 Concepts of Physics (754-181 Lab 1 cr.)
- * PHYSICS 201 Principles of Physics I w/lab (5 cr)
- * ENV SCI 102 Introduction to Environmental Science
- * ENV SCI/ PHYSICS 141 Astronomy
- * ENV SCI 142 Exploration of the Universe

NPS-2

- * ENV SCI 188 Issues in Biological Conservation
- * ENV SCI 260 Energy and Society
- * ENV SCI 303 Conservation of Natural Resources
- * ENV SCI 390 Emergence of Western Technology
- * ENV SCI 460 Resource Management Strategy
- * ENV SCI 468 Ecological Applications
- * ENV SCI 469 Conservation Biology Faculty Senate New Business(4d)
- * I COM SC 201 Information, Computers, and Society 27 April 2005

CURRENT**Natural Sciences Requirement: 10-12 credits**

Complete a minimum of one course from each of the following three lists of courses. Students who do not wish to complete a laboratory science course must complete four courses (12 credits). The fourth course may be selected from either the ES1 or NS2 list.

HB1 – Human Biology Introduction

- * BIOLOGY 202 Principles of Biology I w/lab (4 cr)

- * HUM BIOL 102 Introduction to Human Biology

ES1 – Environmental Science Introduction

- * CHEM 108 General Chemistry w/lab (5 cr)
- * CHEM 211 Principles of Chemistry I w/lab (5 cr)
- * EARTH SC 102 Introduction to Earth Science
- * EARTH SC 202 Physical Geology w/lab (4 cr)
- * EARTH SC/ GEOG 222 Ocean of Air: Weather and Climate
- * ENV SCI 102 Introduction to Environmental Science
- * ENV SCI/ PHYSICS 141 Astronomy
- * PHYSICS 103 Fundamentals of Physics I w/lab (5 cr)
- * PHYSICS 180 Concepts of Physics (754-181 Lab 1 cr.)
- * PHYSICS 201 Principles of Physics I w/lab (5 cr)

NS2 – Natural Science Issues

- * ANTHRO/ HUM BIOL 364 Human Variability
- * ENV SCI 142 Exploration of the Universe
- * ENV SCI 188 Issues in Biological Conservation
- * ENV SCI 260 Energy and Society
- * ENV SCI 303 Conservation of Natural Resources
- * ENV SCI 390 Emergence of Western Technology
- * ENV SCI 460 Resource Management Strategy
- * ENV SCI 468 Ecological Applications
- * ENV SCI 469 Conservation Biology
- * HUM BIOL 205 Biotechnology and Human Values
- * HUM BIOL 206 Fertility, Reproduction and Family Planning
- * HUM BIOL 217 Human Disease and Society
- * HUM BIOL 310 Human Genetics
- * HUM BIOL 331 Science and Religion: Spirit of Inquiry
- * NUT SCI 242 Food and Nutritional Health

- * NUT SCI 250 World Food and Population Issues
 - * NUT SCI 300 Human Nutrition
 - * NUT SCI 302 Nutrition and Culture
 - * I COM SC 201 Information, Computers, and Society
-

Report to the Faculty Senate

April 27, 2005

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

University of Wisconsin-Green Bay

I. ACADEMIC AFFAIRS BUDGET UPDATE

The budget reductions presented by Chancellor Shepard at our open forum in March will all be carried out with two exceptions. These exceptions are intended to ease the transitions required by our budget reductions. They are made possible by the use of one-time funds:

- Graduate assistantships will not be reduced in 2005-06.
- The Institute of Learning Partnership is very important to our ongoing partnership with the K-12 system in CESA 7 and CESA 8. The Institute leadership and Board of Directors are working on strategies to generate funds and cost-recovery mechanisms sufficient to cover their reduction in general fund support in the next biennium. According to these plans, the Director's position will continue but will, over the next biennium, transition over to non-general fund support. One-time funds will be used during 2006-07 and 2007-08 to offset some of the reduction in base budget support, in order to give the Institute time to transition to more of a cost-recovery model, designed to generate revenues to sustain the Institute and even, we hope, to expand its operation in the future.

II. LOSS OF FEDERAL GRANT

Recently we were informed that federal grant funding for UWGB's Student Support Services/Academic Opportunity Program will not be renewed. After thirty years of grant funding, and being cited three years ago as an exemplary program nationally, this non-renewal was both a surprise and a disappointment. Six UWGB employees have been supported by this grant, which helps us serve students who have potential for success but who would otherwise not qualify for admission to the University. Many of these students are economically disadvantaged, first-generation college students.

Student Services is in the process of developing a contingency plan to assist us in serving those students who have already been admitted to this program for next year. Meanwhile, we will be appealing the non-renewal. It is expected that some institutions' funding will be restored, but we won't know if we are one of those until summer.

III. ACADEMIC AFFAIRS PLANNING COMMITTEE UPDATE

The Academic Affairs Planning Committee (AAPC) has identified five major goals, as well as objectives and performance indicators, that will guide our planning and budgeting in the year ahead. These will be circulated campuswide for discussion and feedback before the semester ends. AAPC discussions and priorities also guided the Academic Affairs area in planning for budget reductions in the next biennium. A more detailed "Update" will be distributed at the Senate meeting.

IV. FACULTY NEWS

Meir Russ, Assistant Professor in Business Administration, and Kassie Van Remortel, Program Manager for Outreach and Extension, were recently informed that their “Regional Economic Development Indicators: Partnership for Northeastern Wisconsin” project has been funded. Meir and Kassie were the key players in securing this funding for the upcoming year. Jan Thornton stated *“this is the best of Outreach – connecting UWGB’s faculty expertise with needs of our region – in this case to the economic vitality of Northeastern Wisconsin.”*

Scott Ashmann, Assistant Professor of Education, recently presented a paper entitled, “Hands-On Science: A Case Study of the Einstein Project in Wisconsin” at the National Association for Research in Science Teaching annual conference in Dallas, Texas.

Ellen Rosewall, Assistant Professor of Communication and the Arts (Arts Management), recently toured Michigan giving workshops in audience development for the arts as a part of the Michigan Assembly for Community Arts Agencies’ Masterminds Series.

Ismail Shariff, Hendricks Professor for Business and Professor Urban and Regional Studies, has published a chapter titled “Growing Economic Integration Prospects, Problems, and the Impact of Globalization” in [Globalization and World Economic Policies](#), edited by professor Clem Tisdell, School of Economics, the University of Queensland Brisbane, Australia.

Kim Neilsen, Associate Professor for Social Change and Development – Women’s Studies, has won an Organization of American Historians (OAH)-Japanese Association of American Studies short-term residency and will spend two weeks based at Japan Women’s University. She will lecture on various topics in U.S. history at six different universities located in three cities —Tokyo, Kyoto, and Hiroshima — during her two-week stay which begins May 21.

Denise Bartell, Assistant Professor of Human Development, Kristin Vespia, Assistant Professor of Human Development, Angeles Rodriguez, Assistant Professor of Humanistic Studies, Asmamaw Yimer, Assistant Professor of Education, and Lisa Poupart, Associate Professor of Humanistic Studies, won spring semester Teaching Enhancement Grants given by the University’s Instructional Development Council. The grants support activities that enhance a faculty member’s teaching skills or result in innovative teaching strategies.

Please join me in congratulating your colleagues. Accomplishments and honors such as these reflect well not only on the recipients but also upon their colleagues who provided the kind of environment and support that encouraged such achievement.

If others have received special recognition not mentioned here, please let me know.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue H.

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