

MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
MARCH 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, M. Galloy, G. Godfrey, A. Hoel, D. Johnson, J. Kapus, L. Miller, S. Orme, A. Parsons, B. Peters, R. Rothaupt, S. Schlough, M. Sherman, S. Shumate, S. Terry, K. Zimmerman

EXCUSED: B. McAlister, M. Nicolai, M. Spencer, A. Vande Linde, G. Wheeler

GUESTS: Provost Sedlak, D. Moen, W. Argo, A. Ramage, R. Olson, M. Wentz

I. Call to Order – 2:35 p.m.

II. Announcements and Information – Allen announced that he attended the February 28 Faculty Representative's Meeting in Madison. He said that the System budget people were concerned that the state's legislature would be tougher on the UW System than the Governor's budget plan was. Most campuses have planned for 5% budget cuts, but it may be more typical that the cuts would be 7% and beyond for the campuses. If the campuses would be required to administer a 7% cut, tuition would increase substantially in order to offset 60% of those cuts. However, campuses have a responsibility to know that students would be paying for more costs of operation and as a result, the campuses should know what the students want. Allen said that he would advocate the students' needs as a member of the Budget Steering Group. He noted that a system-wide student strike was planned for March 5. Allen said that many campus governance groups were divided and passed resolutions on whether or not the United States should war with Iraq; some senates were split right down the middle. Some campuses were also suspending sabbaticals. The faculty representatives were interested in receiving copies of Stout's Principles and Guidelines that the Faculty Senate passed two meetings ago. Allen said that the discussions concerning pay raises for this coming biennium were bleak and pessimistic and if a raise would come, it would be funded entirely by the students. Allen asked the Senate if it could be in Stout's best interest (in showing sympathy to students and parents) to forego a raise for this next biennium. This could be a conscientious effort that would not only add substantially to the students' budgets, but could provide a tremendous impact for Stout's public relations. Discussion ensued with different perspectives noted by Senators.

III. Minutes of February 18, 2003 (Attachment 1)

Motion: Choudhury/Kapus moved to approve the Minutes of February 18, 2003.

Correction: Terry asked that the minutes be changed to add an additional sentence to Page 2, C., Line 23, after the words,... "Health and Physical Education" categories were singled out." that would read, "There was no rationale for Health and Physical Education." (The PRC reviews/surveys from graduates were for "Technology" only.)

Vote: Passed unanimously as amended.

IV. Chancellor's Report - no report.

V. Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs= Report – Provost Sedlak reported that simulations were being done to find ways for the campus to handle the budget deficit that won't generate any dollars or FTE's, but would only demonstrate a capacity within the university. He noted that even though Stout's budget reduction was \$2.4 million, they were examining various capacities that could still maintain the same level of access to coursework and classes. One of the things the deans were doing was requesting that their department chairs make 5% scenario cutbacks, that would examine all vacant and non-renewed positions. It's not simply adequate to cut instructional

positions and not provide an answer to the student access issue. Sedlak explained that Stout needs to find a different way of doing what it does. However, the issue was that we have to find the positions and dollars for the \$2.4 million, but at the same time, maintain the level of access to the students. President Lyall has many principles that recommend to not cut enrollment, and there were things campuses could do right now on how we administer ourselves and departments and where the capacities could still be maintained. Foley said that he heard Lyall say that classes and students' access would be affected with this size of cut. He noted with the two types of academic staff on campus (indefinite and fixed term), there would be an unequal distribution of the teaching load, and recommended that there should be layoffs in the support area—not the teaching area. Sedlak said that there was some capacity on how we chose to use our resources and there were ways in balancing these out. However, there were no easy answers. Sedlak announced that registration would be delayed to March 28 in order to give department chairs more time for their planning. However, the date set for Advisement Day (March 27) would remain the same.

III. Vice Chancellor for Administrative and Student Life Services' Report – Vice Chancellor Moen distributed a budget handout to the group and gave an overview of Governor Doyle's 2004-2005 budget. She said that everyone would like to know Stout's numbers, but the information was coming out very slowly. Moen explained that Governor Doyle proposed no tax increases to fully fund the nearly \$1 billion school levy tax credit and to maintain support for schools and Medical Assistance. He is also making deep cuts in state government spending, shrinking the state work force by 2,900 positions, and cutting state support for the UW System by \$250 million. Moen explained that the UW System was approximately 9% of the state's GPR budget. The \$250 million budget cut was 38% of the Governor's recommended reductions and was a biennial reduction of 12% to the UW System's GPR base. Tuition for students at campuses (other than UW-Madison and UW-Milwaukee) will increase up to \$250 per semester in 2003-04 and an additional \$250 per semester in 2004-05, and could net Stout \$10 million (that could cover 60% of what the campus needs). Terry said that the students would want to know where their money was going. Moen explained that it would go toward health insurance, the pay plan, providing Blackboard licensing, an other costs of doing business. She noted that the Governor recommended reducing the number of GPR positions for the UW System by 650 FTE in 2003-04. Smith asked if Moen knew the number of positions that Stout would be required to cut. Moen replied between 25-30.

VII. Committee Reports

- A. Curriculum & Instruction (Steve Cole; Attachment 2)
- B. Planning & Review (Dick Tyson; Attachment 3)
- C. Department Representatives – Allen explained that at the last Faculty Senate Meeting, a resolution was passed that would give all Department Senators an opportunity to report on any issues or concerns that their department had. Allen then asked each Senator if he/she had a concern.
 - Bob Foley: Academic staff load issues.
 - Lou Miller: The proposal to cut program directors. Miller added that he had a resolution to distribute to Senators later in the meeting supporting the role of program directors at UW-Stout.
 - Ann Parsons: Workload distribution and the discrepancy of student credit hours for CAS faculty.
 - Bob Evans: We share similar concerns—but whatever actions are taken, equity and fairness should be paramount.
 - Anne Hoel: Student access and confidentiality in bringing issues to the Faculty Senate.
 - Mehar Arora: Unable to replace department vacancies with qualified people and the program director issue.
 - Brian Bergquist: Program director changes.
 - Karen Zimmerman: Formation of the new School of Education and departmental budgets.
 - Scott Orme: Program director model and the School of Education.
 - Mitch Sherman: Same issues as noted above.
 - Rich Rothaupt: Program directors.
 - Jerry Kapus: Academic staff teaching load changes and the program director changes.
 - Gary Godfrey: Program director changes.

Foley noted that the administrative reports took 45 minutes; the departmental senators' reports took 15 minutes.

- D. **Other** – Kapus asked Allen what the status was concerning the General Education charges that Provost Sedlak gave at the last Senate meeting. Allen replied that the items went to the General Education Committee and were still ongoing. Provost Sedlak agreed that they were being discussed and not finalized yet. Allen reported that the Executive Committee recommended creating a Faculty Task Force that could examine more closely the curriculum and budget cuts, including the degree requirements and course credits. He said that he, Sue Beckham, Dick Tyson, and Claudia Smith volunteered to create a proposal for the framework of this Task Force. The group would also be examining additional ways that Stout can be more efficient in its services to the students. Peters reminded the group of the short turnaround time that the Provost and Chancellor have.

VIII. Old Business

- A. **Other**

IX. New Business

- A. **Administrative Evaluations (Anne Ramage; copies will be distributed at the meeting)** – Ramage distributed draft copies of the evaluations to Senators and explained that PPC approved the documents on March 3. She noted that the Chancellor approved his evaluation, and there was one suggestion that Diane Moen gave for hers. However, Provost Sedlak still needed time to review his evaluation and give input. Sherman (Chair of the subcommittee) said that they tried revising existing survey, rather than creating an entirely new one. He noted that they also examined current job descriptions and Stout's Mission statements in order to help formulate the revised questions, and any overlapping items were eliminated to help streamline the evaluations. Allen asked who would administer the evaluations. Ramage replied that the Senate Office would do it (as in the past). Smith asked what the process would be. Sherman replied that the Senate of Academic Staff would examine it during their meeting on March 5, the three administrators were still reviewing it, and it would be coming to the Faculty Senate again on March 25 for approval. He asked Senators to e-mail himself or Ramage with any concerns or suggestions. Allen explained that the evaluations have been done for five years now and were a joint function of both Senates--the administrators were evaluated on the odd years, and the deans were evaluated on the even years. He stressed that there needed to be some stability in the instrument in order to compare data for each year and asked if many of the questions were the same as before. Wentz replied that most of the original questions remained the same, but were only reworded. Arora asked if other instruments from other campuses were reviewed. Sherman said they weren't. Smith said that she thought the evaluations were well constructed, thorough, and asked if any department chairs used these types of instruments in their evaluations. Most Senators said that their departments did. Smith suggested having all department chairs evaluated in the same way in order to foster the same qualities as in the administrators. Evans explained that the Chancellor, Provost, and Moen were not elected, but that the department chairs were and go through a fairly rigid evaluation by their deans. He noted that the deans felt that the chairs were spokespersons for them to their department, and the departments felt that they were their spokespersons to the deans. Department chairs were not administrators, he stressed, but sometimes can be caught in a bind. Allen said that this item would be placed on the March 25 Faculty Senate Agenda.

- B. **Budget Reduction Steering Group Progress Reports (Tom Allen; Attachment 4)** - Allen distributed the budget report from the February 28 meeting and said that Claudia Smith attended the meeting for him, as he was in Madison. He noted that he sent everyone the Budget Web Site for their information.

Zimmerman asked if the program directors would be eliminated at Stout. Smith explained that there were three different program director models on the Web that propose to not eliminate the positions, but make them more efficient. Allen said that the Budget Reduction Steering Group would meet again on March 12.

- C. **Other** – Allen explained that Bill Kryshak sent out an e-mail to all Faculty Senate members and then distributed his reply to the group. Hoel said that her concern was that faculty needed to be accountable for any issues. Allen explained that there was an issue of promotion by exception in the past. Discussion ensued regarding PPC's recommendation

and confidentiality. Allen explained that he and Smith meet each Wednesday to finalize the Senate's agenda, and that the Senate packets were mailed out on Thursday or Friday. Moen read the agenda ahead of time and simply provided background information concerning her office's restructuring for the meeting. Terry asked what the issue was that Kryshak was referring to. Smith explained that he suggested reinstating an old inactive Faculty Senate Standing Committee--the Budget and Finance Committee. The purpose of this committee was to review, monitor, evaluate, and recommend policy, procedures, and guidelines for budget development and decision-making. It was accountable to the Faculty Senate, and its members were faculty. Allen noted that Bill Kryshak served as Past Chair of the Budget and Finance Committee. The Faculty Senate decided to inactivate this committee in 1998, when the Budget, Planning, and Analysis Office was restructured on campus to review similar issues. Hoel said that concerning the recent budget crisis and issues, Kryshak wanted to feel sure that faculty were represented in the budget cuts and that their voice was heard. Foley explained that the issue was not the committee, but that Kryshak felt that this issue was already discussed, information generated, and was in the process of being rejected before he had a chance to express his views. Parsons asked why the Executive Committee chose not to bring it forward to this Senate meeting. Weckmueller replied that the committee thought it would be helpful if Diane Moen could attend the meeting to present her ideas to the group as well. Ramage said that Moen's memo and Kryshak addressing the Executive Committee were two things that just happened simultaneously. This item will be placed on the March 25 Faculty Senate Agenda.

Foley distributed a resolution to the group that supports the role of Program Directors at UW-Stout.

Motion: Miller/Weckmueller moved to approve the resolution to support the role of Program Directors at UW–Stout.

Vote: Passed with 1 abstention.

X. **Adjournment** – 4:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Mike Galloy, Secretary

Recorded and prepared by,
Joy Morical