

**NOTES FROM THE MEETING OF THE COMBINED SENATES
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-STOUT
FEBRUARY 14, 2006
BALLROOM C
2:30 P.M.**

Steve Schlough, Faculty Senate Chair, welcomed everyone at 2:30 p.m. He announced that Chancellor Sorensen was recognized as Citizen of the Year by Menomonie's Chamber of Commerce. Schlough also said that Faculty Senate Past Chair, Mike Galloy, went in to have an angioplasty and a stent inserted into one of his arteries. During the procedure, his heart stopped and a pacemaker was put in. He is fine, at home recovering, and plans to return to campus in approximately a week.

I. Chancellor's Report – Chancellor Sorensen announced that he had recently spoken with Galloy, who was in good spirits. The Chancellor announced that the Board of Regents approved lowering the nonresident student tuition in order to help draw more students into the state's campuses while not decreasing the number of in-state students. The Chancellor said that UW System was providing an opportunity for campuses to apply for more FTE positions. These FTE would be one-time positions annually reviewed by System. The Chancellor also reported that System informed the campus that it needed to buy back one of two positions that it gave up within the last couple of years. He will share additional information when he finds out more. Terry asked about the DIN funding requests and if departments could request these. The Chancellor replied that they could, encouraged departments to apply, but noted that the requests must be submitted by late March.

II. Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs' Report

A. "Early Alert" System (Joan Thomas) – Joan Thomas, Associate Dean of Students, demonstrated the "Early Alert" System to the Senate and asked that everyone help participate in the process so the students could benefit. This system will help target students who aren't retained and who might have adjustment issues, alcohol or drug problems, depression, etc. With a large incoming freshman class, the campus has a difficult time zeroing in on every student at risk and this process could help find him/her earlier. Thomas explained that the system was very user-friendly and demonstrated the procedure to the group. She explained that everyone who teaches freshmen will receive an e-mail from her asking to identify at risk students via the Early Alert System in their courses who weren't performing academically successfully. After her office receives an e-mail from the instructor, advisers will then contact the students. Schlough agreed that the university at-large would benefit from the system and encouraged Senators to participate. Thomas also added that her office receives many phone calls from parents asking why the campus doesn't let them know that their students were doing poorly in their classes. However, students may now sign a release form that could possibly let their parents know if they weren't performing well. Additionally, the system could be used to identify students who were excelling academically as well.

III. Vice Chancellor for Administrative and Student Life Services' Report

A. 2005 Governance Evaluation Report and Recommendations (Wendy Knutson; Attachment 1) – Chair Schlough announced that this item would be postponed due to a family emergency.

Vice Chancellor Moen distributed an "Administrative Briefing on the Strategic Planning Group" to Senators and reported that the group met earlier in the day to review the six-month progress towards select action plans— Plan 2008; University Priorities; Academic Plan; and IT Plan. She explained that the website for the group was at the bottom of the document. Moen added that the other side of the handout explained the recent travel updates.

Tammy Cutsforth, Budget, Planning & Analysis Office, gave an overview of the "Alumni Outcomes Survey Report for 2005" and explained that it compared the results of the alumni outcome surveys from 2000 and 2005 and was conducted by UW-System.

Chair Schlough asked Moen why the Facility Use Policy needed reviewing by both Senates. Moen replied that the policy was very outdated (1989) and it just needed to be modernized in order to get it in line with the Chancellor's mandate that states that the Registrar's Office was the centralization office responsible for scheduling classrooms first, then the Student Center would be responsible.

An invitation was given asking everyone to attend the on-campus interviews and give input regarding the candidates for the Director of Library Position. An announcement was also made inviting everyone to attend and give feedback to the Chancellor at the Priority Listening Forums scheduled later in the week.

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
FEBRUARY 14, 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, P. Calenberg, K. Carlson, S. Cole, M. Decker, J. Dzissah, G. Earl, B. Flom, R. Howarton, L. Koepke, K. Mauldin, M. Ondrus, B. Peters, A. Scott, S. Terry, K. Thomas, N. Weckmueller

EXCUSED: B. Bergquist, T. Brantmeier, M. Galloy, W. Haid, A. Hoel, E. Hughes, K. McDonald, S. Nold, F. Schultz, R. Teleb

- I. Call to Order – 3:32 p.m.
- II. Announcements and Information
- III. Minutes of January 31, 2006 (Attachment 2)

Motion: Decker/Bensen moved to approve the Minutes of January 31, 2006.

Vote: Passed unanimously.

IV. Committee Reports

- A. **Personnel Policies Committee (Karen Martinson; Attachment 3)** – Chair Schlough said that PPC’s report was only an update, as Martinson was unable to attend Senate Meetings during this time.
- B. **Planning and Review Committee (Brian Finder; Attachment 4)** – Chair Schlough explained that this item was also for information.
- C. **Other - Polytechnic Report (Kirk Maudlin)** – Maudlin reported that the Polytechnic Group was examining different categorizations regarding various universities/schools and created a matrix list that compares Stout to the other campuses. He noted that they met three weeks ago and have not been called to meet again. Senators engaged in discussion on what “polytechnic” meant, if the term brought to mind Calpoly or Chippewa Valley Technical College, and what these words and/or associations say to people, especially Stout’s important stakeholder groups. Mauldin said that the Chancellor has chosen to hire the James Tower Group for \$25,000 to research if polytechnic was the way Stout should go. The James Tower Group also works and does research for other technological universities and their focus is a technology service provider, he explained. Discussion further ensued concerning if the students knew what polytechnic meant and the data that showed that twice as many students think it’s not a favorable idea. Why pretend to engage in a process that’s basically confirmatory? Chair Schlough explained that Stout wasn’t the only campus trying to do something different, especially since there was a charge driven by System asking the thirteen campuses to differentiate themselves. Terry asserted that Stout’s most important stakeholders were the students; it’s imperative to find out what they think, especially the ones recruited. What are the actual questions that the James Tower group will ask? He elaborated that if James Tower was a more technical consulting group, they are still obligated to ask the students good questions in order to receive good data. Bensen proposed that perhaps the Faculty Senate should pass a resolution that offers another alternative to collecting information as well. Senators could get opinions and information from the students in their classes. Peters added that many Senators also have former alumni that could be surveyed. The group then discussed the possibility of developing their own questions with more objective data. Some Senators voiced frustration with the process, especially if the final decision was preordained. Allen suggested that the freshmen in some of the Senators’ large classes could be surveyed, but care must be given to use the best procedures available, and asked Bensen to contact him to discuss this further. Mauldin reminded everyone that the Chancellor would like to make his decision in less than month from now. Parejko reminded the group that Stout was a Baldrige university and asked the group what the Baldrige

process would be for gathering additional information and applying it. Bensen clarified that many questions must be answered before the Faculty Senate could make a knowledgeable decision. Mauldin noted that the Polytechnic Committee was formed by the Chancellor, but individuals could be free to analyze the data themselves. Allen acknowledged that he had faith in a focus group process where questions could be developed in a precise way with a clear perspective and used with some of the Senators' freshmen classes. Much discussion ensued. Dzissah asked the group what polytechnic really meant and added that it's difficult to talk to people if faculty don't know what it all means. Bensen emphasized that the faculty needed to examine other polytechnic institutions in order to understand it better, but may not get the necessary answers regarding who it would benefit better (either students or stakeholders) until a decision was made. Schlough reminded the group that there would be no name change, only a designation change for marketing purposes. Questions were raised regarding how Stout compared to other polytechnic universities, especially with the realignment of budget resources, marketing terms of the stakeholders, and if the process was backwards. Schlough clarified that the campus needed to define what it is and where it wants to be in ten-fifteen years from now. Everyone talks about technology and engineering as being polytechnic, he added, but the strong science programs that campus has would be a part of polytechnic as well. Flom mentioned that her SOE constituents were very concerned where their support would come from and how they would fit in the equation. Ondrus added that his constituents in the sciences area were concerned with support and funding, too. Calenberg said that it was very difficult to thoroughly discuss any of these issues because the Faculty Senate doesn't have enough information yet. Schlough asked Mauldin if any of these questions/concerns came up in the steering committee's meetings. Mauldin replied that they have and were trying to expand their charge.

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. Revised Marshal Policy (Steve Schlough; Attachment 5) – Chair Schlough stated that this item was mainly for information and explained that the Faculty Senate passed a resolution last year eliminating the marshals' terms in order to streamline the process. The revised policy would have the marshals serve until they retire or choose not serve.
- B. Facility Use Policy (Steve Schlough; Attachment 6) – Chair Schlough explained that the document was being updated, as the original was dated from 1989. Anderson recommended to strike the words, "provided such services shall not be conducted on a regular or continuing basis" on the last page of the document under "Appendix F Appropriate Use Criteria," and to insert a period be after the word, "staff," in the last sentence. Discussion ensued regarding not restricting religious groups from using Stout's facilities. Due to a lack of a quorum, Chair Schlough said this item would be placed on the next Faculty Senate Agenda.
- C. UWS 7 (Steve Schlough; Attachment 7) – Chair Schlough explained that the document pertains to defining faculty/staff misconduct when committing serious crimes while they're employed. If a person was charged with a serious crime, the policy would provide him/her to be dismissed without pay. Schlough said that UW System was collecting feedback regarding this issue and all faculty reps were asked to bring this to their campuses for input. However, the Board of Regents won't act until April. This item will be placed on the agenda again for more input.
- D. Revision to General Education Requirements (Ken Parejko; Attachment 8) - Senator Bendel said that he remembered seeing this item earlier in the year. Chair Schlough asked Joy to check the status of the document.

Chair Schlough asked the group if they had heard of any additional governance concerns from their colleagues that needed to be addressed by the Faculty Senate. He reminded everyone that every department and college/school has representation on the Senate and these Senators could bring items in for discussion. However, all items must come through the Faculty Senate Executive Committee first, as this group formulated and finalizes each Faculty Senate's agenda.

Senator Calenberg stated that he was concerned that the Faculty Senate lost its quorum during the meeting and asked Schlough if a message needed to be sent to Senators in order to set a standard. Discussion ensued regarding changing the order of the agenda, so the Senate could pass business items first. It was agreed to place these items on the Agenda for the February 21 Faculty Senate Executive Committee Meeting for further dialogue.

E. Other

VII. Adjournment – 4:34 p.m.

**Respectfully submitted,
Anne Hoel, Secretary**

**Recorded and prepared by,
Joy Evenson**