

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
MARCH 8, 2005**

ATTENDANCE:

CHAIR: Mike Galloy
PAST CHAIR: Tom Allen

VICE CHAIR: Steve Schlough
SECRETARY: David Johnson

PRESENT: D. Albrecht, S. Cole, A. Hoel, L. Koepke, K. Parejko, A. Ramage, G. Ruenger, D. Tyson, K. Zimmerman

EXCUSED: B. Murphy, M. Ondrus

GUESTS: R. Sedlak, D. Moen, C. Smith

I. Call to Order – 2:35 p.m.

II. Announcements and Information – Chair Galloy announced that the Joint Finance Committee would be coming to UW-Stout on Monday, March 14, to discuss the budget. Galloy said that he served on a Team that would be involved in gathering information to present to the Committee.

III. Minutes of February 22, 2005 (Attachment 1)

Motion: Schlough/Ramage moved to approve the Minutes of February 22, 2005.

Vote: Passed unanimously.

IV. Chancellor's Report – no report.

V. Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs' Report

VI. Vice Chancellor for Administrative and Student Life Services' Report – Vice Chancellor Moen distributed the “2005-2007 Biennial Budget” to the group and explained that the Governor was including \$65 million in total cuts to the UW-System. Stout’s share of Administrative Efficiencies is \$580,500 in 2005-2006 with an estimated amount of \$774,000 ongoing by July 1, 2006. Standard budget principles were used to make the cuts. The Chancellor’s Advisory Council agreed to preserve the function of the digital campus and minimize elimination of front-line workers. Moen explained that some people’s salaries (or a proportion) would come out of non-revenue sources (the campus would lose 102 dollars and FTE). Stout’s share of Procurement Savings is \$193,500 and would come from better and fewer vendors, including food supplies, travel consolidation, peripherals & networking gear, office supplies, software, janitorial supplies, copiers & faxes, IT contractors, and printers. Stout’s share of UW-System’s Asset Management \$10 million cut is \$387,000, and is a one-time cut. The Governor is suggesting that the campus sell off some of its assets (land, facilities, etc.). Moen explained that Stout could also develop contracts that would help create a revenue stream, such as soft drink pouring rights, bookstore, increasing parking rates, etc. Provost Sedlak explained that the Chancellor’s Advisory Council preferred Model 1, so the students wouldn’t be hit as hard. There was a real concern that students were being taxed more and more. Discussion ensued regarding fringe benefits, layoffs, and other issues. Parejko said that he was against cutting the International Program Director’s position and explained that he felt it was important to keep a global perspective in the students’ education. Koepke agreed. Sedlak explained that the vacant positions were analyzed first and this was only an option.

Vice Chancellor Moen said that the Diversity Plan 2008 was being prepared and all units had sent their initiatives in to BPA. A Forum would be held on March 27 to give people an opportunity for input. Provost Sedlak said that the campus was still admitting students, as the campus needed 1700 new freshman. However, there were challenges on how to create the course structure for these extra students in order to accommodate the class size and finding additional staff to go through the one-to-two year bubble. The dilemma was finding the FTE to go around, especially in light of the budget cuts. Currently, the campus has approximately 1500 new freshmen enrolled. This semester, the campus was down by 250 students. Schlough asked Sedlak how many

programs required 120 credits. Sedlak replied that approximately four did. Schlough said that there could be more efficiency in having more programs require 120 credits, so students could graduate one semester earlier. Sedlak said that students appear to be making better decisions in picking out their courses. Smith added that blocks were set up for fall and spring classes in order to help balance out the sections. She asked for departments to let her know if they are seeing any shifts in their block. Sedlak noted that he'd received 28 e-mails regarding Army ROTC coming to Stout. Three e-mails were neutral, 6 were opposed, and 19 were in favor. Johnson spoke in favor of Army ROTC coming to Stout. Schlough added that the department chairs in CTEM were overwhelming in favor of the idea during their recent meeting.

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) – none.
- B. Educational Activities (Donna Albrecht) – none.
- C. Elections (Steve Schlough)-none.
- D. Finance Committee (Bill Murphy) – none.
- E. Graduate Education Committee (Gene Ruenger) – none.
- F. General Education (Ken Parejko) – Parejko said that GEC would meet on March 11.
- G. Personnel Policies (Anne Ramage) – Ramage reported that PPC met on February 28. Nancy Schofield presented information concerning revisions that defined research. PPC would eventually be bringing the item forward for Senate approval.
- H. Planning & Review (Dick Tyson) – Tyson said there was an item under New Business.
- I. Other

VIII. Old Business

- A. Admission Requirements (Donna Albrecht; Attachment 2) – This item was postponed until the next Faculty Senate Executive Committee Meeting on March 29, 2005.
- B. Other

IX. New Business

- A. Army ROTC at Stout (Mike Galloy; Attachment 3) – Chair Galloy stated that Provost Sedlak was requesting an endorsement of approval by the Faculty Senate. Allen asked Sedlak if the faculty/staff teaching the courses would be employed by Stout. Sedlak replied that they would be and would be subject to the Dean and Stout's guidelines. Johnson added that their salaries would be the same as on active duty. Sedlak explained that the campus would be interviewing those Army personnel who would be teaching on campus. Much discussion ensued. Chair Galloy asked Senator Schlough to work with Dean Meyer in order to compose a resolution for Faculty Senate approval that could also be shared with the Senate of Academic Staff and the Stout Student Association.

B. Other

- 1. B.S. in Professional Studies
Tyson distributed the "B.S. in Professional Studies" to the group and explained that there were eight more pages that went with the proposal. PRC recommended that the Plan was generally consistent with the mission of Stout and fits with existing programs of study.

Motion: Johnson/Parejko moved to forward the B.S. in Professional Studies to the Faculty Senate for approval.

Cole asked if other committees were involved. Smith replied that once PRC approves it and sends it to the Faculty Senate, it was in Stage 1. The CIC review and approval process would come during Stage 2. Allen recommended that another term should be used for "inverted degree". Cole also said he didn't care for the "inverted degree" term. Parejko said that he wasn't in favor of it either, but the concept does apply. Galloy said that he would e-mail the Senators the full

proposal and the item would be placed on the March 29 Faculty Senate Executive Committee Agenda under Old Business.

Motion to Table: Johnson/Parejko moved to table the B.S. in Professional Studies until March 29, 2005.

2. Promotion Quotas

Chair Galloy said that only five applications were received to promote people to the Associate Professor level this year and the quota was set at nine. He asked the group if the problem could be due to faculty not presenting their information well and asked if they needed better mentoring. Schlough said that he thought there was a low number of applicants, but noted that there were six applications for Full Professor and the quota was seven. Chair Galloy said that he was concerned about the low number of Associate Professor applications. Cole asked if people could still apply by exception. Ramage replied that they could, as applying by exception was still possible in the promotion policy, but that promotion by exception was "rare." She explained that the fault may lie in how the information was presented. As Chair of the PPC, she's invited Dan Riordan to attend the Promotion Workshops to help explain to applicants how to better present their materials. Allen recommended that people attend the Workshop, even if they planned to apply within one or two years. Getting the information would enable them to plan ahead accordingly. Zimmerman said that she served on a college committee; one applicant was qualified and one was not. She said that they told the person what he/she needed to do to better qualify for the promotion process. Schlough stated that if the department personnel committee took contract renewals seriously, the applicants should be prepared when they come up for promotion. Smith added that promotion was recognizing people with quality performance, which was tied together with teaching, service, and research.

X. Adjournment – 3:55 p.m.

**Respectfully submitted,
David Johnson, Secretary**

**Recorded and prepared by,
Joy Evenson**