

AGENDA**UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 9**

Wednesday, 14 May 2003, 3:00 p.m.

PHOENIX ROOM C, University Union

Presiding Officer: Illene Noppe, Speaker

Parliamentarian: Professor Jerrold C. Rodesch

AUTOMATIC CONSENT

1. [Approval of minutes of UW-Green Bay Faculty Senate Meeting No. 8, April 16, 2003](#) (attached)

CHANCELLOR'S REPORT**ACTION ITEMS**

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

DISCUSSION ITEM

1. [Strategic Budgeting and Budget-Building Committee \(SBBBC\)](#). Presented by Professor John Lyon

INFORMATION ITEMS

1. [Report of the Provost](#). Presented by Provost Sue K. Hammersmith
2. [University Committee Report](#). Presented by Professor John Lyon, Chair

NEW BUSINESS**ADJOURNMENT**

MINUTES 2002-2003**UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 8**

Wednesday, April 16, 2003

Niagara Rooms AB, University Union, 3:00 p.m.

Presiding Office: Illene Noppe, Speaker

Parliamentarian pro tempore: Lloyd Noppe

PRESENT

Clifford Abbott

Forrest Baulieu

Derryl Block

James Coates

Kevin Fermanich

Scott Furlong

Sue Hammersmith

Craig Hanke

Curt Heuer

Ray Hutchinson

Andrew Kersten

Anne Kok

William Lepley

Dennis Lorenz

John Lyon

John Mariano

James Marker

Robert Nagy

Illene Noppe

Gilbert Null

Jennifer Popiel

Joyce Salisbury

W. Bruce Shepard

Linda Tabers-Kwak

Patricia Terry

NOT PRESENT: M. Jan Bradfield, Aeron Haynie, Michael Hencheck, Sylvia Kubsch, Richard Logan, and E. Nicole Meyer

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

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

AUTOMATIC CONSENT

1. Approval of Minutes of UW-Green Bay Faculty Senate Meeting No. 7, March 12, 2003

The minutes were approved without change.

CHANCELLOR'S REMARKS

The Chancellor reminded the body that he would make a presentation concerning the budget at a general university forum the next day. The details will be announced then and also placed on his web site. He reviewed the process for the budget's development, including hearings about the five percent budget reduction exercise. The new Strategic Budgeting and Budget-Building Committee played a helpful part in the review. The UW System has never taken a budget reduction as big as this, and the consequences will be painful. Positions are affected. The Board of Regents' priorities were used in planning cuts: 1) protect long-term capacity to serve students and programs; 2) reduce administrative expenses; 3) look for opportunities to combine programs and reduce program commitments to low-enrollment courses (we will not eliminate programs); 4) raise revenues through tuition increases; and, all else failing, 5) reduce access.

He has also been active in Madison speaking to area legislators in the company of community leaders. There has been a ten-year decline in support for the UW System. This longer-term phenomenon is very serious. One of the finest systems of public higher education is in danger of becoming an empty shell. Local leaders are especially upset by the "theft," as one called it, of student fees to cover increased financial aid commitments. Legislators got a clear message. The Chancellor and Government & Community Relations Director Dan Spielmann also regularly meet with legislative leaders.

Commencement is approaching. The very large graduating class means that in case of rain it will be necessary this year to conduct two commencement ceremonies in the Weidner Center. This is common practice at many institutions.

Senator Null asked the Chancellor to comment about the effects on the university of receiving a larger proportion of its funding from private sources. Isn't this harmful, forcing us to serve private rather than public interests? Yes, the Chancellor agreed, in the sense that the people who give money call the shots. Private funds don't go into basic instruction. They don't fill the holes left by cuts in state support. Student tuition makes up the loss. Controlling quality by reducing size then has a larger budget impact. He is not sympathetic to President Lyall's vision of the UW as a charter rather than a public university, one that might be freed of the expenses and inefficiencies of the state bureaucracy. His own commitment is to a public higher education that opens doors, provides access to an excellent higher education. The state and people of Wisconsin need to feel ownership of their university. And the owners need to take responsibility. Moreover, the UW System would dissolve if it were "chartered." The idea would work well only for Madison, although institutions located in urban centers such as Milwaukee and Green Bay would not suffer.

Senator Furlong asked if the *Press-Gazette* had covered the budget issue after President Lyall and the Chancellor had spoken to its Editorial Board. A tiny story the Chancellor said. And legislators need public attention and pressure before they react. Cutting the UW's budget has not produced the kind of response that gets their attention. We need to make our case more dramatically.

ACTION ITEMS

1. Resolution on the Granting of Degrees

Senator Lyon moved and Senator Baulieu seconded a resolution to grant degrees to the students who have completed their programs in time for the Spring 2003 Commencement. The motion passed unanimously.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Proposal for an Extended Degree Faculty Executive Committee

Presented by Professor John Lyon. The proposal, modified since the Senate's previous meeting, was transmitted with the agenda for this meeting. It focusses specifically on the right of faculty to have oversight of a degree-granting program, but now eliminates specific criteria for implementing a committee. The University Committee intends to conduct an in-depth analysis of the Extended Degree program to answer questions raised at the last Senate meeting, including the relationship between Extended Degree and other degree-granting programs; identification of the Extended Degree faculty and their role in the program; and the funding of the program. Additional issues may be raised by the Deans, Provost and Chancellor, as well as Senators and other faculty members. Senator Null asked what the problem was that this is a solution for. Lyon said that it was important to have consistency in faculty oversight of programs. Senator Salisbury said the issue was a matter of principle: the faculty are responsible for education at UW-Green Bay. For whatever reason, Extended Degree has been left out.

Senator Fermanich said that there is a possibility that regularly enrolled students would be taking Extended Degree courses for credit. This is a reason for asserting faculty oversight now. Salisbury agreed. Senator Heuer asked what personnel matters would be under the scrutiny of the new executive committee. The usual ones that other executive committees deal with he was told. Senator Baulieu wondered if the Senate would be able to review implementation of the executive committee, including its

charge. Speaker Noppe said that the University Committee's review of the Extended Degree program would certainly include the role of the executive committee and would therefore come before the Senate. Salisbury doubted the Senate's role in the detailed management of executive committees. Senator Popiel was not troubled by these details. The important thing is that we would be creating a faculty body to be in charge of the program, because there is none now. She did wonder, however, who would be on the executive committee. Anyone who had ever taught in the program? Senator Furlong thought this a good question, because some individuals are explicitly budgeted to Extended Degree, but in some units individuals are not identified. Letters of appointment need to include all Extended Degree faculty, and it must be understood that merit and other personnel reviews will include input from the Extended Degree executive committee. Senator Null also remembered from the previous discussion that membership on the executive committee would be voluntary. What if no one volunteered? Senator Lyon said that in a quick survey of present faculty teaching in the program half replied that they would serve. There were no negative responses. There are many questions to be resolved. The proposal before the Senate only affirms a faculty role. It does not create the executive committee.

Chancellor Shepard thought the proposal a step in the right direction. He was puzzled that a degree program existed that was not under the supervision of a faculty body. Senator Baulieu said he would like to support the principle but couldn't agree with the language of the University Committee proposal. The missing details are too important. What weight would the Extended Degree personnel evaluations have in promotion decisions? If it has an advisory role that should be made explicit. Speaker Noppe and Senator Heuer pointed out that disciplinary unit executive committees already have such an advisory role, and faculty responsibilities in more than one interdisciplinary program are not uncommon. Nothing new is being proposed. Senator Null was more concerned about conflicts over curriculum. Extended Degree uses courses from other programs. Would a new executive committee be involved in approving curriculum forms? Senator Hutchinson had a related concern: Extended

Degree has been offering courses from other units without those units being able to decide or even know who would teach them. Senator Kersten thought that the proposal under discussion would be a step toward answering such questions. Without an executive committee it's not clear who is responsible. Moreover, Noppe said, Extended Degree has created its own independent courses.

The Chancellor said he didn't like the current arrangement and worried that safeguards for academic quality are absent without faculty oversight. There ought to be a wall between faculty responsibility for curriculum and degree requirements, and those responsible for delivering the program to nontraditional audiences. Perhaps the entire structure needs to be reexamined. Do we want an Extended Degree or degrees which we have now that we are extending to another audience? The Provost agreed that degrees and courses are the prerogative of faculty. The issue of delivery needs to be disentangled from this.

Senator Block asked if there might not be a different mechanism than an executive committee for dealing with these questions. Who will be on the executive committee? The faculty teaching in the program may not be the right ones to provide the needed supervision. Perhaps an appointed committee would be more effective. Speaker Noppe said that the University Committee would take this broader perspective into account in its review of Extended Degree. Its recommendations will go to the Dean and the Academic Affairs Council and eventually come back to the Senate. The Chancellor thought that the University Committee's report and a decision about the kind of program we want should precede the governance question. Senator Lyon said that the details of the executive committee or other faculty governing body would not be decided until the review initiated by the University Committee was completed. Senator Salisbury will be leading the review. She said the recommendations will present a range of options.

2. Faculty Pay Package

Presented by Professor John Lyon. He said that we don't know what the pay package will be, a situation confirmed by the Chancellor. Absent that knowledge we ought still, Lyon said, prepare guidelines to reaffirm the Senate's role in pay allocation decisions. It will be good practice. Normally the Board of Regents provides a general rule for distribution: one-third for satisfactory performance, one-third for merit, and one-third for campus needs. The last third is the topic of our deliberation. In the past we have often deferred to budget unit executive committees on this. He invited questions and discussion about the guidelines proposed by the University Committee. The issue of compression in particular might be addressed. Also market value. Senator Null questioned the intention of deferring to unit merit judgement for the discretionary third. Is this to deal with compression? Lyon said it was the exact language used for the last pay package guidelines. This is a starting point. And, yes, the intent is to avoid further compression.

Senator Popiel wanted to know how the proposal, giving two-thirds to merit, would affect compression. Lyon said it doesn't fix the problem, but it won't make it worse. Senator Furlong said that each unit has discretion to define merit for its own purposes. The proposal will not change recent practice. It reaffirms

unit responsibility, said Lyon. Speaker Noppe and Null recommended that the wording be changed to clarify this intention. Senator Block wanted to know why one of the thirds is to address merit/market and the other just merit. Is there a difference? If not, use the same language. Senator Salisbury thought that "market" gave units still more flexibility. Senator Kersten asked for clear communication to faculty about how the pay and merit system works, a brochure perhaps. The process is bizarre. Chancellor Shepard said that enlightenment should come along with the secret handshake that accompanies tenure. Senator Baulieu said that he possesses a paper written by Professors Wenger and Girard that provides an excellent analysis of how units may create formulas for merit allocations. Kersten said that transparency is necessary before we can even begin to deal with compression. Salisbury pointed out that the opaqueness of the current system results from the authority assigned to the units. If we want to do this, it can't be consistent or simple. Senator Furlong noted that the computation formula, translating merit numbers into dollars, is separate from the merit evaluation itself, and several years ago it was modified to minimize the compression effect by making merit increases percentages of salary rather than dollar amounts assigned to merit numbers. Senator Popiel said that we take our paychecks on faith, not knowing how or whom to challenge if we think the numbers might be wrong.

INFORMATION ITEMS

1. Report of the Provost

Provost Hammersmith wanted to celebrate the wonderful things going on even in these hard times, including especially the Academic Excellence Symposium which is putting on display the intellectual achievements of our students. The Dean's search is nearing completion. The announcement should be made in the next week. All candidates seemed highly impressed by UW-Green Bay and its faculty. New Institutional Review Board (IRB) procedural guidelines have been prepared by the IRB. They govern reviews of research that uses human or animal subjects. In-service training for faculty will be provided next year. Enrollments look very good. The residence halls are full and the wait list is over 300. That should trigger the go-ahead for construction of another hall. The freshman class will be unusually large (1,035 compared to 907 this year), because of record graduations this year. The new admission standards are being applied. Professor (and Senator) Kevin Fermanich has received a \$1.5 million grant for monitoring the lower Fox River, and congratulations are in order. The Search for Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff is on going.

Senator Heuer asked about decisions to cancel low-enrollment class sections. What criteria are being used? Not just numbers, said the Provost. There has been good management of course enrollments here, and there are few small classes. Curriculum requirements are also taken into account. The Deans are doing the first screening. Senator Lorenz inquired why the Provost thought a very large freshman class was a good thing. With many graduating seniors, didn't we have an opportunity to reduce our student body and alleviate the bad student-faculty ratio? The Provost said that we have tried to maintain stable enrollment. In any event, transfer students may not come in numbers we anticipated.

2. Strategic Budgeting and Budget-Building Committee

Presented by Professor John Lyon. SB³C has begun operating following the Senate's action to create it as a pilot. It has taken part in the review of the recent difficult budget reduction planning. Senator Salisbury wanted clarification about where the impact of cuts on instruction is considered in budget reviews. Lyon, as faculty chair of the SB³C, said he needs information from faculty about this if he is to fill his role. The Chancellor added that the budget reviews have paid a lot of attention to the broad effects of budget choices. Senator Null wondered if the SB³C short circuits the normal process by which faculty members work through chairs and chairs through Deans on budget needs and issues. No, said Lyon. This is not an attempt to manage unit budgets. The Provost noted that the process this year is under unusual pressure and in future the idea is to integrate budget planning at all levels and make it more fully open.

3. University Committee Report

Presented by Professor John Lyon, Chair. He summarized the University Committee's work:

- It is close to setting up interviews with candidates for the Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff.
- It is engaged in a review of the Extended Degree.
- A special election will be conducted to replace Senator Salisbury on the Committee, as she will assume the position of Assistant Dean next year.
- Professor Clifford Abbott has been elected to serve as Chair of the University Committee for 2003-04.
- A ballot will soon be distributed to elect the next faculty chair of the SB³C.

Lyon also spoke about discussions in the UW System concerning reduction in program arrays and greater efficiency in program delivery to deal with the budget problem. This hasn't been on the agenda at UW-Green Bay. It should be, because our proposals to UW System need to respond to this. In particular we can talk about collaborations with other UW System institutions. Senator Kersten asked how many candidates there were for the Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff position. Currently, four, Lyon said: Professors Sandra Stokes, Kenneth Fleurant, Lloyd Noppe, and Jeffrey Entwistle.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no new business, the meeting adjourned at 4:47 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jerrold Rodesch,

Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

Faculty Senate Action Item #1, 5/14/03

FACULTY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FOR THE INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES MAJOR

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 Interdisciplinary Studies Major 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 Interdisciplinary Studies Major.

Faculty Senate Action Item #2, 5/14/03

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 Unit Pay Plan dollars be distributed according to unit merit judgments based upon a policy defined by the Budgetary Unit's Executive Committee that is consistent with the required minimum of 1/3 of the dollars allocated for solid performance and the required minimum of 1/3 of the dollars allocated for merit-market considerations.

