

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
MARCH 29, 2005**

ATTENDANCE:

CHAIR: Mike Galloy
VICE CHAIR: Steve Schlough

SECRETARY: David Johnson
PAST CHAIR: Tom Allen

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

EXCUSED: B. Murphy

GUESTS: Chancellor Sorensen, R. Sedlak, C. Smith, L. Milanesi

I. Call to Order - 2:30 p.m.

II. Announcements and Information

A. Jeff Russell Workshop (Mike Galloy) – Chair Galloy stated that there was good feedback from the people attending the workshops.

III. Minutes of March 8, 2005 (Attachment 1)

Motion: Ramage/Johnson moved to approve the Minutes of March 8, 2005.

Vote: Passed unanimously.

IV. Chancellor's Report – Chancellor Sorensen stated that Stout's Science Complex proposal (a \$45 million capital project) was in the Joint Finance Committee and the Governor should sign off on it by July/August. When completed, the Mathematics Department would be joining the other science departments all in one building. This will be a tremendous improvement to our campus, he added, with plans including a huge classroom area that would be available.

V. Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs' Report – Provost Sedlak reported that the M.S. in Communication Technology was now moving ahead in the approval process and the Entitlement to Plan was also going ahead. However, the Golf Enterprise Management Program, which had been on hold for more clarification, was down at System. Stout was still waiting for a response. Reports should be coming shortly from the state-level committees that were analyzing ways on what the UW System could do to become more effective. Sedlak concluded by saying President Reilly has implemented a freeze on all administrative positions at the System level on March 16.

VI. Vice Chancellor for Administrative and Student Life Services' Report – none.

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) - none.

G. Personnel Policies (Anne Ramage) – Ramage reported that PPC was working on a proposed redefinition of research and scholarly activity that should be coming forward in April. Allen asked Ramage the status of progress toward tenure. Ramage replied that committee was still examining it. Galloy added that PPC was also determining what to do about the category of "Other."

- H. Planning & Review (Dick Tyson) – none.
- I. Other

VIII. Old Business

- A. Admission Requirements (Postponed from 3/8/05; Donna Albrecht; Attachment 2)
Albrecht asked for this item to be deferred until Joan Thomas could attend the meeting. It was agreed.
- B. Army ROTC at Stout (Mike Galloy) – Chair Galloy announced that he would draft a resolution for the Faculty Senate’s approval regarding having the ROTC come to Stout. Sedlak noted that he had received 30 emails on the topic--3 were neutral; 8 opposed; and the remaining were in favor of having ROTC come to campus.
- C. B.S. in Professional Studies (Tabled from 3/8/05; Dick Tyson; Attachment 3) - Chair Galloy explained that this item was tabled from the March 8 Faculty Senate Executive Committee Meeting because Senators wished to see the entire document. He had e-mailed the entire Entitlement to Plan to Senators for their review and the item was now ready to move forward for Faculty Senate discussion and approval. Tyson noted that after approval, it would be sent to UW-System, where it would be reviewed by the campuses. AAAT would also receive the document for their information. Sedlak added that this was the first step in the final approval process; the second stage would include the “permission to plan, where Stout would develop the curriculum, determine the credits, set the rules, and work out the details. He said that he’s asked the deans to recommend names to form an advisory group for the curriculum, in anticipation of it being approved.

Motion: Johnson/Ramage moved to take the B.S. in Professional Studies off the table and place it on the April 12 Faculty Senate Agenda.

Vote: Passed unanimously.

- D. Other

IX. New Business

- A. Recommendation of the Focus 2010 Implementation Team Reviewing Program Alignment (Mike Galloy; Attachment 4) – Chair Galloy explained that the Implementation Team met, examined the data received, and adapted the attached proposal that could accommodate a changing environment from all focus groups. He said that they also examined driving forces, including the budget challenge, student enrollment, and the technical college initiative. The task force made two recommendations: The first being that the campus needed to expand its program array, perhaps by examining programs and related majors. Students could be recruited to majors instead of degree offerings. Secondly, a reorganization process could be initiated, whereby all departments that currently serve within the university structure would be analyzed to determine what purpose they’re actually serving. The units and colleges would also be examined to see how they function with their current resources and could also be reorganized around groupings of faculty driven by specific curriculum content. Are those administrative structures currently in place, still viable, or do we need smaller/more agile units/structures? Chair Galloy said that the task force honestly believes there is a better way of accomplishing the work on campus than the way it’s currently being done, especially with the present budget challenges. One way to achieve this could be to focus on maintaining the larger structures right now and, in time, examine the smaller structures and create them to become more agile, complementary to faculty, and not bogged down with heavy governance structuring. If we organized around functions and disciplines, then the campus could organize around more specific needs.

Milanesi said that he mailed the program alignment proposal out to his colleagues for feedback and received many concerns, the biggest being faculty governance issues. Some people recommended that governance could function best at the department level for

personnel issues, as most personnel rules were written around the department level and then filtered up to the higher levels. There was currently an election process in place to determine the department chair (who serves in a peer/administrator dual role). Milanesi added that he felt that under the new proposal, current departments would be reduced in size and may not have a voice in faculty governance. Galloy replied that two administrators would be elected by faculty in those departments/units. Koepke said that she also had many concerns with the proposal and felt that it was really a marketing issue instead of a Senate issue. She recommended that someone from the recruitment area would be helpful sitting on this committee, but from a theoretical standpoint, thought it made things more complicated. Cole said that he had concerns as well, but understood that the proposal was meant to initiate discussion. Based on his experience in business and industry, he thought that the proposal looked like decentralization and could actually result in costing more money to accomplish. If the campus could decentralize and save money, he noted, it would be a first. Much more discussion ensued. Albrecht said that the campus had four schools that had been collapsed into three, before the School of Education was added. She suggested that the student should be put in the center of the proposed organizational diagram, as the campus' purpose was how to better serve the student. Schlough said that the campus had already hired a marketing consultant and that most people were open to having a wider program array. Chancellor Sorensen added that Stout's enrollment had fallen short of its freshman target by 50-75 students per year. He wondered, perhaps, if certain programs could be renamed or retitled for a better focus. Much discussion ensued regarding the model, inefficiencies, program directors, and how to define majors and concentrations. Hoel said that she commended the task force for creating a document that the campus could discuss. She noted that change was difficult, but 70% of all organizations that attempt to change, inevitably grow. The Chancellor added that the campus currently was not very agile and unable to respond to outside groups quickly. The current campus structures have silos. At issue is the campus' ability to serve the future public more effectively. Schlough said that the task force examined several models, but this was the one that provoked the most discussion. Allen said that he was concerned that a single faculty member would not get an opportunity to express concerns in a two-layered governance structure. Tyson recommended that it would be helpful to downsize each part of the proposal before it was examined. Chair Galloy said that this was only a starting point for discussion and asked the group to place it on the Faculty Senate Agenda for April 12. He further suggested that no action be taken for an eighteen-month time-frame in order to allow for a period of study and discussion. It was agreed that the item would be carried forward to the next full Senate meeting.

B. Other

X. Adjournment – 3:45 p.m.

**Respectfully submitted,
David Johnson, Secretary**

**Recorded and prepared by,
Joy Evenson**