

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
FEBRUARY 4, 2003**

ATTENDANCE:

CHAIR: Tom Allen
VICE CHAIR: Claudia Smith

SECRETARY: Mike Galloy
PAST CHAIR: Ned Weckmueller

PRESENT: A. Adekola, A. Antonippillai, M. Arora, B. Bergquist, G. Choudhury, S. Deckelman, B. Evans, B. Foley, G. Godfrey, D. Johnson, J. Kapus, L. Miller, S. Orme, A. Parsons, B. Peters, R. Rothaupt, S. Schlough, M. Sherman, S. Shumate, G. Wheeler, K. Zimmerman

EXCUSED: A. Hoel, B. McAlister, M. Nicolai, M. Spencer, S. Terry, A. Vande Linde

GUESTS: Chancellor Sorensen, B. Sedlak, D. Moen, R. Olson, M. Skutley, W. Argo, A. Ramage, D. Tyson, M. Wentz

I. Call to Order – 2:35 p.m.

II. Announcements and Information – Chair Allen reminded departmental Senators to send their department bylaws to Joy in the Senate Office, 50 Harvey Hall.

III. Minutes of December 3, 2002 (Attachment 1)

Motion: Johnson/Rothaupt moved to approve the Minutes of December 3, 2002.

Vote: Passed unanimously.

IV. Chancellor's Report – Chancellor Sorensen reported that he had no additional information concerning the budget, but that UW-Stout would have significant budget reductions as a result of the very deep fiscal crisis in the state. He said that he and Allen would be attending the Board of Regents' Meeting on February 7. Chancellor Sorensen then presented Claudia Smith with a pin in recognition for her leadership in this year's United Way drive.

V. Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs' Report – Provost Sedlak reported that he was meeting with the deans concerning the budget crisis. He announced that there would be a School of Education forum on February 7; a proposed organizational, governance, and administrative structure for the new unit would be proposed.

VI. Vice Chancellor for Administrative and Student Life Services' Report – Vice Chancellor Moen reported that faculty/academic staff should have received the second part of their raises in their February check. She said that additional restrictions have been established to help deal with the budget crisis. These restrictions included that all out-of-state-travel must have the Chancellor's approval, all GPR general advertising has been suspended (although minimal advertising would continue for job announcements and student recruiting), and that all GPR vacancies would be selectively filled. Where possible, positions will be held vacant in order to provide flexibility for the 2002-03 budget lapse and the 2003-05 budget reduction. The campus has a \$265,000 budget lapse that must be paid--half of this amount would come from the Chancellor's university special project fund, and the other half would be split from areas around the campus. Moen explained that Stout's capital projects have been under further scrutiny. The replacement of the floor in the Fieldhouse was approved because of health concerns, but the project to remodel 210 Applied Arts was still in limbo. Moen announced that the Budget and Planning Office has a website available that lists outcomes from each Budget Steering Group Meeting and also provides additional budget information for faculty/staff to read.

VII. Committee Reports

A. Curriculum & Instruction (Steve Cole; Attachment 3)

B. Educational Activities (Donna Albrecht; Attachment 4) - Allen announced that EAC was working on a major revision to Stout's Withdrawal Policy. The item would take two Senate meetings; the first to present the information and to allow time for Senators to get feedback from their colleagues, and the second to vote on the issue.

C. Other

VIII. Old Business

A. Other

IX. New Business

- A. Principles and Guidelines for Base Budget Reduction (Attachment 2) – Allen said that the document had been updated since the previously distributed one last semester. Foley asked Allen where the document came from. Allen said that it came from the Budget Reduction Steering Committee, and members of the group included the Chancellor, Provost, Diane Moen, Deans, Senate Chairs, SSA President, and Kass Ingala. All employment groups were represented.

Motion: Smith/Johnson moved to endorse the Principles and Guidelines for Base Budget Reduction.

Tyson said that he thought that the Executive Committee decided to bring forth the principles only and not the strategies. Smith said that the first two pages of the document were almost identical to the previous document--only page three was different.

Amendment: Galloy amended the main motion by proposing that the Senate should endorse the principles and guidelines on pages one and two.

Sherman asked the Chancellor to clarify number five concerning vacant positions. Chancellor Sorensen explained that all vacancies were frozen; however, the searches would still go forward. Foley asked who would negotiate the selected vacancies. The Chancellor said that all vacancies would be scrutinized by the deans, Provost Sedlak, and himself in order to decide which ones would be filled. He explained that every effort would be given to maintain and provide the necessary courses for the students first. Foley asked at what point do the faculty/department enter the process. Chancellor Sorensen replied that he is encouraging the process to happen now. Faculty members could give their chair and dean input at any time.

Vote on endorsing the first two pages of the document: Passed unanimously.

Motion: Galloy/Weckmueller moved that the Faculty Senate support the classified staff in receiving their raises that were agreed to during this past fiscal year.

Vote: Passed unanimously.

Parsons asked Allen what would happen in the event a fiscal emergency was declared. Allen explained that in a fiscal emergency faculty could be laid off. Evans stated that as a department chair, he was pleased to see the items on page three, but in terms of the pending budget cuts, he needed to have help from other people on campus when trying to decide some fair and equitable way to administer his cuts. He explained that he saw page three as a set of tools to guide him in the process and that the information was well thought out and could be a useful strategy for him to use. Foley said that he was concerned about endorsing page three before any decisions were made. Allen said that this was not exclusive, but only a proposal and reminded the group that Stout was scheduled to have a \$2 million base budget cut on July 1--decisions must be made by then. Additionally, he explained, that there was pressure from the state in serving the student body first, so they could get through four years of college unimpeded. Allen said that the purpose of having the document appear on the Senate's Agenda was to "lay all the cards on the table." Evans noted that the information on page three was no surprise--all items were discussed

at a Council meeting. Arora asked if all courses would be available for the students. The Chancellor said that because the extent of the cut was unknown for our campus, we don't know which courses would get cut. However, all required courses would be put into place first and then other courses would be determined. Smith encouraged for Senators to ask input from their colleagues concerning the dilemma, and forward any information received to their department chairs and deans. Foley explained that the Faculty Senate's Constitution specifies that faculty should have the primary responsibility in deciding faculty and personnel matters, including class sizes and course offerings. He said that he felt it was time for the faculty to exert primary responsibility on these issues--that they were not just a listening body. Chancellor Sorensen agreed, but said that the campus was caught in a budgetary crisis situation. He added that the primary concern was how to deliver our programs/courses in a substantial way to the students. Foley said that he just wanted the faculty to be partners in the decision. The Chancellor agreed. Orme asked about faculty carrying full loads and class sizes. The Chancellor said that the deans and department chairs would interpret and decide that policy for their faculty workload. Peters asked Allen if Senators could take this document back to their departments. Allen encouraged Senators to get any input they could in order to help the crisis. Evans stated that he felt good to have an opportunity to discuss with his faculty/colleagues on how to make the cuts, rather than to be told "just to do it." He added that he felt it was a credit to the current administration that the faculty were even being asked for any input at all. There was no easy way to do it, he added—if we take on more students, then it means teaching full-time. Evans stated that he was thankful for the opportunity to have a discussion on the issue. Sedlak said that there was only one principle and several strategies, that the principle dealt with equity, and that the deans and he were trying to divide the cuts as equitably as they could. He encouraged the Senators to endorse the principle. Galloy stated that because the administration must make a decision quickly, faculty must get their input to their department chairs and deans as soon as possible if they want to be involved.

B. B.S. in General Business Administration (Dick Tyson; Attachment 5)

Motion: Weckmueller/Zimmerman moved to approve the B.S. in General Business Administration.

Vote: Passed unanimously.

C. B.S. in Telecommunication Systems (Dick Tyson; Attachment 6)

Motion: Galloy/Johnson moved to approve the B.S. in Telecommunication Systems.

Vote: Passed unanimously.

D. Governance Evaluation Report (Ross Olson; Attachment 7) – Meridith Wentz, from the Budget, Planning and Analysis Office, explained that the report showed results from both faculty (31.4%) and academic staff (18.9%). She gave a brief overview of the Executive Summary, saying that faculty reported high ratings for questions dealing with governance at the department level, but ratings were lower for questions regarding governance at the college level. Most respondents indicated that their level of involvement in the senates was sufficient. The biggest strengths identified by the faculty were knowledge of the roles, responsibilities and representatives of the Faculty Senate and standing committees, and involvement in the Senate and committees discussing issues with their Senate representatives. Communication surfaced as the biggest opportunity for improvement for the faculty. There were some differences in results based on gender, title/category, years at Stout, and college/unit. Respondents who had been at Stout for 6-15 years and professors reported higher ratings for most questions than respondents who had been at Stout for 0-5

years and assistant professors. Smith said that the standing committee bylaws should be more readily available on the Web. Allen asked Senators for their help, or if they had a graduate student that could help place them on the Web. Foley offered his services. Allen then thanked Meridith for all her hard work in preparing the Report.

- E. **One-Minute Governance Evaluation Instrument/Procedure/Timeline (Claudia Smith, Ross Olson; Attachment 8) – Smith explained that questions on the survey were pulled directly from the large report, that the large survey would be done once every three years, and the small survey done every year.**

Motion: Foley/Smith moved to approve the One-Minute Governance Evaluation Instrument/Procedure/Timeline.

Arora asked the group if more items should have been included on the short survey and if it should go back to the committee. Sherman said that as a member of PPC, the questions should focus more on the problems that the campus was having--he added that he would like for PPC to review the document again. Wentz explained that they took the questions they felt were most important. Wheeler said that less than 1/3 of the faculty completed the survey--more results would be helpful and suggested to encourage people that are least connected to the governance process to fill it out. Schlough suggested to have the department chairs distribute this to their members during department meetings and encourage them to complete it. He noted that most people filled them out based on their interest.

Vote (by show of hands): 12 in favor; 5 opposed; 2 abstentions. Motions carried.

- F. **Other – Foley distributed two motions to the group and asked that these items be placed on the Faculty Senate Agenda for action on February 18. Foley explained that his social security number was given out recently in an administrative report, which was a security issue. He stated that the only way to protect a person's social security number was not to have it used or released without permission. Galloy asked Foley why there was a need to have departmental reports at Senate meetings. Foley explained that the structure of the Senate has changed; departmental Senators should have an opportunity to report any concerns they have. For instance, he added that if Senators had a time where they could have brought up the social security number concern ahead of time, it would have gotten on the table and addressed earlier. Galloy asked Foley if this could be done under “Other” on the agendas instead. Foley said that he felt going around the table and asking Senators if there were any issues would be more helpful. Schlough cautioned the group that if this passed, the Senate meetings could become lengthy. Smith agreed that time could be an issue, but also felt that giving Senators an opportunity to bring issues/concern up at Senate meetings was a good idea. Foley suggested that the group could at least try out the idea and if it took up too much time, he would make a motion that would cancel it.**

X. **Adjournment – 4:10 p.m.**

Respectfully submitted,
Mike Galloy, Secretary

Recorded and prepared by,
Joy Morical