

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
NOVEMBER 5, 2002**

ATTENDANCE:

CHAIR: Tom Allen
VICE CHAIR: Claudia Smith

SECRETARY: Mike Galloy
PAST CHAIR: Ned Weckmueller

PRESENT: A. Adekola, A. Antonippillai, M. Arora, S. Deckelman, B. Evans, G. Godfrey, A. Hoel, J. Kapus, B. McAlister, L. Miller, S. Orme, A. Parsons, B. Peters, G. Wheeler, K. Zimmerman

EXCUSED: B. Bergquist, G. Choudhury, B. Foley, M. Galloy, D. Johnson, M. Nicolai, R. Rothaupt, S. Schlough, M. Sherman, S. Shumate, M. Spencer, S. Terry, A. Vande Linde

GUESTS: Chancellor Sorensen, R. Sedlak, A. Ramage, D. Weber, M. Young, K. Ingala, R. Verdon, B. Johnson, W. Argo, J. Murphy, D. Moen, J. Furst-Bowe, J. Brown, M. Hopkins-Best, D. Tyson, M. Stanley, P. Hall, R. Olson, C. Frey, L. Milanesi

UNIVERSITY PRIORITY SESSION (Attachment 1)

The University Priority Session is open to **ANYONE** who would like to attend and participate in the meeting. We are allowing approximately one hour for the Session.

The regular November 5 Faculty Senate Meeting will follow.

2:35 p.m.— Chair Allen called the University Priority Session to order. Ross Olson, Director of the Budget, Planning and Analysis Office, gave the introduction based on the attachment showing the actual priorities contained in the Senators' packets. Olson explained that the University Priority Sessions have been held since 1995. Chancellor Sorensen said that the Priority Sessions were very important, and nine sessions are held each fall. He explained that the sessions give an opportunity for all faculty, staff, and students to give direct, unfiltered communication and ideas to Stout's administration, which helps to develop good communication and a broader understanding of the potential needs for the entire organization. The Chancellor noted that the computer cost share program originated out of the first priority sessions in 1995, and the instructional workload reports came from the ones held in 1997 and 2000. He explained that the Chancellor's Advisory Council considers all input from sessions held during the previous year. The Council discusses the issues, analyzes the environmental scanning reports, and drafts the potential university priorities for the next year. Chancellor Sorensen stated that the current university priorities for 2002 include the Stout Technology Advantage, Branding and Marketing, Graduate Education, Applied Research, Recruitment, Premier Institution of Workforce, and Career Preparation.

Sedlak and Moen reviewed each of the following University Priorities for 2003 and gave all attendees an opportunity for input. Pinckney Hall recorded the comments made by members of the group.

1. Academic Advising
2. AQUIP Leadership Development
3. Assessment and Continuous Improvement Center
4. Campus Diversity Climate
5. e-Campus
6. Education

Allen encouraged all attendees to write down additional comments and suggestions on their input cards and mail them to Olson. He added that this was a great opportunity for faculty and staff to communicate with administrators important issues they believe can make a difference in helping to improve our campus.

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

- I. Call to Order - Chair Allen called the meeting to order at 3: 35 p.m.
- II. Announcements and Information – Allen announced that there are two Dahlgren Professorships at \$7,500 each and one Maybelle Ranney Price Professorship for \$3,500 available for 2003. Application forms will be available in the Senate Office during February for interested faculty.

III. Old Business

- A. Entitlement to Plan B.S. Cross-Categorical Special Education - For Approval (Dick Tyson; Attachment 5)

Motion: Weckmueller/ Peters to approve the Entitlement to Plan B.S. Cross-Categorical Special Education for the planning phase only, with the stipulation that the program must come before the Faculty Senate for final approval again after it has been approved by the Curriculum and Instruction Committee.

Parsons asked Weckmueller to give a rationale for his motion and asked if the CIC was a standing committee of the Faculty Senate, why would a program need to come to the full Senate again? Weckmueller replied that the Senate never has a chance to examine a program when its resources for funding is decided and should have the opportunity to examine programs and ask appropriate funding questions, if necessary. Peters and Kapus agreed. Evans said that perhaps the Senate was making too much an issue out the situation--if there was no money for it, the program simply wouldn't be implemented. He recommended that CIC should have input before the program comes to the Faculty Senate. Arora agreed. Evans also explained that in due respect to the administrative forces over the years, one of the reasons for leaving funding issues out was to avoid publicizing the issues and bogging down the program so it wouldn't get approved--the Senate was simply asked to make political decisions for the good of the college. He also cautioned the Senate that perhaps it would be "opening a can of worms." Smith asked Hopkins-Best if this program would be in the new School of Education. Hopkins-Best replied that it would be; however, CHD would also continue having courses provided by the Rehabilitation Program as well.

Vote: Passed with 1 abstention.

- B. Entitlement to Plan for Master of Fine Arts - For Approval (Dick Tyson; Attachment 6)

Motion: Weckmueller/Peters moved to approve the Entitlement to Plan for the Master of Fine Arts for the planning phase only, with the stipulation that the program must come before the Faculty Senate for final approval again after it has been approved by the Curriculum and Instruction Committee.

McAlister asked Weckmueller if the steps and procedures for approving programs and courses were written somewhere. Weckmueller explained that the procedures currently used originated from the Vice Chancellor's Office (see <http://www.uwstout.edu/provost/currhb/NewMajorSteps.htm>) in response from a request by Madison to streamline the process from ten years to two. This was done in order to better utilize the time and resources so programs could pass through the process more efficiently and quickly. Through this streamlining, however, the roles of the Faculty Senate and Standing Committees had been reduced. Currently, the Faculty Senate has only one chance to review programs early on in the procedure and doesn't get another chance to examine cost, budget ramifications, or program development. He noted that approving new programs used to be a three-stage process; now it is a two-stage process. Weckmueller added that the Faculty Senate never as a body voted on the new streamlined program review process. Smith stated that the Chancellor and Provost agree that the process should be changed and feel comfortable for the Senate to revise it.

Smith asked Verdon how many faculty would be in the program planning committee from the Art and Design Department. Verdon replied that the number was not finalized yet, but

he was anticipating three or four members from the Department, as well as others from the university, for a total of eight or nine people.

Vote: Passed unanimously.

VII. Adjournment –4:04 p.m.

**Respectfully submitted,
Mike Galloy, Secretary**

**Recorded and prepared by,
Joy Morical**