

MINUTES  
FACULTY SENATE MEETING  
OCTOBER 15 2002

ATTENDANCE:

CHAIR: Tom Allen  
VICE CHAIR: Claudia Smith

SECRETARY: Mike Galloy  
PAST CHAIR: Ned Weckmueller

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

EXCUSED: B. Bergquist, M. Nicolai, M. Spencer, S. Terry

GUESTS: Chancellor Sorensen, B. Sedlak, D. Moen, J. Murphy, W. Argo, J. Enger, S. Hunt, R. Olson, R. Verdon, M. Skutley, D. Tyson, D. Albrecht

I. Call to Order- 2:35 p.m.

II. Announcements and Information

A. Announce Committee Winners from Oct. 1 Election – Smith announced that the following committee winners were elected by the Senators during the October 1 Faculty Senate Meeting:  
Admissions and Credit Appeals Committee - Anne Cross and Mahshid Jalilvand  
General Education Committee - Anne Antonippillai  
University Ethics Committee - Joan Menefree  
UTLG Campus Screening Committee - Howard Lee, Member and Paul Lokken, Alternate

B. Sabbatical Leave Quotas (See below)

*"We expect 10 sabbatical awards for 2003-04. In order to fully cover the replacement costs for sabbaticals, at least two of the sabbaticals must be for a full year. If there are no full year sabbatical recommendations, then the sabbatical awards will probably not exceed eight.*

*As a goal, about 25% to 30% of the recommended sabbaticals should include a global international element with the plan."*

III. Minutes of October 1, 2002 (Attachment 1)

Motion: Johnson/Peters moved to approve the Minutes of October 1, 2002.

Vote: Passed unanimously.

IV. Chancellor's Report – Chancellor Sorensen reported that he, Julie Furst-Bowe, Bob Meyer, and Carol Mooney were invited to go to the Kanazaw Institute of Technology in Tokoyo, Japan, to present information concerning Stout's Baldrige process and experience. He said that it was a marvelous experience for Stout's team to be able to participate in. The Chancellor noted that the campus continues to receive many invitations from various schools and companies to come and speak about our Baldrige experience.

V. Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs' Report – Provost Sedlak gave his time to Vice Chancellor Moen's Report.

VI. Vice Chancellor for Administrative and Student Life Services' Report – Vice Chancellor Moen distributed "UW-Stout Laptops, Maintenance and Insurance Coverage" and "ASLS Focused Initiatives 2002-04" to Senators.

A. UCLA Faculty Survey (Attachment 2) – Ross Olson, Director of Budget, Planning & Analysis, explained that this was the second time the survey was done. He said that the first time it was administered was in the Fall of 1995 and was designed to provide colleges and universities with timely information about the workload, teaching practices, job satisfaction, and professional activities of collegiate faculty. Compared to the national average, Stout faculty spend more time in the classroom and preparing for teaching; however, less time is spent doing research and scholarly writing. Overall job satisfaction has increased from 62.7% in 1995 to 72.5% in 2001, but UW-Stout's overall satisfaction was slightly lower than the national average. Highlights of the survey show that satisfaction with childcare was rated higher by women than men and the emphasis on

technology at Stout was also rated higher than the other four-year colleges. Overall, faculty seem to be satisfied with the decision to become a college professor.

- B. **Workload Report (Attachment 3)** –Olson explained that faculty workload issues emerged as one of the top priorities of the university during the facilitated group sessions commencing the 1996-97 budget process. The report summarizes annual workload information for faculty/staff by college, including (1) assigned time, (2) overload payments, (3) instructional workload measures generated from UW System PMIS and IAIS reports, and (4) workload perception. Faculty and Instructional Staff were asked to rate a list of factors in terms of their impact on their morale. Three factors (teaching load, committee load, and advising load) were all issues related to workload. Compared to 1991, the 2001 report indicates that workload has for the most part decreased significantly at the university level. One issue that emerged, however, was that overloads increased in 2001-02 by over 19% from the 2000-01 overload report.

VII. **Committee Reports**

- A. Curriculum & Instruction (Steve Cole)
- B. Educational Activities (Donna Albrecht)
- C. General Education (Sue Beckham)
- D. Personnel Policies (Anne Ramage)
- E. Planning and Review (Dick Tyson; Attachment 4)
- F. Election Committee (Claudia Smith)

VIII. **Old Business**

- A. **Proposed New Web Information Policy #02-62 - For Endorsement** (was Attachment 8 in the October 1 Faculty Senate Packet) – John Enger, Director of University Relations, said that he co-sponsored a Web Review Committee approximately one-and-a-half years ago. This committee developed fifty-five different recommendations in order to maintain a viable and vibrant Web for our university. One of these recommendations was for Stout to develop a policy addressing various publishing standards that would help ensure that current, accurate, and consistent information was presented on the Web servers under the authority of the university. The policy also helps clarify possible violation of copyright laws, federal and state statutes, as well as determining appropriate information that should be on the Web.

**Motion to Endorse:** Smith/Galloy moved for the Faculty Senate to endorse the Proposed New Web Information Policy #02-62.

Smith asked Enger how the policy would impact Stout. Enger replied that there would be no operational changes whatsoever; the policy would just clarify information that was out on the Web.

**Vote to Endorse:** Passed unanimously.

- B. **Other**

IX. **New Business** - Because of her time schedule, Albrecht asked Allen if the Agenda's order could be changed so she could address EAC's item in IX., E. Allen granted her request.

- E. **Summer Commencement (EAC; Donna Albrecht - "Is Commencement an Educational Activity?"** Albrecht stated that EAC stood behind its initial recommendation for the 2002-03 calendar which included a Summer 2003 Commencement. She recommended that if the Chancellor's Council wished to not have a Summer Commencement, a representative from the Council should come to the Faculty Senate and request a change; then the Senate could ask for EAC to react to the policy. She noted that commencement was considered in the 170 days that were counted as an educational activity. However, if faculty were expected to attend commencement, EAC could revise this to a teaching day instead. Chancellor Sorensen asked that the Faculty Senate take a strong stand for faculty to mandatory attend commencement ceremonies. He noted that the Summer Commencement has had poor attendance in the past and that the location was moved from the Johnson Fieldhouse to the Great Hall in order to accommodate this lack. Foley said there was no motion on the floor and called for a Point of Order. Smith said that this revised issue didn't come to the Executive Committee and recommended for it to go before that committee again. She suggested for EAC to settle the details; then if EAC wanted to bring it to the full Senate, a discussion would be needed in order to form a policy mandating faculty's attendance during commencement ceremonies. Albrecht said that EAC still stood behind its decision to hold Summer Commencement and that it was another issue if the Senate decided if it was worthwhile or not. She again stated that if the

Chancellor's Council wished to change it, they should come before the Faculty Senate. Much discussion ensued regarding if commencement should be considered a teaching or activity day, and the dilemma for faculty when that day is held when classes are in session. It was decided that this issue would be revisited.

Allen stated that the remaining Agenda items would be taken in the order given.

A. Faculty Senate/Standing Committee Roles in Proposals for New Major/Degree (Ned Weckmueller; Attachment 5)

Weckmueller explained to Senators that over the last several years, UW-Stout's process for the application and review of new programs had been streamlined by Madison. He said that this was done in order to better utilize the time and resources so programs could pass through the process more efficiently and quickly (by moving through the process in two years instead of ten). Through this streamlining, the roles of the Faculty Senate and Standing Committees had been reduced. A special task force was set up to review this issue a couple of years ago, but due to certain circumstances of the members, it was discontinued. Weckmueller stated that the Faculty Senate now only has one chance to review programs early on in the current process, and doesn't get another chance to examine cost, budget ramifications, or program development. He added that the Faculty Senate never as a body voted on the new streamlined program review process, and suggested that this should be examined by the Senate.

Allen distributed Weckmueller's proposed motion and said that a vote would be taken during the November 5 Faculty Senate Meeting:

"To approve only an Entitlement to Plan a new program in \_\_\_\_\_.

The Faculty Senate approves *only* the Entitlement to Plan a new program in \_\_\_\_\_. This motion *should not be interpreted as any approval* of the \_\_\_\_\_ program beyond the planning stage. In order for implementation of the \_\_\_\_\_ program to occur, the Senate must grant approval for that stage at the appropriate time."

Chancellor Sorensen explained that the new streamlined process was done in all innocence by Madison in order to reduce the number of years (from ten to two) that programs moved through the system. Both the Chancellor and Provost agreed that there should be a second reading at the Senate level. Allen said that he would take recommendations and suggestions between now and November 5 when the motion is voted upon. He noted that the motion just "holds" the process so the Faculty Senate could have a second opportunity to examine the program. Provost Sedlak explained that in the old process, the Entitlement to Plan would come to the Faculty Senate twice. He noted that System eliminated one of the steps we had on campus and now only has two stages—the Preliminary Plan and Entitlement to Plan. Much discussion ensued regarding CIC's role in reviewing and endorsing new programs on campus and if the Senate would review a program after CIC's recommendation. Chancellor Sorensen asked that the process not be bogged down so the campus couldn't implement the programs in a timely manner. More discussion ensued regarding the appropriate way to modify the process. Smith asked Sedlak if the Senate could change the procedure. Sedlak replied that he would need time to study the process and that it could. Weckmueller said that the Senate had jurisdiction to "nit-pick" at programs or at a general education list of courses, but would usually trust the recommendations made from the Senate's Standing Committees. He noted that the Senate should have the power to do this if necessary, but 95% of the time, it probably wouldn't happen. Evans recommended that the new process needed to be examined, but also cautioned Senators that it was not fair to delay the Entitlements to Plan that were on the Agenda. Kapus and Foley agreed.

B. Entitlement to Plan for B. S. Cross-Categorical Special Education (Dick Tyson; Attachment 6) – Tyson explained that PRC heard the proposal at their September meeting and noted that it would be brought back for UW-Stout to review again in a couple of years. Weckmueller called a Point of Order, saying there was no motion on the floor so that discussion could take place. Foley asked Allen what the original intention for this program was. Allen said that it would be for discussion only. Allen informed Senators that he called Mary Hopkins-Best and Ron Verdon for their opinion

if delaying their programs by three weeks would cause major hardship. He said that Hopkins-Best preferred to wait and felt that the Faculty Senate's motion could enhance her program. It was decided that this item would be placed on the November 5 Agenda.

- C. Entitlement to Plan for Master of Fine Arts (Dick Tyson; Attachment 7) – Allen announced that this item would also be for discussion only. Ron Verdon explained to Senators that this plan came as a result last year from a planning retreat held by the Department of Art and Design. The Department recommended ten items it felt were important for future planning and this program was one of the recommended items. Verdon said that members of his Department felt that the Plan complemented the existing undergraduate and graduate programs within the Department and that it would provide an interesting opportunity for Stout to have it. He explained that only two other institutions within the UW-System currently offer an MS in Fine Arts, and no private institutions in Wisconsin offer it at all. Of 6300 MFA degrees granted nationally in 2001, only 220 degrees were granted in Industrial and/or Graphic Design and only 1/3 came from public institutions. He said that the availability for students to pursue an MFA is limited; this proposal would give Stout a unique opportunity to provide additional resources for the students. Discussion ensued regarding base reallocation and finding additional resources to support the degree. Verdon explained that the proposal has already been through CIC, PRC, AAAT and now the Senate and noted that differential tuition could make a tremendous difference with customizing a program such as this. Arora asked Verdon what type of background students enrolling in the course should have. Verdon replied that they would be required to have an Art undergraduate degree, but it could be a variety of types. If a student didn't have an Art undergraduate degree, then additional course work would be needed in order to bring the student up to the base level. Much more discussion ensued regarding potential enrollment, credits, years to completion, qualifications of faculty, impact on existing art programs, resource projections, and accreditation. This item will be placed on the November 5 Faculty Senate Agenda.
- D. Resolution on Laptop Theft/Damage (Jerry Kapus; See Below and Attachment 8)

Resolution:

*Be it resolved that since departments have limited funds to provide for exigencies, a university-wide fund should be set aside to cover the cost of deductibles for faculty and staff laptop theft and damage.*

Motion:

Kapus/Choudhury moved to pass the above Resolution as written.

Kapus explained that the resolution was approved during the last English and Philosophy Department Meeting because they were heavily implementing the laptop initiative program this semester. The Department was concerned about the original Laptop Policy holding the departments liable for the deductible cost of damaged or stolen laptops and noted that his Department recently had an \$800 laptop repair bill. Given their limited budget, the faculty in his Department felt that the university was in a better position to cover the cost and drew up the resolution.

Vice Chancellor Moen distributed the "Laptops, Maintenance and Insurance Coverage" to Senators and explained that the Resource Principles within the document provided flexibility at all levels of the organization through the use of reserves to fund emergencies and other discretionary purposes.

The Resource Principles provide the framework for budget/resource allocation decisions and recognize the variety of funding and resources that support UW-Stout functions and encourage creativity and flexibility in financing strategic plans. Moen said that this principle could be used to cover the deductible cost for laptops that were stolen in departments. She said that Stout was also covered by the State's insurance pool, but the companies have increased their amounts; that's why the campus has such high deductibles for theft and damage. Moen added that at this time, security devices were not required for laptops; however, the University Bookstore sells them for \$35.00. She noted that of this date, no student laptops have been stolen. Schlough asked Moen what the deductible amounts were for forcible and non-forcible theft. Moen replied that the deductible was \$500 if forced (where visible pry marks or broken glass are evident) and \$2500 for non-forced. Much discussion ensued regarding security, student liability for theft, and maintenance costs. Foley suggested to establish a campus general fund whereby departments could pay a small fee into. Evans cautioned Senators that there are many people that have keys to offices in certain areas; security could be a problem. Smith suggested that this item be discussed and suggestions taken during the November 5 budget meeting.

Vote (by hand): 5 In favor; 8 Opposed; 9 Abstentions. Motion failed.

- F. **Volunteers Needed to Join a Group Studying Alternative Transportation (Keith McCarten; Attachment 9) - Allen said that Mingshen Wu had volunteered to serve on this meeting. A Senator asked what this group would do. Allen replied that a memo would be sent to Senators after more information was gathered.**
- G. **Executive Committee Recommends Motion to Delay PRC Review of Early Childhood by One Year (Tom Allen) – John Wesolek, Dean of the College of Human Development, requested the Senate to delay approving this program by one year. He explained that this program would be incorporated into the new School of Education coming to campus. Allen said that an additional major change that needed to be addressed before approval was the implementation of new DVI Standards. Tyson explained that PRC felt that the major issue was personnel-based. Provost Sedlak also suggested and asked that this be delayed.**

**Motion: Smith/Johnson moved to endorse the recommendation to delay PRC's Review of Early Childhood by one year.**

**Vote: Passed unanimously.**

- H. **Other – Allen reminded Senators that the Budget Priority Session would dominate the November 5 Faculty Senate Meeting. He said that the meeting was an open meeting and asked that Senators encourage their constituents to attend.**

X. **Adjournment –4:33 p.m.**

**Respectfully submitted,  
Mike Galloy, Secretary**

**Recorded and prepared by,  
Joy Morical**