

**MINUTES  
FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
OCTOBER 7, 2003**

**ATTENDANCE:**

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

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

**PRESENT:** D. Albrecht, S. Beckham (for K. Parejko), S. Cole, M. Decker, L. Koepke, B. McAlister, A. Ramage, R. Rothaupt, D. Tyson, N. Weckmueller

**GUESTS:** D. Moen, C. Smith

**I. Call to Order – 2:35 p.m.**

**II. Announcements and Information**

Chair Galloy stated that he attended the October 3 Faculty Reps Meeting last week and many hot topics were discussed. He explained that a Board of Regents Study Committee was established that has five subcommittees. Allen added that this group was planning ideas for future, was very similar to Stout's Focus 2010, and consisted of a few faculty reps, chancellors, provosts, and regents to form a diverse group. Galloy explained that the long-term implication of the committee was trying to create a process to measure the quality of the UW-System and give suggestions for improvement. Some of the subcommittees were the Revenue Authority Group (looks at measures to improve revenue flow, differential tuition, and per credit tuition policy); Operating Efficiency Group (looks at efficiency reports, technical college transfer credits, how UW Extension is funded, regulations, and collaboration); Research & Public Service Group (looks at how the public views the UW-System, examines why the System has a damaged partnership with the legislators in state government and how it could be repaired. Galloy stated that there was a long discussion concerning transfer credits between UW-System and the technical schools. He noted that Stout was ahead of the other campuses because of our articulation agreements. Other topics discussed included sabbaticals, pay plan, and health care costs.

Galloy stated that as Chair of the Faculty Senate, he sits on the Chancellor's Advisory Committee, which met yesterday. He reminded the group that he needs to have feedback from Senators and constituents that he can bring back to the Chancellor on items of concern. Galloy said that years ago, there was a huge "S" on the clock tower of Bowman Hall (Stout's Alma mater song refers to it). A donor has now come forward to donate the entire cost of the project, and the CAC approved it during their October 6 meeting.

The Assessment Oversight Committee needs Faculty Senate representatives from the Planning & Review Committee and General Education Committee. Copies of the committee's charger will be given to Tyson and Parejko.

The faculty promotion quotas for 2004-05 have been announced: 9 to Associate Professor and 7 to Full Professor. Two Dahlgren Professorships have been approved at \$7,500 each and one Maybelle Ranney Price Professorship at \$3,500 for 2004.

**III. Minutes of September 23, 2003 (Attachment 1)**

**Motion:** Tyson/Johnson moved to approve the Minutes of September 23, 2003.

**Vote:** Passed unanimously.

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

**V. Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs' Report – Claudia Smith reported for Provost Sedlak. She reminded the group that Sedlak would like EAC to rethink the assumptions regarding the calendar. Issues for EAC's review include Advisement Day for fall semester (do we really need it after the new advisement system is now in place?); Evaluations Week in the spring (it doesn't seem to be used as much as we thought it would be); extend the days students could pick up their**

laptops (because of the laptop rollout and two batches of people needing computers, there may need to be two days set aside for students to get them); student arrival and when classes begin (to help avoid the student drinking problems that occurred this year); Professional Development Days that get lumped into various parts of the calendar (there aren't professional development plans now as compared to years ago); and equal days between semesters (please examine the guidelines to see if this was mandatory, or if they could be changed). Smith said that she would give the list to Albrecht and Galloy. Albrecht said that the Calendar Committee felt it must abide in following the assumptions and need additional data to decide whether to keep or delete them. Discussion ensued regarding if EAC should bring several calendars for Senate approval and the time involved approving them.

VI. Vice Chancellor for Administrative and Student Life Services' Report - Vice Chancellor Moen asked the group if they would like Mary Kay Sankey to give an overview of the changes made this year to health insurance plans and if they also wanted her to report on the ASLS Focused Initiatives. It was decided to include both for the Administrative Briefing.

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 October 16. A subcommittee was studying the Bylaws of the Graduate Education Committee.
- B. Educational Activities (Donna Albrecht) - Albrecht said that EAC examined the Graduate Education Bylaws last spring and determined they were fine. The committee would meet on October 9 to address the Grade Change Policy and Add/Drop Policy. She noted that EAC was receiving many e-mails regarding the calendar. Allen asked if there would be any changes to EAC's Bylaws if the Graduate Education Committee Bylaws were approved. Albrecht replied that they would just need to add the word, "undergraduate" in a couple of places in order to define certain tasks for graduates or undergraduates, and that the committee adjusted their bylaws to reflect this. Galloy explained that the Graduate Council voted to create this committee and their bylaws would be returned to them once each standing committee examined them for any implications or impact to their bylaws. Then the Council's task force would revise them and bring them forward again for Faculty Senate approval. McAlister was concerned that the duties of the Graduate Council would be reduced to simply a Faculty Senate standing committee. Galloy replied that the Graduate Council had no representative in governance issues, this was an effort for them to get it, and it was assumed that the Graduate Council would remain functioning as they had in the past. McAlister invited Galloy to attend the next Graduate Council's meeting to help explain the situation later in the month. Galloy agreed to attend.
- C. Elections (Tom Allen) – Allen reported that the university committee elections were being conducted and the Faculty Senate would elect its representatives on October 14.
- D. General Education (Ken Parejko) – Because of a class conflict, Sue Beckham reported for Parejko and said that GEC would meet on October 10. The Assessment Committee was still working on their tasks.
- E. Personnel Policies (Anne Ramage) – Ramage reported that PPC approved Graduate Education Committee Bylaws and announced that there would be a workshop on October 8 for all promotion committee chairs.
- F. Planning & Review (Dick Tyson) – Tyson reported that PRC would meet on October 10 to discuss the School of Education and the Graduate Education Committee Bylaws.
- G. Other

VIII. Old Business

- A. Graduate Education Committee – done.
- B. Finance Committee Task Force – Weckmueller explained that the Finance Committee would like to ask the Faculty Senate if it wanted the committee reinstated. He noted that there were only three people left on the committee—he, Kryshak, and Zito. Weckmueller said that the committee wouldn't meet regularly, but only during critical times in the year in order to act as a sounding board if any hot issues would come up. Then they would

meet with the administrators, gather more information, and report back to the full Senate. The Task Force recommended for the committee to be reinstated, to hold elections for the vacant positions, and then the newly-elected committee could be charged with modifying and rewriting their bylaws in order to bring them up-to-date. It was decided that this item would be placed on the October 14 Agenda for the Faculty Senate to decide if it wanted the committee reinstated.

- C. Pay Plan and Health Care Benefits – Galloy stated that this item would be removed from the Agenda.
- D. Other

**IX. New Business**

- A. Administrators on Faculty Committees – Ramage explained that PPC unanimously supported a motion brought to the Faculty Senate on September 30. The Senate asked PPC to make minor revisions and Ramage distributed the revised motion to the group. Much discussion ensued regarding having administrators sit on tenure and promotion committees and if it could be approved in time for both processes. It was decided that when the motion was passed, the it could be applicable for tenure this year, but would be too late for this year’s promotion timetable. The Executive Committee decided to have PPC revise the motion and bring it to the Faculty Senate Meeting on October 14 for approval.
- B. Focus 2010 – Galloy explained that the Chancellor’s Advisory Council was projecting Stout’s future in Focus 2010, and the quality initiative would be on the October 14 Agenda. Tyson asked if the document could be broken up into sections for discussion. Galloy replied that it could be and that the standing committees could be asked to review appropriate parts pertaining to their issues. Koepke stated that the most obvious language concern was the revision of the faculty role—what does it mean? Would faculty act as team leaders? If so, this could be a PPC issue. Galloy noted that faculty need to pay more attention in reading documents such as this so they would be able to give input. Smith explained that Focus 2010 derived out of the Chancellor’s Retreat last summer, and the Chancellor’s Advisory Council reviewed a huge notebook of reading articles, material, and a speaker was brought in. Smith said that some of the material from the notebook could be given to the Senate if it would be helpful, and that the scenarios were not “cut and dried”—they were simply notes taken from the focus groups. Discussion ensued regarding whether to have each standing committee review the document for issues that could impact them, or to have the Faculty Senate flush out the issues first. Cole said that he would bring the document to his committee now. Decker recommended for department reps to bring it to their departments for feedback and then bring their concerns to the Faculty Senate. Then the Senate would have a consensus of issues to bring forward to the budget sessions and could contribute knowledgeably during the discussions. Galloy reminded the group that the entire version was on the BPA website and encouraged the Senators to inform people and gather feedback as timely as possible.
- C. Other

**X. Adjournment – 4:09 p.m.**

Respectfully submitted,  
David Johnson, Secretary

Recorded and prepared by,  
Joy Morical