

NOTES FROM THE MEETING OF THE COMBINED SENATES
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-STOUT
FEBRUARY 28, 2006
BALLROOM C
2:30 P.M.

Steve Schlough, Faculty Senate Chair, welcomed everyone at 2:35 p.m.

- I. **Chancellor's Report** – Chancellor Sorensen announced that the proposed UWS 7 (Faculty and Academic Staff Disciplinary Process), would be delayed for a couple of months, especially since four schools shared governance concerns with due process and protections. He will know more in a few weeks and share additional information with the Senates. The Chancellor stated that the campus' DIN requests were due to UW-System in March. Stout will compete by submitting a very brief outline to them within the first week of the month and then the entire final request by the end of the month. He explained that an additional request would be submitted regarding a polytechnic thrust, such as a polytechnic studies or collaborative center, that could work in partnership with other areas of the university. Some schools currently have this in place, he explained, and the campus could put together a center, that may possibly include state-of-the-art innovative sciences and technologies, and could be funded as soon as this summer. However, the concept hasn't been fully developed yet, and a meeting would be held tomorrow to explore the idea further. The Chancellor then distributed a 'nanotech university' document to the group for information that helped illustrate what other areas were doing in the country.
- II. **Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs' Report** – Interim Provost Furst-Bowe explained that summer session contracts would be handled this year by using a flat rate paid based on the faculty's rank. She added that the topic was discussed by the deans for the last two-to-three years and all but one dean implemented this formula last summer. This will enable the campus to offer more courses. McDonald said that he surveyed his constituents and people work during the summer because they need the money. Faculty who were close to retirement would be impacted by this.
- A. "New Tools in the Career Services" Office (Lamont Meinen) – Career Services Director, Lamont Meinen, gave the group a demonstration of the "New Career Services Job Search Tools" and explained that many features were added since last summer. The "Stout CareerLink" now has a facet that allows students to search the entire system after entering a key word. This instantly connects them with a current job listing according to their interests. Meinen noted that Stout was the only school thus far to have this arrangement, and it was customized for only Stout's faculty/staff, alumni, and students to have access. Additionally, students don't need to Register for this service. "EmployOn" is a powerful job search engine that allows students to do a nationwide real-time job search using specific job titles, and/or geographical locations (some 1,000 sites), and has the capability to speak Spanish. Meinen added that majors can be tracked, and it has the potential to grab anything off the internet. Also new is the "Reference USA"—a database that provides contact with over 13 million U.S. businesses and organizations. This also provides the business' credit rating, number of employees, phone numbers, etc. Meinen emphasized that Stout's faculty/staff can register to have access to all the search engines. He further explained that "Going Global" allows the students the ability to search for jobs or co-op/internship positions in countries worldwide and ties them into cultural and job search advice. "RezFuzion" allows the students to help improve their interviewing skills and make strong first impressions by doing a private videoed "practice interview" with a virtual interviewer via webcam. Freshmen and sophomores can practice their interviewing skills, Career Services can help give them feedback, and their mock interviews can be stored on the web for sixty days. Students would also have accessibility to these services even if they were in the military, overseas, or alumni. Meinen concluded by explaining that a mentoring system was added this year and encouraged faculty/staff to become mentors. He said that people from his office can come to any class to help explain the new career tools available.
- III. **Vice Chancellor for Administrative and Student Life Services' Report** – Vice Chancellor Moen announced that the Morale Committee has been formed on campus to develop a new morale survey. People will be chosen by random to serve in focus group sessions, and she encouraged people to participate if asked. Moen reported that the campus was continuing to move forward regarding electronic technology for pay stubs, payroll records, and by end of the year, students will be able to submit time sheets via the computer program, KRONOS Timekeeping System. She distributed the "Campus Physical Planning Process" to the group and noted that it was a two-year process. It will go to System for review on March 20 and also was on the BPA website.
- A. 2007-2013 Campus Physical Development Plan Issues (George Acker; Attachment 1) – Facilities Architect, George Acker, said that the thirteen issues were itemized in priority order and gave a brief overview of the document. The Harvey Hall Theatre Remodeling and Infrastructure Upgrade

- was first on the list.
- B. 2007-2013 Campus Physical Development Plan Priority Sequence Project List (GPR/PR) (George Acker; Attachment 2) – Acker stated that the document was for information and showed the General Purpose Revenue (GPR) and Program Revenue (PR) in priority sequence order.
 - C. Update on the Jarvis Hall Science Wing Renovation and Addition project (George Acker) – Acker thanked all the department people who worked to get this into the budget within the timeframe to get the request to UW-System. He noted that he anticipates four-six months before an architect would come to Stout for a Jarvis Hall update.

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
FEBRUARY 28, 2006
BALLROOM C – (Following Administrative Briefing)**

ATTENDANCE:

CHAIR: Steve Schlough
VICE CHAIR: Forrest Schultz

SECRETARY: Anne Hoel
PAST CHAIR: Mike Galloy

PRESENT: T. Allen, B. Anderson, C. Bendel, B. Bergquist, P. Calenberg, S. Cole, M. Decker, J. Dzissah, G. Earl, B. Flom, P. Ghenciu, A.R. Howarton, L. Koepke, K. Mauldin, K. McDonald, S. Nold, B. Peters, K. Thomas, N. Weckmueller

EXCUSED: T. Bensen, T. Brantmeier, K. Carlson, M. Galloy, W. Haid, E. Hughes, M. Ondrus, A. Scott, S. Terry

GUESTS: Chancellor Sorensen, Interim Provost Furst-Bowe

- I. Call to Order – 3:15 p.m.
- II. Announcements and Information- Chair Schlough explained that the Executive Committee discussed Faculty Senate attendance during its last meeting, as the Senate lost a quorum during its February 14 Meeting. He said that the order of the agenda could be changed, but the Senate’s Bylaws would need to be revised first. Agenda time limits could also be delegated for lengthy discussion items or reports, if necessary.
- III. Minutes of February 14, 2006 (Attachment 3)
 - Motion: Peters/Koepke moved to approve the Minutes of February 14, 2006.
 - Mauldin asked that the spelling of his name be corrected.
 - Vote: Passed unanimously as corrected.
- IV. Committee Reports
 - A. Planning and Review Committee (Brian Finder; Attachment 4) – Chair Schlough said that this item was for information.
 - B. Other
- V. Old Business
 - A. Polytechnic Designation (tabled from October 18 Faculty Senate Meeting for more input)
 - B. Faculty Senate Continues to Engage in Polytechnic Discussion (Motion from Faculty Senate Meeting of November 29, 2005)
 - C. Facility Use Policy (Steve Schlough; was Attachment 6 in February 14 Meeting packet) – Chair Schlough explained that both Senates had the same concerns regarding the religious organizations meeting on campus, so he checked with Diane Moen’s Office. Meridith Wentz checked with the Board of Regents Office and Policy 75-15 no longer exists—it was replaced by the new Policy UWS 21 (which does not have the same language included regarding use of facilities for religious services.) Robert Johnson recommended removing discussion about the policy from the Senate agenda until they can review the section in question to ensure it meets campus needs.

D. UWS 7 (Steve Schlough; Attachment 5) – Chair Schlough explained that the document was controversial on some of the UW campuses, and it will be discussed again during the UW-System Faculty Reps Meeting on March 3. Chancellor Sorensen added that the Regents would probably delay making a recommendation on the item, as they want to ensure that everyone has due process. Mauldin said he was concerned about page two, where people can be suspended from pay when they have only been charged with a crime. He asked if the Provost was the appropriate person to make the final decision. Chancellor Sorensen replied that the Regents were still clarifying the policy. Schlough asked if anyone had any concerns, to please e-mail him, so he can present them during the Faculty Reps Meeting on March 3.

E. Other

VI. New Business

A. B. A. in Psychology (Brian Finder; Attachment 6)

Motion: Peters/Koepke moved to approve the B. A. in Psychology.

Vote: Passed unanimously.

B. 1st Year Early Alert Program (Donna Albrecht; Attachment 7) – Chair Schlough explained that EAC was bringing the document forward for Faculty Senate endorsement and noted that Joan Thomas presented the program during the February 14 Faculty Senate Meeting.

Motion: Howarton/Bendel moved to endorse the 1st Year Early Alert Program.

Vote: Passed unanimously.

C. Graduate Faculty (Gene Ruenger; Attachment 8) – Chair Schlough explained that the document revises the language to specify that past things done by the Graduate Council will now be taken care of by the Graduate Education Committee (GREC). He elaborated that the GREC was created to create a better link between the Faculty Senate and graduate faculty on campus.

Motion: Peters/Mauldin moved to approve the Graduate Faculty document.

Vote: Passed unanimously.

D. PPC's Recommendation Regarding SOE and Other (Karen Martinson; Attachment 9) – Chair Schlough explained that there were only two people left in the "Other" category who were not administrators. He clarified that the people would not be voting members of SOE, but just have a designation to fall under that would be used to run for vacancies on campus committee.

Motion: Decker/Mauldin moved to approve PPC's Recommendation regarding SOE and Other.

Bendel clarified that this category would need to be deleted from all Bylaws, committees, the Handbook, etc. and would be the last step to be completed, as no faculty would be hired under this category in the future. Chair Schlough said that he and Vice Chair Schultz could meet and clean things up.

Vote: Passed unanimously.

E. Polytechnic Timeline Proposal from Faculty Senate Executive Committee (Steve Schlough; Attachment 10) – Chair Schlough reminded the group that there were two polytechnic items under Old Business that allows the Senators time to make some kind of recommendation to the Chancellor by the end of the year. He explained that the proposed Timeline was formulated by the Executive Committee and then explained each step to the Senators. The vote going out to all faculty, he clarified, would only be another way to gather data that would be used by the Senate to make its decision on May 9. McDonald said that his biggest concern was what would happen if the referendum was voted down and the Faculty Senate still recommended the polytechnic--what would this say to the faculty? Schlough clarified that it was only one step out of four that would be used for the Senate to obtain its data. McDonald cautioned that all constituents needed to fully understand the concept before voting.

Motion: Nold/Decker moved to approve the Polytechnic Timeline Proposal.

Much discussion ensued. Allen asked the Chancellor to explain the alternate polytechnic center that he mentioned earlier in his report. The Chancellor replied that it was a brand new concept that could create a synergy of programs with a new emphasis in another area. He will be discussing the item further with the Senate leadership groups on March 2 and invited all to attend and added that he would like to interview Southeast Missouri State, where this is practiced. One Senator asked if the Steering Committee would be examining this model as well. Thomas, a member of the Steering Committee, said that it was not part of the group's charge. Schultz said that people on campus needed to know exactly what a polytechnic school was. Schlough commented that they could get a fairly good idea by doing a web search on the topic and then narrow it down to similar items comparable to Stout. Peters asked if information could be shared with the Senators earlier, so it could be shared with their constituents. McDonald asked what would happen to the Chancellor's piece. The Chancellor replied that James Tower would be asked to design a parallel concept. If his Council liked the new model, he would submit a DIN request, the timeline could be revised, and additional information could be shared. By May, the campus would have a good sense of what it wanted to do. McDonald said that he was concerned if Stout could lose its competitive advantage while the university was being informed and gives its input; it was important to move forward and evaluate this. The Chancellor said that a model, including a matrix, could be compiled after people from campus visit Missouri State. This information could be another piece that could be shared with the university. Much more discussion ensued. McDonald said that he's seeing a warming side to the entire polytechnic idea on campus—the faculty just needs to be more informed to ensure that Stout was positioned correctly to go forward in this direction. Peters summarized that it seemed there were three items to accomplish—the first was to get the placeholder DIN; the second were the two information pieces from James Tower and the Steering Committee; and the third was the center, or “school within a school” idea. Allen asked the Chancellor to clarify what a DIN was. The Chancellor replied that the DIN (Decision Item Narrative) requests were opportunities for campuses to obtain 102 money from the State in order to help fund certain programs. (The last one received was used to help fund the Graphic Communications Management Program.) He explained that Stout would need to submit a DIN title and outline (to be used as a place holder) to UW-System within the first week of March and then submit the final, more detailed, proposal later in March. Then in August, System decides which DINS would be forwarded to the state. Additionally, the concept should be in alignment with the Governor's growth program for the state's economy and would be an opportunity for him to approve and back new things that have never been budgeted before. The title may be different, but the placeholder will be there. However, Furst-Bowe added, that obtaining the funding was extremely competitive between campuses and each must make a case for its need. A few Senators asked if it were possible to see the proposals. The Chancellor said that he could share them with the Senate.

Discussion then centered on the Timeline and the possibility of eliminating Number 4. Nold said that he felt it was the Senators' responsibility to poll their own constituents instead of having a vote. Flom stated that the two informational sessions planned would be a key piece to help inform faculty and allow them an opportunity to ask questions. She felt that a non-binding vote would be democratic and consistent with the Baldrige approach. McDonald asserted that the Senators' constituents have voted for them to sit on the Faculty Senate and trust them to make decisions. He asked the group how many faculty would actually attend an open forum and noted that it probably would not be a very large group. However, whatever the Senate does, it must ensure that its constituents were all knowledgeable and received the same information. Peters said that a couple of years ago, PPC held focus groups regarding tenure and only 8%-9% of all faculty showed up. He suggested that each Senator would probably get a better sense of what his/her constituents felt by polling their departments. Nold said that he could accept the motion better if the word, “vote,” was changed to “opinion” in Number 4.

Motion: Weckmueller/McDonald moved to amend the Timeline by striking Number 4.

Vote: By show of hands: 8 in favor; 11 opposed. Motion failed.

Weckmueller called for the question.

Motion to Amend: Nold/Ghenciu moved to amend the language of Number 4 by replacing “Nonbinding referendum vote goes out to all faculty” with “Sample the faculty opinion.”

Anderson agreed with the change. More discussion ensued regarding the choice of wording and which way to go to obtain a better response rate from the faculty. McDonald stressed the importance for all faculty to receive the same information before they could give their opinion, and suggested that paper documents could be included that could explain the data in a clear, non-partial way. Dzissah and Mauldin agreed and recommended that all perspectives should be shared so faculty could make an informed decision.

Schlough cited that the vote would be taken to revise the wording of Number 4 to: “Survey of faculty opinion regarding the polytechnic.”

Vote on Amendment: By show of hands: 16 in favor; 4 opposed.

The amendment passed.

Discussion continued regarding the possibility of sending faculty a website that could include key documents for their information, having the Senate appoint a special committee to do the work, or have the Executive Committee plan out the process. Schlough summarized by saying the Senators at their February 14 Meeting wanted a process. The Executive Committee formulated the Polytechnic Timeline based on their request. The Chancellor explained that the idea developed from three-and-a-half years of planning, the campus appointed a special task force, hired a marketing group to help gather information, and to brand the campus in a unique way in order to stay competitive with the other campuses. McDonald agreed and felt that polytechnic could benefit the campus to be uniquely positioned for the future. However, he said he was frustrated by the tight timeframe allowed in the Timeline. Chancellor Sorensen suggested moving the timeframe back; however, the DIN placeholder requests would need to go forward.

Schlough specified that the final vote for the Polytechnic Timeline would include the newly-revised wording of Number 4: “Survey of faculty opinion regarding the polytechnic,” and if passed, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee would define how to distribute and process the survey.

Vote: By show of hands: 11 in favor; 9 opposed.

Schlough said that the motion passed and it would now go to the Executive Committee for the March 7 Meeting.

F. Other

VII. **Adjournment 4:35 p.m.**

Respectfully submitted,
Anne Hoel, Secretary

Recorded and prepared by,
Joy Evenson