

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 21, 2006
NORTHWOODS ROOM
2:30 – 4:30 P.M.**

ATTENDANCE:

CHAIR: Steve Schlough
VICE CHAIR: Forrest Schultz

SECRETARY: Anne Hoel
PAST CHAIR: Mike Galloy

PRESENT: D. Albrecht, B. Anderson, S. Cole, J. Dzissah, B. Finder, L. Koepke, K. Mauldin, K. Parejko, G. Ruenger

EXCUSED: M. Galloy, K. Martinson

GUESTS: Chancellor Sorensen, Interim Provost Furst-Bowe

I. Call to Order - 2:35 p.m.

II. Announcements and Information – Chair Schlough announced that Mike Galloy was back to work, but on a limited schedule. He explained that 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.

III. Minutes of February 7, 2006 (Attachment 1)

Motion: FINDER/RUENGER moved to approve the Minutes of February 7, 2006.

Vote: Passed unanimously.

IV. Chancellor's Report – Chancellor Sorensen announced that DIN requests would be submitted to System by late March regarding engineering concepts, science, engineering, and technical initiatives. Steve asked what time of year campuses could request their DIN proposals. Chancellor Sorensen replied that these were submitted to System during the biennial budget request to the state and were extremely competitive to receive. Schlough asked him when Stout received its last DIN request. The Chancellor replied it was either in 1996 or 1998 and used to help fund the Graphic Communications Management Program.

V. Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs' Report – Provost Furst-Bowe said that Lamont Meinen would be coming to the February 28 Faculty Senate Meeting to report on new tools for Career Services. On March 20, Dr. Christina Bailey, Chair of Chemistry Department from Calpoly, will meet with various groups on campus to talk about the polytech structure, programs, etc.

VI. Vice Chancellor for Administrative and Student Life Services' Report – no report.

VII. Committee Reports

Committee chairs are requested to give oral reports to the Executive Committee and prepare brief written reports for Faculty Senate meetings. Committee chairs who are not Senators need not attend Senate meetings unless there are specific agenda items from their committee on the agenda. Reports should be submitted by e-mail to Joy by noon on Thursdays. All standing committee chairs are expected to attend the Executive Committee Meetings, since they are voting members of the group.

A. Curriculum & Instruction (Steve Cole) – none.

B. Educational Activities (Donna Albrecht) - none

C. Elections (Forrest Schultz)- Schultz reported that the call for nominations went out to all faculty to help fill vacancies on the Faculty Senate standing committees and many other university committees on campus; they are due to the Senate Office on March 3. The Deans' Evaluations were sent out to all faculty and academic staff and are due to the Senate Office on March 6.

D. Finance Committee (Bill Murphy) –Ruenger reported that the Finance Committee set up

- accomplish representative attend the
- three subcommittees to examine coordinating systems and investigating ways to various goals. He said that he would be serving as the Finance Committee's at Executive Committee Meetings, as Murphy had a class conflict and couldn't Executive Committee Meetings.
- E. Graduate Education Committee (Gene Ruenger) – Ruenger said that there was an item under New Business.
 - F. General Education (Ken Parejko) – Parejko reported that the committee was doing minor housekeeping and had an interesting discussion in looking at the General Education category definitions for each of the Gen Ed areas. The group decided to analyze the criteria and decide if these should be changed and how they interface with the Gen Ed objectives. Parejko noted that his committee had its assignments and was going forward. Furst-Bowe noted that UW-System was looking at a common Gen Ed core, which was discussed at the Vice Chancellor's Meeting last week. No agreement was reached, however, but the goal would be desirable so students could complete the core in their first two years. She said she would keep the Senators informed as she received additional information.
 - G. Personnel Policies (Karen Martinson) - Schlough distributed PPC's recommendation on SOE and Other to the group and said this item would be placed on the February 28 Agenda.
 - H. Planning & Review (Brian Finder) – Finder distributed the PRC Report to the group and explained that the Entitlement to Plan for the M.S. in Scientific and Technology Communications Program and the M.S. in Food and Nutritional Sciences Program were presented on February 17. The B.S. in Applied Mathematics and Computer Science and the B.S. in Applied Science will be presented on February 24. Other committee reports nearing completion include the B.S. in Manufacturing Engineering Program, Status Report for the Early Childhood Education Program, M.S. & Ed.S. in Career and Technical Education, M.S. Ed & Ed.S. in School Psychology.
 - I. Polytechnic Steering (Kirk Mauldin and Forrest Schultz) – Schultz reported that the group would meet on February 24 to discuss work group items. Janice Coker helped coordinate having Dr. Bailey come and visit Stout and the Polytechnic Steering Group will meet with her on March 20 from 2:30-3:25 p.m. Schultz added that he visited California Polytechnic State University recommended Tina Bailey to the Provost because she comes from the science/arts area, has a mid-west background, and could provide an interesting and honest polytechnic perspective to the campus.
 - J. Other

VIII. 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)
- C. Facility Use Policy (Steve Schlough; was Attachment 6 in February 14 packet) – Chair Schlough said that this item was brought to the Senate, but it lost a quorum and couldn't vote. However, both Senates were concerned with the wording of Appendix F in regard to the language of leaving it open to interpret what is worship—what is continuous or regular? There is an undefined set of criteria on the issue and the campus need to be cautious. If any group has prayer, he added, then that is considered worship. Schlough said that he forwarded the Senates' concerns to Diane Moen.
- D. UWS 7 (Steve Schlough; was Attachment 7 in February 14 packet) – Chair Schlough said that the Faculty Senate lost its quorum and couldn't take action on this item. It would be placed again on the February 28 Agenda. Schlough asked the Chancellor if his group or the Provost's assembly had a chance to discuss the felony and due process concerns yet. Chancellor Sorensen said that the Chancellors will meet on February 24 and he would try feedback to get this item on their agenda. Schlough explained that UW System has asked from the faculty reps in the System as well.
- E. Other – Polytechnic
Anderson asked Schultz and Mauldin if the Polytechnic Steering Committee had a deadline to complete its charge. Schultz replied that the group must give its recommendation to the Chancellor by April 1. Schlough added that the committee was examining a very narrow charge. Schultz added that their group was only one piece to the large polytechnic enigma. Chancellor Sorensen noted that he was hoping to have everything completed, including the Senate's recommendation, by April or May. Parejko asked Schultz what the Polytechnic Steering Committee's charge was. Schultz read the following charge to the

group:

college programs, the

- (1) Information: Gather information on schools nationwide that have a polytechnic, technology, institute of technology or technological designation.
- (2) Analysis: Review and analyze the information with attention to size of or university, educational philosophy of education, distribution of distribution of students within the college or university, relationship to private sector, K-12 or state and federal agencies, technology parks or incubation centers, or other relevant information.
- (3) Visitations: Recommendations on sending small teams to visit such universities or invite visitors to UW-Stout to discuss the designation.
- (4) Develop a plan to share with the campus for an open dialogue on the issue.
- (5) Make recommendations to Governance and/or the Chancellor.

Chair Schlough asked the Chancellor that if the campus would go to the polytech design, when would the student marketing begin. The Chancellor replied he would begin by recruiting this summer for the 2007 session. Schlough asked what type of approval the campus would need with only a designation change. The Chancellor replied that the campus would be sanctioned with the Board of Regents only with a different brand name that would help the campus distinguish itself from the other campuses in the System, especially since state dollars continue to diminish. Schlough asked if the Admission's Office needed approval to change Stout's marketing plan. The Chancellor explained that the campus could change its recruiting materials right away, but chose to wait until the sanction was designated in order to be fair. However, the Enrollment Management Committee could change its materials at any time. Schlough elaborated that if programs wanted to change their text, they only needed to get approval from Don Steffen. Parejko asked the status of the off-campus consultant group. The Chancellor replied that the contract was signed and they were now designing the instrument for approval. He further clarified that President Reilly has only said that he was supportive of the campus' effort to market itself differently from the other campuses, and the strength of the UW plan was for each campus to have a distinctive plan and backing. The campuses control the UW System through a federation, not the Board of Regents, he added. Much discussion ensued.

timeline, Faculty Senate render would place the

Anderson proposed that the Executive Committee formulate a polytechnic including a clear step-by-step process, that could be used to help the an intelligent recommendation to the Chancellor. Schlough said that he item under New Business.

IX. New Business

PRC

A. B. A. Psychology (Brian Finder; Attachment 2) – Chancellor Sorensen asked Finder if examined the instructors' vitas of those teaching the programs. Finder replied that it didn't, as he felt it was the purview of the administration. The Chancellor reminded everyone that Stout's accredited bodies have certain qualifications for teaching positions and spot-checks should be done to ensure that faculty were meeting qualifications for accreditation. Discussion ensued. Koepke stated that many last minute hires were only temporary due to unexpected emergencies and classes would have been canceled if the department couldn't find appropriate instructors to teach. She explained that this was a little different than permanently hiring someone on the tenure track and bringing them into the department's fold. Schlough noted that the Provost ultimately signs off on the instructor's contract and a check could be made during this time. Ruenger agreed and that he felt it should be an administrative action rather than a faculty one. Cole suggested that the Senate could set up an additional committee to study such things. Schlough that if it were composed of mainly faculty, a lot of classes wouldn't have instructors when the fall semester began. It was agreed that Schlough and Furst-Bowe would meet to try to solve the dilemma.

said

replied

Motion: Anderson/Mauldin moved to approve the B.A. in Psychology.

Vote: Passed unanimously.

B. 1st Year Early Alert Program (Donna Albrecht; Attachment 3) – Albrecht said that EAC endorsed the attachment and asked that the item be place on the February 28 Agenda.

Motion: Albrecht/Anderson moved to endorse the 1st Year Early Alert Program statement and bring it to the February 28 Faculty Senate Meeting.

Vote: Passed unanimously.

C. Graduate Faculty (Gene Ruenger; Attachment 4) –Ruenger explained that only minor language changes were made to the document.

Motion: Ruenger/Mauldin moved that the Graduate Faculty be placed on the February 28 Faculty Senate Agenda.

Vote: Passed unanimously.

D. Governance at UW-Stout (Open Discussion) -

during 1. Quorum – Chair Schlough explained that the Faculty Senate lost its quorum the February 14 Meeting, but noted that he felt it was a rare instance because most of the time, there was good, solid attendance of the Senators.

several 2. Agenda Structure - Chair Schlough explained that the current Senate agenda structure was the same one since the Joint Senate Meetings were established years ago. However, the agenda structure could be changed if the Faculty Senate’s Bylaws were changed. Schlough noted that there was an hour to an hour-and-a-half of combined reports given to the joint Senates before the actual Faculty Senate’s business meeting. Koepke asked if some of these oral reports could be given electronically instead, so important time was not taken away from the business items. Schlough said it was very informative to include the three main administrators’ reports, as many topics pertain to both Senates’ Agendas. However, there were a variety of other reports that take up additional time away from the business meeting, especially when the presenters read them to the group. Anderson suggested to have the Faculty Senate prioritize the top five items to be addressed at Faculty Senate meetings and asked the group if some of the reports could be moved to 4:00 p.m. as an alternative. Mauldin agreed. Schlough explained that the joint meetings were devised to have a more efficient way for the administrators to give the same information to both groups at once. However, the Faculty Senate was specifically designed to take care of new business items, but often gets bogged down taking care of trivial business items instead. He suggested that the Senate could have a consent agenda, where minutes and reports could be dealt with. If the Senate has responsible faculty serving on its standing committees who bring documents forward, then they should be trusted to do their work. If there was an issue to be discussed or a motion that needed to be approved, the item could always be pulled out and handled separately. Schlough asked the group if there was an interest in analyzing this issue further and suggested that he and Anderson could meet to look at ways where the agenda could be improved. Cole recommended that this could be done at the next Executive Committee meeting instead.

E. Other - Polytechnic item discussed earlier in the meeting

Chair Schlough explained that the Executive Committee needed to decide what the role of the Faculty Senate was regarding to giving important polytechnic feedback to the Chancellor by the end of the year that would be in the best interest of the university. Anderson proposed that the group create a framework that would incorporate a timeline that the Faculty Senate could approve, so that it could help move the process forward. After much discussion, Anderson proposed the following five steps to the process:

1. April 1 - Chancellor’s Polytechnic Steering Committee will complete its charge.

2. April 4 - Chancellor’s Polytechnic Steering Committee will report its consensus to

the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. This will also be given at the April 11 Faculty Senate Meeting. Findings from the Tower study will also be summarized for the Senate.

- 3. April - Two faculty informational sessions will be held to give an opportunity for faculty to honestly dialogue with faculty members that served on the Chancellor's Polytechnic Steering Committee.**
- 4. April - Nonbinding referendum vote goes out to all faculty regarding the polytechnic issue.**
- 5. May 2 - Faculty Senate Executive Committee will draft a motion (based on the results of the faculty referendum vote) to bring to the May 9 Faculty Senate Meeting.**

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee commended Anderson for his effort and gave its unanimous consensus to bring the polytechnic timeline to the February 28, 2006 Faculty Senate Meeting.

X. Adjournment – 4:01 p.m.

**Respectfully submitted,
Anne Hoel, Secretary**

**Recorded and prepared by,
Joy Evenson**