

Faculty Association
Spring Faculty Association General Meeting
Wednesday, April 23, 2014
Ostrander
3 pm
Approved Notes

1. Approval of notes from the Spring General Meeting **Hustoles/Hadley Motion to approve. Passed.** Attendance fluctuated with 67 in attendance at the high mark. Speakers identified as possible.
2. Faculty Association President's Report (Grabowska): I entertain any questions moving forward. Marg: Please describe the process of *Bill of Particulars to Vote of No Confidence* process. Grabowska: There is not a formal process. We historically had a vote here locally involving former President Preska. However, there is no process for the Chancellor. As outlined in the email you all received, the contract is not this issue but the precipitating event was when the mediator called off the last negotiating session. That was one of a series of things that happened. Concern of the union is with the Chancellor in general. What can we do as a union to move this Chancellor so he understands the practice of shared governance? The decision was made to do a Bill of Particulars. Actions taken and not taken by the Chancellor over the last few years are at issue. IFO Board meeting composed an initial document that is being shared with the campuses. Broad based conversation would happen with all the members, the hope is we do not have to go as far as *Vote of No Confidence*. The message would have been sent that this union and the issues are serious, hoping he will modify his actions so we can have a positive relationship with the system office. We are not talking about a *Vote of No Confidence* now. It depends on the regular members, seven state universities, not going to be a rush. The *Bill of Particulars* is very specific on the part of the IFO board, move to a change, and effect change in this Chancellor. Not to complain but to move us to action, which is what we want to happen? Robbins: Call from alum, union rep, is there coordinated, parallel discussions with other bargaining units? Grabowska: Does not know of anything like that. MSCF there was no communication, MSUSA, the student group that they have talked about the regional groups, concerns about CTF. Haven't been about the outcomes, but about the process. Larsson: Echo what Rick Robbins was just asking, occurred to me with this new Chancellor. The 2 years programs have a lot more clout, they have been less than pleased with the length of negotiations. In looking at the *Bill of Particulars*, what is the goal? Move the negotiations, increased presence in CTF, on paper, there was movement there we did not see there. Laundry list seemed more to the other campus interests. Needs to differentiate. Do we need to focus on shared governance, contract negotiations? Grabowska: 10 are of more interest to some specific campuses. We started the list on Friday. Russ Stanton has done more reflection, writing his thoughts. Some campus did distribute his reflection piece. More refinement is needed. Outcomes? Is this to get a contract? The answer is NO. The contract is the straw, they spent 2 years in getting the last contract, and we thought there would be interest to put his contract to bed in this session. Was not a matter of funding. Chancellor does not have the money. Budgetary tails are just numbers used to move the discussion ahead. Starting point for conversation. Nonmoney issue was being used to hold up negotiation. The Board would begin this process. To change behavior, not to

get a contract. We will get a contract. Brauer: The point about the list in the *Bill of Particulars* -- it must be accurate and iron-clad with evidence, we cannot risk our credibility. Russ is astute; he will know what is problematic. Reiterate the negotiations are the straw, but there have been many problems, missteps, related to consultation with the system office. One example. The transfer report out of his office to the legislature, sent without anyone seeing it. It has at least two errors. It's cherry picked. It neglects issues, to the benefit to the 2-year-institutions to the detriment of the state universities. There are other things...myself and the other two reps to the policy council, legislation maneuver to stop something from being rammed through policy council. The people who are advising him are less than competent. He is not being well served by them. The Meet & Confer will be very contentious. Severns: In meetings, I have described part of the problem is the Chancellor's management style, negotiations are just one example. The difference between what the Chancellor says versus what he does. In front of the Delegate Assembly he said we will have a contract in a week, but didn't happen. What is said at one level and what gets done at different level is a problem. Let him know that they have to follow through. Plan what you are going to do on a consultative basis. Needs to understand, we are watching, if he wants help at the legislature. Grabowska: The two of them, Pelowski and Chancellor thought the contract would be settled by now. Some disagreements broke loose in the legislature, Pelowski could not deliver. The Chancellor invited the IFO membership to be at the table moving forward to help define and inform all the initiatives, all the issues that ill coming up on the table. Not complaints, but an invitation. Give us input on the budget proposal. That is my invitation to everyone here, that we do provide suggestions, ideas, action steps, moving forward. Rep Pelowski did not just want ideas, wanted language, invitation to help write the languages of the legislation. We really want to accept, really want to engage, and then we can really our abilities to serve our students. We saw immediately action out of the office; he drafted a communication to the legislation for the contract settled, recognized sacrifices, urging movement within the legislature. Do not know if it is real. He has been taking notes. I was called Friday afternoon from a Vice Chancellor. What does this mean, what is the turnaround? They were paying attention. We have to start moving toward our goal. Carson: been on the board 5 years, we had informal conversations, good impression; one of his first steps was about work needs of the state for people who employ the 2 year graduates. We do more than workforce training. He said he understood. He keeps saying he knows what we do. He does not. Doesn't understand our needs, our graduate programs, does not understand research needs. Last year Davenport had to restrict something because Chancellor does not support graduate education. CTF, 6 committees, we have one on each, each has 18 members. Two teachers and he calls it consultative. Another example. The MnSCU budget has to be separate from the individual campuses. Davenport recently announced will be giving half time administrator support for 2 years, for CTF. Chancellor is picking labor. It is not the money, it is the labor. He pulls this kind of stuff. How many times do we have to remind him about graduate education? We do not have a lot of leverage. Brauer: The issue about graduate ed/research very difficult. The Chancellor going to the legislature and trying to advocate for research is problematic because it's widely seen as the purview of the U of MN. He thinks it would be dangerous to lobby legislators about this. As far as Mankato, Davenport had to rescind a strategic plan re: graduate education, all the Presidents have to present their mission statement and have them be reapproved. Mankato and several others, it was their turn. When he said that one of the missions was the doctoral piece the board of trustees went ballistic, that is not what the legislature authorized -- to offering some

doctoral programs. That was the board of trustees. Have to be accurate. Knoblich: What happens after a *Vote of No Confidence*? Grabowska: if it obtained, it would be delivered to the Board of Trustees. What would take place? Obviously, it provides a black eye, has an impact but it is also a reflection on us. When legislators are talking about the Chancellor, they are also talking about us. There is an underlying concern to be careful; we do not want this to be an indictment of the statement of the universities. I don't know what would happen. Could ask for a resignation. Larsson: Connie Howard wrote a legal white paper-- long story short, it's PR, it can rebound on you, can be smeared on you. Universities are seen as overpaid underworked, liberal professors-- I do not look for support from the public. Gilbert: The warning provided should be focused on process not product, steer clear, avoid any criticism --Stay focused on process and style.

Email this afternoon re: Coach from Davenport. Continuing saga. The *Star Tribune* took us to task on Saturday op ed, 2 column of concern about the two most highly paid MnSCU employees—the Chancellor & Davenport – in light of the Hoffner debacle. Patti Hoffman: House divided cannot stand. What the union is doing to think about calling attention to the concerns of higher education, which is in peril from the for-profits, we need to focus on why it is so important for us to collaborate for the success of the students. Grabowska: A number of colleagues suggested that at the emergency meeting—we need to have the language focus on changing behaviors to what we want to see. Articulating the changes we would like to see, what would help us to work together. Talk about procedures, processes, how can we can work with that to achieve our objectives to best serve students. Grabowska apologized for having to leave at four to teach. Before he goes, what are we doing here moving forward? Grabowska takes office July 1. He will start transitioning in June. How does this campus move forward? He will resign next week during EXEC meeting. At that point, Visser will become the President, will carry forward. Greg, VP, 2 years.

Brauer: I view the President's email about Coach Hoffner and the remarks of the Chancellor to be disingenuous, we can't talk about it, but the press can; it made *Time* magazine this week. Mr. Hoffner was railroaded. Arbitration findings were discussed in the press, but we can't discuss. The processes were bogus as the *Time* and the *NYT* said. I have no faith in those statements. Truesdale: Hoffner mentioned Visser specifically in an article in the *Free Press*. Holmes: I read the *Times*. There is a lot of suspicion about the process. Anderson: Where is the money coming from for the lawsuits? How many faculty positions would that cover? If there was a civil suit, that is many faculty positions. Brauer: IFO has to stay on our toes, keeps advocating with our legislators. It has cost MNSCU a lot to pursue this. The system has 450 million in reserves they can tap for anything they want. King gets nervous that that money would have to be used in a civil suit. Keating: *Bill of Particulars*. What I recommend is that we communicate how much MnSCU has undermined the students. They do care about students and the quality of the education. I love the state university system, and they have undermined our mission. How do we get the data? The problems with transfer? A number of our disciplines. Focus on the damage MNSCU has done to the students. Larsson: Appreciation for JIM! Our campus does it better than any of the others.

3. Faculty Association Vice President's Report (Visser). I have learned a lot, I have my seatbelt on. You need to participate. We have some very interesting opportunities. There is a lot going on, ask your help through your participation. I look at lot of campuses and we're in better shape. It is not

perfect, want to work to move us forward. Not Jim, I will do it on our way. Grievances-- some have gone away; discipline was trying to be imposed inappropriately. We filed another grievance for hiring irregularities. Two have gone up to the system level. Inappropriate discipline; at the system office. No procedures for cell phone use. Larsson: The MnSCU general counsel has been there for a while, but that has been part of the problem. They are not on the local campus. Disadvantage of the system. Visser: Working with the provost on grievances. She likes to settle them quickly. It has been my sense with the grievances that she is willing to be reasonable. Appreciate that. Likes to move things forward. Connie Howard has been a saint, very gratifying to see. Am sad to see the name of the university dragged through the mud, so much good stuff going on in our colleges and the university.

4. Negotiations Update (Brauer) as we speak, supposed to have it on this weekend. Usually by this time of the week, we should have materials from the MnSCU team. Because we're in mediation, the mediator is in charge. He cancelled the last one. It is all about money and he knew without parameters to offer money, not point in meeting, did not want to waste his time. He is still thinking this over. Last offer was 1.4 and 1.4 per annum. If negotiations are going to be cancelled, we are also scheduled to meet the following weekend. We do not know. I cannot report any progress. Until the whole tails business in the legislature is resolved, I have no faith that the Chancellor will give permission to proceed to offer some more. Carson: THE contract should have started LAST YEAR. The contract we have expired LAST JUNE. We are half way through. Usually May is when we start negotiating. Should be opening for the contract for the years 15-17. Holmes: MSCF hasn't settled. ASF has not. AFSME and MAPE are negotiated by MMB. They are whining that MMB got so much money for the other union members. Larsson: Alluded to language issues: Do you get the sense of any tradeoffs? Language vs. money? Brauer: There are certain things they would like...tenure for administrators. They do not have the money to buy tenure for them. It comes down to money. Absurd. It is costing everyone money. Keating: Any language issues we could hope for or bemoan? Brauer: Tentatively settled some language things having to do with parental leave. Knoblich: What happened to the commitment to settle at Delegate Assembly? Brauer: What happened was that this tails business. The 17 million to help faculty improve. They said we cannot use it, it is one time. Legislature gives us 14 million. Pelowski said yes, here is the bill, into the NEXT biennium 30 million added to the starting talking points. When the chairs of both committees in the house /senate, speaker, the senate has been trying to put some brakes on the spending of the house. Tax moneys going back to the citizens. They did not put anything in the tails. The Chancellor, relying on King, does not understand the tails. The dollar number has to be in the tails, they went home for Easter. Brauer will be staying on the negotiation team. Applause for Brauer.

5. Questions/Discussions

Anderson: Adjuncts are we trying to get any language? Visser: Grievance possibly in the next two years, overuse of fixed term in certain departments. Will continue to work as we can. We are the worst. Knoblich: Thanks we appreciate the support on that issue. Brauer: State office worked so hard for Coach Hoffner, Fair Share members should understand they would do that for them too. It is not that much more money.

Many of you are aware of the FA donation to the scholarship fund from the FA to honor Jim's Mom. If you would like to help contact Donna

6. Information

a. Russ Stanton

1. Tuesday, September 2, 2014

8:00-9:00 –Faculty Nearing Retirement Workshop - CSU 204

9:00-10:00 Newly tenured Faculty Workshop - CSU 204

10:00 – 12:00 – ½ hour Individual Appointments – FACR - MH 240C

12:30-1:00 LUNCH

1:00-5:00—1/2 Hour Individual Appointments - FACR - MH 240C

2. Wednesday, September 3, 2014

8:30-12:00 ½ Hour Individual Appointments - FACR - MH 240C

12:30-1:00 –LUNCH

1:00-2:00—Faculty Nearing Retirement Workshop - CSU 240C

2:00-5:00 – ½ hour individual appointments – FACR - MH 240C

3. Thursday, September 4, 2014

8:30-12—1/2 Hour Individual Appointments - FACR – MH 240C

12:30 -1 LUNCH

1:00 to 5:00—1/2 hour Individual Appointments – FACR - MH 240C

Respectfully submitted,

Kellian Clink