

NOTES FROM THE MEETING OF THE COMBINED SENATES
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-STOUT
MARCH 21, 2006
BALLROOM C
2:30 P.M.

Vi Jones, Chair of the Senate of Academic Staff, welcomed everyone at 2:35 p.m.

Faculty Senate Chair, Steve Schlough, introduced Emily Ballinger, who gave a brief report that April is Sexual Assault Awareness Month and "Take Back the Night" will be reinstated at Stout. Posters will be posted around the campus to increase awareness and to encourage the reporting of sexual assault on campus. Ballinger asked that Senators inform their colleagues and students.

I. Chancellor's Report –no report.

II. Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs' Report – Interim Provost Furst-Bowe announced that the campus filed a joint proposal with UW Eau Claire for a partnership in the nanotech/math/science areas.

A. Report on Title III Activities (Jane Henderson; Website <http://www.uwstout.edu/mba/t3project/>) Jane Henderson, Assessment & LTS, distributed "Title III Student Success Plan" to the group and explained that the student success plan was designed to provide additional and enhanced programs and services that assist students in attaining their academic and career goals. She explained the Title III Project websites to Senators and said that the first goal was to improve Stout's retention rates and help students. Furst-Bowe added that Title III was a nice benefit for the campus, as it brought \$400,000 of federal grant funds into the campus per year.

III. Vice Chancellor for Administrative and Student Life Services' Report – Vice Chancellor Moen announced that UW-System approved ten new positions for Stout. She explained that they will be on an annual basis and tied to generating more revenue—not like other guaranteed funded positions. However, Stout would cover all the costs of these positions through tuition. Moen announced a 3.02% pay plan increase could occur on July 1 and another raise on April 1, 2007. If the Union agrees, Classified could receive a 4.25% increase for next year (2% on July 1; 2.5% April of 2007). However, System may go back in and ask for parity for the Unclassified. Moen thanked the one hundred participants who were in the Morale Study Focus Groups and noted that the feedback has been tremendous; the complete report should be available next fall. Stout will be hearing from the Governor by April 17 regarding tornado or severe weather drills for the campus. UW-System has asked that each campus be more accountable for energy utilization and allocated utility budgets for each. If Stout overspends, the remainder would be taken out the operating budget. Argo distributed a memo to the group regarding the use of sick and needing a doctor's certification for a medical necessity for Unclassified staff in the UW System. Argo explained that the document originated from inquiries at the System level and the policy was created to outline certain conditions. If an individual is gone for medical necessity for more than five consecutive work days, he/she must bring a statement in from the health provider to justify the reason. Schultz asked Moen what kind of search process would be required for the ten new positions at Stout. Moen replied that they would be issued one year contracts; Weber added that a recruitment process would also be required.

MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
MARCH 21, 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, B. Bergquist, T. Brantmeier, K. Carlson, S. Cole, M. Decker, J. Dzissah, G. Earl, B. Flom, P. Ghenciu, R. Howarton, L. Koepke, K. Mauldin, S. Nold, M. Ondrus, B. Peters, A. Scott, K. Thomas, N. Weckmueller

EXCUSED: P. Calenberg, M. Galloy, W. Haid, E. Hughes, K. McDonald, R. Teleb, S. Terry

GUESTS: Interim Provost J. Furst Bowe

I. Call to Order -3:00 p.m.

- II. **Announcements and Information** – Senator Allen announced that he surveyed two sections of his General Psychology students regarding the polytechnic campus and distributed their responses to the Senators. Chair Schlough asked for Senators to read them during the meeting prior to discussion under New Business.

Schlough announced that there were three full Faculty Senate Meetings left for this year and encouraged the standing committees to get their items on the Agenda as soon as possible. Schlough said that there would be no meetings on March 28, as it was Advisement Day.

III. **Minutes of February 28, 2006** (Attachment 1)

Motion: Koepke/Decker moved to approve the Minutes of February 28, 2006.

Vote: Passed unanimously.

IV. **Committee Reports**

- A. Planning and Review Committee (Attachment 2)
- B. Other

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. UWS 7 (Steve Schlough/ was Attachment 7 in February 14 packet) – Chair Schlough said that Senators should have received e-mails regarding other campus' feedback on UWS 7.

Motion: Peters/Howarton moved to remove the item off the floor.

Vote: Passed unanimously.

Schlough explained that there was a quicker dismissal process used to dismiss with pay and another process used to remove someone without pay. The original policy draft states that the Provost acts on both of these processes. Interim Provost Furst-Bowe said that she would like to see the wording changed, so it's not just the Provost who makes the decision. Mauldin said that he read through UW-Whitewater's revisions and agreed with the changes, particularly that a person needed to be convicted of a crime instead of only charged with the crime. Much discussion ensued. Schlough asked Furst-Bowe how the deans felt about the document. She replied that they were concerned with the timeline involved. Schlough explained that the Chancellor and Provost were agreeing with what the faculty was saying.

Motion: Mauldin moved for the Faculty Senate to endorse the UW-Whitewater's resolution.

Peters said that he would like time to gather feedback from his constituents regarding the issue instead of voting on something we haven't all read yet. Schlough said that any feedback would need to come to the Executive Committee by March 30.

Mauldin withdrew his motion and said that he agreed with Peters' idea. Discussion ensued regarding the timeline, who has power, and the conviction vs. the charge wording.

Motion: Peters/Mauldin moved for the Faculty Senate to take the UW-Whitewater resolution back to their constituents for feedback and to submit all feedback to the Senate Office for the April 4 Executive Committee Meeting by March 30.

Vote: Passed unanimously.

- D. Other

VI. **New Business**

- A. B. S. in Dietetics (Brian Finder; Attachment 3)

Motion: Decker/Maudlin moved to approve the B. S. in Dietetics.

Vote: Passed unanimously.

- B. M. S. in Scientific and Technical Communication Program (Brian Finder; Attachment 4) - Chair Schlough said that the Senate needed to endorse the program**

Motion: Bensen/Allen moved to endorse the M. S. in Scientific and Technical Communication Program.

Vote: Passed unanimously.

- C. B. S. in Technology Education (Brian Finder; Attachment 5)**

Motion: Decker/Peters moved to approve the B. S. in Technology Education.

Vote: Passed unanimously.

- D. Polytechnic Survey – Chair Schlough explained that the Faculty Senate approved the Polytechnic Survey Timeline during the last Senate Meeting. The Executive Committee was charged to do an opinion survey regarding the polytechnic. They discussed the options of having the faculty reps take the ballots to their departments, but thought it would be too cumbersome. The committee also discussed the election process whereby the Election Committee could count the ballots and the possibility that an electronic survey could be filled out more than once. Election Committee Chair, Forrest Schultz, was following up with Barb Button. After much discussion, the Executive Committee wanted more feedback from the Faculty Senate, especially with the timeframe involved and only a one-to-two week window for sending out and gathering the survey information. Discussion ensued regarding the wording and structuring of the questions and how many should be used. The group agreed that all responses would need to be in by April 20 for tallying and typing. Thomas recommended the Senate analyze what the students said and then define a matrix for the first page. Schultz reminded everyone that the Steering Committee’s results would be shared with the campus at the two open forums in April. Much discussion ensued. Chair Schlough said that the Senate of Academic Staff endorsed the polytechnic idea in February; however, the Stout Student Association hasn’t done anything yet. Flom said that she would like to hear more about polytechnic and other schools that have this designation before she votes. Anderson said that there was one key piece that won’t be available until May or June and that was the James Tower Report. Nold recommended that the Senate postpone its decision until all the reports were available, so an informed judgment could be made. Bergquist asked if a date was set that the Senate would need to have its recommendation in to the Chancellor. Schlough replied that May 9 was the last Faculty Senate Meeting for the semester. Furst-Bowe said that the Board of Regents doesn’t meet over the summer and could be told that the campus was still working on it, as there was no set timeline. She added that in talking with other polytechnic institutes, it doesn’t seem to be a real factor as to whether students go there or not. The three main reasons students choose to attend a polytech campus, she added, were the specialized programs, location, and reputation. Thomas said that the polytech dilemma had no set deadline, there was not enough information, no procedure, and asked the group if there was a fear on campus that the Chancellor would do something over the summer if nothing was done in May. Several people said that this was a concern. More discussion ensued and a recommendation came forward to vote on May 9 that the Chancellor can’t take any action until the James Tower Report was done and people had the opportunity to read it.**

Allen agreed and said a motion passed could certainly relay that message, with a request for the Chancellor to please not take this forward over the summer. Koepke said that the Senate knew it had a short timeline, but thought it would have more information. This includes the Steering Committee’s Report, the James Tower Report, and the two open forums. As it now stands, the Senate only has the Steering Committee Report and the dilemma is frustrating. Bensen agreed, but suggested moving the timeline’s deadline. Schultz reminded everyone that the Senate agreed to perform a survey and needs to put it together.

Peters suggested using a scale for the first survey, such as from 1 to 5 on how the person felt about Stout becoming polytechnic and a second, more detailed survey could be performed later. Thomas recommended including a comment section. Schlough said that a Likert scale could be used for the survey and it could be administered through normal election procedures.

Peters likes the timeline as it stands, with the forums needing to happen as soon as possible after

April 1. Discussion ensued regarding the students seeming confused about the potential polytechnic designation and also needing additional information.

Before the Senate can survey faculty, the Steering Committee information needs to be disseminated. Bensen asked about the comparison matrix being completed and Mauldin stated that it will be given to the Chancellor and Senate. Schlough recommended placing it in the daily e-mail. If we only get a 20-30% response rate when surveying faculty, we'll take this into consideration. Allen stated that if we assume that all faculty decide this is a fantastic idea and want it to happen, given the population response, is this a wise thing to do, as much as we like it? Where would the wisdom be if we're fighting against this association? Bensen felt it may be a lack of awareness and is therefore a marketing issue. Allen asked if making a quick decision allowed time to get the message out to people. Schlough commented that people will make the decision from other criteria, too. Cole asked if we had this much discussion on the letterhead change after winning the Baldrige Award. Furst-Bowe explained that changing letterhead is a management system decision and a part of marketing. Bergquist wondered if a polytechnic designation will change the way business is done at Stout. Furst-Bowe stated that nothing different is being planned. Cole felt that it would be nothing different, since we currently do technical, hands-on learning. Stout was a technical college, we've heard that for 50 years, and it doesn't prevent students from coming here. Based on comments from the Cal Poly visiting faculty member, Ondrus believes becoming a polytechnic will necessitate change. Science, math, and engineering must be more important than they currently are. We will need other forms of engineering, and must strongly promote science and math. Furst-Bowe stated that this would affect long-term planning. Schlough stated the Senate had received enough direction on the survey to go on to the next step.

E. Other

VII. Adjournment - 4:12 p.m.

**Respectfully submitted,
Anne Hoel, Secretary**

**Recorded and prepared by,
Joy Evenson**