

NOTES FROM MEETING OF THE COMBINED SENATES  
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-STOUT  
JANUARY 31, 2006  
BALLROOM C  
2:30 P.M.

Steve Schlough, Faculty Senate Chair, opened the meeting at 2:33 p.m.

- I. **Chancellor's Report** – Chancellor Sorensen announced that he would begin a search for the Provost's position, as Julie was only appointed for a two-year interim term. The Chancellor said that a permanent person would help give the campus stability, especially as he plans to initiate searches for the Dean of Students, Dean of School of Education, and the CIO position. He asked Mike Galloy and Laura McCullough to co-chair the Provost's Search Committee; other members would include 1 from each college, 3 reps from the Faculty Senate and two reps from the Senate of Academic Staff, as well as others. The Chancellor noted that he hoped that the committee could meet next Monday, review applications in March, interview candidates in May, and have the person in place by July 1.

The Chancellor also announced that the Technology and Information Services was in the process of being realigned, especially as a result of the commitment to technology and the loss of positions due to budget cutbacks. The restructuring would be announced later in the week, he noted. Moreover, no jobs would be lost; the unit would only be realigned for efficiency reasons. The Chancellor reported that the campus was trying to retain student enrollment at its target (there were 90 freshmen over the campus' target this year). Concerning FTE, if the budget remained stable, the campus would be 11 FTE short. However, UW System announced that campuses could have an opportunity to obtain additional FTE (not 102 account positions, but 131 positions) from tuition revenue, which could be used to fund approximately ten extra instructional academic staff positions. In addition to this, UW-System was asking campuses to submit DIN (Decision Item Narrative) requests in March for 2007-2009, which could give Stout another opportunity to obtain 102 money from the State to help fund certain programs. (The last one received, he noted, was used to help fund the Graphic Communications Management Program.) However, obtaining the funding was extremely competitive between campuses and each must formulate a case for its need.

The Chancellor reported that System President Kevin Reilly would submit in February plans regarding the growth for the UW System, Reilly will also discuss possible ways that Wisconsin could grow economically, and how graduating students could earn higher wages.

Chancellor Sorensen said that there were plans to reduce out-of-state tuition in order to help bring in more out-of-state students. This would hopefully increase the student retention rate, graduation rate, students of color, and holistic concerns. Discussion ensued regarding Stout's retention rate; two major reasons that students transfer out were that they wanted to be closer to home and Stout doesn't offer their major. In conclusion, the Chancellor reported that Stout graduates earn the highest wages and have the highest employment rate of all the other UW schools, so the campus must be doing something right.

- II. **Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs' Report** – no report.

- III. **Chancellor for Administrative and Student Life Services' Report** – Vice Chancellor Moen distributed the "2005-2007 Base Cuts" to the group and explained that it showed the results of the Chancellor's decisions regarding the most recent budget cuts. Phase II will happen on July 1, when positions and dollars will be cut, including partial layoffs of classified employees. However, most of the cuts were accomplished through vacant positions, finding other funding sources, or through layoff. The JFC Reduction consisted of three positions that weren't filled effective at the beginning of the school year through retirements (the Director of University Relations was one of these). The remainder of the cuts (for a total of fifteen positions) will happen next year. Overall, the campus lost \$1.3 million dollars in base funding, which it can never get back. Moen distributed the "Annual Planning/Budget Development Process" to Senators and explained that it showed Stout's annual planning budget development process, beginning with the Summer Retreat in July. Moen also distributed "UW-System Summary of Transfers for System Wide Billings" and explained that the summary showed assessments and charges that come to UW-System and the State every year. Moen noted that the document showed mandatory transfers, tuition holdbacks, and nonmandatory transfers.

- A. **Beginning College Survey of Student Engagement (Tammy Cutsforth; Attachment 1)** – Tammy Cutsforth, Budget & Planning Office, gave a summary of the report and explained that the BCSSE was a companion survey to the NSSE that measures entering first-year students' high school academic and extra-curricular involvement, as well as the importance that these students place on

their future participation in educationally purposeful activities while in college. The pilot survey was administered by web only in 2005 to all new freshman at the beginning of the 2005 fall term. She also noted that 705 students responded out of approximately 1,722, which resulted in a response rate of 41%.

**MINUTES  
FACULTY SENATE  
JANUARY 31, 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, T. Bensen, B. Bergquist, T. Brantmeier, P. Calenberg, K. Carlson, S. Cole, M. Decker, J. Dzissah, B. Flom, W. Haid, R. Howarton, L. Koepke, K. Mauldin, K. McDonald, S. Nold, M. Ondrus, B. Peters, S. Terry, K. Thomas

**EXCUSED:** G. Earl, E. Hughes, A. Scott, R. Teleb

**GUESTS:** Chancellor Sorensen, W. Argo, D. Tyson

**I. Call to Order – 3:28 p.m.**

**II. Announcements and Information - Chair Schlough announced that three faculty representatives were needed to serve on the Provost Search and Screen Committee. Bob Peters volunteered to serve as the graduate program representative, and Kirk Mauldin and Anne Hoel volunteered to serve as the other representatives. Schlough asked if any other Senators were interested. Schultz nominated Steve Nold. McDonald seconded the nomination.**

**Motion: Brantmeier/Thomas moved to approve Bob Peters to serve as the graduate program representative on the Provost and Vice Chancellor Search and Screen Committee.**

**Vote: Passed unanimously.**

Schultz distributed paper to the Senators for them to vote for the other two committee representatives.

**III. Minutes of December 13, 2005 (Attachment 2)**

**Motion: Bensen/Howarton moved to approve the Minutes of December 13, 2005.**

**Correction: Bendel said that the word, “not,” needed to be struck from the motion at the top of Page 4 regarding the Graduate Education Committee Bylaw Changes.**

**Vote: Approved as corrected.**

**IV. Committee Reports**

**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. Other**

**VI. New Business**

**A. B.S. in Information and Communication Technologies (Brian Finder; Attachment 3)**

**Motion: Peters/Decker moved to approve the B.S. in Information and Communication Technologies.**

**Vote:** Passed unanimously.

- B. Bylaws of the Graduate Education Committee (Gene Ruenger; Attachment 4) – Flom explained that the committee wanted to remove the language concerning the program directors from the bylaws. Allen asked Flom if the intention of adding alternates was to give them membership status. Schlough said that the alternates would serve the same way as they do in CIC or GEC and only attend meetings if the regular members couldn't. The document was modeled after CIC's Bylaws and the official members would have the responsibility to contact their alternates in the event that they couldn't attend meetings.

**Motion:** Flom/Galloy moved to approve the Bylaws of the Graduate Education Committee.

**Friendly Amendment:** Mauldin suggested eliminating the word, "and," in the fourth sentence under C. 1. b. and capitalizing the "F" in "Four" to begin a new sentence. Flom and Allen agreed to the change.

**Vote as Corrected:** Passed unanimously.

- C. Graduate Education Committee's Recommendation for Revising the Exceptions to Graduate School Policies Committee (Gene Ruenger; Attachment 5) – Flom explained that this committee would examine expired requests from students.

**Motion:** Peters/Flom moved to approve the Graduate Education Committee's Recommendation for Revising the Exceptions to Graduate School Policies Committee.

**Vote:** Passed unanimously.

Vice Chair Schultz announced the results of the two faculty representatives elected to serve on the Provost's Search Committee: Anne Hoel and Steve Nold. Chair Schlough asked Joy to send a memo to the Chancellor informing him of the faculty representatives.

- D. Concern about Open Communications in Shared Governance (Steve Schlough) – Chair Schlough explained that many concerns were discussed during the January 24 Executive Committee Meeting, and this item was recommended to be brought forward to the Faculty Senate for discussion only. He noted that some members of administration thought that they were treated harshly at previous meetings or via written correspondence; other faculty also thought they were treated harshly. If the campus is to have an effective governance process, open communication is vital. This doesn't always mean that everyone agrees with each other, but people need to feel comfortable being able to speak during meetings. Hoel agreed and said that "agreeing to disagree" was the bottom line, especially since the faculty serve as role models for the students on campus. Even if there were differences of opinion, people still need to respect and trust each other and be able to speak their belief. Much discussion ensued. Schlough noted that some of the concerns had been resolved between certain individuals. Allen asked Schlough to clarify the situation regarding a certain department that felt it was unfairly treated. Schlough replied that he talked to the Chancellor, Provost, and Dean. Some members on the Executive Committee felt that the issue was not a Senate issue, but a department issue instead. Decker asked if it was a systemic problem on campus, or an issue of people hurting each other's feelings. Schlough replied that some people felt both have occurred. Terry said that the campus prides itself, especially in the Baldrige Process, on having open and honest communication and that needs to be the guiding compass during all meetings. Mauldin stated, in principle, faculty/staff do have rights to question things, whether they be using technology in classrooms or having the campus become polytechnic. There seems to be a lot of administrative pressure on both of these issues. Perhaps the Senate should examine these as a group? Certain departments shouldn't have these things held over them—as it limits open communication. Kirk also said that on a department level, there was no need to drag things out, but to only examine the concerns regarding evaluating technology in the classroom or the polytechnic issue. Thomas added that the department was split over the administrative decision—half felt it was retaliatory and half felt it was about time that the department was held responsible. Peters said that he always felt that he could say anything in an open forum and always felt comfortable with it. Schlough asked the group if this was a campus issue, or an isolated issue. Much more discussion ensued. Allen said that the campus went through a terrible process ten years ago and everyone has learned from that. It's a healthy sign that we can speak of this; otherwise it's kept a "hush-hushed" conversation. Senators then discussed the possibility of people not feeling comfortable serving on committees. Schultz tried to summarize the dilemma and said that the Faculty Senate was a place for open forum and dialogue

to take place. It's a place for faculty to have discussion and an opportunity for input. In the past ten years, strong leadership was desirable for the Senate, especially since there were times where a stronger departmental representative was needed to sit on the Faculty Senate. He asked the group if something should be done with all of the information. Perhaps the group would say to the administrators, "job well done," or perhaps it needed to analyze Mauldin's concerns and see if things needed to change. Some Senators said that their departments felt that their academic freedoms have been jeopardized, especially in light of the budget cutbacks. Allen added that the campus has a positive action committee that could operate regarding any grievance or complaint issues. Once a complaint was received by Wayne Argo, he would initiate the process to form the positive action committee process to arrive at finding a solution. If a person felt he/she had been wronged, Allen concluded, that he/she could always go this route. It was agreed that the Chancellor will send Joy a copy of the letter to distribute to Senators for their information. Terry said that the dialogue demonstrated the Senate's ability to discuss a very difficult issue. Schlough reminded the group that there were also listening boards on the web where people could anonymously list concerns and respond to issues.

E. Other

VII. Adjournment – 4:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Anne Hoel, Secretary

Recorded and prepared by,  
Joy Evenson