

NOTES FROM COMBINED SENATES' MEETING  
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-STOUT  
FEBRUARY 1, 2005  
BALLROOM C  
2:30 P.M.

- I. Call to Order – 2:30 p.m. by Mike Galloy, Faculty Senate Chair.
- II. Announcements and Information - Chair Galloy announced that the Jeff Russell Workshops, that were originally available only for faculty and academic staff Senators, would now be available for all faculty and academic staff to attend. He encouraged Senators to inform their colleagues and to contact Joy, x1789, to register if interested. Smith added that she spoke with Russell on January 31 and said that the term “leadership” was an all-encompassing word that could also mean taking a leadership role in the classroom.
- III. Faculty Senate Remarks
- IV. Senate of Academic Staff Remarks
- V. Chancellor’s Report - Chancellor Sorensen reported that UW-Stout received extra money this year. The funds (approximately \$1.3 million) would be used to update the labs on campus and must be encumbered by June 30. The Legislative Audit Bureau (LAB) identified that UW-System had 25% administrator staffing; however, it was closer to 5-6 %. The Chancellor said that a 10% reduction in Stout’s budget would be \$600,000; a 20% reduction would be \$1,200,000. He added that faculty lines can’t be touched, but the campus could lose staff in services. President Reilly will share more with the campuses as he receives additional information. The Chancellor said that financial aid money was scheduled to be restored for students; these funds increase as student tuition increases. Additional good news is that some GPR money was scheduled to be restored to UW System which could lead to additional faculty positions. The Governor’s address could also discuss enterprise savings and centralized purchasing statewide; however, we won’t know until we hear his speech later in the month. Campuses are still dealing with the utilities shortfall. Student enrollment looks good for next fall and the contracts for housing look very good. UW-Stout campus representatives recently met with Senator David Zein, who is on the Building Commission, to lobby for the Science Wing and Harvey Hall Theatre projects. It is anticipated that planning and funding would be coming yet this biennium.
- VI. Vice Chancellor for Administrative and Student Life Services’ Report – Assistant Chancellor Moen announced that more restrictions were occurring at the State level, including restrictions on state cell phone use. Personal calls would not be allowed on these cell phones. The State plans to also send out new regulations concerning fleet vehicles; one idea proposed was that rental vehicles would be identified as a state vehicle. Moen reported that the new residence hall in North Campus was named, “Red Cedar Hall,” and that it was fully contracted out for next fall. She concluded by saying that additional parking spaces were now available for students in North Campus on the old Cenex property.
- A. National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) 2004 Report (Attachment 1) – Tammy Cutsforth, Budget Planning & Analysis, explained that this survey was given annually to first-year students and seniors to determine the extent that they engage in a variety of good educational practices. Most of the items represent student behaviors that were correlated with many important and personal development outcomes of college. She noted that this was the fifth year that Stout has participated in the survey. Cutsforth said that the survey sampled 2100 students and 874 responded. Of these, 65% were first year students and the rest were seniors.
- B. Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE) 2004 Report (Attachment 2 - Cutsforth explained that this survey was a project coordinated by the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) at Indiana University Bloomington. The survey was designed to measure faculty expectations of student engagement in educational practices that were linked to high levels of student learning and development and how faculty use these practices in their work with students. She noted that this was the second year Stout participated in the survey; the first year was a pilot. Approximately 41% of Stout’s faculty and instructional staff responded to the survey. Zimmerman asked Cutsforth if the information could be separated by school/college. Wentz replied that it was possible and for Zimmerman (or any others that wished to receive this information) to contact the Budget, Planning & Analysis Office.
- VII. Laptop Assessment/Teaching and Learning Center (Jane Henderson and Meridith Wentz) - Wentz explained that a student survey was conducted last spring at UW-Stout. It was developed by Dr. Kathryn Holleque, Professor, Division of Education and Psychology, Valley City State University, and included questions dealing with computer use, student learning, courses taught partially online, online interactions,

interaction with faculty, and the importance of various technology elements. The survey was sent to 1,188 students; 600 responded for a response rate of 50.5%. Dan Riordan, English and Philosophy Department, said that 53% of Valley City State University students indicated that they use their computer during class time “often” or “very often,” as compared to 18% of Stout students. The majority of Stout student comments were related to “money issues.” Students in their first year at Stout reported higher ratings on 95% of the survey questions than students in their second year at Stout. Riordan explained that the second page of the handout showed an Executive Summary of results from the Learning and Technology Faculty Focus Group conducted on September 1, 2004; there were 21 instructors that attended the focus group and shared their opinions about learning and the use of technology. Overall, instructors expressed a mix of positive and negative comments with the laptop program. Positive comments included “instant access,” increased accessibility, communication, availability of resources, and an increase of critical thinking and better research. Negative comments included increased faculty workload and laptop computer misuse by students during class.

VIII. Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs’ Report - Provost Sedlak introduced Major Edward Ripp, Department Chair of Military Science from UW-Stevens Point, and explained that there was an interest in expanding an Army Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) at Stout. Major Ripp distributed a handout to the group that provided general information on the ROTC program. He explained that the program consisted of a Basic (4-year) and Advanced (2-year) courses that implemented a Leader Development curriculum and used basic military operations and tactics to facilitate leader development. Ripp stated that there was a tremendous potential for this program in this area (UW-River Falls, UW-Eau Claire, and UW-Stout). A partnership between Stout and ROTC would provide the campus with an additional academic/career-enhancing opportunity for prospective students and would be externally (federally) funded. Scholarships and financial benefits would also be available. Decker asked Sedlak where the military department would be housed if it came to campus. Sedlak replied that CTEM would probably be the best area.

FEBRUARY 1, 2005  
MINUTES  
FACULTY SENATE MEETING

ATTENDANCE:

CHAIR: Mike Galloy  
PAST CHAIR: Tom Allen

VICE CHAIR: Steve Schlough  
SECRETARY: David Johnson

PRESENT: C. Bendel, T. Bensen, B. Bergquist, P. Calenberg, S. Cole, M. Decker, G. Earl, A. Hoel, E. Hughes, L. Koepke, K. Mauldin, L. McCullough, K. McDonald, L. Milanese, S. Nold, B. Peters, F. Schultz, G. Wheeler, K. Zimmerman

EXCUSED: D. Brouillard, G. Godfrey, B. McAlister, M. Ondrus, R. Teleb, S. Terry, N. Weckmueller

GUESTS: Chancellor Sorensen, C. Smith, A. Ramage, D. Albrecht, D. Tyson

IX. Announcements

- A. Technical College Initiative Task Force – Chair Galloy explained that this Task Force examined various processes, so UW-Stout could portal with the technical colleges. The group met with the Provost, Deans, and several technical college presidents; each presented their side. As a result, the Task Force was proposing to plan for a very generic completion degree that would articulate with the associate degrees that the technical colleges offer. The Task Force recommended that UW-Stout submit an “Entitlement to Plan” document to UW-System. After obtaining approval from the UW-System, the campus could make further plans. Chair Galloy noted that it was desired to enhance and build on Stout’s goals and the credits that the technical college students already have. The process is now in Dean Murphy’s hands, so CAS could design a working interdisciplinary degree that could function within the UW-System. Chair Galloy concluded by explaining that this subcommittee had completed its work, but he would continue to serve on the broader CAS committee as an advocate to help bring the Technical College Initiative to completion.
- B. Program Alignment Task Force - Chair Galloy explained that this Task Force discussed various program alignment options and agreed that things needed to be done differently. Steve Schlough and Mike Galloy drafted a proposal for a polytechnical group, that would help address budget issues, student enrollment issues, etc. Schlough explained that the proposal calls for a separate entity that would examine customized instruction, off-campus degrees, and include an approval

process. Three technical colleges would have an on-line component linked to Stout, and there would be a Board of Directors (comprised by members from Stout and the tech colleges), that would help move the degree completion requirements through. Schlough stressed that this was still in the concept stage, but it could also be used as a model to expedite things at the System level. If it could be self-funded, resources shouldn't be an issue. Control could still be maintained by the college/school, as the courses/programs would be approved by them and meet university criteria, he concluded. This group will be reconvened during this semester.

Chair Galloy announced that more people were needed to attend the Jeff Russell Workshops which will be held on February 15 and March 22 from 1:30-4:30 p.m.

X. Minutes of December 7, 2004 (Attachment 3)

Motion: Decker/Peters moved to approve the Minutes of December 7, 2004.

Vote: Passed unanimously.

XI. Committee Reports

A. Election Committee

1. Ballots for Faculty Senate Elections are due February 11, 2005 (to fill positions for Vice Chair, CAS, CTEM, SOE, and At-Large) – Schlough explained that no one was nominated for the Secretary position, so someone will be appointed after the elections were completed.

XII. Old Business

A. Grade Review Policy and Procedures (Donna Albrecht; Attachment 4) – Albrecht explained that a slight revision was made to the document that was reviewed last spring to no longer have references to another Statute. She added that EAC included a schematic drawing that showed the path flows, recommended that grade books be kept for one year, and outlined the appeal process. The Hearing Committee would be arranged by the Dean of Students' Office.

Motion: Peters/Milanesi moved to approve the Grade Review Policy and Procedures.

Allen said he was overall pleased with the Hearing Committee's portion of the document, but had concern with the last sentence that stated that the final decision rested with the Grade Review Hearing Committee. Allen distributed a friendly amendment to change the last sentence to read:

"Following the hearing, the Grade Review Hearing Committee shall issue a recommendation to the Provost and inform all interested parties of its recommendation. The final decision rests with the Provost."

Motion to Amend: Allen/Koepke moved to approve the document by replacing the last sentence on Page 3 with the above paragraph.

Chancellor Sorensen stated that according to the Statutes, any final decision would be determined by him, as the Chief Executive Officer on campus. The Senate agreed to replace the word, "Provost," in Allen's Amendment with the word, "Chancellor." It was also recommended to add the word, "approved," before the words, "Hearing Officer," to 1. B. on Page 2.

Vote to Amend: Passed unanimously.

Much discussion ensued regarding the policies and procedures. Bendel asked who served as the Hearing Officers on campus. Ramage replied that she served to represent faculty. Albrecht said that Joan Thomas also serves as an academic staff rep. Ramage explained that she serves if the Dean of Students was involved in an investigation and Thomas serves if Ramage was involved in the investigation. Cole asked how they were approved. Ramage said that she was appointed by the Chancellor. Allen stated that he had a concern with using course syllabi against the student's documentation of an error. He asked the group if the Hearing Committee would ask themselves if this student was treated differently than other students in the course. How was this student's grade determined? Much discussion ensued. Schlough called for the question.

Vote to approve the Grade Review Policy and Procedures with the Amendments: Passed unanimously.

B. Other

XIII. New Business

- A. **Dean's Evaluations (Mike Galloy) – Chair Galloy reported that the Dean's Evaluations were compiled during the semester break and the numerical results were available in the Senate Office. He and Vi Jones, Senate of Academic Staff Chair, would be meeting with each Dean and the Provost to give them the results.**
- B. **Regents Teaching Excellence Awards ((Mike Galloy; Attachment 5) – Chair Galloy asked the group to share this information with their colleagues and noted that no one from Stout had ever received this award.**
- C. **Merle Price Award of Excellence for Academic Staff and Faculty (Mike Galloy; Attachment 6) – Chair Galloy explained that this was a new award funded by the McCord Family Trusts. As a faculty member and Dean of Men, Merle Price exemplified a deep commitment for the welfare of students. In his name, the McCord Family Trusts have funded an annual award for outstanding service for tenure-track faculty (\$3,000) and a second award for outstanding service by academic staff (\$1,000). He encouraged everyone to apply if interested.**
- D. **Jeff Russell Workshop (Mike Galloy) – Chair Galloy stated that the first workshop would be held during the next full Faculty Senate Meeting and asked the Senators to contact Joy if interested to attend.**
- E. **Salary Guidelines for 2005-2006 (Anne Ramage; Attachment 7) – Ramage distributed additional salary information to Senators and stated that it provided some basic background used to determine the salary proposal. Ramage explained that approximately twelve years ago, PPC recommended that Stout's floor be set at 108% of the UW-System floor because the salaries at Stout were rock bottom by rank. As a result, Stout's salaries have risen to ninth of twelve in the state. Ramage further explained that some salary adjustments don't come from the salary pay plan, but out of the Provost's budget, such as difference between floors, changing of an educational prep code, and promotion. Everyone automatically gets brought up to the System floor each year, even if they don't get a raise. The first proposal was based on a raise of 2% or less (which would be an across-the-board raise for solid performers) and the other was based on a raise that was above 2% (where salary adjustment procedures would be made). Much discussion ensued regarding how the faculty's salaries at Stout compared with other campuses. Ramage noted that PPC determined the rank adjustment figures based on the salary mean from the peer group median (13% below for full professor, 12% below for associate professor and 8% below for assistant professor). The Educational Preparation Code, she added, was determined the same way as in the past. The salary/rank distribution would be distributed as 1/3 to solid performers (those receiving "above" or "within" on their performance evaluations). The remaining two-thirds will be distributed so that individuals receiving "above" ratings receive twice the amount that is awarded to individuals in the "within" category. Of the remaining two-thirds, one-half (50%) will be distributed as a percentage of the individual's base salary. The one-half (50%) will be distributed via rank adjustments. If the Chancellor's discretionary fund/amount of 10% is granted, it is encouraged that a major portion of the money be used for addressing internal salary inequities. Adjustments for the floor levels by rank and Educational Preparation Code for 2005-06 will be determined by using 108% of the System floor for the Educational Preparation Code for floor and adding the amounts of the Educational Preparation Code/qualifications adjustment to determine the floors for the other Educational Preparation Codes.**

Ramage said that Tammy Cutsforth and Dick Tyson calculated the proportion of the deficit share for each rank in order to try to close the gaps and address issues on how the amount of money could be distributed. Cutsforth said that she followed Tyson's guidelines and took the number of professors at each rank, what current salaries were in the budget, and took that number times the peer group median.

Ramage also said that PPC passed a motion the night before to add an additional statement to Guideline II. E. as follows:

**"It is recommended that the Chancellor use at least 50% of the 10% discretionary funds to provide an additional sum of money to all faculty who have post-tenure status and received an above rating in their last evaluation/review."**

Ramage said that PPC's recommendation to the Chancellor would help reward people and help lessen compression within the ranks. She added that this would only affect faculty who have been

tenured.

**Motion:** Milanese/Decker moved to approve the Salary Guidelines for 2005-2006.

Peters called for the question.

**Vote:** Passed unanimously.

Galloy commended PPC for all their hard work. Ramage thanked Claudia Smith, Tammy Cutsforth, Wayne Argo, and David Johnson for all of their time and work on the project.

- F. **Tenure Timelines for 2005 and 2006 (Anne Ramage; Attachments 8 & 9)**  
Ramage explained that only the dates were changed to accommodate the 2005 and 2006 calendars.

**Motion:** Decker/Peters moved to approve the Tenure Timelines for 2005 and 2006.

**Vote:** Passed unanimously.

- G. **Examine Curricular Process (Mike Galloy) - Chair Galloy stated that he would like to follow-up on the Chancellor's concern regarding possible ways to streamline the curriculum process by forming a task force to study the issue . He said that he would serve on the group as Chair, and other members so far included Gene Ruenger and Steve Cole. Galloy asked the group to contact him if anyone else was interested.**
- H. **Other – Chair Galloy reported that Ned Weckmueller had surgery last week, was doing fine, and would be back to work in four-to-six weeks.**

Cole asked if the Finance Committee was taking an active role in examining the current campus budget situation. Galloy said they he would check and get back to him.

Schlough said that he had some questions regarding the \$1.5 million dollars that would be redistributed and asked the group where the money came from. Where was it originally taken from? Will it be redistributed back in equal proportion?

XIV. **Adjournment** – 4:10 pm.

Respectfully submitted,  
David Johnson, Secretary

Recorded and prepared by,  
Joy Evenson