

NOTES FROM THE MEETING OF THE COMBINED SENATES
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-STOUT
NOVEMBER 29, 2005
BALLROOM C
2:30 P.M.

The meeting was called to order by Steve Schlough, Chair of the Faculty Senate, at 2:30 p.m.

I. **Chancellor's Report** – Chancellor Sorensen reported that the CIO Search was coming to a conclusion; four candidates will be interviewed in December, with the chosen person beginning the position in mid-January. There recently was a CVTC gathering in Eau Claire regarding the nanotechnology effort. The Governor is extremely interested in this region and to develop a work force. CVTC is a genuine visionary leader for the economy and this would provide a good opportunity for Stout. The Chancellor reported that he met with System President, Kevin Reilly, and Don Mash, System Executive Senior Vice President, last Friday regarding the polytechnic issue and gave them copies of the Discussion Paper. Their support was general and they liked the idea of a branding effort for Stout. The Chancellor also added that he intends to hire a firm from the Twin Cities to come and meet with various focus groups/stakeholders to help decide what could be done to enhance Stout and asked all campus governance groups to continue discussion. All discussions and focus session feedback should be completed by mid-March, when a decision would be made. If the polytechnic brand is approved on campus, the Chancellor said he would work with the Board of Regents and move forward with the proposal. Currently, Chancellor Sorensen was visiting departments to talk about the issue.

II. **Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs' Report**

A. **Laptop Update (Jane Henderson)** – Jane Henderson, Assessment and Learning Technology Services, explained that the goal of the Teaching and Learning Center, as well as e-Scholar, was to continue offering strategies and support to instructors for learning and teaching and also demonstrate what was possible in a learning environment. The staff from LTS was focusing on celebrating what the campus' faculty and staff were doing in their fields; Stout's faculty were on the cutting edge and out in front of comparable companies and universities. She noted that LTS staff has heard concerns about classroom management and how to manage large classrooms with laptops and was currently assisting instructors in how to work those challenges. (Instructors can always tell their students to put the tops down on their laptops.) Concerning student engagement, a recent workshop has been held that was very successful. There have been scholarships given in teaching and learning areas and various types of programs held. Cultural affirmation was also being examined on campus. Over 90 participants shared what was going on in their classrooms in a recent workshop. The Teaching and Learning Center was growing, and faculty/staff were implementing some of the teaching practices and lesson studies learned in their classrooms. Henderson reported they were currently coordinating a mentoring program with the Advisory Board, since many instructors have various ideas to share, but do not wish to go public with them. Anne Hoel (Faculty Senate Secretary) was assisting with the project. Henderson reported that in January, they would be conducting the Student Learning Engagement Survey. Faculty Senate Kitrina Carlson is involved in a TLC supported learning community project with first and second year faculty. The data they were collecting from faculty vs. students shows a learning gap, and the Center will try to fill this gap by holding more professional development workshops, she concluded.

III. **Vice Chancellor for Administrative and Student Life Services' Report** – Vice Chancellor Moen distributed and gave a brief overview of the "UW-Stout's Administrative and Student Life Services Focused Initiatives." She explained that the mission of her unit was committed to promoting the growth of students by providing quality programs, services, and facilities in collaboration with the university, community, and others they serve. Moen also distributed the "Administrative & Student Life Services 2004-2005 Annual Report on Focused Initiatives" and explained that the document showed 2004-2005 accomplishments and progress toward initiatives in providing services in more efficient ways regarding Information Technology, Diversity, Health & Safety, Students, Training & Development, Facilities, and Collaboration & Communication. She explained that some of the improvements include implementing a payment process for students to pay tuition fees on-line, utilizing an imaging project for records (one process was saving 31,000 pieces of paper per year), asbestos management, classified mentoring, and performing more tasks electronically (i.e. on-line auditing, work orders, etc.). The per credit tuition program has begun this fall, with Stout slowly moving toward a per credit campus. A career exploration program has begun which includes minority students from the Menomonie High School who are paid to work for Stout as interns.

A. **UCLA Survey Overview (Attachment 1)** – Meridith Wentz, Director of Budget, Planning and Analysis, stated that the survey was administered every three years to all instructional faculty and staff. Compared to the 2001 survey, faculty/staff have become less satisfied with salary and fringe

benefits, opportunities for scholarly pursuits, and relationship with administration. There were mixed responses regarding questions dealing with diversity. Stout faculty/staff feel the quality of students has increased since 2001, but feel working with unprepared students was a source of stress. The most important goals faculty/staff felt were to prepare students for employment after college, develop ability to think critically, and help master knowledge in a discipline.

- B. **Morale Committee Update (Attachment 2)** – Wentz announced that the Morale Survey Revision Task Force was being charged to develop and implement a revised morale survey to be administered in 2006-2007. This survey would serve as the university-wide climate assessment survey outlined in Plan 2008. It is hoped that Stout’s results could also be benchmarked with other institutions.
- C. **Scanner** - Wentz explained that the company where Stout purchased the Scanner from would no longer be able to provide support for the software in December 2006, and the campus would need to replace all the equipment if it wanted to continue using the Scanner. It would cost an estimated \$13,300 to upgrade the software and equipment, plus an annual charge. The campus is currently working with Doug Wahl in examining various possibilities and options that could be used if the Scanner was eliminated. Wentz noted that there were many piloting tools that could be used. Schlough said that the item would be discussed further under New Business.

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
NOVEMBER 29, 2005
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, P. Calenberg, K. Carlson, S. Cole, M. Decker, J. Dzissah, G. Earl, B. Flom, R. Howarton, L. Koepke, K. Mauldin, K. McDonald, M. Ondrus, B. Peters, A. Scott, R. Teleb, N. Weckmueller

EXCUSED: B. Bergquist, T. Brantmeier, D. Brouillard, E. Hughes, L. Milanesi, S. Nold, S. Terry, K. Thomas

GUESTS: Chancellor Sorensen

I. Call to Order – 3:17 p.m.

II. Announcements and Information

- A. **Promotion Quotas for 2006-2007: 10 to Associate Professor; 6 to Full Professor.**
- B. **Steve Cole was added as the Faculty Senate representative to the CIO Search Committee by the Chancellor.**

III. Minutes of October 18, 2005 (Attachment 3)

Motion: Decker/Howarton moved to approve the Minutes of October 18, 2005.

Vote: Passed unanimously.

IV. Committee Reports – Chair Schlough stated that the reports were for information only and noted that PPC was planning on bringing the Salary Guidelines to the December 13 Faculty Senate Meeting.

- A. **Personnel Policies Committee (Karen Martinson; Attachment 4)**
- B. **Planning and Review Committee (Brian Finder; Attachment 5)**

V. Old Business

- A. **Dahlgren & Price Ranney Professorships for 2006-2007 Academic Year (tabled from October 18 Faculty Senate Meeting; Attachment 6) – Chair Schlough explained that three options were presented in an earlier Senate meeting. During the last Senate Meeting, a motion was passed asking the Chancellor to check with the Foundation Office concerning using discretionary funds so the entire number and original amount of the professorships could be maintained. Chancellor Sorensen said that the Foundation Office could provide funding, but only for one year. The dilemma would occur next year and a decision would again need to be made. He asked that the Senate discuss this during the coming year on what to do for next year. Galloy asked how much**

discretionary funds could be funded. The Chancellor replied between four and five thousand dollars. Peters asked where the Foundation Office funds could be used if they didn't go toward the professorships. The Chancellor replied that they would be used toward scholarships. Peters stated that he would rather see the money fund more scholarships and was in favor of granting fewer professorships and more scholarships next year.

Motion: Galloy/Mauldin moved that the Faculty Senate support the solution of funding the professorships through using discretionary funds from the Foundation Office this year, and visit the issue again next year.

Vote: Passed unanimously.

- B. Digital Governance (Faculty Senate charged Executive Committee to craft a formal charge to the Digital Governance Committee; Attachment 7) – Chair Schlough explained that the Digital Governance Committee met last year. The Executive Committee gave them more direction in a formal charge (Attachment 7) on November 15, 2005. Vice Chair Schultz will chair the committee, which plans to meet before the end of the semester.

Motion: Decker/Dzissah moved to approve the Digital Governance Committee Charge.

Vote: Passed unanimously.

- C. Polytechnic Designation (tabled from October 18 Faculty Senate Meeting for more input; Attachments 8 and 9) – Chair Schlough explained that this item was tabled, discussed during the November 15 Executive Committee Meeting. The Senate recommended to leave it tabled, since there was a motion under New Business to further study the polytechnic issue. There was no motion to remove the item from the table.

- D. Committee Inventory (Steve Schlough)- Chair Schlough stated that since no one volunteered to serve on the task force, the Executive Committee agreed that he and Joy would go through the list of committees, contact the chairs to see which ones were still valid, and clean up the committee list. Galloy suggested that the committee list be put on the website, once it's functioning. Schlough reported that he, Schultz, and Joy met last week and progress was being made. However, the office needed to order Contribute 3 in order to be compatible with new passwords that the Computer Center sent Joy. Galloy said that he liked the pdf format. Schlough replied that he would try to put the meeting materials into this format, especially when the packet included many attachments.

- E. Other

VI. New Business

- A. Focus Groups and Discussion of Polytechnic (Steve Schlough)

Motion: Galloy/Howarton moved that the Faculty Senate continues to engage in the polytechnic discussion.

Weckmueller asked the Chancellor if there was a timeline. Chancellor Sorensen replied that he would like the results from the focus groups by mid-March. Weckmueller asked if the focus groups would parallel the Faculty Senate discussions, or be different. The Chancellor replied that he would like them to parallel what was being discussed, and added that he was visiting campus departments to discuss the item internally. Weckmueller said that he felt comfortable with leaving this item on the Senate Agenda until mid-March. Chancellor Sorensen said that he was planning to appoint a steering committee within the next two weeks that would obtain ongoing information and run comparisons, as well as send a few campus groups as delegates to visit comparable polytechnic schools to obtain more information. Polytechnic representatives could also come to Stout to share their information. Additionally, information would also be gathered from the student population in other schools. Sorensen clarified that all information would be shared with the Senates. As the campus looks at increased competition from other schools in higher education, it's important for Stout to brand itself differently from the others—and the issue of branding is important. Sorensen then asked the group if there could be another alternative or direction Stout could go if it doesn't move toward polytechnic. Much discussion ensued. Mauldin explained that his department wanted the faculty to have an opportunity to give more input on the

subject and wanted to ensure that data collecting didn't substantiate where the leadership wanted to go. The department also wanted to ask people how they feel about it, rather than being convinced. Polytechnic could mean completely different things to other schools; we need a clear indication of marketing appeal of all groups, especially as the campus is trying to strengthen relationships with the two-year schools. Mauldin said that that his colleagues further discussed the possibility of faculty voting for a referendum later on in the process, as well as possibly hiring an outside consultant to prevent bias research. Teleb said that everything should complement each other as the campus acquires its research, and the polytechnic campus needs to be thoroughly explained to the campus, so they can comprehend it. Bensen added that if a faculty survey was done now, it would show a negative and uninformed viewpoint--everyone needs to understand all the benefits and obtain more information, so the campus could make a knowledgeable decision. Decker said that his department was wondering if polytechnic would gain anything for General Education and would like to see information that could compare Stout with other polytechnic campuses. Flom agreed and said that the more SOE people learned about it, the less negative they would feel. Galloy interjected and added that it all had a lot to do with marketing and branding. The Chancellor said that being polytechnic also dealt with the campus' program array. Perhaps Stout should market which student careers could be obtained from its majors instead. How could the campus craft a successful marketing plan? What types of careers do students have when they leave Stout? Galloy recommended seeing the data first before making a decision. Allen made the point that Stout faculty and administrators are likely to be familiar with polytechnics all over the nation. Polytechnics such as Cal Poly were selected as benchmarks for comparisons in the Baldrige processes because they have distinctive missions similar to Stout and because they represent levels of excellence to which we aspire and would choose to be compared. The concern is that our prospective students, their parents and teachers and other major stakeholder groups may be thinking of institutions on a far more regional basis. Polytechnic is not a descriptor used in Wisconsin and Minnesota universities. Illinois, Michigan, and Indiana have universities with the label, but probably few of our prospective students seriously consider going to these states. It would be interesting to see how the term is interpreted in the focus groups by those who are unfamiliar with prestigious institutions like Cal Poly. It is suggested that reactions to the Polytechnic label be solicited before any mention that Stout is considering using the descriptor. The Poly label that we see as positioning our campus among some highly prestigious campuses could bring to mind the local two-year tech college for our Wisconsin and Minnesota stakeholders. We need to know how this label might enhance or diminish how stakeholders view Stout. McDonald asked if the focus group was affiliated with a professional firm. The Chancellor replied that it was. Anderson said that the Morale Report showed that faculty felt they were typically at odds with campus administration and suggested that they possibly felt that not "all cards were on the table." Would the polytechnic decision create a healthy climate for Stout? Bensen asked the group if the polytechnic campus would present Stout as favorable or unfavorable and would it lower the campus' hiring standards? It is very important to benchmark ourselves against comparable institutions for growth opportunities as a campus. Are we asking the right people and asking the right questions? Schlough encouraged Senators to send all feedback to Chancellor Sorensen or the Senate Office, as the campus needs to pass all information to the consulting group to help them make an informative decision. Chancellor Sorensen concluded by saying the polytechnic idea didn't come out of a single mind—it came out in 2001 from many different people; the idea has been out there for quite awhile. Change is inevitable—how can we best position Stout for the next level? Chair Schlough said that this item would be kept on the Agenda, so discussion could ensue week by week.

Vote: Passed with 1 abstention.

- B. Graduate Education Committee Bylaws Changes (Gene Ruenger; Attachment 10) – Flom explained that the committee needed to change its bylaws. Allen questioned the ambiguous language that allowed program directors to vote and questioned how many needed to show up at a meeting. Discussion ensued regarding membership and difficulty in finding a common time for large committees to meet. Galloy said that the attachment wasn't clear enough and recommended that new handout be made showing the old bylaws and what was amended. Flom agreed and said she would bring another document that had better clarification to the next meeting.

Motion: Galloy/Weckmueller moved to table the Graduate Education Committee Bylaws Changes.

Vote: Passed with 1 opposed.

C. General Education Credit Distribution (Ken Parejko; Attachment 11) – Chair Schlough explained this was just an information piece and the committee was still working through the document.

D. B.S. in Hotel, Restaurant and Tourism Management (Brian Finder; Attachment 12)

Motion: Galloy/Peters moved that the Faculty Senate accept the B.S. in Hotel, Restaurant and Tourism Management.

Vote: Passed unanimously.

D. Scanner (Steve Schlough) – Chair Schlough stated this topic was discussed at the Executive Committee and Wentz explained that there were other options available for electronic media. Galloy said it was difficult because the campus doesn't know what other media the Scanner was being compared to. It would be helpful if the Senate could examine a list of alternatives/options. Allen explained that he spoke with Chris Ness—the current system came on campus in 1997 and was running on a Windows 95 machine, which was old technology. He recognized that the needs for the simple Scanner would eventually taper down, but thinks there was enough need to justify keeping it. Wentz said that more information could be sent out. Allen agreed that it would be helpful. Mauldin explained that the feeling of the Executive Committee was to endorse getting the new Scanner. It wasn't an issue of whether to go on line or not, but that a reliable testing method still needed to be maintained when students take their exams, especially in the larger classrooms. Perhaps five years from now, the campus would be in a different place that could accommodate other alternatives easier.

Motion: Mauldin/McDonald moved that the Faculty Senate recommends purchasing the new scanner.

Discussion ensued regarding the \$1,000 per year maintenance contract and ongoing license fees. Bensen agreed with Mauldin and said that Scanner use may diminish over the next few years, but many instructors and departments were currently very dependent on its availability.

Vote: Passed with 2 No's and 1 Abstention.

E. Other - e-Scholar Assessment Committee (Bob Peters)

Peters said that a concern came up after this summer when there was discussion regarding e-Scholar course management and the implication that faculty could be evaluated on the basis of how often they used the digital components in their classrooms. He added that this issue was not related to the Committee, but were just his thoughts relative to the digital environment and faculty being impacted by it. Peters asked the group if the Faculty Senate should examine various issues and provide input/insight regarding the digital environment, especially since it's causing faculty/staff to change the way they teach and could impact pedagogy. If a professor chooses not to utilize the computer in his class, would he be penalized on his evaluation? Furthermore, faculty shouldn't be all lumped in together, especially since the courses they teach are so diverse. Decker agreed, felt it was a valid issue, and said that a pottery class probably wouldn't use a laptop as often as some of the other classes. Bensen also agreed, said it was time for faculty to reflect on its appropriateness, and was stunned that students haven't discussed this yet. However, it would be helpful to get additional feedback on the different ways faculty/staff use the electronic media. Much discussion ensued regarding how some faculty don't feel comfortable using digital media, and some felt very comfortable, and should this be a reflection on how well faculty perform their work? One Senator mentioned that the Provost possibly wanted to evaluate internet use, or how many faculty were putting courses and other information on line. Would this be an indirect measure of how well faculty were doing their job? As faculty, we need to insert ourselves in the discussion, or at least be part of it, especially if the intent is to evaluate faculty. Mauldin informed the group that the Executive Committee felt it was a valid concern and faculty should have input. Cole and Hoel agreed. Many students indicate they would much rather talk directly to a professor, rather than type to each other. Allen also agreed, and said that the primary role and responsibility of faculty should not slip away. Schlough asked Senators to think about it and give him feedback, so the Executive Committee could take further discussion of the item.

VII. Adjournment – 4:31 p.m.

**Respectfully submitted,
Anne Hoel, Secretary**

**Recorded and prepared by,
Joy Evenson**