

the Faculty Senate Executive Committee are to find information, pull the information together, and report back. This will make it easier for the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to determine if any action may need to be taken, especially by looking at the budget implications for the proposed realignment.

- E. Graduate Education Committee – No Report
- F. General Education – No Report
- G. Personnel Policies - Dennis Vanden Bloomen reported that PPS committee will be meeting on Friday, October 19th.
- H. Planning & Review - Jonna Gjevre stated that there will be a meeting on Friday, October 26th.
- I. Other

VIII. Old Business

- A. Faculty Workload - Chair Kapus explained the matrix that will be used to provide feedback. Should this go forward? A discussion pursued regarding having a facilitator to control feedback and to complete the matrix. It was suggested using a scale (ranking) to determine what model may work or not. Another issue is trying to get input from departments. The Provost has already received white papers from several departments on campus. Since keeping the current structure is pretty slim, it was mentioned that Model 5 should be removed. Chair Kapus feels it should be kept on the matrix since many senators feel it is the only option. At the next faculty senate meeting, Tuesday, October 16th, a report will be presented from the results. Break up into small groups, and every senator will be asked to write their comments and give back at the end of the meeting. The matrix will be emailed before the meeting. Alan Block made a statement that without a vote, the comments could be misinterpreted. If a strong preference is made to vote to evaluate, it could move in that direction. It was voted on the type of matrix to use. Dennis Vande Bloomen suggested to rank each box, 1-5, and this was agreed to by consensus. After discussion, Chair Kapus agreed to revise the matrix and ask Mike Nicolai to facilitate the meeting.

Cost analysis was another concern. Chancellor Sorensen stated that administrative costs would not increase. He mentioned that it is possible that two models may be tweaked together.

- B. Alignment Discussion – Schultz said the Program Director’s meeting, that was held on Friday, September 28th, was facilitated by Juli Taylor and Steve Nold. The main points of the meeting included the barriers students face in their program, and how would the alignment help remove these barriers. It was felt that there should continue to be a separation between programs and departments. Program directors are an underutilized voice on campus. Chancellor Sorensen sees a tremendous inconsistency in program directors’ responsibilities and job description. There are even programs that don’t have a program director. The discussion continued by stressing that this is the time to review and improve the roles of program directors. Program directors have a very important role, allowing cross-disciplinary programs.

IX. New Business

- A. 2008-2009 Promotion Timetable
- B. Marshalls
- C. Other Listening Sessions – Chair Kapus said that only eight faculty attended yesterday, October 8th, and seven faculty attended today, October 9th. The discussion yesterday focused on Diversity. It was noted that 18% of employees hired last year were minorities. This is a great increase. The discussions today included the Program Director’s meeting and the NSSE report. Student evaluation forms should be evaluated to see how it affects the NSSE report. At the listening session today, it was also suggested to have the department chairs and program directors meet to figure out what is working and what isn’t working. This will be scheduled during professional development in January 2008.

X. Adjournment - 3:42 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Ned Weckmueller, Secretary

Recorded and prepared by,
Janell Reitz