

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-STOUT  
SENATE OF ACADEMIC STAFF  
MINUTES  
April 11, 2006

**ATTENDANCE**

CHAIR: Vi Jones  
SECRETARY: Dennis Shaw

PRESENT: Lori Anda-Bowen; Heidi Gilbertson-Gansberg; Ilse Hartung; Vi Jones; Lelah Lugo; Kari Merritt; Robin Muza; Peter Schlosser; Dennis Shaw; Evan Sveum; Darrin Witucki

ABSENT: Krista James (excused); Michael Lawler; Heidi Rabeneck (excused); Jennifer Rudiger (excused); Brenda Swannack (excused); Sherwood Thompson; Ryan Wilson

GUESTS: Forrest Schultz

**I. Call to Order:** The meeting was called to order by Chair Jones at 3:07pm.

**II. Announcements and Information:**

None.

**III. Approval of Minutes:**

Minutes from the February 28, 2006 meeting were discussed. On page 10, in order to be consistent, the bylaws changes approved in **Changes to ARTICLE II , Section 5.B**, contained the following sentence which starts: Electronic Bballots must be submitted electronically within five working days of distribution

That should have read: Electronic Bballots must be submitted electronically within eight working days of distribution

The minutes were approved for filing with the above noted correction.

**IV. Reports (Distributed as E-mail Attachments)**

**A. Personnel Committee – Senator Lugo**

Currently there are four except requests for multi-year contracts that are pending. These will be completed within the week. On March 25th the committee reviewed the exception we had at the time. It was decided that more information was needed before

the committee would concur or not concur with the exception. After the meeting three other exception requests were received.

The Academic Staff Personnel Committee was charged with reviewing and revising the Board of Regent's proposed dismissal for cause document. The committee met on March 25th to discuss this proposal. The Chair had made some preliminary revisions in order to stimulate discussion. After the meeting, the Chair revised the document as well as added the memo. It was sent out to the committee for comments and is now attached for the Senate to review.

**B. Professional Development Committee - Senator Rudiger**

No report.

**C. Elections Committee – Senator Hartung**

The Elections Committee met on Thursday, February 23 to review the timeline, call for nominations material, Community News announcement, and list of senators whose turns will expire in 2006.

Joy will request the most updated list of eligible Academic Staff members from Wayne Argo's office. Committee chair will discuss web update with Barb Button, as materials are now online.

The Elections Committee met on Tuesday, March 28, to review names forwarded for the upcoming elections. The committee noticed that, with recent restructuring, some units are moving from one division to another. The committee will make it a priority to review the entire university structure by units and divisions as early as possible. The committee wishes to inform the Senate that it anticipates some changes as to senate seat representation.

The Senate has candidates for all the positions open at this time. Elections will run from April 13 to April 21.

**D. Curriculum & Instruction Committee – Senator Sveum**

Minutes of the February 16, 2006 Curriculum and Instruction Committee meeting were sent to Senators via email but was not in a format to cut and paste into the minutes. Contact the Senate Office if you want a copy sent to you.

**E. Educational Activities Committee – Senator Shaw**

From the March 3, 2006 EAC Meeting:

Announcement

Faculty Senate agreed to support the Early Alert Program, i.e., EAC endorses the 1st

Year Early Alert Program and encourages faculty and staff to participate as this program addresses issues of classroom performance beyond just attendance.

### Subcommittee Reports

- **Academic Standing:** The subcommittee is discussing two issues. First, they would like to standardize the GPA for students being placed on probation. Secondly, students are placed on probation if they have a low cumulative GPA – which could be up to four semesters. The subcommittee is considering putting students on probation if they have a low GPA at the end of a term. However, they would like to review some data before making that recommendation.
- **Attendance Policy:** Faculty Senate Executive Committee accepted the Early Alert Program. Albrecht will check to see if the charge to the committee is now completed.
- **FSSE and NSSE Reports:**
  - Albrecht distributed a handout entitled "Executive Summary of the National Survey of Student Engagement 2005."
  - The Chancellor and Provost liked how the document was laid out.
  - Selected peers need to be added to the document.
  - The Teaching and Learning Center discussed the document. They were hoping that administration would make a recommendation to the campus.
  - The Student Services Steering Committee discussed the document. They felt quality and quantity of writing should be stated first. Some courses have a lot of lab hours. Synthesizing and analyzing should be included under #2. Acknowledge that freshman advisement has had a positive impact.
  - The subcommittee will review the document again.
  - The document should be discussed at Faculty Senate and the Senate of Academic Staff.
- **Mandatory Declaration of Major by the End of the Students Third Term:** Wu is waiting for the results of the Career Cluster Survey before writing the report.

### **F. Educational Support Unit Review – Senator Muza**

No report.

### **G. Planning & Review Committee – Senator Rabeneck**

From the March 31, 2006 PRC Meeting:

### Announcements

- Finder announced that there will be three Entitlement to Plan documents for the

committee to discuss. Two of them are from the College of Technology, Engineering and Management.

- Another PRC meeting has been scheduled for April 7 to review CTEM's Entitlement to Plan documents and finalize the outstanding consultant reports.

#### Dean's Response for M.S.Ed. and Ed.S. in School Psychology

MOTION: (Schofield/Gjevre) Move to accept the dean's exemplary response and forward the document to Faculty Senate. Motion carried.

#### Consultant Report for M.S. Food and Nutritional Sciences

MOTION: (Gjevre/Harris) Move to receive the draft consultant report for the M.S. in Food and Nutritional Sciences.

The following changes were recommended:

##### Abstract

- Include the number of students.
- "Our population" should be "U.S. population" in the second sentence.
- Spell out what CAADE stands for.

##### Previous Review

- Have a lead-in paragraph which includes when the previous review was completed and who the consultants were at that time.
- Indicate that each summation of the consultants is from 2005-06.
- Recommendation #1: Change the ending to read "...at least 75% devoted to teaching."
- Recommendation #2: The summation indicates that a lab mod proposal for 2006-07 received a priority rating of "5" with the highest priority being "1." Don't know the total number of proposals that were submitted.
- Recommendation #3: Did the dean complete this recommendation?
- Recommendation #5: Expand the summation for this recommendation.
- Recommendation #6: The summation needs to state that this continues to be an issue. This will also need to be listed as an issue of concern for this year.

##### Program Review: Program Strengths

- Change #7 to read as follows: "...achievement on the dietetic..."

##### Program Review: Issues of Concern

- Insert an issue that deals with the library holdings.
- Change the last sentence in #1 to read as follows: "...department can promote the IFT..."
- Change the last sentence in #4 to read as follows: "...20-year old color..."

##### Program Review: Recommendations

- Add a short lead-in to the paragraph for the program director and department

chair that is similar to the recommendations for the dean.

Thielman will highlight the revisions in the document and e-mail it to the committee. A final vote will be made at the April 7th meeting.

#### Consultant Report for B.S. Applied Mathematics and Computer Science

Revisions are being made that were suggested at the last meeting. A revised document should be ready for the April 7th meeting.

#### Consultant Report for B.S. Applied Science

Not available at this time.

#### Consultant Recommendation for Status Report on B.S. Early Childhood Education

- Schofield distributed a revised consultant recommendation for the status report for the B.S. in Early Childhood Education program.
- The committee findings need to be revised to indicate that the School of Education has received approval to offer early childhood/middle childhood licensure.

MOTION: (Harris/Rabeneck) Move to have Finder and Gjevre revise the committee findings and send to the Faculty Senate. Motion carried.

#### PRC Student Survey

The committee revised Question #14 on the student survey to make it consistent with the wording of the rest of the questions. The question was revised to read as follows: "My program has few or no problems with unnecessary repetition or overlap of content. (If you disagree or strongly disagree...)"

MOTION: (Schofield/Harris) Move to approve Question #14 of the student survey as amended. Motion carried.

#### Program Audit and Review Plan

The provost had a request to include a question which helps determine a program's utilization of technology/Learn@Stout in order to keep it current with accepted delivery methods. At the October 28th meeting, Schofield agreed to talk to Jane Henderson to discuss the proper wording of the Title III grant before the committee approved the revised Program Audit and Review Plan. At today's meeting Schofield reported that Henderson doesn't have a definition for technology. The committee agreed to approve the document as written. Finder will talk to the provost.

MOTION: (Schofield/Harris) Move to accept the revised document as submitted. Motion carried.

### Follow-up Alumni and Employer Surveys

The Budget, Planning and Analysis Office is revising the follow-up surveys for alumni and employers. Henderson would like to include questions related to e-scholar on those surveys. The committee agreed that not all programs would find that applicable. It was felt that it isn't necessary to have PRC representation on the committee that is revising those follow-up surveys.

### Health and Physical Education Component of General Education

In 2004-05, PRC reviewed the health and physical education component of general education. The dean still hasn't responded to that consultant report. The committee agreed to have Finder ask the dean to submit a report so the file can be closed. Ken Parejko and Jonna Gjevre should also receive a copy of the memo.

### B.S. Art Education

Sheri Klein submitted a request to have the review of the B.S. in Art Education delayed to 2007-08 because she has a sabbatical during the Spring 2007 semester. The committee objected to this request because: (a) delaying the review would cause an undue overload to the committee, (b) the surveys can be conducted this semester so she would have the summer to work on the report, (c) and the majority of the seniors are doing their student teaching in the fall semester. Finder will send a memo to Klein.

### CTEM's Entitlement to Plan Documents

Pete Heimdahl distributed the following Entitlement to Plan documents: B.S. Electrical/Computer Engineering and B.S. Polymer Engineering. Pete Heimdahl and Don Olson will come to the April 7th meeting and discuss both proposals. The committee is being given the documents now so they have time to review them prior to the meeting. Both documents will require additional funding. The CTEM Council will be meeting next week. If the proposals are not approved, then they will be removed from the PRC agenda for next Friday. Also, if the State doesn't approve funding for the documents, they will not be forwarded to the next level.

## **H. General Education Committee - Celene Fry**

Minutes from the meeting on February 17, 2006:

Course Approvals: Approved continued GE status to ART 100 Drawing I, ART 101 Fundamentals of Design, ENGL 247 Critical Writing, and TCS 103 Communication and Information Technology.

Learning Communities: Joan Thomas will attend our next meeting to talk about learning communities.

Ongoing discussion of GE Objectives, Definitions, and Criteria: Discussion ensued regarding GE objectives, definitions, and criteria. Although the committee felt the technology definition is outdated, they also felt that much work was put into development of categories, and only the most qualified should make recommendations for revision. It was also noted that some criteria were written as objectives; this should be reviewed for consistency and flexibility. Courses should also be re-evaluated to see how they meet the criteria.

Before the next meeting, members should review the criteria and prepare for discussion, keeping GE objectives in mind. Also, check the California Polytechnic University GE component (the Chancellor mentions it often): <http://ge.calpoly.edu/Advising/chart3.htm>

Parejko handed out a list of GE objectives, showing a tally of the 67 GE courses assessed in 2005 and how many claimed to address each of the objectives.

Parejko also handed out an alumni survey of educational outcomes, comparing UW-Stout with UW System. The survey revealed the least valued skills are GE skills, and the most valued skills are personal ethics, group work, and communication. This is a survey geared toward jobs and employment, not toward courses. UW-Stout results matched those of UW System.

Minutes from the meeting on March 10, 2006:

Learning Communities: Joan Thomas (Dean of Students Office) and Jean-Marie Dauplaise (English and Philosophy Department) spoke about a learning community pilot that has been taking place this school year. The students are first-year freshmen, all in the Art program, living in the same residence hall, and enrolled in the same sections in four of their 5-6 courses. Expected outcomes include beneficial relationships, student engagement, and improved retention. Feedback from the students has been mostly positive; two more groups are planned for fall '06, including one for education majors to see if the learning community results in improved PPST scores.

Discussion: GEC members' concern is "linked" GE courses. (Linked courses are those associated with the learning community.) Students in the same major have the same interests and outlook. The concern is that course content may be too narrowly focused on that major. GE allows broader learning outside of the major.

Dauplaise, a former student and now instructor, shared examples of assignments and student work. As a student, she made connections between courses and felt instructors should have capitalized more on the intersection and relatedness of material. She sees added value in GE courses that share cross-disciplinary connections and more student engagement.

GEC members suggested more diverse learning communities, perhaps several CTEM majors in a community, for example. Thomas requested proposals for other thematic communities that will avoid insulation and warping of GE. All agreed with the need to

maintain academic integrity.

General Education Definitions and Criteria: Parejko will ask department chairs to review and comment or edit. At the next meeting, members will decide whether or not to edit the definitions and criteria, based on department chair input.

Assessment: Members noted that courses are approved based on meeting definitions but assessed based on GE objectives. Assessment may be less intimidating if working with Definitions and criteria. The GE assessment website doesn't reference definitions at all; this needs to be addressed. It was noted that in some departments, the chairs require instructors to verify that courses met the GE definitions during the assessment process, but not all.

GE related to major: A few programs specifically do not allow courses related to the major to be used in the GE component; others do. The GE task force that wrote the 1989 GE Goals and Objectives report adhered to the NCA stipulation that GE remain general and not related to professional or vocational study. Aspen will copy and distribute this report.

GE Statement of Philosophy: Members agreed to focus on a draft brought to the April meeting and make recommendations before the end of the academic year.

Our next meeting has been changed from April 14 to April 7; at it we will discuss a year-end report of accomplishments and concerns.

**I. Human Resources Office – Wayne Argo**

No report.

**J. Chair Report - Chair Jones**

First of all, I would like to remind everyone to vote in the upcoming elections for Chair and Senators of our Senate of Academic Staff. It is exciting that for the first time our election will be held electronically. We are truly leaders on our campus (and throughout the state) in this regard. A special thank you goes out to Ilse Hartung, Dennis Shaw, Joy Evenson, and all others who worked very hard to make this happen.

Let me also take this opportunity to thank you for giving me the opportunity to serve as Chair of the Senate Academic Staff for four out of the last six years. It is truly a privilege to serve as a leader of such a dedicated and hardworking group as ours at UW-Stout.

On April 20, I will be in Madison for our academic staff reps meeting. I am anticipating that we will be discussing the Disciplinary Process for academic staff, the summer leadership conference, pay plans, and other opportunities and challenges. Let me know if there are any particular topics that the group should address.

The Leadership Conference this summer will be at UW-Claire on July 13 and 14. Since it is virtually in our backyard, we should have good representation (as we did last year at UW-River Falls). Once again, the Provost's Office has agreed to pay the registration for those wishing to attend. Please let me or your Senator know if you are interested in attending. After the 20th, I should have more details about the theme or topics that will be highlighted.

As the Strategic Planning Group is preparing for the summer retreat, we are seeking input for possible university priorities. If you have ideas to contribute, please let me or your representative know; remember that these priorities need to align with the FOCUS 2010 goals and should affect the university as a whole, not just your division or department. Your ideas are encouraged and welcomed.

## **K. Others - Ethnic Studies Curriculum Advisory Committee**

### ES-C Proposal

Motion (Kirby/Stanton) to approve Category C for TCS-103 Communication and Information Technologies

Len Bogner, instructor of the course, was unsure whether the course meets criteria for Category C because he found the definition vague. He admitted that he considered adding content. He explained that course instructors use technology as a teaching tool to reach minorities, bringing diversity into the classroom to meet course objectives.

Discussion followed. Members noted that content does not address American minority groups specifically or necessarily foster appreciation, and there is nothing to guarantee each instructor would teach the course in the manner described. Bogner agreed; he wasn't sure if his interpretation of the category was accurate and considered this a valuable exercise, reiterating how vague the C definition is. Members offered ideas for incorporating ethnic studies into the course.

Vote on the Motion: Motion failed; 2 abstentions.

### Ethnic Studies course syllabi review

Members shared reactions to syllabi review:

- courses haven't been updated in ages
- definitions need revision
- language courses don't necessarily incorporate American minority cultural groups
- the committee needs to review the impact of courses on students
- the syllabus may not reflect how the course is taught – it's hard to judge the value of a course based on a syllabus

Members felt, after this review, that there are several alternatives for the next steps:

- target weak courses and request revision and resubmission for ES inclusion
- offer exemplary examples of syllabi
- help instructors improve their syllabi with questions/suggestions

- consider asking students enrolled in courses for feedback
- compile questions for course evaluation
- emphasize the conceptual framework of understanding multicultural concepts that will affect change
- involve instructors in a professional development activity for improved ethnic studies courses. This hasn't been done in years, and courses have evolved.
- Work with the Diversity Education Committee to promote activities that further the goals of the Ethnic Studies requirement.

Short-term and long-term solutions were considered:

- address Category C courses: either update them or get them off the list
- conduct student evaluations in ethnic studies courses this semester (Karris offered to recruit an Applied Psychology student to do the survey; Duffenbach offered to distribute and collect questionnaires)
- recommend to the CIC by the end of this semester a 1- or 2-year process for review and revision of the ethnic studies requirement
- research current, effective approaches to discouraging racism and promoting appreciation of ethnic diversity

## **V. Old Business**

### **A. Leadership Conference**

The Academic Staff Leadership Conference will be held in Eau Claire this year on July 13 & 14. Provost will again support a large number of AS to attend. Thank you Julie!

### **B. Chancellor's Award**

Ilse Hartung will be the 2006-2007 recipient of the Chancellor's Academic Staff Award. Congrats Senator Hartung!

### **C. Election Update**

Senator Hartung updated the Senate on the progress in holding an electronic vote for new Senators and the Chair. Some items of note include:

- The process of getting everyone into the system was VERY labor intensive. Hopefully this was a one-time setup and it will be easier in the future.
- The committee kept things consistent with the procedures that they used with the paper process.
- We will be able to see bios online
- Concern for future – one person will need to be ballot master
- New Chair will not have instructor access for 3 months to maintain confidentiality of the vote
- Committee may want to survey afterwards

## **VI. New Business**

## **A. University Priorities**

This year there is a new "bottom up" procedure to solicit possible priorities. As mentioned in the joint meeting the Chancellor is soliciting input from groups including the Senate. He is looking for broad transformational initiatives. Anyone who has ideas should email them to Chair Jones. We will also provide time to discuss them at the Senate Exec Meeting at the end of April and everyone is welcome to come to that meeting.

## **B. Disciplinary Process**

**Motion:** Senator Witucki moved that the Senate of Academic Staff forward on the April 3, 2006 document titled "UW-Stout Academic Staff Personnel Committee Review and Revisions of the Board of Regents Proposed Dismissal for Cause Procedure" drafted by the Personnel Committee. Senator Muza seconded the motion.

**Discussion:** Senator Lugo discussed the information sent out by email. The Personnel Committee took some time to review and comment on the System proposal and on the markup of that document from UW-Whitewater.

**Vote:** Passed unanimously.

## **C. Polytechnic Resolution**

**Motion:** Senator Sveum moved and Senator Hartung seconded a motion that the Senate of Academic Staff adopts the following resolution:

### **Senate of Academic Staff Resolution Supporting the Polytechnic Branding of UW-Stout**

WHEREAS, the University of Wisconsin-Stout Senate of Academic Staff is pleased that the administration has put a planning process in place that solicits valuable public input on the idea of branding the campus as the "polytechnic" institution of the UW System; and

WHEREAS, it is very important to clearly differentiate this campus from the other UW System campuses when marketing UW-Stout to potential students and business partners; and

WHEREAS, the administration has assured us that there is no plan to change the official name of this institution even if we are approved for the special designation; and

WHEREAS, our program array does match up favorably with other national institutions calling themselves a "polytechnic" and, therefore, we would not need to significantly change the programs we offer; and

WHEREAS, we see little or no downside and great potential by achieving such a designation; now, therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Senate of Academic Staff at the University of Wisconsin-Stout looks forward to a positive recommendation in the consultant's report, supports the concept of designating UW-Stout as Wisconsin's "Polytechnic" University and, assuming the campus will indeed recommend the special designation, pledges to work closely with the administration on implementation strategies.

**Discussion:** Faculty Senate Vice Chair Forrest Schultz was present and answered many questions from Senators. The Senate of Academic Staff thanked the Faculty Senate for putting on two forums so the polytechnic committee could provide a report and answer questions from the community. It was also noted that the term "Comprehensive Polytechnic University" which was mentioned at the forums seemed to have broad support.

**Vote:** Passed unanimously.

#### **D. Other**

A reminder that Margaret Lewis from UW System will be here on May 9. She will address the joint senate meeting then our Senate will give her time to speak in our May 9 meeting. Chair Jones would like to get some questions from Senators so she can pass them on to Ms. Lewis so she can prepare.

### **VII. Adjournment**

The Senate was adjourned at 4:03pm. Next meeting will be held on May 9, 2006.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Dennis Shaw, Recording Secretary.