

NOTES  
ADMINISTRATIVE BRIEFING  
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-STOUT  
NOVEMBER 4, 2003

The administrative briefing was called to order at 2:33 p.m. by Mark Skutley, Chair of the Senate of Academic Staff.

- I. Chancellor's Report – Chancellor Sorensen distributed “Issues For Discussion” to the group, explaining that it originated from his Chancellor’s Advisory Council. Issues that the Council were studying, or needed improvement on, included: 1) Enrollment (to review the trends this year and the demographic trends in our region and state for 5-10 years; 2) Stout Solutions (have the charges and philosophy as originally intended been met?); 3) Technology Alignment (it’s imperative to review how effectively we’ve deployed technology given that it’s in two different directions); 4) International Education (the strategic plan needs to be reviewed and shared; ideas need to be entertained from the campus on future directions); 5) Block Scheduling (Stout can do a more effective job with the freshmen to assure they’re getting the proper courses during their freshman year); and 6) Curricular Transformation (working closely with governance and individual faculty, we need to create a “think tank” to look at how Stout’s curriculum might appear in the next 5-10 years). Provost Sedlak distributed “Re-Examining the Sacrosanct Credit Hour” to the group. Chancellor Sorensen explained that the article dealt with accountability for performance, including using the credit hour as the most pervasive performance measure in higher education. Arora asked if Stout was offering to charge less tuition in order to encourage students who once attended the campus and left, to return. The Chancellor replied that this was called the “Legacy Program” and the university was examining how it’s working with other campuses before participating in it. Chancellor Sorensen also stated that President Lyall is removing the Salary Range for Chancellor’s item from the Board of Regents Agenda. The item was only to accommodate a range change for the Chancellor at UW-Milwaukee. He explained that this item significantly hurt the UW System, and his salary was not affected by it.
- II. Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs’ Report – Provost Sedlak referred to the “credit hour” document he distributed earlier in the meeting and explained that everything came down to assessment, learning, and outcomes. How can those things be documented? Sedlak noted that it was more about what students understand when they leave a class rather than about time. Sedlak said that the Chancellor’s Advisory Council recently had a good discussion regarding Ethics and the law; continuing discussions would be held in the colleges and departments regarding this subject.
- III. Vice Chancellor for Administrative and Student Life Services’ Report – Vice Chancellor Moen explained that there were still budget reductions to be made regarding health insurance for part-time employees. She noted that this item was lobbied out of the budget; however, because the Governor left in the assessment amount, each campus needs to pay back their share. Moen said that there would be a continual shift for the cost of fringe benefits going to each campus. She stated that the state was taking a “cash grab” from 128 accounts to fund aid for students that was part of the biennial budget reductions.
  - A. 2002-03 Annual Teaching Workload Report (Attachment 1; 5 minutes) – Ross Olson, Director of Budget, Planning and Analysis, reviewed the Executive Summary of the document and stated that all information was also on the BPA Website. Olson said that the report summarized annual workload information for faculty/staff by college. Information gathered includes (1) assigned time, (2) overload payments, (3) instructional workload measures generated from UW System PMIS and IAIS reports and (4) workload perception. Much discussion ensued regarding overload teaching and the pros and cons on how it impacted faculty, academic staff, and the colleges.
- IV. e-Scholar Program (Meridith Wentz; Attachment 2; 5 minutes) – Meridith Wentz, Budget and Planning Office, reviewed the “Training and Expectation Survey, 2003, Executive Summary” with the group. She said that the survey was given to all new 2003 e-Scholar students at the conclusion of the laptop deployment training program. There were 1,513 respondents. The report included information regarding the two following survey questions: 1) In your own words, briefly explain what being an e-scholar means to you, 2) How do you expect to use your laptop in your daily life as a new student? Individual responses on these questions were analyzed and coded into themes that were identified in the 2002 Training and Expectation Survey. Wentz concluded by saying that all the information was on the BPA Website.

MINUTES  
FACULTY SENATE MEETING  
NOVEMBER 4, 2003

ATTENDANCE:

CHAIR: Mike Galloy  
VICE CHAIR: Vacant

SECRETARY: David Johnson  
PAST CHAIR: Tom Allen

PRESENT: M. Arora, C. Bendel, T. Bensen, P. Calenberg, S. Deckelman, M. Decker, K. Deery, G. Earl, B. Evans, G. Godfrey, A. Hoel, L. Koepke, B. McAlister, L. Milanesi, L. Miller, A. Parsons, J. Roiter, R. Rothaupt, S. Schlough, F. Schultz, M. Spencer, N. Weckmueller, G. Wheeler

EXCUSED: B. Bergquist, D. Johnson, S. Orme, J. Pejsa, B. Peters, M. Sherman, S. Terry

GUESTS: A. Ramage, D. Tyson, D. Albrecht, P. Hall

I. Call to Order – 3:30 p.m.

II. Announcements and Information - Chair Galloy announced that he attended the October 31 Faculty Reps Meeting in Madison. One issue discussed was the statistics concerning how much other peer groups were paying for their health plans, and it was determined that Stout was in range with other peer institutions. However, as insurance premiums increase, the values will also increase over the years, and some of the cost will be passed on to faculty/staff. Groups that have bargaining rights have yet to settle on their premiums. Galloy said there was also a general discussion concerning staffing across the system between faculty and academic staff. Academic staff was more cost-effective to employ and gave administration more flexibility. However, there were lower expectations of academic staff in that they weren't required to do scholarly activities, community service, and research. Galloy explained that each faculty representative at the meeting was asked how much they taught, and it was split 50/50. Much discussion ensued regarding the pros and cons of credit hours, academic staff teaching 15 credits, the disadvantages to faculty, and the impact on departments and colleges. Galloy announced that he served as a faculty representative on the Chancellor's Advisory Council, just as Senators serve as departmental and college representatives on the Faculty Senate. He reminded the Senators to discuss various campus issues with their department members and communicate feedback to him so he can share this during the Council meetings. Galloy also encouraged Senators to read attachments and reports in order to help formulate positive ways to move the university forward.

III. Minutes of October 14, 2003 (Attachment 3)

Motion: Koepke/Hoel moved to approve the Minutes of October 14, 2003.

Vote: Passed with 1 abstention.

IV. Committee Reports

- A. Curriculum and Instruction Committee (will be brought to the meeting) – Galloy distributed the CIC Report to the group.
- B. Personnel Policies Committee (Attachments 4 & 5)
- C. Planning and Review Committee (Attachment 6)
- D. Department Representatives

Hoel: The Business Department has been concerned about classroom overloads and the problems students face to get into their required classes that they needed in order to graduate in a timely manner.

Bensen: CET Department was discussing the e-Scholar Program, especially the purpose of its goal and the intent of the student.

Deery: The Rehabilitation and Counseling Department was dealing with the death of its Chair, Shirley Stewart, and were taking time to pull itself together; Steve Shumate was acting as temporary chair.

Bendel: The Mathematics and Statistics Department was concerned that more and more students wanted to test out of Math courses (at \$5 per credit and \$5 to take the test). Galloy said that EAC was examining this dilemma.

Evans: The Social Science Department was concerned about classes being so overloaded, that no more students can be put into their rooms.

E. Other

V. Old Business

A. Bylaws of the Finance Committee (Ned Weckmueller; Attachment 7) – Weckmueller explained that the committee met and rewrote the bylaws to revise their membership according to a charge given by the Faculty Senate from the last meeting. The members agreed that any changes to the committee’s mission could be addressed by the new committee, after elections were held. Membership was revised to eliminate the past chair of the Faculty Senate and to have only one member be a Senator. The Executive Committee recommended having the elections completed by the end of the semester.

**Motion:** Weckmueller/Decker moved to approve the revised membership portion to Bylaws of the Finance Committee.

Parsons asked Weckmueller to give the rationale for only having tenured faculty serve on the committee. He replied that the group had some discussion on whether the members needed to be tenured or not, but all agreed that they should be in order to help avoid people feeling intimidated when discussing sensitive issues with administrators. He noted that faculty members were always tenured on the committee in the past. Arora said that some non-tenured faculty have excellent backgrounds in the finance area and it wouldn’t be fair to exclude these people if they wanted to serve. Milanesi agreed.

**Friendly Amendment:** Schlough/Parsons moved to amend the document by striking the word, “tenured” from lines 1, 2, and 3.

Decker stated that as a non-tenured person, he would feel uncomfortable by not having the credibility that being tenured could offer. Deckelman said that a non-tenured person always had the option to say “no” when nominated. Allen said that he favored the amendment.

**Vote on removing the word, “tenure,” from the document (by a show of hands):** 19-Yes; 2-No’s; 2 Abstentions. The motion passed.

**Vote to approve the Finance Committee as amended:** Passed with 2 opposed and 1 abstention.

B. Graduate Education Committee Bylaws (Galloy) - Galloy announced that he would meet with the Graduate Council on November 20. All standing committee bylaws would be reviewed after the Council made their decision and finalized their bylaws.

C. Other

VI. New Business

A. Elect Faculty Representative to the Parking Appeals Board (ballots will be brought to the meeting) Galloy distributed ballots to the group, asked them to vote, and that they give them to Joy at the end of the meeting.

B. 2005-2006 Academic Calendar (EAC; Lou Miller; Attachment 8) - Miller explained that usually the Calendar Committee examines the calendar from the previous year and just updated the dates. This year, Provost Sedlak requested that the committee examine items from prior years to see if they were still needed. Changes to the 2005-2006 Calendar included having a 4-day Spring Holiday. Milanesi asked if the “equal length for each semester” item was an original idea created by administrators or faculty. Miller replied that it was originally a faculty initiative. Allen added that Advisement Day and Evaluation Week were also faculty ideas. There was some discussion concerning pros and cons of not having the words, “Professional Development,” appear on the calendar. Miller stated that his committee felt that people were professionally responsible and that self-directed activities and meetings would still occur; the words just wouldn’t appear on the calendar. Albrecht explained that when they researched other campuses, none had these words on

their calendars, either. Evans cautioned the group that there could be some problems at the dean's level concerning the excluding the words.

**Motion:** Miller/Evans moved to approve the 2005-2006 Academic Calendar as submitted.

More discussion ensued regarding legal constraints from legislature dictating the beginning of the semester. Allen said he was supportive of the calendar, but asked the Senate to examine the reaffirming of Evaluation Week and Advisement Day as a necessary calendar inclusion. Albrecht explained that EAC would be measuring and surveying faculty/students to get a random sampling on how they felt about keeping the items; supportive data needed to be gathered. Galloy reaffirmed that EAC was charged to investigate issues and to bring results of their findings to the Faculty Senate for an open discussion before next year's calendar was drafted.

**Vote:** Passed unanimously.

C. Faculty Representatives in Senate (Mike Galloy; Attachment 9) – Galloy explained that the Faculty Senate needed to be restructured because of the new School of Education that was newly-organized on campus. He, Weckmueller, and Allen met and wanted to keep the balance ratio between faculty and senators in each unit/college as closely and fairly as possible. Galloy further explained that the basic sequence was to have a representative from each department sit on the Senate, and to balance the colleges out with At-Large reps, so there was even representation across all colleges/units. He noted that the proposed document showed that one At-Large rep was added to CAS, one rep was added to SOE, one was removed from CHD (due to the new SOE people leaving), one was removed from Other, and CTEM was left the same. The biggest reason for reducing the At-Large (Other) group, Galloy explained, was that most of the Other members were administrators who attended the Senate meetings and could give input at any time.

**Motion:** Bensen/Decker moved to approve the Faculty Senate Representation as of 10/23/03.

Godfrey questioned the representation in CTEM. Galloy explained that they tried to keep the numbers for representation for all colleges the same. Weckmueller added that they had no power over how many departments a college had. The "magic number" that they tried to stay with was 10 and tried to keep the total senators in each college one or two of this number. Milanese said that he agreed to retain at least one position to cover those in the Other category.

**Vote:** Passed with 1 no vote.

D. Focus 2010 - Galloy reminded the Senate that all Focus 2010 Workshops were scheduled and encouraged everyone to attend. He added that these meetings provide faculty an opportunity to give input according to the Baldrige process and encouraged everyone to get feedback from their constituents so their voices could be heard. Galloy announced that the Faculty Senate's Focus 2010 Session would be held on November 18, and the entire time would be devoted to the Session.

E. Other – Milanese stated that he was working on a Title 3 Grant and questioned the group if Stout would still be eligible, especially with the changing demographics. Allen asked Milanese what the Title 3 Grant was. Milanese replied that the grant provided student financial aid, based on the proportion of students from low income families attending the institution. It would have impact on the amount of financial aid available for Stout students. Galloy asked Senators to contact Milanese if they could provide him with any input.

## VII. Adjournment – 4:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
David Johnson, Secretary

Recorded and prepared by,  
Joy Morical

