

NOTES FROM COMBINED SENATES MEETING  
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-STOUT  
MAY 10, 2005  
BALLROOM C  
2:30 P.M.

- I. Call to Order – 2:40 p.m. by Faculty Senate Chair, Mike Galloy.
- II. Announcements and Information – Chair Galloy thanked all the Senators who were ending their Senate terms for their service to governance at UW-Stout and announced that this was the last Senate Meeting of the semester.
- III. Faculty Senate Remarks
- IV. Senate of Academic Staff Remarks
- V. Chancellor’s Report – Chancellor Sorensen reported that the Board of Regents had a good meeting, were impressed with what the campus was doing, and felt Stout made a good impression. Concerning pay raises, UW-System announced that the unions have been asked to settle; proposed raises include a 2% for this July 1; 2% next July 1, and another 1% next August 1. The Chancellor said that fall enrollment was projected at 1700 new freshmen and the campus was preparing to serve the students. The Chancellor’s Summer Retreat is scheduled for July, where 35 members from governance and other faculty and academic staff will meet to review previous priorities indicated during the year. There will be a three-day preparation for this Retreat. Two consultants will be coming to campus on July 9-10 to determine if the campus is properly aligned for the new CIO search.
- VI. Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs’ Report – Beth Resech, Director of Financial Aid, distributed the “Reauthorization of the HEA: Impact of Proposed Changes in Federal Financial Aid at UW-Stout” to the group and explained that there were several proposed changes in federal finance aid programs which would significantly impact Stout students. The proposal plans to eliminate the “base guarantee” for three campus-based programs: the Supplemental Education Opportunity Grant (SEOG), the Work Study Program, and the Federal Perkins Loan Program. Resech said that there will be changes to the allocation formulas for campus-based funds, which will switch from a “base guarantee” to a “fair share” calculation. Stout would experience reduction to the annual Federal Work Study allocation from \$727,000 to \$315,000; reduction to the Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant from \$505,000 to \$224,000; and reduction of the Federal Perkins Loan Program’s Federal Capital Contribution (FCC) from \$261,000 to \$29,000. The combined loss for UW-Stout would be \$925,000 per year of federal financial aid to award to needy students. These reductions would change substantially the composition of aid Stout could offer students, moving to a significantly higher percent coming from loans. However, the reductions would be phased in over a period of time—by 80%, then 60%, then 40%, beginning in 2007-2008. Additionally, UW-System is scheduled to lose \$10 million in resources for collective students. Provost Sedlak encouraged Senators to contact their legislators; the information would also be shared with SSA.
- VII. Vice Chancellor for Administrative and Student Life Services’ Report
  - A. Exit Interview for Students; Executive Summary (Diane Moen; Attachment 4) – Vice Chancellor Moen explained that the report highlights why students don’t plan to enroll at Stout for the next semester. Reasons for leaving include that they were transferring (69%), or because of personal reasons (28%). Differences were also broken down by segment, and Moen noted that the entire report was on the BPA website.
  - B. 2005 UW-Stout Morale Evaluation; Executive Summary (Diane Moen; Attachment 5) – Vice Chancellor Moen gave a summary of the report, explaining that the NCA Steering Committee recommend a process and format for the evaluation of governance and morale in 1998. The Budget, Planning and Analysis Office conducted the Morale Evaluation in 1999, 2002 and 2005, with the intent to gain a better understanding of how the campus personally experiences the organization and roles in it so we can improve work life at Stout and success as an institution. Overall morale of the respondents rated moderate to high. The mean for all responses was 3.18, a decrease from the 2002 survey mean of 3.40. Factors impacting positively in work morale were interaction with students, access to computer resources, good retirement, and fringe benefits. Negative impact factors include very little opportunity for promotion for classified employees, low salaries, workload for non-instructional academic staff, and the reclassification system by LTE. Moen noted that this report would also be available on the BPA website.

- VIII. e-Scholar Assessment Committee Update (Julie Furst-Bowe) – Assistant Chancellor Furst-Bowe and Jane Henderson distributed the “Laptop Assessment Summary” to the group and explained that the report showed the impact of the e-Scholar Program on Learning by increasing critical thinking and changing the role of instructors to more “active” learning. Data for the summary came from student and instructor surveys and focus group results from 2002 to 2005, and four surveys were done each year. The laptops are saving student’s time by allowing for communication outside of class and providing instant access; students were also using their laptops more than they expected. Stout seniors are scoring higher on several peer and national comparison groups. Students and instructors consistently report high ratings on how well the equipment and software in the labs are working. Furst-Bowe noted that all data was on the Website and would be used to develop faculty initiatives. Jane Henderson distributed the “e-Scholar Assessment Schedule for 2005-2006” for information and explained that the ECAR Survey was a national survey used to benchmark Stout’s students with other campuses across the United States.

MINUTES  
FACULTY SENATE MEETING  
MAY 10, 2005  
BALLROOM C

**ATTENDANCE:**

**CHAIR:** Mike Galloy  
Schlough  
**PAST CHAIR:** Tom Allen  
Johnson

**VICE CHAIR:** Steve

**SECRETARY:** David

**PRESENT:** C. Bendel, T. Bensen, B. Bergquist, P. Calenberg, S. Cole, M. Decker, J. Dzissah, G. Earl, A. Hoel, L. Koepke, K. Mauldin, B. McAlister, L. McCullough, L. Milanese, S. Nold, M. Ondrus, S. Eberhard (for B. Peters), F. Schultz, M. Sherman, R. Teleb, I. Ul-Haq, N. Weckmueller, K. Zimmerman

**EXCUSED:** D. Brouillard, G. Godfrey, K. McDonald, S. Terry, G. Wheeler

**GUESTS:** Chancellor Sorensen, R. Sedlak, C. Smith, A. Ramage, D. Tyson

IX. Call to Order - 3:15 p.m.

X. Announcements

XI. Minutes of April 26, 2005 (Attachment 1) – Correction made by Koepke on Page 4, 8<sup>th</sup> Paragraph-- Koepke said that the sentence should read: “Koepke stated she assumed Galloy would want faculty endorsement of a plan before taking it to the Chancellor’s Advisory Council.”

Motion: Decker/Milanese moved to approve the corrected Minutes of April 26, 2005.

Vote: Passed as corrected.

XII. Committee Reports – Tyson distributed “Planning and Review Committee’s 2004-2005 Annual Report to the Faculty Senate” to the group and explained that final action following responses from the deans would be concluded early in the 2005-2006.

Chair Galloy announced that PPC Chair, Anne Ramage, and PRC Chair, Dick Tyson, would be ending their terms as chairs and thanked them for their service.

XIII. Old Business

A. **Committee Structure** (Mike Galloy) – Chair Galloy said that this would remain on the Agenda for future use next year.

B. **Recommendation of the Focus 2010 Implementation Team for Program Alignment** (Mike Galloy; Attachment 3) – Chair Galloy asked that discussion for this item be delayed until the end of the meeting when all other business was finished on the Agenda.

Chair Galloy explained that he revised the prior task force’s recommendations, gave a summary of the changes, and suggested activities that might be included for each. The task force members

were in agreement that this report goes forward to the Chancellor's Summer Retreat. He explained that the implementation team was made up of representation from each of the colleges and school, including faculty, academic staff, and students. Data was gathered through stakeholder meetings, focus groups, retreats, other implementation reports, and in general discussion with others. In an effort to begin discussion on meaningful change that responds to the demands of budgets, recruitment and retention, the technical college initiative, other initiatives on campus, and position ourselves for the Twenty-first Century, the task force offered the recommendations for consideration.

Cole thanked Galloy for serving as Faculty Senate Chair the past two years and noted that he stepped in when needed. (The regular term for Chair is one year.)

C. Other

XIV. New Business

- A. B.S. in Applied Social Science (Dick Tyson; Attachment 2) – Tyson explained that PRC recommended the Preliminary Entitlement to Plan the B.S. Applied Social Science degree as it was generally consistent with the mission of Stout and its fit with existing programs of study.

Motion: Decker/Schlough moved to approve the Entitlement to Plan the B.S. Applied Social Science.

Allen said that some people that he spoke to felt that the name was too vague and suggested looking at a proposal that had alternate names. He added that the skills that were articulated in the policy were built into the present B.S. in Psychology program and asked the group how did this program compare with other comparable programs that Stout has. Maudlin replied that all of the companies listed in the documentation welcomed a Social Science Degree and felt that as a working title, it would be fine. Discussion ensued regarding overlap of some of the courses with other degrees/programs on campus, the possibility of having a more marketable name instead of a narrowed/precise name, coursework data analysis, etc. Tyson explained that social science gathers data differently, and uses a different studying approach based on broader data gathering, opposed to a narrow analysis. Smith stated that this was just a permission to plan and the number of degrees was very small when compared to others within the university. She said that she felt it would give more options to the students enrolling with Stout, and didn't see it as being an overlapped application. Cole said that it could be a good pre-law field. Schultz agreed and said it could be a great potential with what Stout does. Weckmueller said that although he was neutral to the program, it would be much easier to shoot the program down now rather than spending the time to do it two years from now. More discussion ensued regarding how it would fit within the humanities, speech, and technical writing areas. Johnson called for the question.

Vote: Passed by majority vote with 8 abstentions.

- B. Motion on Definition of Research (Anne Ramage) – Ramage distributed the following motion to the group and explained that it would be the actual wording that would appear in the Handbook as an addition to the Research and Scholarship information.

“Each academic department must establish their own definition of research that will guide faculty through promotion and the pre- and post-tenured processes. The departments' definition(s) of research should be in accordance with the established definition of research found in the Faculty and Staff Unclassified Handbook under Definition of Teaching, Research and Services (UW-Stout 85-40, 10/1/85), subsection Research and Scholarship.”

Motion: Johnson/Koepke moved to approve the proposed motion and to have it be placed in the Handbook.

Much discussion ensued regarding each department establishing its own definition of research. Chair Galloy encouraged the departmental Senators to bring the motion back to their departments, so they can work on it. Koepke asked Ramage if an applicant could just attach their department's definition of what was required if it was different from the Handbook. Ramage replied that he/she could, but it also could be addressed how he/she meets the criteria in the five-page application. Allen suggested for PPC to survey each department and propose a more specific description. Decker said that he felt that a survey would be an extra step for the departments to do. Ramage stated that there were some departments that have different disciplines, so they would need more

than one definition. Nold asked Ramage who the departments would submit their definitions to. Ramage replied that when people apply for tenure or promotion, it should accompany their application, so the Chancellor knows what their department expects. Zimmerman asked for the history behind PPC's decision. Ramage replied that Research Promotion Services brought a redefined research description to PPC for input. PPC discussed the issue with Steve Nold and Nancy Schofield at length and decided it should be shared with all departments. PPC unanimously agreed to retain the existing definition in the Handbook, but also to bring it forward with an addition that would have each department define its own definition. PPC discussed the issue with Chancellor Sorensen and Provost Sedlak. In the past, when tenure applications came forward, it was difficult for them to know what the department expected from its people. This will help make the process much clearer. Decker said that this would also help give peace of mind to new faculty. Irfan agreed. Ramage said that each department chair and dean would know the expectations. It was agreed that the Senate Office would be a logical place for the definitions to be kept. Allen asked Ramage if this would go into the Handbook. Ramage replied it would. Discussion ensued regarding some of the wording in the motion. Cole asked who would monitor each department in carrying out its responsibility. Galloy responded that it would be each department's responsibility to make sure it's incorporated into their bylaws. Ramage agreed and said that each department and dean would have the responsibility. When a promotion application comes from the department to the college level, the application must have the department's requirements justifying why they are recommending this person for promotion. That information will let the college level know that they were consistent with what the department required. Johnson called for the question.

**Vote to add 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph into the Handbook: 15 for; 8 opposed; 0 abstentions. Motion carried.**

Chair Galloy charged PPC to follow up and ensure that the promotion and tenure documents were consistent with the process.

- C. **Motion on Progress toward Tenure (Anne Ramage) - Ramage explained that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee asked for a handout to show where the motion would be placed in the Handbook and distributed copies to the group.**

**Motion: Johnson/Bergquist moved to add the following section into the Handbook.**

**“Each academic department must develop a procedure for providing annual feedback on progress toward tenure in accordance with their departmental bylaws and the Faculty and Staff Unclassified Handbook, particularly sections UWS 3.0-6, 3/1/94 and UW-Stout 3.06 2/10/05.”**

Allen asked the group if the second sentence in the first paragraph of UW-Stout 3.06, Appointments, was approved last fall and thought that the language included the department chair. Ramage replied that the first paragraph was approved as written. Allen said that he has always been an advocate for providing input on the progress to tenure, but recommended that the process should include the entire tenured faculty within a department (not just the department chair) who would examine the performance objectives of the person that was going for tenure. How can only one person speak for an entire group of people? Allen noted that the Psychology Department uses a model (which he sent to PPC) that included the entire department in making the decision for tenure. Ramage replied that the proposed paragraph would give the department a choice in how they developed its procedure for providing annual feedback on progress toward tenure to the person. She further explained that tenure qualifications vary from department to department, as each discipline was different. The proposed motion was written in order to allow each department to establish their own procedures and guidelines. More discussion ensued and Johnson called for the question.

**Vote by hand: 17 approved; 2 opposed; 3 abstentions. Motion carried.**

D. **Other**

XV. **Adjournment – 4:15 p.m.**

Respectfully submitted,  
David Johnson, Secretary

Recorded and prepared by,  
Joy Evenson