

**MEETING OF THE COMBINED SENATES
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-STOUT
FEBRUARY 27, 2007
BALLROOM C
2:30-5:00 P.M.**

- I. Chancellor's Report**
- II. Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs' Report**
- III. Vice Chancellor for Administrative and Student Life Services' Report**
 - A. Polytechnic Peer Comparison Report (Meridith Wentz; Attachment 1)**
- IV. Other Announcements & Information**

**AGENDA
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
FEBRUARY 27, 2007
BALLROOM C – (Following Meeting of the Combined Senates)**

- I. Call to Order**
- II. Announcements and Information**
 - A. University Priorities**
- III. Minutes of February 13, 2007 (Attachment 2)**
- IV. Committee Reports**
 - A. Planning and Review Committee (Brian Finder; Attachment 3)**
 - B. Alignment Self-review Committee**
- V. Old Business**
 - A. Learning Values/Culture of Affirmation at Stout (TABLED during Feb. 13, 2007 Faculty Senate Meeting)**
 - B. Other**
- VI. New Business**
 - A. PRC Assessment Modification Proposal (Brian Finder)**
 - B. Other**
- VII. Adjournment**

NSSE 2006

Polytechnic Peer Comparison Summary

February, 2007



STOUT
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

Report prepared by:

Budget, Planning and Analysis

Institutional Research

Contact:
Tammy Cutsforth

Report Prepared for:

Chancellor's Advisory Council

Chancellor Sorensen

Survey developed by:

NSSE

Distribution of report:

Chancellor's Advisory Council
And Senates

Chancellor Sorensen
Forrest Schultz
Dennis Shaw

UW-Stout NSSE 2006 Polytechnic Peer Comparison Summary

UW-Stout has participated annually since 2000 in the National Survey of Student Engagement or NSSE. The NSSE is an annual undergraduate survey that assesses the extent to which first-year students and seniors engage in a variety of good educational practices. Peer institution comparisons for the NSSE have included the UW System comprehensives and a select peer comparison group in 2005. For that peer group, UW-Stout selected six institutions that were Baldrige peers that had also participated in the NSSE in 2005.

With the recent decision to have a polytechnic peer group, a NSSE special analysis was requested to compare Stout to its polytechnic peers that participated in the NSSE in 2006. The following six polytechnic peer institutions were identified as participating, and were submitted as our peer group for this analysis:

- Wentworth Institute of Technology
- Worcester Polytechnic Institute
- Ferris State University
- Michigan Technological University
- New Jersey Institute of Technology
- Polytechnic University

Stout Means Compared to Polytechnic Peer Means

Overall comparison

On 63% of the survey questions, UW-Stout senior mean scores were equal or higher than the polytechnic peer group means. First-year student data show a pattern of mean scores somewhat below the average with 60% of the survey means below the polytechnic peer group means. This pattern of seniors scoring higher on more than half (62%) parallels the trend we saw with the UW System peer group but this pattern differs slightly for first-year students with Stout students scoring higher on just over half of the questions (52%).

Listed below are the questions that Stout seniors scored significantly **higher** and had an effect size of .30 or greater than the polytechnic peer group. Questions with an asterisk indicate that Stout seniors compared to the UW System peer group scored significantly higher and had an effect size of .30 or greater.

- Worked with other students on projects during class*
- Participated in a community-based project as part of a regular course
- Used e-mail to communicate with an instructor (also significantly higher for first-year students)
- Number of written papers or reports of fewer than 5 pages
- Number of problem sets that take you less than an hour to complete*
- Acquiring a broad general education
- Voting in local, state, or national elections
- Contributing to the welfare of your community

Below are the questions that first-year students and seniors scored significantly **lower** and had an effect size of .30 or greater than the polytechnic peer group. Questions with an asterisk indicate that Stout students compared to the UW System peer group scored significantly lower and had an effect size of .30 or greater.

- Had serious conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity than your own (1st year)
- Worked with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments (1st year)

- Number of books read on your own (not assigned) for personal enjoyment or academic enrichment (Senior)
- Culminating senior experience (comprehensive exam, capstone course, thesis, project, etc.) (Senior)*
- Spending significant amounts of time studying and on academic work (1st year)

EAC Questions

In 2005-06 the Educational Activities Committee or EAC was given a charge to review NSSE 2005 results to identify areas of focus for improvement and for celebration. In the tables below are the items they identified as areas of concern and areas of note/celebration with the mean results for Stout in 2006 compared to 2005 along with the comparison group means for 2006. A bold mean indicates the 2006 mean for Stout is statistically different than the polytechnic peer group mean.

Areas of Concern							
Survey Item		Class	Stout 2005	Stout 2006	Polytechnic Peers	Carnegie Peers	UW System
Writing	3c. Number of written papers or reports of 20 pages or more	FY	1.20	1.18	1.31	1.26	1.17
		SR	1.48	1.62	1.79	1.64	1.56
	3d. Number of written papers or reports between 5 and 19 pages	FY	2.04	2.06	2.14	2.24	2.15
SR		2.45	2.57	2.47	2.56	2.55	
3e. Number of written papers or reports of fewer than 5 pages	FY	3.08	3.06	3.09	3.00	3.08	
	SR	3.47	3.41	2.90	2.93	3.18	
Diversity	1e. Included diverse perspectives (different races, religions, genders , political beliefs, etc.) in class discussions or writing assignments	FY	2.52	2.51	2.52	2.77	2.64
		SR	2.64	2.65	2.40	2.82	2.73
	1u. Had serious conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity than your own	FY	2.12	2.14	2.52	2.53	2.19
SR		2.28	2.26	2.54	2.63	2.30	
1v. Had serious conversations with students who are very different from you in terms of their religious beliefs, political opinions, or personal values	FY	2.55	2.41	2.65	2.64	2.57	
	SR	2.59	2.61	2.65	2.68	2.61	
Time studying	10a. Spending significant amounts of time studying and on academic work	FY	2.89	2.90	3.15	3.02	3.03
		SR	2.89	2.94	3.11	3.06	3.00

Areas of Note/Celebration						
Survey Item	Class	Stout 2005	Stout 2006	Polytechnic Peers	Carnegie Peers	UW System
1b. Made a class presentation	FY	2.29	2.30	2.42	2.28	2.12
	SR	3.05	3.03	2.85	2.87	2.85
1g. Worked with other students on projects during class	FY	2.66	2.65	2.58	2.41	2.41
	SR	2.97	2.98	2.69	2.58	2.58
11b. Acquiring job or work-related knowledge and skills	FY	2.78	2.77	2.93	2.67	2.64
	SR	3.16	3.23	3.13	3.04	3.04
11g. Using computing and information technology	FY	3.15	3.21	3.23	2.98	2.91
	SR	3.30	3.44	3.38	3.20	3.19
12. Overall, how would you evaluate the quality of academic advising you have received at your institution?	FY	3.09	3.06	2.93	2.93	2.96

Overall, UW-Stout freshmen fall below the polytechnic peers on all of the areas of concern, and UW-Stout seniors fall below the polytechnic peers for four of the seven the areas of concern. UW-Stout freshmen ratings are above the polytechnic peers on two of the five areas of celebration. UW-Stout senior ratings are above the polytechnic peer ratings on all areas of celebration. Further, on the areas of celebration, the polytechnic peer ratings meet or exceed the UW System ratings on all questions except for academic advising.

Diversity Questions

There were five questions on the NSSE that addressed diversity. This area was identified as an opportunity for improvement for UW-Stout in the 2006 NSSE report. Stout first-year students are lower than the polytechnic peer group on four of the five questions and statistically **lower** for 3 of the questions, which are listed below.

- Had serious conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity than your own
- Had serious conversations with students who are very different from you in terms of their religious beliefs, political opinions, or personal values
- Encouraging contact among students from different economic, social, and racial or ethnic backgrounds

Stout seniors scored higher than the polytechnic peer group on 3 of the 5 diversity questions.

Two of the five questions were significantly **higher** and are listed below.

- Included diverse perspectives (different races, religions, genders, political beliefs, etc.) in class discussions or writing assignments)
- Understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds

Information Technology Questions

The NSSE had four questions that addressed information technology. This area was identified as a strength for UW-Stout in the 2006 NSSE report. Both Stout first year students and seniors scored higher than the polytechnic peer group on 3 of the 4 questions and statistically higher on one question. The one question which was statistically higher was *used e-mail to communicate with an instructor*. The one question that Stout seniors scored lower on was *using computers in academic work*. First-year students scored lower on the question *using computing and information technology*.

Benchmark Comparison

Benchmark	Class	UW-Stout	Polytechnic Peers	Carnegie Peers	NSSE
Level of Academic Challenge	FY	48.2	52.5	50.6	51.8
	Seniors	54.5	54.8	55.3	55.8
Active and Collaborative Learning	FY	40.2	44.5	41.0	41.3
	Seniors	55.0*	52.2	50.8	50.4
Student-Faculty Interactions	FY	33.0	33.0	31.8	32.1
	Seniors	42.3	41.5	40.4	41.3
Enriching Educational Experiences	FY	21.6	25.7	25.8	26.8
	Seniors	35.8	38.9	37.5	39.9
Supportive Campus Environment	FY	59.4	58.5	58.6	59.1
	Seniors	59.4*	55.4	56.6	56.6

Note: bold score indicates equal to or higher than the polytechnic peer group score

*indicates bold score is significantly higher

- Stout's first year students scored below the polytechnic peers for three of the five benchmarks in 2006. The scores were statistically lower for all 3 benchmarks (Level of Academic Challenge, Active and Collaborative Learning and Enriching Educational Experiences).
- Stout seniors scored higher than the Polytechnic Peers in 3 out of the 5 benchmarks and were statistically higher for the Active and Collaborative Learning and Supportive Campus Environment benchmarks.

Attachments

NSSE 2006 Mean and Frequency Report
NSSE 2006 Benchmark Comparisons Report



**National Survey
of Student Engagement**

University of Wisconsin-Stout

Special Analysis

Benchmark Comparisons

January 2007

				UW-Stout compared with:										
				UW-Stout		Selected Peers			Carnegie Peers			NSSE 2006		
Variable	Bench- mark	Class		Mean ^a	Mean ^a	Sig ^b	Effect Size ^c	Mean ^a	Sig ^b	Effect Size ^c	Mean ^a	Sig ^b	Effect Size ^c	
1. Academic and Intellectual Experiences														
In your experience at your institution during the current school year, about how often have you done each of the following? 1=never, 2=sometimes, 3=often, 4=very often														
a.	Asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions	CLQUEST	ACL	FY	2.62	2.68		2.80	***	-.21	2.78	***	-.19	
				SR	2.93	2.98		3.10	**	-.20	3.06	*	-.15	
b.	Made a class presentation	CLPRESEN	ACL	FY	2.30	2.42	**	-.15	2.28		2.23			
				SR	3.03	2.85	*	.21	2.87	*	.18	2.80	***	.28
c.	Prepared two or more drafts of a paper or assignment before turning it in	REWROPAP		FY	2.75	2.47	***	.29	2.69		2.65	*	.10	
				SR	2.49	2.48		2.55		2.49				
d.	Worked on a paper or project that required integrating ideas or information from various sources	INTEGRAT		FY	3.05	2.92	**	.16	3.04		3.03			
				SR	3.25	3.20		3.31		3.30				
e.	Included diverse perspectives (different races, religions, genders, political beliefs, etc.) in class discussions or writing assignments	DIVCLASS		FY	2.51	2.52		2.77	***	-.29	2.76	***	-.28	
				SR	2.65	2.40	**	.28	2.82	*	-.18	2.78		
f.	Come to class without completing readings or assignments	CLUNPREP		FY	1.97	2.04		2.00		2.03				
				SR	2.05	2.11		2.06		2.12				
g.	Worked with other students on projects during class	CLASSGRP	ACL	FY	2.65	2.58		2.41	***	.29	2.40	***	.30	
				SR	2.98	2.69	***	.32	2.58	***	.45	2.51	***	.53
h.	Worked with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments	OCCGRP	ACL	FY	2.31	2.67	***	-.41	2.27		2.36			
				SR	3.09	3.04		2.71	***	.42	2.75	***	.37	
i.	Put together ideas or concepts from different courses when completing assignments or during class discussions	INTIDEAS		FY	2.48	2.57	*	-.12	2.54		2.57	*	-.11	
				SR	2.94	2.89		2.89		2.91				
j.	Tutored or taught other students (paid or voluntary)	TUTOR	ACL	FY	1.65	1.85	***	-.23	1.64		1.67			
				SR	1.90	2.05		1.84		1.89				
k.	Participated in a community-based project (e.g. service learning) as part of a regular course	COMMPROJ	ACL	FY	1.47	1.47		1.48		1.50				
				SR	1.89	1.56	***	.39	1.70	*	.21	1.69	**	.22

^a Weighted by gender, enrollment status, and institutional size.

^b * p<.05 ** p<.01 *** p<.001 (2-tailed).

^c Mean difference divided by comparison group standard deviation.

**NSSE 2006 Mean Comparisons
University of Wisconsin-Stout**

				<i>UW-Stout compared with:</i>									
				UW-Stout	Selected Peers			Carnegie Peers			NSSE 2006		
	<i>Variable</i>	<i>Bench- mark</i>	<i>Class</i>	<i>Mean^a</i>	<i>Mean^a</i>	<i>Sig^b</i>	<i>Effect Size^c</i>	<i>Mean^a</i>	<i>Sig^b</i>	<i>Effect Size^c</i>	<i>Mean^a</i>	<i>Sig^b</i>	<i>Effect Size^c</i>
l.	Used an electronic medium (listserv, chat group, Internet, instant messaging, etc.) to discuss or complete an assignment	ITACADEM	EEE	FY	2.77			2.63	*	.13	2.64	*	.12
				SR	3.04			2.86	*	.17	2.85	*	.18
m.	Used e-mail to communicate with an instructor	EMAIL		FY	3.20	***	.35	2.97	***	.26	3.01	***	.22
				SR	3.51	***	.35	3.27	***	.30	3.31	***	.25
n.	Discussed grades or assignments with an instructor	FACGRADE	SFI	FY	2.53			2.56			2.56		
				SR	2.80			2.81			2.79		
o.	Talked about career plans with a faculty member or advisor	FACPLANS	SFI	FY	2.19			2.09	*	.11	2.10		
				SR	2.60	**	.23	2.39	*	.22	2.40	*	.20
p.	Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with faculty members outside of class	FACIDEAS	SFI	FY	1.79			1.78			1.81		
				SR	2.04			2.06			2.08		
q.	Received prompt written or oral feedback from faculty on your academic performance	FACFEED	SFI	FY	2.60			2.58			2.58		
				SR	2.72			2.79			2.76		
r.	Worked harder than you thought you could to meet an instructor's standards or expectations	WORKHARD	LAC	FY	2.54			2.58			2.58		
				SR	2.69			2.73			2.69		
s.	Worked with faculty members on activities other than coursework (committees, orientation, student life activities, etc.)	FACOTHER	SFI	FY	1.66			1.53	**	.16	1.56	*	.13
				SR	2.03			1.76	***	.29	1.81	**	.23
t.	Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with others outside of class (students, family members, co-workers, etc.)	OOCIDEAS	ACL	FY	2.37	***	-.23	2.66	***	-.33	2.69	***	-.36
				SR	2.64			2.82	*	-.20	2.84	**	-.23
u.	Had serious conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity than your own	DIVRSTUD	EEE	FY	2.14	***	-.38	2.53	***	-.39	2.55	***	-.41
				SR	2.26	**	-.29	2.63	***	-.37	2.64	***	-.39
v.	Had serious conversations with students who are very different from you in terms of their religious beliefs, political opinions, or personal values	DIFFSTU2	EEE	FY	2.41	***	-.25	2.64	***	-.24	2.68	***	-.28
				SR	2.61			2.68			2.71		

^a Weighted by gender, enrollment status, and institutional size.

^b * p<.05 ** p<.01 *** p<.001 (2-tailed).

^c Mean difference divided by comparison group standard deviation.

				<i>UW-Stout compared with:</i>											
				UW-Stout			Selected Peers			Carnegie Peers			NSSE 2006		
Variable	Bench- mark	Class		Mean ^a	Mean ^a	Sig ^b	Effect Size ^c	Mean ^a	Sig ^b	Effect Size ^c	Mean ^a	Sig ^b	Effect Size ^c		
<i>During the current school year, how much has your coursework emphasized the following mental activities? 1=very little, 2=some, 3=quite a bit, 4=very much</i>															
2. Mental Activities															
a.	Memorizing facts, ideas, or methods from your courses and readings so you can repeat them in pretty much the same form	MEMORIZE	FY SR	2.71 2.79	2.80 2.67			2.88 2.76	*** 	-.20 	2.87 2.74	*** 	-.19 		
b.	Analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory, such as examining a particular case or situation in depth and considering its components	ANALYZE	LAC FY SR	2.89 3.07	3.01 3.16	** 	-.16 	3.01 3.20	** *	-.15 -.17	3.06 3.22	*** *	-.22 -.20		
c.	Synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences into new, more complex interpretations and relationships	SYNTHESZ	LAC FY SR	2.65 2.84	2.81 2.89	** 	-.20 	2.78 2.99	** *	-.16 -.18	2.83 3.01	*** *	-.21 -.20		
d.	Making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods, such as examining how others gathered and interpreted data and assessing the soundness of their conclusions	EVALUATE	LAC FY SR	2.72 2.88	2.80 2.89			2.82 2.94	* 	-.12 	2.82 2.94	* 	-.12 		
e.	Applying theories or concepts to practical problems or in new situations	APPLYING	LAC FY SR	2.85 3.14	3.06 3.19	*** 	-.24 	2.94 3.16			2.98 3.17	** 	-.16 		
<i>During the current school year, about how much reading and writing have you done? 1=none, 2=between 1 and 4, 3=between 5 and 10, 4=between 11 and 20, 5=more than 20</i>															
3. Reading and Writing															
a.	Number of assigned textbooks, books, or book-length packs of course readings	READASGN	LAC FY SR	3.22 3.20	3.05 2.97	*** **	.20 .25	3.18 3.12			3.26 3.18				
b.	Number of books read on your own (not assigned) for personal enjoyment or academic enrichment	READOWN	FY SR	1.76 1.95	2.01 2.26	*** ***	-.26 -.31	2.06 2.19	*** ***	-.32 -.25	2.06 2.21	*** ***	-.33 -.27		
c.	Number of written papers or reports of 20 pages or more	WRITEMOR	LAC FY SR	1.18 1.62	1.31 1.79	*** *	-.18 -.19	1.26 1.64	* 	-.11 	1.25 1.64	* 	-.11 		
d.	Number of written papers or reports between 5 and 19 pages	WRITEMID	LAC FY SR	2.06 2.57	2.14 2.47			2.24 2.56	*** 	-.22 	2.29 2.59	*** 	-.27 		
e.	Number of written papers or reports of fewer than 5 pages	WRITESML	LAC FY SR	3.06 3.41	3.09 2.90	*** 	.44 	3.00 2.93	*** 	.41 	3.05 2.98	*** 	.37 		

^a Weighted by gender, enrollment status, and institutional size.

^b * p<.05 ** p<.01 *** p<.001 (2-tailed).

^c Mean difference divided by comparison group standard deviation.

				<i>UW-Stout compared with:</i>											
				UW-Stout			Selected Peers			Carnegie Peers			NSSE 2006		
<i>Variable</i>				<i>Mean^a</i>	<i>Mean^a</i>	<i>Sig^b</i>	<i>Effect Size^c</i>	<i>Mean^a</i>	<i>Sig^b</i>	<i>Effect Size^c</i>	<i>Mean^a</i>	<i>Sig^b</i>	<i>Effect Size^c</i>		
<i>Bench- mark</i>															
<i>Class</i>															
4. Problem Sets				<i>In a typical week, how many homework problem sets do you complete? 1=none, 2=1-2, 3=3-4, 4=5-6, 5=more than 6</i>											
a.	Number of problem sets that take you more than an hour to complete	PROBSETA	FY	2.67	2.81	*	-.13	2.57			2.63				
			SR	2.78	2.86			2.59			2.57	*	.18		
b.	Number of problem sets that take you less than an hour to complete	PROBSETB	FY	3.12	2.96	*	.12	2.76	***	.29	2.74	***	.31		
			SR	2.97	2.55	***	.34	2.40	***	.47	2.34	***	.52		
5. Examinations				<i>1=very little to 7=very much</i>											
	To what extent have your examinations during the current school year challenged you to do your best work?	EXAMS	FY	5.28	5.44	*	-.14	5.37			5.42	*	-.12		
			SR	5.19	5.36			5.45	*	-.21	5.41	*	-.18		
6. Additional Collegiate Experiences				<i>During the current school year, about how often have you done each of the following? 1=never, 2=sometimes, 3=often, 4=very often</i>											
a.	Attended an art exhibit, gallery, play, dance, or other theatre performance	ATDART05	FY	1.91	2.07	**	-.19	2.06	**	-.16	2.10	***	-.21		
			SR	1.79	1.94	*	-.18	1.92			2.01	**	-.24		
b.	Exercised or participated in physical fitness activities	EXRCSE05	FY	3.03	2.81	***	.22	2.72	***	.29	2.77	***	.25		
			SR	2.89	2.75			2.62	**	.26	2.70	*	.18		
c.	Participated in activities to enhance your spirituality (worship, meditation, prayer, etc.)	WORSHP05	FY	1.78	1.84			2.06	***	-.25	2.09	***	-.28		
			SR	1.85	1.96			2.14	**	-.26	2.18	***	-.29		
d.	Examined the strengths and weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue	OWNVIEW	FY	2.33	2.44	*	-.12	2.55	***	-.24	2.58	***	-.27		
			SR	2.61	2.53			2.66			2.69				
e.	Tried to better understand someone else's views by imagining how an issue looks from his or her perspective	OTHRVIEW	FY	2.57	2.60			2.72	**	-.18	2.74	***	-.21		
			SR	2.84	2.68	*	.18	2.82			2.83				
f.	Learned something that changed the way you understand an issue or concept	CHNGVIEW	FY	2.71	2.69			2.77			2.80	*	-.11		
			SR	2.78	2.74			2.85			2.87				
7. Enriching Educational Experiences				<i>Which of the following have you done or do you plan to do before you graduate from your institution? (Recoded: 0=have not decided, do not plan to do, plan to do; 1=done. Thus, the mean is the proportion responding "done" among all valid respondents.)</i>											
a.	Practicum, internship, field experience, co-op experience, or clinical assignment	INTERN04	EEE	FY	.04	.08	**	-.15	.08	***	-.16	.07	***	-.15	
			SR	.48	.54			.49			.53				

^a Weighted by gender, enrollment status, and institutional size.

^b * p<.05 ** p<.01 *** p<.001 (2-tailed).

^c Mean difference divided by comparison group standard deviation.

**NSSE 2006 Mean Comparisons
University of Wisconsin-Stout**

				<i>UW-Stout compared with:</i>									
				UW-Stout		Selected Peers		Carnegie Peers			NSSE 2006		
	<i>Variable</i>	<i>Bench- mark</i>	<i>Class</i>	<i>Mean^a</i>	<i>Mean^a</i>	<i>Sig^b</i>	<i>Effect Size^c</i>	<i>Mean^a</i>	<i>Sig^b</i>	<i>Effect Size^c</i>	<i>Mean^a</i>	<i>Sig^b</i>	<i>Effect Size^c</i>
b.	Community service or volunteer work	VOLNTR04	FY	.22	.36	***	-.27	.35	***	-.26	.37	***	-.30
			SR	.65	.57			.54	**	.22	.59		
c.	Participate in a learning community or some other formal program where groups of students take two or more classes together	LRNCOM04	FY	.09	.16	***	-.18	.16	***	-.17	.16	***	-.17
			SR	.25	.26			.24			.25		
d.	Work on a research project with a faculty member outside of course or program requirements	RESRCH04	FY	.06	.05			.04			.05		
			SR	.14	.19			.15			.19		
e.	Foreign language coursework	FORLNG04	FY	.10	.12			.18	***	-.21	.22	***	-.29
			SR	.25	.22			.34	*	-.19	.41	***	-.33
f.	Study abroad	STDABR04	FY	.01	.03			.03	*	-.09	.03		
			SR	.13	.12			.10			.14		
g.	Independent study or self-designed major	INDSTD04	FY	.02	.03			.03	*	-.09	.03	*	-.09
			SR	.14	.17			.16			.19		
h.	Culminating senior experience (capstone course, senior project or thesis, comprehensive exam, etc.)	SNRX04	FY	.01	.01			.01			.01		
			SR	.13	.46	***	-.67	.30	***	-.39	.32	***	-.43
8. Quality of Relationships				<i>Mark the box that best represents the quality of your relationships with people at your institution. 1=unfriendly, unsupportive, sense of alienation to 7=friendly, supportive, sense of belonging</i>									
a.	Relationships with other students	ENVSTU	FY	5.65	5.50			5.45	**	.14	5.48	*	.12
			SR	5.90	5.61	**	.22	5.61	**	.22	5.60	**	.22
				<i>1=unavailable, unhelpful, unsympathetic to 7=available, helpful, sympathetic</i>									
b.	Relationships with faculty members	ENVFAC	FY	5.07	5.08			5.20			5.19		
			SR	5.44	5.29			5.45			5.42		
				<i>1=unhelpful, inconsiderate, rigid to 7=helpful, considerate, flexible</i>									
c.	Relationships with administrative personnel and offices	ENVADM	FY	4.60	4.66			4.63			4.60		
			SR	4.63	4.55			4.56			4.50		

^a Weighted by gender, enrollment status, and institutional size.

^b * p<.05 ** p<.01 *** p<.001 (2-tailed).

^c Mean difference divided by comparison group standard deviation.

				<i>UW-Stout compared with:</i>											
				UW-Stout			Selected Peers			Carnegie Peers			NSSE 2006		
<i>Variable</i>	<i>Bench- mark</i>	<i>Class</i>		<i>Mean^a</i>	<i>Mean^a</i>	<i>Sig^b</i>	<i>Effect Size^c</i>	<i>Mean^a</i>	<i>Sig^b</i>	<i>Effect Size^c</i>	<i>Mean^a</i>	<i>Sig^b</i>	<i>Effect Size^c</i>		
<i>About how many hours do you spend in a typical 7-day week doing each of the following? 1=0 hrs/wk, 2=1-5 hrs/wk, 3=6-10 hrs/wk, 4=11-15 hrs/wk, 5=16-20 hrs/wk, 6=21-25 hrs/wk, 7=26-30 hrs/wk, 8=more than 30 hrs/wk</i>															
9. Time Usage															
a.	Preparing for class (studying, reading, writing, doing homework or lab work, analyzing data, rehearsing, and other academic activities)	ACADPR01	LAC	FY	3.83	4.17	***	-.20	3.76			3.99			
				SR	4.01	4.30			3.98			4.10			
b.	Working for pay on campus	WORKON01		FY	1.67	1.64			1.49	**	.15	1.53	*	.12	
				SR	2.02	2.06			1.65	**	.25	1.83			
c.	Working for pay off campus	WORKOF01		FY	1.88	1.96			3.06	***	-.45	2.59	***	-.30	
				SR	3.75	3.12	**	.24	4.42	**	-.24	3.81			
d.	Participating in co-curricular activities (organizations, campus publications, student government, fraternity or sorority, intercollegiate or intramural sports, etc.)	COCURR01	EEE	FY	2.42	2.29			2.03	***	.26	2.17	**	.17	
				SR	2.35	2.39			1.91	***	.30	2.08	*	.18	
e.	Relaxing and socializing (watching TV, partying, etc.)	SOCIAL05		FY	4.09	3.94			3.75	***	.20	3.79	**	.18	
				SR	3.62	3.57			3.40			3.48			
f.	Providing care for dependents living with you (parents, children, spouse, etc.)	CAREDE01		FY	1.37	1.58	**	-.15	2.01	***	-.33	1.78	***	-.24	
				SR	1.63	2.05	**	-.21	2.70	***	-.43	2.33	***	-.31	
g.	Commuting to class (driving, walking, etc.)	COMMUTE		FY	2.08	2.22	*	-.14	2.27	***	-.18	2.24	**	-.15	
				SR	2.29	2.38			2.45	*	-.15	2.38			
<i>To what extent does your institution emphasize each of the following? 1=very little, 2=some, 3=quite a bit, 4=very much</i>															
10. Institutional Environment															
a.	Spending significant amounts of time studying and on academic work	ENVSCHOL	LAC	FY	2.90	3.15	***	-.34	3.02	**	-.16	3.07	***	-.22	
				SR	2.94	3.11	*	-.22	3.06			3.08	*	-.18	
b.	Providing the support you need to help you succeed academically	ENVSUPRT	SCE	FY	2.87	3.02	**	-.19	2.96	*	-.11	2.99	**	-.15	
				SR	2.94	2.86			2.86			2.87			
c.	Encouraging contact among students from different economic, social, and racial or ethnic backgrounds	ENVDIVRS	EEE	FY	2.37	2.52	**	-.15	2.53	**	-.17	2.57	***	-.20	
				SR	2.36	2.31			2.41			2.40			

^a Weighted by gender, enrollment status, and institutional size.

^b * p<.05 ** p<.01 *** p<.001 (2-tailed).

^c Mean difference divided by comparison group standard deviation.

				<i>UW-Stout compared with:</i>											
				UW-Stout			Selected Peers			Carnegie Peers			NSSE 2006		
	<i>Variable</i>	<i>Bench- mark</i>	<i>Class</i>	<i>Mean^a</i>	<i>Mean^a</i>	<i>Sig^b</i>	<i>Effect Size^c</i>	<i>Mean^a</i>	<i>Sig^b</i>	<i>Effect Size^c</i>	<i>Mean^a</i>	<i>Sig^b</i>	<i>Effect Size^c</i>		
d.	Helping you cope with your non-academic responsibilities (work, family, etc.)	ENVNACAD	FY	2.24	2.10	**	.16	2.12	*	.13	2.13	*	.12		
			SR	2.01	1.84	*	.19	1.90			1.91				
e.	Providing the support you need to thrive socially	ENVSOCAL	FY	2.43	2.30	*	.14	2.33			2.37				
			SR	2.27	2.03	**	.27	2.10	*	.19	2.14				
f.	Attending campus events and activities (special speakers, cultural performances, athletic events, etc.)	ENVEVENT	FY	2.64	2.74			2.64			2.75	*	-.12		
			SR	2.65	2.45	*	.21	2.43	**	.22	2.57				
g.	Using computers in academic work	ENVCOMPT	FY	3.48	3.41			3.27	***	.25	3.32	***	.20		
			SR	3.49	3.56			3.44			3.47				

To what extent has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following areas?

1=very little, 2=some, 3=quite a bit, 4=very much

11. Educational and Personal Growth

a.	Acquiring a broad general education	NGENLED	FY	3.01	2.92	*	.11	3.09			3.12	*	-.13
			SR	3.25	2.97	***	.34	3.22			3.24		
b.	Acquiring job or work-related knowledge and skills	GNWORK	FY	2.77	2.93	**	-.17	2.67	*	.11	2.70		
			SR	3.23	3.13			3.04	*	.21	3.02	**	.23
c.	Writing clearly and effectively	GNWRITE	FY	2.87	2.68	***	.21	2.95			2.95		
			SR	2.96	2.78	*	.20	3.07			3.07		
d.	Speaking clearly and effectively	GNSPEAK	FY	2.80	2.64	**	.17	2.79			2.75		
			SR	2.97	2.80	*	.19	2.99			2.96		
e.	Thinking critically and analytically	GNANALY	FY	2.99	3.16	***	-.20	3.12	**	-.16	3.16	***	-.21
			SR	3.22	3.26			3.30			3.33		
f.	Analyzing quantitative problems	GNQUANT	FY	2.79	3.04	***	-.29	2.82			2.85		
			SR	2.97	3.18	**	-.25	3.00			3.02		
g.	Using computing and information technology	GNCMPTS	FY	3.21	3.23			2.98	***	.25	2.99	***	.23
			SR	3.44	3.38			3.20	***	.29	3.21	***	.28
h.	Working effectively with others	GNOTHERS	FY	2.93	3.02			2.92			2.92		
			SR	3.37	3.14	**	.28	3.15	**	.26	3.14	***	.27

^a Weighted by gender, enrollment status, and institutional size.

^b * p<.05 ** p<.01 *** p<.001 (2-tailed).

^c Mean difference divided by comparison group standard deviation.

				<i>UW-Stout compared with:</i>										
				UW-Stout		Selected Peers			Carnegie Peers			NSSE 2006		
	<i>Variable</i>	<i>Bench- mark</i>	<i>Class</i>	<i>Mean^a</i>	<i>Mean^a</i>	<i>Sig^b</i>	<i>Effect Size^c</i>	<i>Mean^a</i>	<i>Sig^b</i>	<i>Effect Size^c</i>	<i>Mean^a</i>	<i>Sig^b</i>	<i>Effect Size^c</i>	
i.	Voting in local, state, or national elections	GNCITIZN	FY	1.84	1.65	**	.21	1.94	*	-.10	1.92			
			SR	2.35	1.68	***	.75	2.06	**	.28	2.10	**	.25	
j.	Learning effectively on your own	GNINQ	FY	2.72	2.77			2.82	*	-.11	2.85	**	-.15	
			SR	2.97	2.89			2.96			3.00			
k.	Understanding yourself	GNSELF	FY	2.68	2.52	**	.16	2.69			2.71			
			SR	2.82	2.54	**	.28	2.74			2.78			
l.	Understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds	GNDIVERS	FY	2.36	2.35			2.57	***	-.21	2.58	***	-.22	
			SR	2.54	2.34	*	.21	2.58			2.57			
m.	Solving complex real-world problems	GNPROBSV	FY	2.51	2.68	**	-.18	2.55			2.58			
			SR	2.80	2.80			2.68			2.72			
n.	Developing a personal code of values and ethics	GNETHICS	FY	2.47	2.45			2.56			2.59	*	-.12	
			SR	2.66	2.42	**	.25	2.61			2.65			
o.	Contributing to the welfare of your community	GNCOMMUN	FY	2.14	2.17			2.29	**	-.16	2.34	***	-.21	
			SR	2.40	2.12	**	.30	2.37			2.42			
p.	Developing a deepened sense of spirituality	GNSPIRIT	FY	1.98	1.76	***	.23	2.03			2.05			
			SR	1.81	1.61	*	.22	1.89			1.92			
12. Academic Advising				<i>1=poor, 2=fair, 3=good, 4=excellent</i>										
	Overall, how would you evaluate the quality of academic advising you have received at your institution?	ADVISE	FY	3.06	2.93	**	.16	2.93	**	.15	2.94	**	.14	
			SR	2.89	2.78			2.81			2.82			
13. Satisfaction				<i>1=poor, 2=fair, 3=good, 4=excellent</i>										
	How would you evaluate your entire educational experience at this institution?	ENTIREXP	FY	3.15	3.10			3.13			3.16			
			SR	3.16	3.08			3.16			3.19			
14.				<i>1=definitely no, 2=probably no, 3=probably yes, 4=definitely yes</i>										
	If you could start over again, would you go to the same institution you are now attending?	SAMECOLL	FY	3.21	3.15			3.18			3.20			
			SR	3.14	3.03			3.14			3.17			

^a Weighted by gender, enrollment status, and institutional size.

^b * p<.05 ** p<.01 *** p<.001 (2-tailed).

^c Mean difference divided by comparison group standard deviation.

**NOTES FROM MEETING OF THE COMBINED SENATES
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-STOUT
FEBRUARY 13, 2007
BALLROOM C
2:30-5:00 P.M.**

Dennis Shaw, Chair of the Senate of Academic Staff, opened the meeting at 2:30 p.m.

- I. **Chancellor's Report** – Chancellor Sorensen explained that the Board of Regents approved the revised Admissions Policy and also discussed the issue of CVTC offering a parallel Liberal Arts Program during their February meeting. He added that he had an opportunity to discuss Stout's Polytechnic with a couple of Regents and all were supportive of the designation.
- II. **Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs' Report** – Provost Furst-Bowe announced that Stout will have a brief visit from AQIP representatives May 2 - 4 to verify that the campus is doing things correctly; one or more sessions will be planned regarding governance issues.
 - A. **AQIP Quality Check-up Site Visit on May 2-4, 2007 (Provost Furst-Bowe)**
 - B. **Room Scheduling Software (Jeff Kirschling)** – Jeff Kirschling, Registrar, explained that the new software, called Ad Astra Information Systems, will provide a new way in assigning classrooms that will be fully integrated with Datatel and PeopleSoft. One advantage to the program is that it will optimize Stout's classroom usage as efficiently as possible. Kirschling added that he is meeting with department chairs to determine their faculty or course preferences and room features. All pre-assigned general classrooms will be scheduled by Astra Scheduler for fall 2007. The Registration and Records Office will then manually evaluate all assignments, compare the results with the pre-assignments made by the department chairs, and work individually with the chairs to rectify any issues. The software will also be helpful in scheduling faculty teaching back-to-back periods in the same building. Additionally, specific classroom needs, including disability features, will be imbedded and incorporated into the system. Once all of the information is entered, the optimizer will be run, and a web piece will be implemented during this summer, so everyone can see how it's activated.
 - C. **Dunn County Community Visioning (Juliet Fox; Attachment 1)** – Juliet Fox, Director of Dunn County Community Visioning, explained that the group consists of a consortium of county leaders providing an opportunity for citizens to come together to explore options, drive policy, and solve problems initiated by the DCCV. Within the next year, the project will bring together over 350 Dunn County citizens to help create a vision for the future and to recommend programs and policies that will achieve that vision. Chancellor Sorensen asked Fox about the community's response. Fox replied that the project began as a "grass roots" project and is slowly gaining momentum. Consultants have been hired from Australia and Wisconsin to work together with the stakeholders, she concluded.
- III. **Vice Chancellor for Administrative and Student Life Services' Report** – Vice Chancellor Moen explained that Governor Jim Doyle's budget would be announced later in the day and his address would be given at 7:00 p.m. on public radio and television. It will be good news for the UW-System, especially since he's proposing many new revenue sources.
 - A. **2005-2006 Year-End Budget Review (Meridith Wentz; Attachment 2)** – Wentz gave an overview of the document, explained that it was an executive summary of a larger version on the BPA website, and provides a summary of accomplishments, challenges, and budget information for 2005-06.
 - B. **General Education Senior Level Assessment Survey (Meridith Wentz; Attachment 3)** – Wentz explained that the General Education Senior Level Assessment Survey was conducted each year for the past nine years, focuses on results from the past two years, and makes comparisons to the first year that the survey was conducted. The senior students who completed the survey were in the second cohort group who received laptop computers (during freshmen orientation) as part of the e-scholar program.

- IV. **Other Announcements & Information** – Jordan Chabalowski, SSA, explained that SSA was conducting some open listening sessions toward to the end of February to help improve communications between the students and administration and faculty/staff. The sessions will be used to facilitate good conversations and follow-up with concerns. Chabalowski asked Senators to please encourage their colleagues and students to participate.

Chair Shaw announced that Tommy Thompson will be on campus February 23 to talk about stem cell research.

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
FEBRUARY 13, 2007
BALLROOM C – (Following Meeting of the Combined Senates)**

ATTENDANCE:

CHAIR: Forrest Schultz

SECRETARY: Anne Hoel

VICE CHAIR: Len Bogner

PAST CHAIR: Steve Schlough

PRESENT: T. Allen, L. Jerlach for T. Brantmeier, K. Carlson, K. Doll, J. Dzissah, B. Flom, P. Ghenciu, D. Homa, R. Howarton, T. Karis, A. Kirby, K. McDonald, M. Miller-Rodeberg, R. Qalyoubi-Kemp, C. Rohrer, A. Scott, L. Stradins, J. Taylor, R. Teleb, J. Watts

EXCUSED: B. Anderson, B. Bergquist, P. Calenberg, S. Cole, G. Neidermyer, S. Nold, S. Terry

GUESTS: Chancellor Sorensen, Provost Furst-Bowe, W. Argo, W. Argo

I. **Call to Order**- 3:10 P.M.

- II. **Announcements and Information** – Chair Schultz explained that the Governor’s budget was discussed during the February Faculty Representative’s Meeting, including the Domestic Partners Benefits issue, LAB Audit, and collegial coverage. Dennis Shaw serves as an academic staff representative on the state-level committee and will be Stout’s contact person. The domestic partners benefits dilemma is becoming a big recruiting and retention tool, and Schultz encouraged Senators to campaign with their legislators regarding the topic.

III. **Minutes of January 30, 2007** (Attachment 4)

Motion: Schlough/Howarton moved to approve the Minutes of January 30, 2007.

Vote: Passed unanimously.

IV. **Committee Reports**

- A. **Planning and Review Committee** (Brian Finder; Attachment 5) - for information only.

V. **Old Business**

- A. **Learning Values/Culture of Affirmation at Stout** (Forrest Schultz; Attachment 6) – Chair Schultz explained that this item was brought to the Faculty Senate last fall by Hector Cruz and Dan Riordan as a result from last year’s University Priorities.

Motion: Bogner/Taylor moved to endorse the Learning Values/Culture of Affirmation at Stout.

Chancellor Sorensen asked how the document could be measured. Taylor reminded the group that this question was also asked last fall by the Faculty Senate. Schultz asked the Senators if they wanted to see this piece of the document. McDonald added that the discussion last fall focused on if it would only show up in a policy in a book sitting somewhere on a shelf, or be actually seen by people. Hoel said that she would follow-up with Riordan. Schlough suggested inviting them to attend a future Faculty Senate Meeting, so they could help answer questions. Schultz asked the group how this could be implemented at Stout. Provost Furst-Bowe replied that it would be publicized to demonstrate to new faculty what the culture at Stout's would be. However, performance evaluations would not be affected, she added.

Motion to Table: Schlough/Scott moved to TABLE the item until Cruz and Riordan could attend a Faculty Senate Meeting to give more information and answer questions.

Vote: Passed with one abstention.

B. Other

VI. New Business

- A. Dunn County Visioning Resolution (Forrest Schultz; Attachment 7) – Chair Schultz explained that the resolution came from Juliet Fox, Director for Dunn County Visioning.**

Motion to Endorse: Schlough/Scott moved that the Faculty Senate endorse the Resolution for Dunn County Visioning.

Scott and Kirby both felt that the feedback from the community was good, but would also like to see additional research, literature, smart growth planning, or examples from other communities that could be used to help formulate the guidelines for Dunn County. Schlough asked if other governmental bodies could help create the planning guidelines. Fox replied that they would; however, the core group would develop specific recommendations for the policy-makers regarding land use, development strategies, policy, and program implementation. Dunn County is unique because the community is embracing this concept before any changes in economic growth occur. Discussion ensued regarding having people randomly selected from a jury pool to ensure that representatives from different groups of people were represented.

Vote: Passed unanimously.

- B. University Priority Development (Forrest Schultz) – Chair Schultz explained that this item would remain on the agenda, since new priorities would be discussed during Faculty Senate meetings. Bogner stated that all Senators were enrolled in D2L in an effort to provide an opportunity for input and encouraged them to also discuss new issues in their department meetings. All information received would be used to help formulate new priorities for next year during the Chancellor's Summer Retreat.**
- C. Alignment Committee (Forrest Schultz and Len Bogner) – Chair Schultz explained that during its last meeting, the Executive Committee discussed forming an alignment committee and process on campus. The group would consist of three or four representatives from each Senate, who would work with Provost Furst-Bowe in forming the principles and giving input yet this semester. Schultz stated that he supported the proposal and the opportunity that faculty/staff and governance have to become engaged early in the process. Schultz said that Steve Noll, Julianne Taylor, and Len Bogner volunteered to serve as the Faculty Senate representatives; he has asked them to keep the Senate informed as the committee progresses. Discussion focused on the type of alignment that could meet Stout's challenges for the 21st century and the composition of the committee. Schultz said that it would be an evolving process and asked faculty to forward any ideas or concerns to the Senate's representatives. Brainstorming would take place this semester and summer, so models could be developed by**

fall semester. Schlough suggested examining the structures of UW-Superior and UW-Green Bay. Chancellor Sorensen added that the committee could look at different matrixes from various campuses, but should really try to think of a model that would be unique and benefit Stout the most. Discussion ensued regarding the pros and cons of realigning cross-disciplines across campus and how students could benefit by departments sharing labs and equipment facilities. For instance, it could be very beneficial for the sciences to share resources to enhance their specialties. How can Stout serve the students more efficiently? The committee would sift through all of the information and determine a structure that would add value to the students, as well as determine how various majors and departments could interface with each other.

D. Other

VII. Adjournment – 4:05 p.m.

**Respectfully submitted,
Anne Hoel**

**Recorded and prepared by,
Joy Evenson**

DATE: February 20, 2007
TO: Faculty Senate Executive Committee
FROM: Brian Finder
SUBJECT: PRC Status Report

1. The B.S. in Family and Consumer Sciences Program (program director is Diane Klemme) presented to the committee on 2/16/07.
2. The Honors Program (presented to the committee on 12/1/06) report has been approved by the committee and was recently forwarded to the Associate Vice-Chancellor's office for response.
3. Two SSA representatives, Jen Ragan and Jordan Chabalowski, have been recently added to the committee. The committee is still in need of two members from Faculty Senate, one from CHD, and one from the Graduate Education Committee.
4. During the next meeting on 3/2/07, the Art Education (P.D. is Joseph Haid) and the Mental Health Counseling (P.D. is Gary Rockwood) will be presenting their programs to the committee.
5. The PRC is currently entertaining a proposal that is designed to streamline the self-assessment process that the respective program director is currently required to follow. It is anticipated that a final decision regarding this proposal will be made during the next committee meeting.