

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
MARCH 7, 2006**

ATTENDANCE:

CHAIR: Steve Schlough
VICE CHAIR: Forrest Schultz

SECRETARY: Anne Hoel
PAST CHAIR: Mike Galloy

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

EXCUSED: B. Finder, M. Galloy, K. Martinson

GUESTS: Interim Provost Furst-Bowe

I. Call to Order - 2:30 p.m.

II. Announcements and Information -

III. Minutes of February 21, 2006 (Attachment 1)

Motion: Parejko/Mauldin moved to approve the Minutes of February 21, 2006.

Vote: Passed unanimously.

IV. Chancellor's Report – no report.

V. Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs' Report – Interim Provost Furst-Bowe distributed a tentative itinerary for Dr. Christina Bailey's visit on March 20. Dr. Bailey is the Chair of the Chemistry Department from the California Polytechnic State University and will meet with various groups on campus to talk about the polytech structure, programs, etc. Jane Henderson will attend the March 21 Senate Meeting to give a report on Title III Activities. Mauldin asked if Stout submitted a DIN. Furst-Bowe replied that the campus filed a joint proposal with UW Eau Claire for a partnership in the nanotech/math/science areas.

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.

Chair Schlough reported that he attended the March 3 Faculty Reps Meeting in Madison and the reps continued discussing UWS 7. The Collective Bargaining bill doesn't look like it will move out of committee and the Student Bill of Rights was not getting much support from other legislators. However, the Reps felt that some items may come back next year.

A. Curriculum & Instruction (Steve Cole) – no report.

B. Educational Activities (Donna Albrecht) – none.

C. Elections (Forrest Schultz) – Schultz reported that there were still many committees that needed nominations and will send a message out to the department chairs or deans. He announced that the Deans' Evaluations would be opened on March 8.

D. Finance Committee (Gene Ruenger) - no report.

E. Graduate Education Committee (Gene Ruenger) - no report.

F. General Education (Ken Parejko) – Parejko reported that GEC would meet on March 10.

G. Personnel Policies (Karen Martinson) – Chair Schlough stated that there was a concern about faculty being evaluated on their use of technology in their classrooms. UW-System's

and Stout's rules stipulate that the department was responsible for evaluating and promoting faculty. PPC felt that the concern was dealt with in each department's bylaws. Mauldin reminded the group that the Faculty Senate formally charged PPC if technology should be used as criteria in promotion and tenure. Schlough said that he would go through his e-mail again to determine if this was PPC's conclusion, or if it would be discussed one more time.

- H. Planning & Review (Brian Finder) – Chair Schlough distributed the PRC report to the group.
- I. Polytechnic Steering (Kirk Mauldin and Forrest Schultz) – Schultz reported that the group will meet on March 9 and will determine what to do with the data and how to submit its report to the campus. The Steering Group will also determine questions for Dr. Bailey on March 20, and the 2:30 p.m. meeting will be recorded and broadcasted, so everyone can listen if interested. Susan Wolfgram will facilitate. Ruenger asked Schultz why the Chancellor didn't submit the DIN regarding the polytechnic "center within a center." Schultz replied that it would complicate things at this point, as the campus is in the process of deciding whether or not to seek the polytechnic designation, and the Chancellor's Advisory Council recommended dropping the issue at this time.
- 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. UWS 7 (Steve Schlough; was Attachment 7 in February 14 packet) – Chair Schlough reported that the Faculty Reps discussed the same objections that the Faculty Senate during its last meeting and as a result, UW-System will revise the document. Furst-Bowe explained that a different process was needed if a person was suspended without pay. Schlough recommended that the Senate should wait to give any feedback until the revised document was finished. Parejko said that he would be interested in seeing the data from the other state agencies. Schlough replied that he could access the data by going into the UW-System website.
- D. Agenda Structure – Chair Schlough asked the group for any suggestions regarding the rearranging of the Faculty Senate's Agenda and explained that the Senate lost a quorum two meetings ago, which resulted in the inability to act on any new business items. Ruenger suggested that new business items could be moved up in the agenda, time limits could be designated for longer discussion items, or committee reports could go under a consent agenda format. Schlough replied that any of those options could be done. Anderson said that there were meetings where prime energy time was used at the beginning of Senate meetings when presenters read documents to the Senate. Koepke suggested that the reports could be given at 4:00 p.m. instead. Hoel agreed and added that the BPA reports were usually on the BPA website and could be easily accessed by interested faculty. Mauldin suggested that the administrator's time slots could be used instead to answer any questions that Senators might have.
- E. Other

IX. New Business

- A. B. S. in Dietetics (Brian Finder; Attachment 2)

Motion: Koepke/Parejko moved to approve the B. S. in Dietetics.

Vote: Passed unanimously.

- B. M.S. in Scientific and Technical Communication Program (Brian Finder; Attachment 3)

Motion: Mauldin/Koepke moved to approve the M. S. in Scientific and Technical Communication Program.

Vote: Passed unanimously.

C. **B. S. in Technology Education (Brian Finder; Attachment 4)**

Motion: Mauldin/Albrecht moved to approve the B. S. in Technology Education.

Vote: Passed unanimously.

D **Governance at UW-Stout (Open Discussion)** – Chair Schlough said that there were some concerns about the Grade Change Policy that went through EAC a couple of years ago. The Provost changed a student’s grade; however, policy states that if a student has a concern, he/she should talk to the faculty member and department chair and request a hearing before a committee comprised of both students and faculty. This group would then make a recommendation to the Chancellor, who would have the ultimate decision regarding the grade. Furst-Bowe added that as far as she knew, no grade had ever been overturned by a student. Schlough read Chapter 36 to the group that states that everything the Faculty Senate does was a recommendation to the Chancellor, who has the final say. A department chair cannot change a grade, unless the faculty or academic staff member who taught the student was no longer employed. If the student requests a hearing of the case, he/she could strike a member from the panel. Schlough said that he received an e-mail that recommended having the policy suspended. He asked Furst-Bowe how many incidents per year were related to this. Furst-Bowe replied that there was not a large number—maybe three per year. Albrecht said that EAC went through the process carefully and didn’t see any problem. However, if there was a concern, the committee could examine it again.

E. **Summer School Pay** – Chair Schlough said that he received two e-mails regarding Summer School Pay. One person said that his department was in favor of the flat rate; the other said that his department was not in favor. Schlough explained that the Provost and Deans were aware of this process two years ago, but he put it on the agenda because some colleges still weren’t consistent. Departments were doing things differently--some were very good to the people who were retiring, while others gave summer school classes to people earning the lowest rates. Furst-Bowe said that the summer school rate would be the same rate as the Continuing Education rate. Discussion ensued regarding the targets and why they can’t be met. Furst-Bowe agreed with the group’s frustration and said that she could invite Vice Chancellor Moen to the next meeting to help explain the process, which she understood was set by UW System. Ruenger said that the Finance Committee was exploring the issue, but would like to have someone from the Business Office come and explain things. He noted that it appears that the summer classes were required to generate revenues above and beyond what it needed to operate. Koepke said that she felt there was much inequity on campus and this could provide a more equitable solution. Ruenger added that research faculty and administrators were excluded. Hoel said that the campus didn’t hear much about workload and wished that there would be more discussion about the issue. Cole said that some professors in the past would take overloads and they wouldn’t get paid any more, but did it for the students’ sake to get them graduated. Where’s the incentive for the faculty? Furst-Bowe said that other schools were examined and UW-Stout was very generous in comparison in using the flat rate. Schlough asked the group if this item should go on the agenda. It was agreed to wait until the Finance Committee could give its report to the Executive Committee first.

F. **Polytechnic Survey (Steve Schlough)** – Chair Schlough distributed the revised timeline to the group and reported that the Senate of Academic Staff endorsed the polytech idea on campus. Discussion ensued regarding how to carry out Number 4 of the process—surveying the faculty. Koepke suggested having each departmental representative ask the same questions in order to survey his/her department and bring the responses back to the Senate. People would want a paper survey, with three-to-four questions, with a week’s turn-around that could easily be tallied. The Executive Committee would need to take action during their May 2 Meeting. Schlough asked the group what would happen if there was only a 35% response rate—how could the Faculty Senate give a fair recommendation to the Chancellor if less than half of the faculty responded? Anderson said that if the Senate could agree on only three or four questions, the departmental representatives could send them to their departmental constituents. This could easily be done and tallied by e-mail. Koepke said that she believed in the power of having Senate reps and this one thing

could hold the reps accountable. Dzissah said that most faculty don't attend the informational meetings because they teach or have other conflicts. Parejko said that the Senate needed to establish an equal process as much as possible. However, people may not respond to e-mails because there would be no anonymity. Mauldin stated that a paper survey would allow a direct way for faculty to express their opinion and be anonymous. Parejko agreed and said that the response rate would probably be higher than an e-mail survey. Hoel said that the survey could be distributed during a department meeting and collected by the departmental rep. Much more discussion ensued. Cole suggested using an electronic form for the opinion survey, which could be set up using D2L or something similar. Schlough asked the Senators to think about the options and to mail each other
over Spring Break.

G. Other

X. Adjournment – 4:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Anne Hoel, Secretary

Recorded and prepared by,
Joy Evenson