

MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 11, 2003

ATTENDANCE:

CHAIR: Tom Allen
VICE CHAIR: Claudia Smith

SECRETARY: Mike Galloy
PAST CHAIR: Ned Weckmueller

PRESENT: D. Albrecht, S. Beckham, S. Cole, S. Deckelman, D. Johnson, A. Ramage, D. Tyson

EXCUSED: K. Zimmerman

GUEST: Provost Sedlak, C. Bendel

I. Call to Order – 2:37 p.m.

II. Announcements and Information – Chair Allen announced that Chancellor Sorensen and Vice Chancellor Moen were not able to attend the meeting, and Provost Sedlak would be a half-hour late.

III. Minutes of January 28, 2003 (Attachment 1)

Motion: Johnson/Beckham moved to approve the Minutes of January 28, 2003.

Vote: Passed unanimously.

IV. Chancellor's Report - no report.

V. Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs' Report – Provost Sedlak reported that he sent an e-mail to faculty regarding a survey on Student Engagement. He explained that it would help them work on NSSE, faculty perceptions, and to see if there were any gaps between the issues. Sedlak said that he and the Chancellor would be requesting that the General Education Committee examine the credits-by-degree area and general education requirements. Discussion ensued regarding various areas and programs that could be reduced or eliminated. Galloy stated that he wanted to go on record as speaking against the proposal to change the program director model. He said that it would be helpful to see a proposal addressing what a program would do with their duties, who would pick them up, or take care of the curricular issues if this was eliminated. Sedlak replied that he was charged with bringing two models to Thursday's meeting and explained that the graduate program direction would be different from the undergraduate program direction. There would be some commonality, he noted, but also some differences that he would try to clarify. Allen announced that at the latest Board of Regents' Meeting, President Lyall proposed moving the tuition to 95% or mid-point—which would mean huge increases. Also proposed at the meeting was having some Regents attend campuses in four various regions of the state to listen to complaints and help address concerns. Perhaps Stout could quickly extend an invitation, since the campus was centrally localized.

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.

A. Curriculum & Instruction (Steve Cole) – Cole distributed CIC's report to the group. He said that the committee drew up new bylaws for the Ethnic Studies Curriculum Advisory Committee (a subcommittee of CIC) and requested that the Faculty Senate help conduct the elections for the committee. Much discussion ensued regarding the process of determining committee members that teach A, B, and C courses. It was recommended that Cole bring the bylaws back to CIC for revision to help make the election process less cumbersome. Smith recommended that CIC appoint part of the committee members and then the Faculty Senate could elect the college reps. Galloy suggested to have the members' terms staggered. Another option suggested by the group would be to have CIC nominate people for the A, B, and C courses and Joy could just put their names on the ballot.

- B. **Educational Activities (Donna Albrecht)** – Albrecht reported that EAC would meet again in February. She said that the subcommittees were working on their charges and noted that the revised Grading Policy/Withdrawal Policy, Add/Drop Policy, and Graduating with Honors Designation should all be coming shortly to the Executive Committee. Allen distributed her memo to the group and requested that EAC revise the Withdrawal Policy with the following points: a rationale for changes made, a section of the existing policy that show the actual language, and then the proposed policy revisions. He said that it would be helpful if the committee used italics and cross-throughs throughout the document, in order to help Senators understand what’s being changed and to show the newly-proposed language. This item will be coming to the Executive Committee within two weeks.
- C. **Elections (Claudia Smith)** – no report.
- D. **General Education (Sue Beckham)** - Beckham reported that the Assessment models did not come to the Executive Committee, as one member thought they weren’t finished yet. GEC will meet on February 14 and discuss if they want it distributed or not. Allen said that this would only be a report from GEC and not something that would need to ask for the Senate's approval.
- E. **Personnel Policies (Anne Ramage; Attachment 2)** – Chris Bendel reported that PPC was revising the governance evaluations for the Chancellor and Deans; the BPA Office was working on revising the form. Discussion ensued regarding the fact that relatively very few people know and work closely enough with the administrators to answer the survey questions in detail. Johnson said that the committee took the original document and modified it when they observed the same problems/concerns. The revised document reads better and gives people a better opportunity to evaluate the people based on their observations. Allen said that the scan sheet process could be revised as well. In the past, he explained, that all information was key-punched into the computer by hand. Galloy said that in order to improve the response rate, the group took Stout’s Mission and Goals and the Chancellor's job description and worked them into the evaluation to give people something more concrete to weigh against. Allen said that each individual making comments currently gets a number that helps the reader tell if only one individual was making negative or positive comments, or if there were many. A number of people thought this was a good idea; however, Allen explained, that this procedure could also be negative because it could help "blow someone's cover." Weckmueller said that he delivered the results to the administrators last year and it was helpful for them to know that the negative comments came from only a few people. It was suggested to explain the procedure on the form, so people could be aware of this process.
- F. **Planning & Review (Dick Tyson)** – Tyson reported that PRC's recommendations would be coming for the Career, Technical Education and Training course and for Guidance and Counseling. He stated that the committee revised four out of eight of their forms that resulted in 15% less volume.
- G. **Other**
 - 1. **Task Force re: Relationship between Graduate College and Faculty Senate Office**

VIII. Old Business

- A. **Other**

IX. New Business

- A. **Faculty Senate/Standing Committee Roles Relating to the Proposal to Reduce Total Credits-to-Degree including Reduction in General Education** – Allen distributed recent budget reports he downloaded from the BPA website to the group. He explained that the members of the Budget Reduction Steering Group included both Senate Chairs, the SSA President, the Chancellor, Provost, Diane Moen, Kass Ingala, and the Deans. Allen explained that Athletics, Intramurals, Placement, and Stout Solutions were areas that could possibly generate self-sustaining revenues or where the scope of the function could be reduced. Additionally, two models would be presented that would modify or eliminate the program director positions (currently there are 13 FTE positions on campus). The deans were being challenged to come up with solutions that would help save these positions. Workload was another area that was being examined; the Steering Group affirmed that there would be a 24-credit teaching load for faculty and a 30-credit teaching load for academic staff--that every department would be brought up to full-time teaching. Additionally, two categories were proposed to be eliminated from the General Education requirements (Technology and Health & PE). Other instructional efficiencies scheduled to be reviewed included Summer School (switching to standard per credit payments for instruction); Curriculum (eliminating or converting courses less than 3 credits); General Education (converting 5 credit courses to 3 or 4

credits and to review the necessity of lab experiences); and developing a common policy on release time and stipends. Allen reported that he attended the February 4 Faculty Reps Meeting and the latest budget reduction projections were 1 out of every 8 dollars— or a 12½ % cut. However, the campus won't know for certain until Governor Doyle presents his budget message on February 18. Allen said that every area will be hit across-the-board. He asked the group what the roles should be for the Faculty Senate and/or standing committees relating to reducing the total credits-to-degree proposal and the proposed reduction in the General Education requirements. Cole said that it would be helpful to have dollar amounts provided for each item. Galloy stated that the Senates should know who/where the money will be generated from for the School of Education. Allen reminded the group that the campus was dealing with a very short time frame. Smith suggested that the General Education requirement proposal be placed on the GEC agenda for their input in which courses should be cut out. Much discussion ensued regarding courses and number of credits. Cole suggested finding out how other campuses were handling the General Education issue-- perhaps GEC could do some research? Albrecht said that a rationale for converting the 5 credit courses to 3 or 4 credits would be helpful. Cole asked if an ad hoc committee could be formed to look at the key issues. Allen replied that people could do anything they wanted to in order to provide input to the Steering Group; CIC would also have a role in this.

Smith informed Senators that Bob Foley presented two motions at the February 4 Senate Meeting and requested that these be listed on the agenda. Smith explained that one motion was regarding using people's social security numbers on identification cards and the other was providing an opportunity for Department Senators to report at Senate meetings. Discussion ensued regarding various options where Department Senators could bring issues forward. Weckmueller suggested that they could bring concerns to either the Executive Committee or the Senate Chair. Galloy suggested that the administrative reports be given at the executive committee meetings leaving more time for faculty issues to be discussed at the faculty senate meetings. It was decided that Foley's motions would be placed on the agenda for Faculty Senate consideration.

- B. **Unclassified 2003-05 Pay Plan Distribution Guidelines (PPC; Chris Bendel; Attachment 3) - this item will be placed on the February 18 Agenda.**
- C. **Wording Change in Promotion Policy (PPC; Chris Bendel; Attachment 4) - Bendel explained that someone observed that the promotion application wording does not agree with the policy concerning the filing of multiple applications. It wasn't a policy change, just a form change. Joy will make language change on the Promotion application form for next year.**
- D. **2003-05 Salary Guidelines (PPC; Chris Bendel; Attachment 5) - Bendel explained that Mike Galloy served on the subcommittee that drafted the Salary Guidelines for 2003-2005 based on last year's plan. Galloy asked if the 3.6% raise would be given for each year, or would it be for two. Allen said that the salary guidelines were passed each year, so it would be for each year. This item will go on the February 18 Agenda.**
- E. **Other**

X. **Adjournment - 4:33 p.m.**

Respectfully submitted,
Mike Galloy, Secretary

Recorded and prepared by,
Joy Morical