

**MINUTES  
FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 9, 2003**

**ATTENDANCE:**

**CHAIR:** Mike Galloy  
**VICE CHAIR:** Vacant

**SECRETARY:** David Johnson  
**PAST CHAIR:** Tom Allen

**PRESENT:** D. Albrecht, S. Beckham, S. Cole, M. Decker, B. McAlister, A. Ramage, R. Rothaupt, D. Tyson, N. Weckmueller

**EXCUSED:** L. Koepke

**GUESTS:** R. Sedlak, D. Moen, C. Smith, J. Furst-Bowe

**I. Call to Order – 2:35 p.m.**

**II. Announcements and Information**

- A. Kathleen Deery is the new Senator from the Rehabilitation and Counseling Department.
- B. Carol Seaborn is the new Senator from the Department of Food and Nutrition.

**III. Minutes of April 29, 2003 (Attachment 1)**

**Motion:** Johnson/Allen moved to approve the Minutes of April 29, 2003.

**Vote:** Passed unanimously.

**IV. Chancellor's Report - no report.**

**V. Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs' Report – Provost Sedlak stated that because of this year's drinking problem, he is asking that EAC schedule next year's calendar differently so that students would move in on Sunday and begin classes on Thursday. He also would like the committee to examine different ways of structuring the fall and spring semester schedules. Sedlak explained that the problem this year stemmed from the number of days that students were on campus with nothing to do before classes began. There were many problems with student drinking behavior, including a high rate of citations given for underage drinking.**

**VI. Vice Chancellor for Administrative and Student Life Services' Report – Vice Chancellor Moen asked the Executive Committee how they wanted her items brought to the Faculty Senate this year and distributed a handout that showed potential Senate agenda items. She noted that the Chancellor would attend the meeting when the University Priorities/Focus Group Session would be discussed. She said that the Chancellor's Advisory Council did scenario building last summer due to the budget decreases and tried to do some "out of the box" thinking on how UW-Stout would look like in 2010. Moen added that a draft document from the summer meetings would be put on the on the Web within a couple of weeks.**

**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 CIC would meet on September 18.
- B. Educational Activities (Dennis Shaw) – Galloy stated that EAC would be charged with revising the calendar for next year.
- C. Elections (Tom Allen) – Allen reported that the ballots were out for faculty to vote for representatives on the All University Promotion Committees and were due to the Senate Office on September 16, with the counting scheduled for September 17. A call for nominations was sent to all faculty to fill a variety of committee vacancies not filled last spring; the due date is

September 17.

- D. Finance Committee (Ned Weckmueller) – Weckmueller reported that the committee would meet on September 11.
- E. General Education (Sue Beckham) – Beckham said that GEC would meet on September 12.
- F. Personnel Policies (Anne Ramage) – Ramage reported that PPC would meet on September 10 and noted that the Promotion Application Workshop would also be held on September 10.
- G. Planning & Review (Dick Tyson) – Tyson distributed his report and said PRC would meet on September 15. He noted that Tom Allen would be attending the meeting to conduct the elections for a chair and vice chair.
  - 1. Where are they with the review process? Tyson said that the instruments have been revised and the committee now has all the new documents. However, PRC was still working on the document that the institution would send out; the committee would continue working on this for first semester.
- H. Other
  - 1. Task Force re: Relationship between Graduate College and Faculty Senate Office (Attachment 2) – Julie Furst-Bowe distributed a page from the NCA Handbook to the group and said that she was representing Bob Peters, Task Force Chair, who couldn't attend the meeting. She explained that Stout was out of compliance for one of the NCA requirements. Currently, the Graduate Council has no say in new curriculum. The current Task Force drafted the attached set of bylaws. Furst-Bowe explained that last spring, Peters visited the other Senate standing committees to ensure that there was no overlap with them. PPC will review the bylaws and then the full Senate will vote to establish the Graduate Education Committee as a new subcommittee of the Faculty Senate. This committee would examine new graduate courses and course revisions and put Stout in compliance with NCA criteria. Secretarial support for the committee would still be provided by the Graduate School Office. Galloy asked Ramage to schedule this for PPC's review on September 12, so it could go to the full Senate on September 16. It was also decided for CIC and PRC to also review the drafted bylaws. Smith suggested that the item could go to the full Senate on the 16<sup>th</sup> for information only, with the understanding that it would return later for final approval. Allen said that a great number of courses were dual-numbered for availability to the undergraduate and graduate students, but the majority of courses were meant for the undergraduates. He suggested that the review process could state that all these courses would go through this extra layer for approval, but seldom would graduate students take some of the courses. Tyson agreed and said that PRC occasionally had graduate programs that were indistinguishable from some of the other courses. He asked if PRC would receive the first-stage proposal. Furst-Bowe replied that both committees would receive the proposal—Planning and Review Committee for mission and the Graduate Education Committee for focus. Beckham noted that the General Education Committee would also need to approve the courses to determine if they met the technical requirement for General Education; however, the Graduate Education Committee would still need to approve them for the graduate objectives. Cole asked if the graduate courses could be grandfathered into the procedure. Furst-Bowe replied that that they would be. Weckmueller asked Sedlak and Furst-Bowe if all the faculty could elect the graduate faculty to this group, once the bylaws were approved. Both Sedlak and Furst-Bowe said that would be permissible.

VII. Old Business

- A. Other

IX. New Business

- A. Faculty Senate Adjustments to Accommodate the School of Education – Galloy said that the Faculty Senate and standing committees needed to be restructured in order to accommodate the new School of Education. He explained that Ned Weckmueller and Zeke Smolarek met years ago to restructure the Faculty Senate so that every department on campus had representation on the Senate. McAlister asked about the disparity between departments; some have 30 members and others have 3. Weckmueller explained that there was a proportional representation done for the Senate; as a result, each department was represented in order to provide a flow of communication between the two groups. Senators could give Faculty Senate reports during their departmental meetings. It was decided that Weckmueller, Ramage, and Galloy would draft a new Senate structure that would incorporate a fair representation for the School of Education and bring it to the

**Executive Committee.**

- B. Grade Change Policy (Attachment 3) – Chair Galloy explained that the Faculty Senate voted last year to alter this policy. The Chancellor did not approve it. It was decided to bring this item forward on September 16 and ask the Senate if they want to revisit it.**
- C. GEC and CIC Motion on Program Changes to General Education Requirement (Attachment 4) – Beckham explained that the motion clarified the responsibilities of GEC and CIC when program revisions seem not to comply with university General Education programs. The two committees felt that not only would the motion codify their relationship, but would also help ensure that the spirit of General Education at Stout was not accidentally violated. Allen agreed and said that Faculty Senate approval would strengthen the motion, but suggested some minor wording changes. It was decided to take the motion forward as it stood and let the Faculty Senate determine if any changes should be made.**
- D. General Education Assessment Process (Attachment 5) – Beckham said that GEC met many times before finalizing the Assessment model. She stated that GEC would like its Assessment subcommittee to continue. It was decided that this item would go forward to the full Senate on September 16.**
- E. Senate of Academic Staff/Faculty Senate Administrative Briefings (Mark Skutley) – Skutley, Chair of the Senate of Academic Staff, explained that his Senate has a need for more timely information. In the past, he said that they met only once a month; they have now changed their schedule to meet twice per month. He distributed a proposal for “Joint Administrative Briefings” that would be attended by both Senates during the first part of their meetings. Skutley explained that the Chancellor, Provost, Vice Chancellor, and other administrators would only need to give their reports once. Meeting jointly for these briefings would improve cohesiveness, allow the Senators to get to know one another, and assist each other in discussing common issues. Skutley suggested that a broader perspective could be created because each Senate had representatives serving on approximately forty of the same committees. The joint portion of each agenda would be carefully created and managed by the Chairs. Skutley concluded by saying that if other issues would require discussion from the administrators, that particular Senate could schedule time with the appropriate administrator. Galloy said that this format could focus the discussion and help keep the lines of communication open between the two Senates. Albrecht said that she was in favor of the idea and it would be worth trying. Allen asked the group what seating arrangement would be best so everyone could hear adequately. Decker said that he was in favor of the plan, but suggested to assess each Senate’s comfort with the change after a certain length of time. Beckham and Decker suggested taking the proposal forward for full Senate approval. It was decided to bring this item forward for information and discussion, and if approved, to revisit the issue at the end of the semester. Albrecht suggested sending an e-mail out to the Senate informing them that this item would be on the agenda and feedback would be appreciated.**
- F. Other – Albrecht said that she was a laptop associate with the e-Scholar program and her group has been charged to visit with the senates. She asked the group to be put on the Faculty Senate agenda on a regular basis in order to keep people informed. It was decided that this would be done.**

**It was decided that the One-Minute Governance Survey would be placed on the Agenda for September 16. Claudia Smith and Meridith Wentz would attend to present the document.**

**X. Adjournment – 3:58 p.m.**

**Respectfully submitted,  
David Johnson, Secretary**

**Recorded and prepared by,  
Joy Morical**

|