

NOTES FROM THE MEETING OF THE COMBINED SENATES
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-STOUT
DECEMBER 13, 2005
BALLROOM C
2:30 P.M.

The meeting was opened at 2:30 p.m. by Faculty Senate Chair, Steve Schlough.

- I. **Chancellor's Report** – Provost Furst-Bowe reported for the Chancellor, as he was unable to attend the meeting. Plans were being made regarding the ongoing research into the polytechnic design from various focus groups including parents, students, stakeholders, and faculty/staff. A consultation has been done with two market research companies, which gave quotes of \$160,000 and \$25,000. However, other alternatives include having Stout's BPA Office perform the focus group research or asking UW System's Research and Policy Operations to do the study. One Senator asked how much the UW System group would cost. Vice Chancellor Moen replied that the fee would be very minimal, if at all. Mauldin emphasized that many colleagues desired the campus to implement an unbiased quality research procedure, and said he was concerned that an in-house study could be more biased and rather limited in the data that was collected. He further asked the group that if the university would hire a cheaper marketing analysis company, would the study have quality, especially since the results would have a huge impact with students, faculty, etc. McDonald stated that he and Pete Heimdahl recently consulted with a company that charged \$400,000, so the company that would cost the campus \$160,000 was a "buy." Schlough asked the Provost what was wanted. She replied that the Chancellor was requesting feedback. Schlough asked how the steering committee would function. Furst-Bowe replied that Forrest Schultz would serve as Chair and other members would include governance and dean's representatives, as well as other members from across campus. Mauldin again voiced concern that this committee should be as unbiased as possible and not out-weighted by administrative opinions. Hoel said that Stout's student leadership was doing their own survey to determine students' understanding of "polytechnic," which included a thorough researching of other universities and background data. Terry elaborated that student recruiting was vital for the campus, especially how the programs and campus would be viewed by seniors in high school. He also suggested that it would be desirable to have a representative from High School Relations serve on the committee. Galloy asked if the Chancellor sent a written proposal to these companies before they submitted their quotes. Furst-Bowe replied that he had and could send the proposals to Joy for distribution, if desired. Schlough added that the Faculty Senate would appoint their representative to the steering committee later during the meeting. Provost Furst-Bowe announced that the campus was carrying out Plan 2008 and soon would be announcing an incentive program for hiring minority faculty/staff. She reported that the Board of Regents approved Stout's sabbatical proposals. Furst-Bowe said that she was getting many e-mails from instructors and others on campus on how she should enforce Evaluation Week. This issue comes up every semester. Chair Schlough emphasized that the Faculty Senate already has a policy on this, which states that it's important for the campus to have an Evaluation Week. Students pay tuition for this time, and instructors should either have a final exam or other meaningful activity during Evaluation Week. Schlough said that he would send an e-mail to all department chairs reminding them of this. Allen suggested that the problem could be solved by having faculty build this time into their syllabi at the beginning of each semester and then be held to it.
- II. **Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs' Report** – given above.
- III. **Chancellor for Administrative and Student Life Services' Report** - Keith McCarten, Security and Police Services, introduced George Acker, Stout's Capital Planner, to the group. Acker explained that the Parking Master Plan was an actual plan and not a design. It's a concept that will change over time and be affected by internal influences and external forces. McCarten gave an overview of the plan's highpoints. Parking has added two new lots for residence students (Lot 32 has 90 spaces; Lot 17 has 100 additional spaces). The objectives of the Plan are to match facilities to university priorities; establish levels of service; target land acquisition (parking is a land-intensive use); budget planning (how do we pay for it?); anticipate campus issues; and address community issues. The demand for parking will continue to grow at a moderate pace and there are limited alternatives to university parking lots (the campus needs to take care of its own). When the campus acquires land, it will be developed as quickly as possible. Good landscaping is a component for parking lots, as well as incorporating good lighting and safety features. Parking lots must meet compliance regarding disabled criteria for university access. Parking lots would not be placed on recreational land, but on other land, preferably on the peripheral of campus. However, they will also strive to continue to meet location parking needs. McCarten further explained that Parking would continue to fully meet every circumstance related to academics. There are currently 2700 parking spaces on campus, with one-half of these reserved for residence hall students, 43% for commuters, and then the campus rents another 250 on North Campus. Voluntary demand management is practiced by asking

freshmen students to leave their vehicles at home during first semester. Funding for the lots come from the customers paying to reserve them, as Parking needs to pay for everything that's proposed and approved. Concerning land acquisition, McCarten explained that it takes a long time to purchase some of the land from property owners living on the campus parameters, and the issue is potentially controversial, as it takes property off the tax roll. However, opportunities to purchase certain parcels of land don't usually come twice. Furthermore, it's also expensive to purchase new property (there are eight properties on a city block, which is worth approximately \$1 million dollars). McCarten additionally explained that as Parking acquires land for new parking lots, it becomes university land, and new buildings may be built on them in the future to meet growing needs. McCarten explained that the campus has been trying to purchase for a long time four acres of Menomonie's old feed mill near North Campus. The benefits of the parcel include that it's close to campus and the land could easily be converted into a parking lot. However, Parking does not have enough funds to purchase this property yet. Additional parcels of land Parking is looking at are by the Ministry and on South Campus, one block west of Home Ec. (it's desirable to expand and develop land west of the campus). One Senator asked if a commuter lot would be available in the future. McCarten replied that it would cause minimal dysfunction in the community, and land by the old railroad could possibly be used for the park and ride.

**AGENDA
FACULTY SENATE
DECEMBER 13, 2005
BALLROOM C – (Following Meeting of the Combined Senates)**

ATTENDANCE:

CHAIR: Steve Schlough
VICE CHAIR: Forrest Schultz

SECRETARY: Anne Hoel
PAST CHAIR: Mike Galloy

PRESENT: T. Allen, C. Bendel, G. Wheeler (for T. Brantmeier), M. Decker, G. Earl, B. Flom, W. Haid, R. Howarton, K. Mauldin, K. McDonald, M. Ondrus, A. Scott, R. Teleb, S. Terry, N. Weckmueller

EXCUSED: B. Anderson, T. Bensen, B. Bergquist, T. Brantmeier, P. Calenberg, K. Carlson, S. Cole, J. Dzissah, E. Hughes, L. Koepke, S. Nold, B. Peters, K. Thomas

GUESTS: C. Smith, W. Argo

I. Call to Order – 3:30 p.m.

II. Announcements and Information – Chair Schlough introduced Woody Haid to the group and explained that he would take Denise Brouillard's seat on the Senate as a representative from the School of Education for the remainder of her term. The Faculty Senate website has been updated by Joy; please send her any corrections. The Faculty Senate would be electing a representative to serve on the Polytechnic Steering Committee later in the meeting.

III.

IV. Committee Reports

- A. Planning and Review Committee (Brian Finder; Attachment 2)**
- B. Election Committee - Vice Chair Schultz announced that the Faculty Senate ballots would be counted on December 15, and the results would be posted on the bulletin board outside of the Senate Office, Room 11, Harvey Hall.**

V. Old Business

- A. Polytechnic Designation (tabled from October 18 Faculty Senate Meeting for more input) – Chair Schlough said that this item would remain on the table unless a motion was made to remove it.**
- B. General Education Credit Distribution (Ken Parejko; Attachments 3 and 4) – Chair Schlough explained that this item was distributed during the last Senate meeting for information. However, Parejko contacted him asking for Senate approval.**

Motion: Mauldin/Howarton moved to approve the General Education Credit Distribution.

Vote: Passed unanimously.

- C. Technology and Faculty Evaluations (Steve Schlough and Bob Peters) – Chair Schlough explained that Peters talked about this during the last Faculty Senate Meeting. There was a concern that**

faculty could be evaluated on the basis of how often they used the digital components in their classrooms. Schlough said that he asked Senators to think about the issue and send him any feedback, so the Executive Committee could further discuss the item. Allen suggested that the concern could be handled similar to the Definition of Research and Service and have each department set its own requirements. However, he added, that this could also be an opportunity for the Faculty Senate to help clarify a message to the departments by requiring them to list their digital component and technology use expectations, especially for their new faculty members who are on a tenure track. Decker suggested to charge one of the Senate's standing committees to explore the issue. Allen clarified that all departments were different in their expectations. Discussion ensued regarding that faculty could lose their ability to teach the way that they wanted to, which could be dangerous territory. McDonald said that PPC would be the logical committee to be charged. Mauldin added that the Provost asked the PPC to examine how this could be incorporated into the programs. Much more discussion ensued concerning the possibility of deans pressuring faculty and integrating certain requirements for the use of technology into faculty's evaluation statements. Claudia Smith clarified that the intent was to use the laptop as a tool for learning and not enforce any part or mode of teaching. Being proactive was fine, but she asked the group not to exaggerate any aspects in their discussion. McDonald agreed, but said he felt that defining the use of technology in classrooms was important because the dean could have authority to enforce it. Terry also agreed and explained that a basketball class would use technology differently than an English class. Schlough said that the evaluation of the faculty was done at the department level. Allen reminded the group that Chapter 36 of the State's Statutes indicates that personnel issues were primary faculty issues and faculty have a lead role in setting policy. After much discussion concerning the motion's wording, the Faculty Senate agreed upon the following:

Motion: McDonald/Weckmueller moved that the PPC be charged with the question, "Should technology be used as criteria in promotion and tenure?"

Vote: Passed unanimously.

Discussion continued regarding defining technology use in the classroom, as well as the strength a statement approved by PPC and the Faculty Senate would have on campus. Galloy suggested that faculty should receive a bonus for using technology in their classrooms and asked the Senate to think back three or four years ago on how many faculty then used technology in their classes, as compared to what percent do now. He stressed that Stout faculty try to do a good job with the tools that they have. Flom stated that technology seemed to only be defined as "digital;" however, in her play therapy class, she does not use a laptop computer, but other alternative types of technology instead. She continued by agreeing that it would be helpful for departments to define for the faculty what technology they wanted them to use.

- D. Faculty Senate Continues to Engage in Polytechnic Discussion (Motion from Faculty Senate Meeting of November 29, 2005) - Chair Schlough explained that the Senate passed a resolution for them to continue to engage in the polytechnic discussion. Galloy added that the Faculty Senate didn't feel comfortable yet with voting the polytechnic university up or down without obtaining more information, but only wanted to keep the polytechnic discussion alive. This item would also be kept on the Agenda, allowing discussion to ensue week by week.
- E. Graduate Education Committee Bylaw Changes (tabled from November 29 Faculty Senate Meeting; Attachment 5) – Flom explained that she was bringing the committee's revised bylaw changes to the Senate for approval. Allen said that the revised membership would add seventeen more members (program directors) and it would be difficult to arrange meetings with that large of group. He suggested instead that the committee not require them as members, but to just give them the opportunity to attend. Flom explained that GREC was approached by a program director that said the Graduate Council was dissolved and they wanted an opportunity to meet. Galloy interjected and said that they chose to let the Graduate Council dissolve. Smith agreed with Allen and explained that the Graduate Council was convened by the Provost and in the last two years, it was impossible to find a common time for them to meet. The Council couldn't do anything because they couldn't make their quorum. If it was GREC's intent to add the program directors as ex officio members, the same thing would happen again and it would be impossible for them to find a time to meet. She continued by saying that the group wanted a formal link to the Faculty Senate, so decided to form the Graduate Education Committee. This link helped fill a gap from an accreditation standpoint. Furthermore, Smith suggested that the group of advisory directors could still be kept as an advisory group. Allen agreed and added that they all could have standing invitations to all meetings, as well as be given the opportunity to submit any business items to the

agenda at any time.

Motion: Weckmueller/Flom moved to not approve the Graduate Education Committee Bylaw Changes and send it back to GREC for revision.

Weckmueller called for the question.

Vote: 1 aye; 2 abstained; Motion defeated by majority vote.

F. Other

VI. **New Business**

A. **Salary Guidelines for 2006-2007 (Karen Martinson; Attachment 6)**

Motion: Terry/Howarton moved to approve the Salary Guidelines for 2006-2007.

Vote: Passed unanimously.

B. Other – Chair Schlough stated that the Faculty Senate needed to appoint a representative to serve on the Polytechnic Steering Committee. Vice Chair Schultz explained that the Chancellor asked him to facilitate the group and he said yes. The polytechnic issue has been brought to the forefront, and many opinions have been voiced. As a result, a steering committee has been formed to provide an opportunity for input to be shared with the Chancellor and administration in an informal setting. The group would also serve as a “think tank” on this subject, helping to decide on possible sources for funding, inviting representatives from other polytechnic campuses and counselors from high schools to campus. Furthermore, Schultz concluded by saying that the group also would help disseminate all the information and give input to the Chancellor in his decision on what the campus should do. Mauldin volunteered to serve. Flom seconded Mauldin’s nomination. Discussion ensued regarding the need for untainted data, for all steering committee members to have open minds that could lead to action, and the importance of being able to provide governance input.

Motion: Galloy/Allen moved to nominate Kirk Mauldin as the Faculty Senate’s representative to serve on the Polytechnic Steering Committee.

Vote: Passed unanimously.

Weckmueller clarified that until the Faculty Senate voted and gave its recommendation regarding if the campus becomes polytechnic or not, no official faculty input would be given. The Faculty Senate has power by representing the faculty and its vote is important, he emphasized. McDonald agreed and said that he felt that the questions being asked concerning the polytechnic issue were critical. Terry added that if we could get our students involved to investigate the issue as well, they could also serve as one of Stout’s marketing tools whether or not to move to polytechnic. Much discussion ensued regarding:

- if moving toward polytechnic would result in a cosmetic change or one that would actually involve a discernable systematic change;
- the importance of Mauldin’s ability to take an agnostic approach on the committee, as well as having an open mind;
- the diverse questioning that needs to take place;
- and concerns that the entire process would be unbiased.

Schultz concluded by stating that the steering group would have the challenge to understand what Stout’s vision could be and how it could also generate this vision for Stout to move forward in the future.

VII. **Adjournment** – 4:21p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Anne Hoel, Secretary

Recorded and prepared by,
Joy Evenson