

**NOTES FROM BUDGET PRIORITY LISTENING SESSION**  
**UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-STOUT**  
**NOVEMBER 7, 2006**  
**GREAT HALL D**  
**2:30-3:30 P.M.**

- I. **Budget Priority Listening Session (2:30-3:30 a.m.)** – Provost Furst-Bowe announced that Chancellor Sorensen was recovering nicely from his surgery. Julie gave an overview of the priority planning process and explained that everyone is given an opportunity for input to develop all of the campus' priorities. Each year, the university develops priorities using its mission, vision, values, enduring goals, and Focus 2010 goals as its base. Two-year priority timeframes are utilized to recognize the amount of time for priority deployment. From the summer's Strategic Planning Group's Summer Retreat and the fall's listening sessions, the Chancellor's Advisory Council determines its budget planning during late fall and winter. Then during the winter, the budget planning is done at the division/college level, after which the Chancellor communicates the final plan campus-wide.

Meridith Wentz, Director of Budget, Planning and Analysis, led the priority session and the Faculty Senate discussed each of the 2005-07 Priorities.

1. **Leverage the technology infrastructure in academic (teaching and learning) activities.** Discussion focused on off-campus students needing more service and the ability to provide new markets and programs through on-line learning. Faculty need to get comfortable using the on-line process, and resources should go with the new program. If a program can build on itself, there should be a guarantee to have the resources cover it.
2. **Implement a school-outside-a-school enterprise that serves learners statewide, nationally and internationally, through distance learning and other delivery methods.** Discussion ensued regarding how the understanding of various cultures could lead to the understanding of how to do business with other countries. People could obtain a broader understanding in the global, political, and international trends through working in co-ops, internships, and studying abroad. One suggestion was to reinstate the English Language Institute to allow Stout to attract more foreign and graduate students and to help change the campus' culture, so they could feel more comfortable. Perhaps we could bring people on campus (modeled after Career Day) to give students an opportunity to compete for intern positions in foreign countries. How can the white students be taught to have a better comfort level and skills to interact with other races?
3. **Create a culture of affirmation inside and outside the classroom.** Discussion included the importance of developing a campus culture instead of a classroom culture, so leadership can provide a culture of affirmation in the students (encouraging them, finding what they are doing right, etc.), especially to build up their morale and self confidence. The Chancellor has been trying to inform the campus on how hard people are working through his letters explaining his walks around campus. However, we still need dialogue within each department and build on that. Perhaps this could be linked to Madison to let the legislators know what Stout is doing. This could be tied in with the following questions: What have you done that you're proud of? How do you feel about the good things happening at Stout? So often, department chairs hear from their people what could be done, but it's often ignored because it doesn't fit, or isn't the right time, or could impact another department better. The open dialogue must go both ways.
4. **Achieve designation as a polytechnic institution and branding.** Discussion focused on how the campus needs to start promoting what it's been doing for years (such as the STEPS Program and Lego Project), instead of keeping them in the background. What kind of polytechnic campus would Stout become--like Georgia Tech (more focused) or broader? Feedback needs to be provided for what people envision for Stout.

5. Create a curricular incubation center that strengthens relationships with the Wisconsin Technical College System and supports the emerging technology programs. Perhaps the campus should try to streamline its programs to fit more with the two- year campuses, so students could easily make the transition to attend the campus. The hands-on, minds-on concept is still what makes Stout unique.

Other priorities included the lack of trust on campus. Why don't people trust each other? People feel that they can't speak out because they don't trust the administration and some colleagues. The campus should find out what the impediments are and if the barriers could be broken down, so it can move forward. This also ties in with the culture of affirmation and goes back to having honest, open communication and the ability to resolve conflict in a professional fashion without retribution. This needs to be addressed. Faculty/staff get invited to express their concerns, but when they do, the response is often negative. Most people care deeply for Stout, especially people who have been here a long time. How can we rebuild trust and pass on a positive communication process? This might be an issue that the Faculty Senate would want to address. Internal communication should also be a priority and people should concentrate on the good of the university as a whole, rather than be competitive between colleagues and departments. When we compete against ourselves, the campus is impeded to move forward.

**MINUTES  
FACULTY SENATE MEETING  
NOVEMBER 7, 2006  
GREAT HALL D  
(Immediately Following Budget Priority Listening Session)**

**ATTENDANCE:**

**CHAIR:** Forrest Schultz  
**VICE CHAIR:** Len Bogner

**SECRETARY:** Anne Hoel  
**PAST CHAIR:** Steve Schlough

**PRESENT:** T. Allen, B. Anderson, K. Carlson, J. Champe, K. Doll, J. Dzissah, B. Flom, P. Ghenciu, R. Howarton, T. Karis, A. Kirby, K. McDonald, M. Miller-Rodeberg, C. Rohrer, A. Scott, L. Stradins, J. Taylor, R. Teleb, S. Terry, J. Weissenburger, K. Zagorski

**EXCUSED:** B. Bergquist, L. Bogner, T. Brantmeier, P. Calenberg, S. Cole, A. Hoel, G. Neidermyer, S. Nold, J. Watts, G. Wheeler

**GUESTS:** W. Argo

**I. Call to Order – 3:30 p.m.**

**II. Announcements and Information**

**A. UWS-7 Update (Forrest Schultz) -** Chair Schultz explained that he attended a recent hearing of the Board of Regents' Disciplinary Committee intended to gather and listen to faculty concerns from each campus. In that hearing, they methodically went through all of the faculty input, took time talking about the validity of the concerns, but determined to not change anything. An open session followed, where Bob Mathieu, Faculty Rep from Madison, gave a methodical argument to change the document. The committee was impressed with the argument that Mathieu gave, plans to draft a new document this week, and hold another hearing. Everything then will go to the Board of Regents for their December meeting. Much discussion occurred after the hearing regarding what was needed to gain the public's trust. However, the committee wanted to understand the faculty's perspective and listen, but

faculty needed to be included in the process much earlier. It was also determined to follow UWS 4 when a person was charged and wanted to work with pay, as it's difficult to justify not paying someone if he/she wished to work. But if the person was in court and not able to work, then he/she would not receive any pay. However, any back pay would be automatically restored if the person was found innocent. If the person was charged with a serious crime, he/she would be asked to not report to work.

III. Minutes of October 17, 2006 (Attachment 1)

Motion: Zagorski/Howarton moved to approve the Minutes of October 17, 2006.

Vote: Passed with one abstention.

IV. Committee Reports

A. **Planning and Review Committee (Brian Finder; Attachment 2) – For information only.** Chair Schultz said that PRC still needs members and encouraged Senators to ask their constituents to serve.

V. Old Business

A. Other

VI. New Business

A. **Tenure Timeline for 2007-08 (PPC; Attachment 3)**

Motion: Ghenciu/Anderson moved to approve the Tenure Timeline for 2007-2008.

Vote: Passed unanimously.

B. **Criminal Background Check Policy (Forrest Schultz; Attachment 4) – Wayne Argo, Director of Human Resources, explained that Stout's Policy mirrors the UW-System's Policy, which will go into effect on January 1, 2007. There is one exception, however, that a person could be pre-approved by the Chancellor before being hired, but it would be contingent on the results of the routine background check. Criminal background checks are nothing new; some employees are required by law to have them done before they can work in certain jobs, such as family development, care centers, SVRI, etc. The Board of Regents would also like to require checks for all employees that have fiduciary responsibilities and hold master keys to state buildings. Stout's procedures would also check student employees that have money responsibilities. Background checks can be performed for people living all their lives in Wisconsin quickly through the free Wisconsin Court System on the web. The other system used is through the Department of Justice, runs \$5 each, and results are obtained in 20 minutes or less. When parallel checks are run, more information is obtained through the Wisconsin Court System, as it's a county-by-county check through the entire state. However, performing background checks in outside states is more difficult. The Big-10 campuses have contracted Hire Right (\$30-\$50 per check) that has results in less than four days. However, background checks for people who worked overseas would take longer. When people come for their interviews, they would sign for permission for Stout to run a check after the job is accepted.**

Schlough asked Argo who makes the decision to hire if a person has committed a felony. Argo replied that it depends how it was related to their job. Argo said that he, the Affirmative Action Director, System Legal, and administration would make the final determination. Much discussion ensued regarding that there were different employee requirements by different colleges/schools, case-by-case determinations, if a first year trial implementation could be done, and how background checks could save the campus money. Argo stated that this will go to the Board of Regents in December for their approval and to determine who would pick up the cost. McDonald said that System should provide a budget line instead of moving the cost to the departments and colleges, which would deplete the

budget needed for services and supplies.

**Motion:** Flom/Weissenburger moved to approve the UW-System Criminal Background Check Policy.

Schlough called for the question.

**Vote (by show of hands):** 16 in Favor; 5 Opposed; 1 Abstention.

**Amendment:** Weissenburger/McDonald moved to amend that the funding of the Background Checks be done at the UW-System level in Madison.

Allen called for the question.

**Vote (by show of hands):** 19 in Favor; 0 Opposed; 1 Abstention.

**Motion:** Scott/Flom moved to accept UW-Stout's Criminal Background Check Policy.

Discussion focused on including the department chair and dean in the decision-making process, especially to determine if the person was suitable for a specific departmental position, and the safety valve provided in the Chancellor being able to make an exception.

Ghenciu recommended that background check costs should be paid by Human Resources. Howarton agreed. Flom recommended that both policies should be consistent with each other and that Stout's Policy should also pass the expense down to Madison.

**Motion:** McDonald/Howarton moved to amend that the funding of the Background Checks be done at the UW-System level in Madison.

**Vote:** Passed with 1 Abstention.

- C. NSSE Report (Forrest Schultz; Attachment 5) – Chair Schultz explained that this item was put back on the agenda for information and to give another opportunity for the Senate to take further action. There were no comments from Senators about the report.
  
- D. Other - McDonald said that he admires the Chancellor walking around campus and trying to communicate what's going on. The lack of communication on campus is very real, and workload is a huge issue. Discussion ensued regarding how most faculty were hard-working people, but the idea of a 40-hour work week could be dangerous. The flow of information must be kept open so the campus knows how hard people are working. Chair Schultz said that the department chair's role was critical and department chairs have been meeting to recognize this, especially since no one has been trained to be a strong personnel manager. People tend to focus too much on the negative instead of the positive. One Senator said that it all comes down to a matter of trusting the department chairs and deans to determine the appropriate workloads for individuals. However, there will always be people that abuse the system and don't respond to their department chairs' and deans' guidelines, showing a lack of responsibility.

Chair Schultz asked the group if the Faculty Senate should endorse a "priority package," to not only help shape the priorities for this year, but ones for next year as well. It was decided to talk about forming a "blue ribbon task force" composed of interested Senators and faculty during the next Faculty Senate Executive Committee Meeting.

## VII. Adjournment -5:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Anne Hoel, Secretary

Recorded and prepared by,  
Joy Evenson