

**MINUTES**  
**FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**  
**APRIL 1, 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, K. Zimmerman

**EXCUSED:** M. Galloy

**GUESTS:** R. Sedlak, D. Moen, L. Miller, B. Peters, J. Thomas, J. Kirschling

**I. Call to Order – 2:35 p.m.**

**II. Announcements and Information**

- A. Faculty/Academic Staff Retirement Dinner will be held from 6:00-9:00 p.m., Friday, May 2, 2003 in the Grandview Terrace. Honored retirees include Stowe Badenoch, Chuck Barnard, Wallace Carlson, Jan Gehrke, Dennis Griffiths, Joe Hagaman, John Hunt, Russell James, Warren Lang, Lee Nicholls, Pat Reisinger, Teresa Schulz, Susan Thurin, and John Wright.**
- B. AQUIP Professional Development – Allen announced that Julie Furst-Bowe would attend the Faculty Senate April 8 Meeting to discuss AQUIP Professional Development. He noted that this item was a featured part of Stout’s accreditation plan.**

Allen distributed the Chancellor's March 25 memo that went to the Faculty Senate and asked what would an appropriate response would be from the full Senate to these kinds of messages. Allen said that he felt that the campus owed a debt to the students, as they were the ones that recently funded the faculty/academic staff raises. Smith said that the budget cuts were made through the colleges; the campus doesn't know where the tuition would go, or if other cuts were going to occur. She added that she was hearing that more people were supporting this instead of grumbling about the situation, and as faculty, we should really support doing as much as we can to make the student's experience at Stout as pain-free as possible. Peters said that he appreciated the open way that the information keeps coming from Administration. These were not easy decisions for the administrators to make, and that faculty should express appreciation for the open communication that's coming from them, even if we don't like what's going on. Johnson said that in his recent departmental meeting, they came to an agreement that faculty should get behind and support it. It was agreed that Peters, Johnson, Cole, Smith, and Allen would draft a resolution to be presented during the April 15 Executive Committee Meeting showing faculty support of the document.

**II. Minutes of March 11, 2003**

**Motion:** Johnson/Ramage moved to approve the Minutes of March 11, 2003.

**Vote:** Passed unanimously.

- III. Chancellor’s Report – Allen stated that the Chancellor was forming an Ad Hoc Committee on Family Friendly Policies, distributed the committee's charter group, and noted that a Faculty Senate representative was needed to serve on the committee. It was agreed that the Faculty Senate would be asked first if anyone had an interest; if no Senators volunteered, the request would then go out to the other faculty.**

- IV. Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs’ Report – Provost Sedlak reported that he and the deans plan on doing an Enrollment Management and Resource Study that would examine programs and align them**

against the people that teach those classes and students. This alignment study would show how everything was meshing together. He said that he and his Council were working on the redefined role of program director and metrics and also the advisement role and metrics for the fall. He asked the group what the Faculty Senate's response was to the Curriculum Revisions-120 credit degree programs. Beckham said that GEC felt that they wanted to stay with the current policy that stated that 1/3 of the student programs should be in General Education. Allen noted that the Faculty Senate never acted on the policy. Beckham replied that she would try to trace where the 1/3 policy came from. Allen said that it came from the Task Force on 120 Credits. Beckham said that GEC was discussing to recommend that whenever a General Education course was a program requirement, that it would also serve as a General Education requirement. She noted that she felt that GEC would probably not recommend that General Education credits go below 40 credits. Smith said that she thought there was some confusion at the Senate Meeting and suggested beginning an assessment on programs that were already at 120 credits. Sedlak replied that he could do this, but first affordability must be determined and maintained for the degree programs. Sedlak said that he would like to align and revise the Personnel Policies and practices with the Faculty Senate, as they were currently misaligned. He said that Advisement Day would be studied--approximately 2/3 of the student body currently see their advisor on this day. Is 2/3 good enough? About 70% of all students register on-line now—how does this interface? He noted that the freshman and juniors were in the high percentage who see their advisors; however, the undecided students would always be a problem. Sedlak reported that fall registration would begin on April 10, and on-line registration would have four questions that students should answer. All responses would be reviewed daily by the Provost's Office and the information would be passed on to the deans to help alleviate the struggles students have in getting their classes.

- V. Vice Chancellor for Administrative and Student Life Services' Report – Moen reported that she would distribute the finalized budget summary in approximately one week. She distributed Stout's Capital Project Status at the state level and explained it included roofing and other projects on campus. She asked the group if they would like to have the Group Philosophy Paper, written by Grounds Director, Lynn Peterson, shared with the Senate. It was agreed that this should be placed on the April 8 Agenda.

VI. Committee Reports

- A. Curriculum & Instruction (Steve Cole) – Cole distributed the bylaws of the Ethnic Studies Curriculum Advisory Committee and asked that it be placed on the Agenda for April 8.
- B. Educational Activities (Donna Albrecht) – Albrecht reported that there were two items on the Agenda, and that EAC was discussing "what does it mean to graduate with honors?" This item would be coming to the Executive Committee in approximately one month.
- C. Elections (Claudia Smith) - Smith reported that the nomination deadline for committees was extended to April 7. She encouraged the group to tell people to nominate others or themselves for any of the committees.
- D. General Education (Sue Beckham) – Beckham reported that GEC met and passed a Chemistry course that explored the relationship between Chemistry and Technology. She said that the Assessment Task Force was reactivated to determine if any of the drafts should be modified before coming to the full Senate.
- E. Personnel Policies (Anne Ramage) – Ramage stated that PPC was discussing and working on changes to the wording for the Promotion Policies and noted that this item should be ready to come to the April 15 Executive Committee Meeting. Ramage reported that five PPC members were volunteering to help with tenure and other personnel policies for the new School of Education. The members of the School will select four-five people that would work with the PPC volunteers on these issues.
- F. Planning & Review (Dick Tyson) – Tyson reported that PRC met on March 28 and heard the second status report for B.S. Apparel Design and Development and the second Social and Behavioral Sciences General Education component report. It approved the report, the recommendations for the B.S. Marketing Education Program, and will refer it to Senate after the dean prepares responses. The Technology component of General Education will also be referred to the CTEM dean for responses. PRC will meet again on April 11. Tyson asked Allen

what PRC should do in evaluating the global component requirement. Allen replied that PRC was relieved of this responsibility, as there were other ways it could be evaluated.

**G. Other**

1. **Task Force re: Relationship between Graduate College and Faculty Senate Office** – Allen explained that Julie Furst-Bowe drafted bylaws for this committee based on the General Education Bylaws. He, Galloy, Peters, Zimmerman, and Furst-Bowe met and discussed the roles that this Graduate College Committee would be responsible for and the potential overlap of duties with other standing committees. Allen asked that the chairs of CIC, PRC, and EAC put the bylaws on their next committee agendas for discussion regarding "turf" issues. He noted that Bob Peters served as chair of the Task Force Committee.

**VI. Old Business**

- A. **Task Force on Instructional Efficiencies (Tom Allen; Attachment 2)**- Allen explained that this issue was on the March 11 Agenda. He worked with Dick Tyson, Sue Beckham, and Claudia Smith to compose the draft document that includes how to free up resources, purposes, and how to get students through college faster. Cole asked if this would be in conjunction with the Budget/Finance Committee, as there could be lot of interaction. Smith said that the committee needed to examine how efficient Stout's programs were and compare them to the budget, especially with the possibility of reducing the credits to 120. Tyson recommended narrowing down the focus for this committee and suggested sending it to the Faculty Senate for ideas and setting boundaries for a deadline. Much discussion ensued regarding potential committee members, as well as when to appoint the task force. It was decided to form the task force as soon as possible this spring and for their work to continue through Fall Semester of 2003. Members would include a chair, representatives from each of the five Standing Committees of the Senate, one from the Graduate Council, two students selected by SSA, the Provost or designee, and one resource person from BPA. This item will be placed on the April 8 Faculty Senate Agenda.
- B. **Other**

**VII. New Business**

- A. **Grade Change Policy – For Discussion Only (Lou Miller, EAC; Attachment 3)**

**Motion:** Albrecht/Weckmueller moved to place the Grade Change Policy on the Faculty Senate Agenda for April 8.

**Vote:** Passed unanimously.

- B. **Withdrawal Policy – For Discussion Only (Joan Thomas, EAC; Attachment 4)** – Joan Thomas, Student Services Program Manager in Advisement, distributed the current policy and gave an overview to the group. She said resources, staff, and dollars were all student concerns. Stout was the most lax campus in its course drop policy; other schools had more teeth and structure. Thomas said that after much information was gathered from other campuses and individuals, a proposal was drafted. The new policy would change the drop date from the mid-term 8th week to the 9th week (in order to allow more opportunity for graded work); change the "WS" or "WU" after the 2nd week add/drop to a "WU" during the 9th week drop period and a "WU" for any drop authorized after that time; change the unlimited number of dropped courses allowed to four 4 allowed drops for the duration of their enrollment at Stout. Also proposed is to change the "NA" option on the grade roster that results in "W" on the transcript or "F" to an "FN (which would factor negatively into their GPA). Thomas said that students who habitually or repeatedly drop courses were taking the place of other students who would complete the course, jeopardize their financial aid, and were less likely to complete their degree, especially within four years. Allen said that some students don't know that they can appeal with the Dean of Students when they have troubles and are given a "WU" or "WS." They just simply drop. He said that students don't know what "extenuating circumstances" were, especially first generation college students or those who

live in the community because they don't have all the resources to draw from. Allen felt that the policy was judgmental and hard for these types of students. Thomas said that they examined what other campuses were doing and formed a similar policy. She noted that every effort would be made to make the students more aware of the new policy. Much discussion ensued. Allen asked what the "FN" was. Thomas replied that it was the same as an "F." Beckham stated that she objected to penalizing a student for never showing up for a class. Thomas said that this idea came from other institutions. Allen asked the group if the document was ready to go to the full Senate. Beckham felt that it should go back for revisions. Albrecht felt that it needed the Faculty Senate's input, as the "WU" and "WS" were not grade point issues. Ramage asked if the policy was only for undergraduate students. Kirschling replied that it was for both undergraduate and graduate students. It was decided that the item would be placed on the April 8 Faculty Senate Agenda for discussion for twenty minutes.

- C. Other – Allen explained that the Senate voted to reinstate the Budget/Finance Committee at its March 25 Meeting. He said that he would ask Eileen Zito, CAS representative and Jim Byrd, CHD representative to serve. He asked the group if a representative from the new School of Education should be on it as well. The Executive Committee agreed. Allen then asked the Committee to determine the CTEM representative and exited the room. After discussion, the group's consensus was that Bill Kryshak should serve as the representative for CTEM.

**VI. Adjournment – 4:32 p.m.**

**Respectfully submitted,  
Mike Galloy, secretary**

**Recorded and prepared by,  
Joy Morical**