

AGENDA

UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 9

Wednesday, 5 May 2004, 3:00 p.m.

NIAGARA ROOM BC, University Union

Presiding Officer: Illene Noppe, Speaker

Parliamentarian: Professor Kenneth J. Fleurant

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. [APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 8, APRIL 21, 2004](#) (attached)

3. CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

4. CONTINUING BUSINESS – Presented by Professor Clifford Abbott

- a. [Code Change for Defining Unit Membership](#) - second reading (attached)
- b. [Code Change for Approval of Freestanding Minors](#) - second reading (attached)

5. NEW BUSINESS – Presented by Clifford Professor Abbott

- a. Election of Faculty Senate Speaker for 2004-05
- b. Requests for Future Senate Business

6. UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE REPORT. Presented by Professor Clifford Abbott

7. ADJOURNMENT

MINUTES 2003-2004

UW-GREEN BAY FACULTY SENATE MEETING NO. 8

Wednesday, April 21, 2004

Phoenix Room C, University Union

Presiding Office: Illene Noppe (HUD-UC), Speaker

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

PRESENT: Clifford Abbott (ICS-UC), Greg Aldrete (HUS-UC), Denise Bartell (HUD), Forrest Baulieu (ICS), Peter Breznay (ICS), Gregory Davis (NAS-UC), Sally Dresdow (BUA-UC), Sue Hammersmith (Provost), Craig Hanke (HUB), Michael Hencheck (NAS), Timothy Kaufman (ED), Harvey Kaye (SCD), Anne Kok (Soc. Wk), Michael Kraft (PEA), William Lepley (BUA), Richard Logan (HUD-UC), Steven Meyer (NAS), Steve Muzatko (BUA), Tom Nesslein (URS), Illene Noppe (HUD-UC), Gilbert Null (HUS), Ellen Rosewall (COA), Bruce Shepard (Chancellor), Linda Tabers-Kwak (ED), Patricia Terry (NAS), Bryan Vescio (HUS), William Witwer (COA).

NOT PRESENT: Derryl Block (NUR), M. Jan Bradfield (COA), Jennifer Popiel (HUS).

REPRESENTATIVES: Michael Schmitt (Academic Staff Committee), Matthew Voigt (Student Government Association)

GUESTS: Scott Hildebrand (University Communications), Associate Provost Timothy Sewall.

1. Call to Order. With a quorum present, the meeting was called to order at 3:02 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes of UW-Green Bay Faculty Senate Meeting No. 7, March 24, 2004.

The minutes were approved without change.

3. Chancellor's Report. The Chancellor wished to share some positive news: High retention rates are projected to continue with next year's class. The budget is stable for 2004-05 and some funds for adjunct instruction may be restored. Founding Chancellor Ed Weidner will be commencement speaker, invited to offer his views on where we are as a campus in light of the ideals on which the University was built almost forty years ago.

4. Continuing Business:

a. Student-led courses. Presented by Clifford Abbott. The University Committee wishes to question the Senate on whether to continue the option for student-led courses. If the response is positive, a set of guidelines will then be proposed for approval. Those guidelines are the recently rediscovered originals as revised by the Senate *ad hoc* committee on student-led courses. **Abbott moved (with second) to place the question before the Senate: "Should UW—Green Bay have student-led courses after the spring semester of 2005?"** Following clarification that a "yes" vote meant that this course option would continue, while a "no" would eliminate student-led courses after 2005 (thus allowing any in process to finish), **the vote on the question was 19 yes, 3 no, 3 abstentions.** Speaker Noppe opened the floor to further motions. **Senator Abbott moved that the Senate endorse the revised guidelines for student-led courses.** The discussion revolved around two principal questions. The first was "Where does the responsibility lie for all aspects of a student-led course?" Some of the specific areas of concern discussed were grading, finishing a course if the student leader could not, and resolving disputes. Senator Dresdow felt that all questions of responsibility are taken care of by the sentence "In the event any question involves, or potentially involves, the legal responsibilities of the University, the sponsoring units will decide the issue." The second question concerned the level of involvement expected of

running the course. A sense appeared to emerge that too much involvement by the instructor of record could negate the reasons for the courses in the first place, while common sense dictates the need for faculty advisors to provide guidance and assistance as appropriate and needed at every stage of the course. Discussion seemed to assuage concerns since only one amendment was proposed. Senator Vescio having suggested a way to clarify III D, **Senator Abbott moved (with second) Vescio's suggested change so that as amended section III would read:**

D. Inform student leaders of relevant University procedures policies, customs and norms. In addition, the faculty supervisor is responsible for training student leaders in FERPA requirements regarding the privacy of student records and in handling course responsibilities such as design of a syllabus, facilitating class discussion, grading, and management of course material.

The amendment was accepted unanimously. With no further discussion, **the motion to accept the guidelines as amended passed 23 in favor, none opposed with 2 abstentions.**

b. Guidelines for Establishing Responsibilities for Academic Staff with Faculty Status. Presented by University Committee Chair Abbott who explained that following approval last month of two resolutions directing units to specify requirements for faculty status, a senator requested that the UC develop at least a generic set of guidelines to help units and teaching academic staff understand the new requirement. The result is presented for the Senate's consideration. **Senator Baulieu moved (with second) to accept the proposed guidelines.** Abbott clarified that the intent is to make the guidelines available to assist future UC members and unit chairs. It would be added to instructions for requesting faculty status distributed yearly by the Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff and, perhaps, included with other policy documents in the faculty handbook and added to the Governance web site. Senator Null asked how many of the listed responsibilities would be considered acceptable. Abbott said the UC's opinion is that attendance at meetings is important and that, beyond that, the unit could decide on at least one other to create a plausible case for faculty status. To reflect that interpretation **Senator Aldrete moved (with second) to amend the guidelines by striking the word "generally."** The text would read that the requirements "...include attendance at meetings and in addition may include such things as...." Debate on the amendment was concise. On one hand the meeting requirement seemed too limiting since a staff member who did not attend meetings could not get faculty status even if their service to the unit was invaluable. On the other hand the right to vote requires informed faculty, which requires presence at meetings. **The amendment to strike "generally" passed 21 in favor, 1 opposed, with 3 abstentions.** There was no further discussion on the motion as amended, and **the original motion as amended passed 23 in favor, 0 opposed with 2 abstentions.** The guidelines will take effect in the 2004-2005 academic year.

5. New Business

a. Resolution on the Granting of Degrees. Presented by Clifford Abbott who explained that this resolution is a reminder of the Faculty's role in authorizing granting of degrees. **Senator Logan moved (with second) adoption of the resolution that passed unanimously *viva voce*.**

b. Code Change for Defining Unit Membership, first reading. Presented by Clifford Abbott who prefaced the proposal by presenting a page of code interpretation that the UC composed at the request of the Provost. The interpretations deal with the meaning in code of *ex officio*, quorum, unit membership, and majority votes. Unit membership posed a particular problem, which is why the UC is bringing the current proposal to modify 53.02 and 53.07 to the Senate. The proposal is to exclude those university administrators without teaching assignments in the unit of their academic appointment from membership in that unit for the duration of their administrative positions. Since code requires that chairs be elected by a simple majority of all members in the unit (and not just those present and voting), counting administrators who do not participate in unit business is problematic. Unit chairs are specifically **not** included in the term "university administrators," the meaning of

which is included in the interpretative note distributed with this proposal. Senator Baulieu asked whether unit members on leave counted as members. Abbott said that they do count as members but do not need to be counted toward the quorum necessary to hold a meeting. Should they choose to come to unit meetings, they are free to do

so. The general principle the UC followed was that it is inappropriate to disenfranchise people in units, but there is a need to clarify the role of university administrators without contractual teaching assignments *vis-à-vis* their membership in academic units. The proposal will return for a second reading next month.

c. Code Change for Approval of Freestanding Minors, first reading. Presented by Clifford Abbott. The proposed change to 52.01 would give the Senate jurisdiction over the approval of freestanding minors, *viz.* minors that have no associated major, such as Women's Studies. On the page containing the proposed change, the UC has included a brief history of and rationale for this proposal that came about as the result of an administrative request for clarification of procedures for the creation of new programs. Abbott added that current language implies that only the AAC need approve freestanding minors, or any minors, for that matter. The UC does not propose limiting the manner in which new programs are developed, but does propose addressing the procedures for approving them. The Provost asked why not drop the term "freestanding" and just require Senate approval of all minors. Senator Logan and Speaker Noppe noted that current code does not require approval of minors beyond the AAC as long as they are associated with an approved major. Senator Kaye questions the definition of a freestanding minor as one that has no associated major, instead suggesting that it has meant a minor independent of any particular budgetary unit, as in the case of Women's Studies.

At this point two questions stand out: 1. What exactly are freestanding minors (minors without existing majors, or minors not captured by a budgetary unit)? 2. Should the Senate approve creation of all minors, not just freestanding ones? Senator Kaye criticized the manner in which the current proposal for a freestanding Global Studies minor has come about without the consideration or participation of units such as SCD that would be directly and seriously affected by it. Speaker Noppe suggested that Kaye's concerns might mean that the UC needs to reconsider its assumption that only the approval process for new programs, not the proposal process, needs to be addressed at this time. The Chancellor said that while "the administration doesn't have a horse in this race," the Faculty does need to decide what curricular procedures it wants. Those procedures and processes are currently cloudy and need to be given careful attention. Further discussion made it clear that how to develop a viable process for developing new programs had become a third major question of the discussion. Given the hour, the Speaker returned the questions to the UC for its further consideration.

d. Requests for Future Senate Business. There were no requests.

4. Provost's Report. Provost Hammersmith referred to her previously distributed report on a recent investigation into allegations of wrongdoing in an academic unit. Those allegations were proven to be unfounded. Senator Kaye regretted that the legitimacy of such an investigation was not made clear to the campus before now, since the lack of information gave rise to numerous questions and rumors. Nonetheless he wished to say that the outcome of the report is very good to hear.

5. University Committee Report. Presented by UC Chair Abbott:

a. The UC met with the Academic Staff Committee and the Student Government Organization to explore common governance concerns. There was a frank sharing of concerns and talk of institutional climate, interactions with the administration, questions of access and responsiveness, plans to coordinate on shared concerns such as the academic calendar, parking, traditions of the university and fostering learning outside of the classroom. It was a fruitful meeting that should continue.

b. The Campus Climate Committee has now been charged and will soon begin its work.

c. The UC needs to appoint members to two Senate Committees. Three new members are needed for the Senate Committee on Planning and Budget (1 from NS, 1 from AH, and one at large). Three new members are also needed (at least two of whom need to be Senators) for the Senate Legislative Affairs Committee. **Current and incoming senators are asked to let the UC know of your interest in either of these committees.**

d. Senators requested that the UC consider the following three items and this is how they stand:

-The status of the Extended Degree Program. The Executive Committee for the new Interdisciplinary Studies Degree Program in Extended Degree has been meeting regularly and reports progress.

-Administrative evaluations have been put on hold pending turnover in administration so as not to react to issues of the moment. The UC will return to this in the future.

-Guidelines on faculty status have already come before the Senate

Senator Logan asked that the Senate recognize Mike Schmitt who has worked diligently to record Senate proceedings for the past fifteen years. Warm applause indicated full agreement with those sentiments.

6. Adjournment. With no further business for the day, the Senate adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kenneth Fleurant, Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff

[Minutes amended and approved on 5/5/04]

Faculty Senate Continuing Business 4 (a), 5/5/04

PROPOSED CODE CHANGES FOR DEFINING UNIT MEMBERSHIP

The proposal is to add the language in bold face between the brackets:

53.02 Interdisciplinary Unit Faculties: Membership

All University Faculty members as defined in 50.01 holding appointments in an interdisciplinary unit[, **excluding those university administrators without teaching assignments, shall be defined as members of that interdisciplinary unit and**] shall have the right to vote and otherwise participate in the governance of that interdisciplinary unit. Appointment is made by the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs upon the affirmative recommendation of the appropriate Dean(s) and the unit executive committee. A faculty member may have a split appointment or assignment with another interdisciplinary unit but may vote in only one interdisciplinary unit.

53.07 Disciplinary and Other Unit Faculties: Membership

All University Faculty members as defined in 50.01 holding appointments in a disciplinary or other unit[, **excluding those university administrators without teaching assignments, shall be defined as members of**

that disciplinary or other unit and] shall have the right to vote and otherwise participate in the governance of that unit. Appointment is made by the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs upon the affirmative recommendation of the appropriate Dean(s) and the unit executive committee. A faculty member may have a split assignment with another disciplinary or other unit and may vote in more than one.

Note: the term "university administrator" is interpreted to mean the Chancellor, vice-chancellors, assistant and associate vice chancellors, deans, and assistant and associate deans. The term does not include unit chairs. "Teaching assignment" is interpreted as a regular, contractual responsibility.

Faculty Senate Continuing Business 4 (b), 5/5/04

NEW PROGRAMS

The University Committee has been asked to clarify the procedure for creating new programs. After a careful review we find it important to distinguish two parts of that procedure: one is the process of putting together a proposal; the other is the process of approving the proposal. We further find that our codification specifies the approval process perfectly adequately. That same codification, however, is silent about the first procedure of putting together a proposal. This does not seem to us inappropriate.

If as an institution we wish to encourage maximum freedom in exploring new ideas, we should not want to constrain the source for innovation to some specific agency within the university. But unless we expect implementation of innovative ideas only when there is perfect consensus (when every voice has a veto), there must be a way to negotiate among competing interests. For those ideas that generate within existing faculty groups, we have mechanisms (such as majority rule) for handling competing interests. For those ideas coming out of faculty across existing groups we rely on the academic leadership of our dean(s) to help with those negotiations. Since frequently points of contention have to do with the allocation of resources and since such allocation is a primary responsibility of the dean(s) (or the provost where the interests of the deans may be at odds), those administrators should help negotiate among competing faculty interests.

Any new program needs a governance structure. If a proposal for a new program does not specify an existing structure - such as an interdisciplinary or disciplinary program or an agreement to share responsibility among several units - then it is necessary to create one and our codification and the rules of UW-System give us a procedure for doing just that (53.01 B and 53.06 B).

To add clarity and consistency we recommend the following change in code.

PROPOSED CODE CHANGE

UWGB 52.01

The proposal is to add the language in bold face between the brackets:

52.01 Jurisdiction of the Senate

-

F. Upon recommendation of the appropriate Dean(s), the establishment, the merger, or the discontinuance of curriculum majors [or minors without an existing major] shall receive the approval of the Faculty Senate.

-

-