

**MEETING OF THE COMBINED SENATES  
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-STOUT  
FEBRUARY 27, 2007  
BALLROOM C  
2:30-5:00 P.M.**

Forrest Schultz, Faculty Senate Chair, opened the meeting and welcomed everyone at 2:35 p.m.

- I. **Chancellor's Report** – Provost Furst-Bowe announced that the Chancellor was out of town until February 28. At the March Board of Regents Meeting, the Chancellor will be presenting Stout's Polytechnic concept.
- II. **Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs' Report** – Provost Furst-Bowe announced that the Board of Regents will have their meeting at UW-Parkside on March 8-9. The Chancellor, Forrest Schultz, and a representative from SSA will present Stout's Polytechnic proposal. The Polytechnic Steering Committee helped shaped the presentation which will be given after the Board of Regents Meeting.
- III. **Vice Chancellor for Administrative and Student Life Services' Report**- Vice Chancellor Moen noted that the campus is still waiting for the approval for the remodeling of Harvey Hall's Theatre. This five million dollar project will go before the Building Commission in March and most likely be funded.
  - A. **Polytechnic Peer Comparison Report** (Meridith Wentz; Attachment 1) – Wentz explained that Stout has participated annually since 2000 in the National survey of Student Engagement or NSSE. Six polytechnic peers participated in the NSSE in 2006, which Stout was compared to. Wentz reviewed areas of concerns, strengths, and celebrations of the report. Chair Shaw summarized that one point of celebration was the ability for Stout freshmen (who scored somewhat below average at 60%) to score 63% equal or above the polytechnic peers by the time they were seniors.
- IV. **Other Announcements & Information** – none.

**MINUTES  
FACULTY SENATE MEETING  
FEBRUARY 27, 2007  
BALLROOM C – (Following Meeting of the Combined Senates)**

**ATTENDANCE:**

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

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

**PRESENT:** T. Allen, B. Anderson, B. Bergquist, P. Calenberg, K. Carlson, S. Cole, K. Doll, J. Dzissah, B. Flom, P. Ghenciu, D. Homa, R. Howarton, T. Karis, K. McDonald, M. Miller-Rodeberg, S. Nold, R. Qalyoubi-Kemp, C. Rohrer, J. Taylor, J. Watts, R. Nyland for J. Weissenberger

**EXCUSED:** T. Brantmeier, A. Hoel, A. Kirby, G. Neidermyer, A. Scott, L. Stradins, R. Teleb, S. Terry, and G. Wheeler

**GUESTS:** Provost Furst-Bowe, H. Cruz, D. Mell, B. Finder

- I. **Call to Order** – 2:50 p.m.
- II. **Announcements and Information** – Chair Schultz announced that the Governor's budget included talking about collective bargaining. None of the faculty representatives anticipated this, and Schultz expects that the topic will be discussed further after Spring Break. Allen reminded the group that

UW-Madison had been very clear in the past that they were against collective bargaining, as they felt they would lose too much of their power. Collective bargaining could allow campuses to hop in and others to hop out as they choose. The University of Minnesota very narrowly rejected the process a few years ago. However, Mankato does have that contract, and their salaries are much higher. Schultz explained that he researched how the Faculty Senate voted when it was discussed two years ago and both Senates passed resolutions which supported it. There are no details yet, but Schultz said he would keep Senators informed as he receives more information. Allen cautioned the group that collective bargaining could possibly be used as a wedge issue to create a division within UW-System. Discussion ensued regarding people in legislature who possibly would like more authority and power and could use this as a tool against the Board of Regents, faculty at Stout perhaps giving up their authority if collective bargaining was approved, and the extreme importance for each campus to have the right to vote whether they want it or not.

- A. University Priorities - Bogner reminded the group that all feedback was needed before Spring Break and encouraged Senators to continue gathering input from their colleagues, especially during department meetings. Carlson announced that a Faculty Forum was held on February 23 with twenty people in attendance; faculty were very happy to have an opportunity to speak anonymously and give input toward additional University Priorities. The subcommittee plans on meeting March 6 to review the information.

### III. Minutes of February 13, 2007 (Attachment 2)

Motion: Bogner/Howarton moved to approve the Minutes of February 13, 2007

Friendly Amendment: Qalyoubi-Kemp recommended adding the words, “and teaching activities.” after “facilities” for Item VI. New Business, C. Alignment Committee, Line 18. She noted that the discussion included talking about alignment in teaching and wanted this reflected in the minutes. Nold seconded the amendment.

Vote: Unanimously passed as corrected.

### IV. Committee Reports

- A. Planning and Review Committee (Brian Finder; Attachment 3) – Finder explained that PRC was in the process of receiving feedback regarding its review process and also entertaining a proposal to streamline the self-assessment process that respective program directors were required to follow. The process would analyze the accreditation reports rather than ask faculty to write their own reports. Finder noted that it would not affect PRC’s bylaws in any way, but would only be an internal change, which will be voted on during the March 2 PRC Meeting.

Finder noted that PRC was still in desperate need of members and in danger of collapsing; two representatives were still needed from the Faculty Senate. It is extremely helpful to serve on the PRC if one was considering becoming a program director. Provost Furst-Bowe reinforced what Finder said and explained that Stout must have this committee, as UW-System requires the campus to review its programs in a cycle and follow-up that the process is being done correctly. Additionally, it would be preferred that a group of peers do this rather than having the Provost’s Office take over if the committee collapses. Schultz and Allen agreed and encouraged volunteers to serve on PRC, stressing the importance for faculty to help monitor the accreditation reports and programs. After further discussion, Petre Ghenciu volunteered to serve as a Faculty Senate representative.

- B. Alignment Committee –Chair Schultz explained that Len Bogner, Steve Nold, and Julianne Taylor served as subcommittee members and were asking for input.

Nold asked Senators what the arching principles and guidelines for decision-making should be as the campus moves forward in its realignment process. Bogner reminded the group that the university priorities would be shared and discussed during the Chancellor's Summer Retreat and asked Senators to continue the conversations in their departments. Faculty desire a greater voice in making campus decisions and this could be a quicker way to get feedback to administrators. Senators then broke into small groups and discussed issues/concerns, which they shared with Nold.

1. **Governance—Enhance and not diminish faculty governance at the department level. It needs to be continued at all levels for voices to be heard. Personnel decisions are made at the departmental level, especially for promotion and tenure decisions.**
2. **Minimizing obstacles/hoops such as money, procedures, committee trail, and paperwork. Develop a faster process for new courses to go through. Develop a more agile response to students and faculty needs.**
3. **Remove one layer of administration. No more than 50 people in a division or department. SOE currently has this structure.**
4. **Facilitate more inter-disciplinary collaboration, including group effort toward the use of resources and teaching, etc. Support the sovereignty of the department and don't undermine the department's governance structure.**
5. **What is the faculty's role in this process in order to maximize their influence and not use unnecessary energy? This can be done by strengthening governance, so faculty could have more influence and power. Maximizing faculty power in areas that it is legitimately held.**
6. **We would need to recognize that everything we do is interdisciplinary and across the lines at every level. It must be interdisciplinary without any barriers to reach across the campus.**
7. **A good guide to decision-making would be to use a business model. The customers would be the students and the stakeholders would be the faculty/parents. The campus' programs would be the products. We recommend using a business model based on customers' products and efficiency.**
8. **Have an elective administrative leadership process. Have the faculty elect the deans instead of going through a hiring process. We could also put term limits on how long that person would be in that position. Many people can manage 50 people, but don't want to manage 150. It would be about balancing, spreading the infusion of programs and general education throughout campus.**
9. **We need to analyze the alignment of *disciplines* instead of aligning programs, so they could be housed at the university level instead of at the college level.**

Allen noted that Chapter 36 creates legislation within UW-System and is a law that allows faculty to have primary responsibilities in personnel and curriculum issues. It also gives the Chancellor responsibility. Allen recommended that the Senate should review Chapter 36 to ensure it's not giving up what the legislation currently provides for the faculty. Collective bargaining would give administration much more responsibility in making personnel and curriculum decisions at an institution. Faculty must retain these two things as much as possible. Allen noted he was concerned, especially with the two current deans' vacancies and possibly a third that if these positions were eliminated, it could open the door to allow a much quicker process for administration to act on their ideas and move things through without additional faculty checkpoints. The current procedure of going through the "layers" do take more time, but if an alternative alignment model would be used that would remove the protective "layers," it could erode the faculty power—most importantly at the departmental level. It could also impact the way all department chairs are chosen (elected by their peers). Department chairs act as peer faculty members representing faculty interests, but also act as administrators in relating to the administrative structure to help ensure that everyone is operating by set rules and procedures. To give up this "checks and balances system" could destroy the rights faculty now have. The deans pull together a variety of departments whose chairs are well-seasoned and experienced. When they come jointly during departmental meetings, there are real advantages. SOE has only one department, which has responsibilities

for the dean and department chair. Because the department chair is not elected by his/her peers, it could give the feeling that the SOE group was at a disadvantage in not having departmental issues or concerns brought forward. Allen concluded by noting that he would not be in favor of eliminating the current structure the campus has.

Schlough disagreed and said that the deans work for the Chancellor and Provost—not for a confederation of their departments. The bottom line should be what would add more value to Stout. Bogner reminded the group that no models would be built at the present time; the subcommittee was only asking for input. Flom suggested that the subcommittee review the set of principles that the old alignment committee used two years ago. Bogner replied that the subcommittee has this information and stressed the fact that the campus would not be realigned if it would have a less efficient system than it currently has.

Nold asked Senators to poll their colleagues during department meetings, as well as informally, and send him, Len Bogner, or Juli Taylor any input. The subcommittee will gather all information and compile a report that will be shared during a future Faculty Senate Meeting. Much discussion ensued and focused on the importance of defining an actual process and eventually, a model. McDonald noted that any realignment must add more value to the students' lives in order to create better students. Discussion then focused on various facility designs that could possibly integrate different campus disciplines that could best benefit the students when they graduate to be much more competitive and advanced. How can we bring the disciplines together (i.e., art and technology or science)?

Allen noted that Stout currently has a fairly simplified hierarchy structure—from the departments on up. There is no one structure that is right for all organizations. He asked Senators to think of the military ranks. Additionally, some companies are set up innovatively in a block structure, where everyone is equal and two or three people at the top can reach out and directly influence any individual in the company. What could be frustrating for top administrators on campus is the fact that the current process has layers to go through that takes more time. Much discussion ensued regarding the recent budget cuts from Madison, the importance of finding a structure that could best use Stout's cut of the "budget pie," and finding a structure that would improve life, rather than detract from it.

Qalyoubi-Kemp reminded everyone that we would not be realigning TEACHING—a course must be kept within that discipline or major for accreditation purposes and NCA standards. She added that today's students must be equipped with diverse employment skills, as all current majors may evolve to something else or disappear over the next fifteen years.

## V. Old Business

### A. Learning Values/Culture of Affirmation at Stout (TABLED during Feb. 13, 2007 Faculty Senate Meeting)

Motion: Bogner/Ghenciu moved to bring the Learning Values/Culture of Affirmation at Stout off the table.

Chair Schultz explained that he invited Hector Cruz to share the revised document with the group and noted that this was a separate document from the Ethics Statement done by the John Russell Group last fall. There is no intent to tie both reports together. Schultz noted that the Learning Values/Culture of Affirmation document came to the Faculty Senate last fall and the Senate provided feedback to revise the document, which was now being brought forward.

Cruz noted that he and Dan Riordan made some minor revisions to the paper after the October 17 Faculty Senate Meeting. The meaning behind the entire idea is just enhancing good practice, not only in the classroom, but beyond. Positive affirmations empower us; negative environments hurt us. Positive, nurturing, and respectful environments help students learn. Chair Schultz reminded the group that this document originated from the University Priorities a couple of years ago. Qalyoubi-Kemp asked if this would cover collegial relationships as well. Cruz replied it would. McDonald noted that the Senate discussed this topic several times; no one was disputing its validity. The question to be answered is how this will be executed? How will it be incorporated into Stout's culture, so it won't be just a set of words? Where will those words go? Provost Furst-Bowe explained that it would go into Stout's mission, communication, university publications, new employees'

orientation, the Teaching and Learning Center, and Advisory Center. Mell added that it would be posted on the Web for all new faculty and staff. Cruz noted that it could be used for professional development grants—to help one another to be affirming outside the classroom. Schultz noted that it could be an administrative role to enable this and could be used for programs and sabbaticals as well. Schlough asked how this would compare to STRAP's value statements. Cruz replied it would only be a further articulation of them. Qalyoubi-Kemp asked how it would be different than departmental bylaws. Cruz replied that it would provide consistency in a broader sense to reinforce the university's goals and what the campus already knows. Everything would work together to create affirmation and positive energy in articulating a vision for Stout, he concluded.

**Motion:** Nold/Watts moved to endorse the Learning Values/Culture of Affirmation at Stout.

**Vote:** Passed unanimously.

B. Other

VI. **New Business**

A. PRC Assessment Modification Proposal (Brian Finder) – was covered earlier in the meeting.

B Other

VII. **Adjournment** – 4:33 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Anne Hoel, Secretary

Recorded and prepared by,  
Joy Evenson