

FA EXECUTIVE MEETING
Wednesday, January 6 , 2016
Heritage Room – CSU
9:00 – Noon
Approved Minutes

In attendance: Mary Visser (FA President), Barb Carson, Diane Coursol, Dan Cronn-Mills, Anne Dahlmann, Steven Gilbert, Patricia Hoffman, Avra Johnson, Kelly Krumwiede, Dick Liebendorfer, John Lindberg, Javier-Jose Lopez, Kari Much, Gregg Marg, Shannon Miller, Patricia Nelson, Roland Nord, Luis Posas, Joseph Reising, Roger Severns, Daniel Swart, John Thoenke, Teri Wallace, Gwen Westerman.

Meeting called to order at 9:12 AM

1. Call for Additional Items/ Reordering of Agenda

2. CONSENT AGENDA

- a. Minutes of previous meeting (Unapproved Minutes –November 12, 2015 (attached) & December 10, 2015)
- b. Business Planning (1 Year Term) - M. Anaam Hashmi
- c. Business UCAP – Spring 2016 – Ann Kuzma
- d. Library/Unaffiliated FA Budget replacement for Spring 2016 Only – Lisa Bauers
- e. Notice of Vacancy Committee (1 Needed) Penny Knoblich
- f. Search Committee – Assistant VP for Undergraduate Education – Andi Lassiter

Swart/Liebendorfer: Motion to Approve: Passed

3. SELECTION OF APPOINTMENTS NEEDED FROM EXECUTIVE

- a. Search Committee – Assistant VP for Undergraduate Education (1 More Needed) –

Liebendorfer/Carson: Motion to Appoint Dan Cronn-Mills: Passed

4. REPRESENTATION STILL NEEDED & INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

- a. State IFO Action – Spring Semester 2016 (1 Needed)
- b. Delegate Assembly – Friday, April 1 and Saturday, April 2, 2016 (44)
- c. Representation Still Needed For Spring 2016
 1. BUSINESS
URC (3 Year Term)
 2. SBS
UCAP (Spring 2016 Only Replacement for Abdalla Battah)

NO ORAL OR WRITTEN REPORTS FOR JANUARY 6, 2016 MEETING

5. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS

- a. FA More Relevant to Adjunct/Contingent Faculty

(Visser): We decided to suggest to State IFO that we have one contingent faculty on the board. We are going to be trying to figure out ways to include contingent faculty more. A survey went out in November asking about services people would like to see. This move comes at a unique time for our organization; the Supreme Court will be voting on the legality of fair share unions. The IFO has been planning forward

for how to deal with this contingency. This is not pandering, but helping to offer services to faculty who also pay dues.

(Question): Would it be worth it to get a list of Contingent Faculty ready for the spring? (Visser): Yes, and we can get that list to everyone so that we can reach out on informal bases.

b. Writing Across the Curriculum Recommendations – Visser (Document Attached)

(Visser): This discussion was brought up at the Dec 10th meeting. It has been somewhat controversial. I didn't want you to act until you had had a chance to review. There is a question as to whether this should go through as a package or individually.

(Question): Having responsibility shared between Gen. Ed. and UCAP seems a duplication of effort. Writing policies are proposed to Gen. Ed. and then go to UCAP for approval. It seems like UCAP could do both.

(Question): The current workflow is if it is a new course it goes to Gen. Ed., otherwise it goes to UCAP for approval.

(Question): That isn't clarified in the proposal. The proposal doesn't differentiate between new and revised courses.

(Question): There is also a difference between course approval and policy issues. Policy needs to come in front of everyone.

(Question): The first proposal is the name change. Does this mean that writing folds into the Gen. Ed.?

(Liebendorfer): I don't think that it gets folded into the Gen. Ed. They don't make decisions, they only give suggestions.

(Question): It seems to me that we need to be clearer on workflow, but I'm not sure that our discussions are in the proposal. The proposal is more vague than what we are speaking of. I suggest that we send it back to the writers for clarification.

(Lindberg): Since UCAP duties include policies, UCAP would be the last stop before it moves on to Academic Affairs. The challenge of the workflow is having Gen. Ed. review Gen. Ed. policies before UCAP does its final review and approval. This doesn't go into details, it was more of a draft.

(Question): This description helps, but we need to get this beyond the draft stage.

(Question): I thought it looked pretty good; the rest of it looks pretty clear.

(Question): Have there been any issues other than the writing proposal? (Lindberg): We've had questions about the diverse culture proposals and honors. UCAP wants to make sure that there are no conflicts, and that the appropriate vocabulary is used in proposals. UCAP wants to be the last umbrella group to look at a proposal before it goes to academic affairs.

(Question): The last director has reassign time, so they answer to Administration. It was confusing who the director actually answered to.

(Question): Workload at UCAP is pretty heavy. How is this going to exacerbate the problem? (Lindberg): I don't know how many proposals go through at any time.

(Visser): It looks like most of the controversy deals with recommendation 4.

Carson/Cronn-Mills: Motion to agree with recommendation 1: Passed

Cronn-Mills/ Liebendorfer: Motion to agree with recommendation 2: Passed

Swart/Thoemke: Motion to agree with recommendation 3: Passed

Dahlman/Thoemke: Motion to recommend that 4 be further spelled out, or a flow chart developed: Passed

Severns/Thoemke: Motion to recommend that position of Writing Director be permanently ensconced: Passed

c. Academic Partnership

(Visser): There has been a lot of movement on this item. Hearing about it in December was a shock. It seems to me that opinions have been solidifying and the Provost is on board with moving ahead as well as the Dean of Nursing. I would like to invite a group from nursing to talk about it. There will be two open forums. Hustoles had an intensive briefing. His general thoughts suggest it is a good idea to start to investigate this model. I asked the Provost whether there could be additional forums. I don't want this to be a bum's-rush to make a decision. (Krumwiede): It seems that this is moving forward without Nursing's input. When we talked about it, we were concerned about moving too fast. A group that worked with Academic Partners had to drop out because they couldn't bring in enough teaching assistants. As faculty, we would only oversee the assistants, we wouldn't be teaching. It sounded like Academic Partners did the hiring, but we could set the standards.

(Question): Besides the quality of your program, if you are only overseeing your coaches, are faculty going to be eliminated?

(Question): Could we get a list of the questions that the Nursing department is asking?

(Question): If their coaches are doing the actual teaching, our accreditation is still in effect. Does the coach of the faculty assign grades? At the state level, the Administration was trying to get 4-year faculty to develop master classes and then have 2-year faculty teach them at the Community Colleges. I would want us to talk to the state IFO about this.

(Question): I would not want to operate out of fear or haste; I believe that our students are hired because the employers know what they are getting. I urge us not to just jump on the bandwagon. If it sounds too good to be true, it probably is. Also, *ad infinitum* claims to our tuition might not even be legal.

(Question): I think our Assessment Director needs to be involved.

(Question): We can't get a straight answer from the Admin on our budget; we don't know if cuts are coming down yet. Why not just give these programs the money to grow directly. (Visser): The argument is that they would be far too slow about it.

(Question): I would recommend that it would be sent to several faculty Sub Meets. This is not just a one-Department or College issue. (Visser): This seems like a good way to review this.

(Question): I think an issue is who actually does the evaluation of the student and who gives the grade. There is no wording for coaches in the IFO contract. Regardless of who writes the curriculum, if coaches are giving grades, they need to be at least adjunct faculty.

(Question): This speaks to the need for us to understand what is going on in higher education. We shouldn't panic and sell ourselves out to private company. We need to talk more than just academics, but a holistic experience.

(Question): If we have to be supervising these people, how are we being compensated? It might look like cost savings, but only out of hide.

(Question): I would be interested in knowing "what is the goal"? What are we trying to achieve? Why would we not invest in our own mechanisms? It might not just be the faculty that are slow to move, it may be the whole system that is slow to move. If we know what the goal is, we should be given the opportunity to try it ourselves. I hesitate to send it out to the Sub Meets, as there needs to be a coordinated response team. We have way too many questions.

(Visser): The Provosts assessment of our meeting was that we appeared to be on board with it. Hustoles explained to them that we were just too stunned to respond.

(Question): I think we actually need the proposal before we can review it.

(Question): This sounds like outsourcing, and that has huge implications. We all know that a common sales technique is to tell the mark that you better move now, or you may be out in the cold.

(Visser): What questions can we ask tomorrow so that we can dispel that we are "on board".

Summary of proposal

Outsourcing comment

Privatization comment
Careful consideration and review comment
Goal comment
Stunned comment

d. Summer School Assignments and Chairs Summer Duty Days – IFO CONTRACT Article 20, Section C, Subdivision 1(Marg)

(Marg): Please talk to your Chairs about chair extra duty days. You don't need to teach, but if you do, you need to do it on days you're not paid for extra duty days. We've never challenged this. The days are supposed to be agreed upon by the Chair, the Presidents designee, and the Union. We've never stuck our nose into it.

(Visser): We also have problems with summer school assignments. This is addressed in the contract. There needs to be a reasonable means to decide who gets to teach.

e. Integrated Academic Master Plan (Nelson)

(Nelson): In the integrated Academic Master Plan, the Provost has come up with shared principles and areas of distinction. The Planning Committee has tried to define these areas, etc. All of these plans are coming together. We started to identify areas of distinction that we see. We defined a list of 6. We did this because we want to tell the President what we think should be the major strategic directives for next year. We will be putting out a survey about the shared principles. The areas of distinction will go a different route, starting with the department chairs. We don't know what the areas of distinction actually are. We want to get the chairs involved; we don't want to leave it up with the Deans. In Planning, we are wading through a lot of stuff. We are hoping that we can come back with some definite list of what we believe we will be focusing on in the next year.

(Question): Where do Program Directors fit into this? (Nelson): They don't really; we would hope that the Chairs would discuss this with their Program Directors.

f. Search Committee for Faculty Association Administrative Assistant

(Visser): Donna will be retiring in April (Correction: I have not decided as to my retirement date, but I am leaning to one of these two - end of May or the first of July) We need to put together a search committee and a yearly calendar for things that need to be done. I have been approached by University employees and they don't realize that they would need to quit their university positions to get this job. I am asking for volunteers for the committee:

Severns, Carson have volunteered.

(Question): This is a ½ time position. How would the Supreme Court issue effect this. Visser: The position is 2/3rds, but we can change nothing and still remain solvent for the next year.

(Question): Is there any further insight on the Supreme Court decision? (Visser): My sense is about 50/50.

6. MEET & CONFER

- a. **FAAD Meet & Confer – Thursday, January 7, 2016 @ 3:00 p.m. in AH 123 (FA Chair AD Agenda)**

8. ORAL AND WRITTEN REPORTS SCHEDULE

- a. **Next FA Executive Meeting – Thursday, January 21, 2016**
- b. **Oral Reports Thursday, January 21, 2016:**
 - a. **Assessment & Evaluation – Carrie Chapman**
 - b. **Budget – Roland Nord**

- c. Extended Education – Paul Wyss
- * d. Planning – Every Meeting - Pat Nelson - Integrated Academic Master Plan
- e. Research – Teri Wallace
- * f. Unit Representative – (Every Meeting)
- g. IFO Academic Affairs – Patricia Hoffman
- h. IFO Budget Oversight – Avra Johnson
- i. IFO Feminist Issues – Leah White
- c. Written Reports Thursday, January 21, 2016
 - a. Faculty Development – Lynn Weber
 - b. Faculty Improvement & Sabbatical – Kari Much –
 - c. General Education & Diversity – Dick Liebendorfer/Anne Dahlman
 - d. Graduate Curriculum & Academic Policy – Barb Bergman/Tim Secott
 - e. UCAP – John Lindberg
 - f. IFO Action –
 - g. IFO GLBTA – Shannon Miller
 - h. IFO GRC – Marty Mitchell/Fred Slocum
 - i. IFO Multi-Culture – Jose Lopez
 - j. IFO Negotiations – Dan Cronn-Mills
 - k. IFO Salary Equity – Dan Cronn-Mills

9. OFFICER'S REPORTS

a. Vice President/Grievance Officer (Gregg Marg)

We filed an initial grievance on a disciplinary issue. We now have an Arbitrator assigned.

b. Treasurers Report (Bobby Bothmann)

c. President's Report (Mary Visser)

Contract Salary Review

Dec 11th was the first meeting. They will be bringing a schedule of when these reviews will take place. The Hoffner case set us back, but it was a huge win for us.

Hockey Tickets 17 Available (Left 3)

One ticket left.

Meeting Adjourned at 11:15 AM

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel J. Swart
FA Secretary