

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
SEPTEMBER 27, 2005**

ATTENDANCE:

CHAIR: Steve Schlough
VICE CHAIR: Forrest Schultz

SECRETARY: Anne Hoel
PAST CHAIR: Mike Galloy

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

EXCUSED: D. Albrecht, K. Martinson, B. Murphy, K. Parejko, S. Schlough

GUESTS: Chancellor Sorensen, D. Moen, C. Smith

I. Call to Order – 2:30 p.m.

II. Announcements and Information- Vice Chair Schultz announced that he would be chairing the meeting, as Chair Schlough was in Massachusetts.

III. Minutes of September 13, 2005 (Attachment 1)

Motion: Galloy/Ruenger moved to approve the Minutes of September 13, 2005.

Two minor corrections were made. Finder suggested changing the word, “Agenda,” to “Minutes” on Page 1. Mauldin asked that the spelling of his name be corrected on Page 3, after the word, “Adjournment.”

Vote: Passed as corrected.

IV. Chancellor’s Report – Chancellor Sorensen said that he wanted to discuss the 2006-2007 Professorships with the Faculty Senate and explained that retaining the funding for the full award amount was eroding the principle. He distributed a handout showing three options: 1) reducing the amounts of each award; 2) award a single Dahlgren for \$7,500 and not award the Ranney Price; and 3) transfer discretionary endowment earnings from other accounts to cover the deficit to be able to offer full professorships for 2006-2007. The Chancellor recommended option Number One that would reduce the award amounts to coincide with the spending policy. Chancellor Sorensen also reported on the enrollment and announced that Stout had 400 additional freshmen enrolled compared to last year, as well as an increase in transfer students. However, retention rates were a bit lower. The campus won’t know for certain how much additional money the extra students would bring in, as there were many factors (such as higher heating costs, WinTerM, etc.) that needed to be considered yet. The Chancellor explained that the Budget Reductions for 2005-2006 included four categories of reductions: a \$20 million Asset Management cut; a \$15 million Administrative cut; a \$5 million Procurement reduction; and finally, a \$15 million Joint Finance reduction. Stout’s share is nearly \$1.7 million (\$580,000 in one-time reductions, and more than \$1.1 million in permanent cuts. All but \$533,302 has been dealt with and the campus is in the process of deciding how to handle the remainder. Final decisions will be made only after discussion with the Senates, Deans, and the Chancellor’s Advisory Council. Vice Chancellor Moen distributed the “Distribution of 2005-07 Budget Reductions” to the group and explained that it showed the breakdown by year. No final decisions have been made yet for the final reductions the campus still must make. Moen also distributed the “2005-2006 Base Budget Cut - JFC Reduction” to the group. Cole asked if the JFC reductions were support-type of positions. Moen replied that they were open-ended and across-the-board, but not necessarily what the campus will end up with. Discussion ensued regarding if the cuts would continue to be spread out all over campus, or would be concentrated within areas that weren’t doing very well that could simply be eliminated. Anderson asked how Stout’s strategy compared with other campuses and what the Faculty Senate could do with the solid pieces of information given. The Chancellor said that all the campuses were in the same situation. He added that the Faculty Senate was reorganized years ago so each department has the representation and ability to send and receive information to constituents on various issues in a timely manner. However, the Chancellor’s Advisory Council makes the final decision on campus, and both Senate Chairs were members.

Discussion ensued regarding aligning Stout more closely with the technical schools and, perhaps, becoming a “school outside of the school. Galloy asked where the money went from customized tuition. Moen replied that it was Stout’s to keep. Schultz noted that the Faculty Senate could be empowered in developing a different curriculum that could help other faculty/staff think differently in how and what the campus offered. Galloy added that the campus needed to look at ways to help further the growth and betterment for the university at the state level as well. He added that the faculty needed to be encouraged and informed that they could teach and share their rich experiences in almost any college on campus, especially since tenure was at the university level and not at the college or department level.

V. Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs’ Report – none.

VI. Vice Chancellor for Administrative and Student Life Services’ Report – Vice Chancellor Moen stated that she would bring some people from the Business Office to the Faculty Senate Meeting to help answer any questions people have regarding the new travel regulations.

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) – Cole reported that he was re-elected Chair and Gary Rockwood, Vice Chair, and subcommittees were set up to review designated courses, timing, and processes.
- B. Educational Activities (Donna Albrecht) – no report.
- C. Elections (Forrest Schultz) – Schultz reported that the election process has been completed for the All University Promotion Committees. Ballots were now out for the University Committee election and due to the Senate Office on October 7. The Senators will also elect representatives to other committees during the Faculty Senate Meeting on October 4.
- D. Finance Committee (Bill Murphy) – no report.
- E. Graduate Education Committee (Gene Ruenger) – Ruenger reported that there were no curriculum issues at their recent meeting; however graduate issues would be reviewed and elections held at their next meeting.
- F. General Education (Ken Parejko) – no report
- G. Personnel Policies (Karen Martinson) – Schultz distributed Karen Martinson’s report to the group.
- H. Planning & Review (Brian Finder) – Finder distributed his report and reported that he was elected Chair and Jonna Gjevre, Vice Chair. The committee will be examining six reviews that were carried forward from last year, updating internal documentation regarding its Program Audit and Review Plan, reviewing twelve program reviews/status reports for this year, and working with the General Education Committee to determine what questions should be asked for the review of general education as a whole in AY 2009-2010. Galloy asked what all the reports really meant. Finder replied that they were a form of accountability to the program directors. Galloy asked if there were information and data in the reports that could aid administration in making their budget cut. The Chancellor said that everything would be reviewed with the deans, especially since some campus programs were stagnant and weak and others were growing and doing well; eventually, some program decisions would need to be made. Discussion ensued. Koepke said that some programs had ebbs and flows, depending on what’s going on in the world. Smith added that people needed to keep in mind that continuous improvement was always in the forefront of reviews and to see if it fit into the overall program review and plan. The Chancellor noted that he would like to work with the Faculty Senate to restructure program realignment around functions instead of by college and to examine two clusters of options that were new for students (using digital technology and communication) to see why some segments weren’t drawing the students and others were. PRC would need to review everything and make recommendations on how to move forward. Discussion ensued regarding getting stakeholders’ responses to the realignment issue and examining comparisons with other assessments in order to find key indicators and common threads.

I. Other

VIII. Old Business

- A. Chancellor's Coalition on Problem Drinking – Vice Chair Schultz announced that Dave DeLambo has volunteered to serve; he will be confirmed during the October 4 Faculty Senate Meeting.**
- B. Other**

IX. New Business

- A. Committee Process (Steve Schlough) – Vice Chair Schultz reported that he, Galloy, and Schlough met to discuss these items and particularly, the CIC curriculum process. Senators were asked to get feedback on how to improve the process from their constituents to share at the October 4 Faculty Senate Meeting.**
- B. Committee Inventory (Steve Schlough) – Vice Chair Schultz explained that Joy assembles and coordinates all faculty memberships on many committees on campus. Past Chair Galloy said that all of the committees need to be analyzed to see if they were staffed properly. The Senate also needs to deal with the group of Other, to ensure that SOE was properly represented, and that the Faculty Senate Bylaws were up-to-date. He recommended that a small task force be formed to accomplish these tasks. Schultz said that he would pass the recommendation on to Schlough.**
- C. Other- Course Management System
Vice Chair Schultz asked the group if it would be advantageous to have a D2L demonstration at the Faculty Senate Meeting on October 4. Chancellor Sorensen added that the campus has two systems in use (e-Scholar and D2L). Consultants analyzed our campus and determined that it was foolish and expensive to maintain two systems and recommended, especially in light of the budget reductions, for the campus to have only one system. Schultz asked the group if a forum should be held. Mauldin said that he felt it wouldn't make any difference, but some people would basically object to switching systems again – and a demonstration wouldn't sway them. The Chancellor added that the campus must pay for D2L--there was no option--but recommended that a Senate discussion should be held to help explain why. Galloy felt that the choice needed to be driven by the budget. Anderson recommended that it would be helpful for the Faculty Senate to pass and support a resolution regarding the decision, as many people see the issue as a curricular concern. It was agreed that no demonstration would be held, and the item would be placed on the October 4 Agenda.**

X. Adjournment - 3:33 p.m.

**Respectfully submitted,
Anne Hoel, Secretary**

**Recorded and prepared by,
Joy Evenson**