

Executive Committee Meeting
Thursday, January 7, 2010
CSU 238
Approved Minutes

In Attendance: Don Larsson, Jim Grabowska, Barbara Carson (recorder), Mary Visser, Roger Severns, Christopher Corley, Craig Matarrese (for Dick Liebendorfer), Andy Johnson, Becky Schwartzkopf, Dan Toma, Jeff Bumgarner, Jackie Lewis, Mary Bliesmer, Roland Nord, Marlene Tappe, Candace Black, Lynn Engeswick, Steve Gilbert, Mark McCullough, Ron Nickerson, Donna Blom.

President Larson called the meeting to order at 8:16 a.m.

1. Minutes of November 19, 2009 – Nickerson/Bliesmer moved to approve. Motion Passed.

2. Grabowska/Severns moved to have Barbara Carson replace Paul Hustoles as FA secretary for Spring Semester. Motion passed.

3. Officers' Reports

a. President – Larsson: Jim and I met with the Provost and Sandman over break to discuss the Metrics. We will discuss this later.

i. IFOSA Negotiations Update - Contract negotiations with IFO staff is proceeding. I will lead the negotiations for management. Thus far there has been exchange of proposals.

ii. IFO Presidential Elections - State presidential election is in April. Rod Henry has announced he will not run for a second term. I have been approached and said I will not oppose being nominated. The official nominations take place in February. According to our Constitution, if I am elected as IFO president, then the Executive Committee would conduct an election at the next scheduled time and in the time, would appoint an interim. This happens to coincide with the end of Grabowska's term as vice president.

b. Vice President/Grievance officer – Grabowska: We filed a grievance yesterday that will not be resolved on campus, it involves a credit multiplier for graduate courses and for ITV. I have spent considerable time dealing with P & T issues. Numerous faculty are concerned about their applications. Some departments are seeing tenure and promotion documents as a final product. As such, faculty are not receiving feedback nor allowed to make adjustments to document. I recommended we add a section to the P & T workshops that addresses the department's role in these evaluations. It is the IFO's position that with the 5th year application, the process, mentorship and learning continue. Faculty should expect input about how to improve their document rather than having it treated as a final product. Departments need to provide guidance but they cannot identify specific standards for Promotion or Tenure, such as a number of published articles. I encouraged all to inform other departments this can't be done. There are many paths to take for promotion, and departments can't limit this.

Johnson: Strict criteria can't be used by Dean but Department can use criteria, can't they?

Grabowska: Criteria such as requiring two refereed articles is in violation of the contract. That is closure of the contract and it is contractually prohibited

Johnson: We see the criteria as giving faculty a bench mark for where to shoot. Having it too nebulous doesn't help faculty.

Larsson: You can give guidelines without designating a typical number. You can specify a range of activities without setting particular benchmarks.

Johnson: I saw this saying that a dean cannot having this type of closure but I didn't see the department has having that much weight.

Grabowska: I disagree. If it happened to me I

would grieve it immediately. Johnson: Another question: “do overs.” I would evaluate a document differently if I knew the faculty member was going to make changes compared to if it was a final product. Grabowska: The process should be established over the probationary years. Feedback is given consistently to promote P & T. The final document is not final if the faculty member hasn’t been mentored on how to create it. Feedback should continue. It could be suggested that the faculty member might want to add something or that something is missing. During the month when the department reviews the document there is to be feedback. The idea is that we want people to achieve promotion and tenure and so we should help them create a successful application. It should be clear over the course of 5 years whether candidate has been successful or not. Severns: In past faculty members could modify their documents throughout evaluation process. For example, if they received noticed that an article is going to be published this could be added. Larsson: This goes as an addendum to the document. The faculty member being reviewed can respond to recommendations of any evaluation in writing and can add documents to the addendum. This continues all the way through the vice-president’s review. Johnson: So if it is within the department, changes can made at any time? Grabowska: If it is within the time the department has the document, then yes. Larsson: This also depends on the issue. For example, the department can inform the faculty member that a section was skipped. Departments can only speak to the evidence. “Speak to the file”, as oppose to deciding promotion or tenure. But if there was nothing to support, then there is nothing to say. Grabowska: Another case we saw over break was where an individual in a department didn’t like an applicant’s document. This person complained that the faculty member hadn’t included all student evaluations for all courses and they were not originals. That’s not allowed and promotes a hostile environment. Creating an adversarial position at the end of the evaluation process is unproductive. Not that everyone who applies for promotion or tenure will receive it but we want to ensure that the process begins when they arrived on campus, not when they turn in their final document. Nickerson: If the process works right, there should be a high percentage who will get promoted. If a faculty member is not going to make it he/she shouldn’t be applying. We should expect a high percentage will make it. Grabowska: Indeed. Johnson: But what about someone who has not gone up for promotion for 10 years? Nickerson: they still need to do annual reports and should get annual feedback. Grabowska: We should encourage faculty to invite peers to observe their classes, to use and react to student evaluations. They are still held to productivity standards. Nickerson: And there is still department input regarding pdp and pdr’s. The process should still nurture to promote associate to full. Doesn’t always work but framework is there. McCullough: We can’t specify any standards for tenure? Grabowska: Standards are different for promotion and tenure. Tenure requires professional competence and promotion requires a higher standard. We once had a person who received separate letters and the recommendation against tenure was based on a higher standard than for promotion. Not acceptable. Larsson: Some faculty request to go up early for tenure. Provost Olson is not supportive of early tenure, but will look at them under extraordinary circumstances. But, he is quite willing to look at requests for early promotion if someone has established early track record. Grabowska: One modification and that is usually after 3 years for promotion. Provost sees this as important. Black: There appear to be problems in departments’ interpretations of the contract and they need to be reminded. Grabowska: They need to be educated. There are certain mindsets and attitudes that need to be informed. We need to reach out and talk about the process and place it in a context. Perhaps adding a component to P & T workshop would help. At these workshops people promoted earlier present their documents and then deans give their views. A component missing is the role of the department and how departments can help faculty grow and become member of the community. I recently talked with Leslie Petersen about this. Larsson: Our schedule for promotion and tenure are ahead of the deadlines in the contract. This is a hold-over from the quarter system. We have agreed on local timelines that are earlier but, if someone was revising material late, contractual deadlines would apply. Issues of departmental handling of P & T arise several times a year and typically from different departments. Severns: A comment, we promoted a change in department

cultures from recommending everyone to a closer review of all. As such, Dr. Olson takes department recommendations more seriously than a couple of years ago. Department recommendations are important. Department recommendations must be based on the criteria. Grabowska: And remember, no votes are allowed to substitute for recommendations, secret or otherwise. Departments' assessments on P & T are only recommendations. And individual faculty sign whether they agree with the department's recommendation or not. And, the applicant can not be excluded. They can vote on their own P & T. Nickerson: Applicants sign department recommendations? Grabowska: Absolutely. Schwartzkopf: We have a faculty development committee. Why are you talking to Leslie Peterson, she isn't faculty. Grabowska: Leslie was organizing the agenda for the meeting. Corley: Doesn't the signature or lack of it, amount to a vote anyway? Larsson: But you are voting on the recommendation. The gold standard is if there is a recommendation against promotion and tenure or renewal, the reasons should be stipulated in terms of the criteria. This protects the department. The only secret ballot is vote for department chair. Nickerson: Another difference between vote and P & T is that a faculty member who receives minority support from the department can still proceed in process. Bumgarner: Given our inability to specify benchmarks in department, what does a negative recommendation look like? I have never seen one. Grabowska: You can't specify a number of articles that needed to be published but you can say there wasn't any active scholarship. They did not pursue the agenda that contributes to the criteria. Or in terms of teaching, "they don't demonstrate effective performance in the classroom based on student evaluations or peer reviews". This is a good question. A good negative document articulates specifically where an individual doesn't meet the standard for promotion. "They don't meet professional competence in this area based on lack of effective performance in the classroom" or "failed to provide sufficient evidence in this category". Larsson: Then the applicant can give a response. Bumgarner: 3 presentations, no publications...everyone agrees it doesn't meet what we are shooting for. Is it just you know it when you see it? Larsson: Each case will be unique, each department is different. You might say, our department members typically do this annually and it may be stated that a person has not risen to this level. Grabowska: Given your example, 3 conferences in 5 years, does that meet the standard for professional competence in the department? Probably not. Also, the faculty member might be successful in the last year but demonstrate a continued level of professional competence.

(Steve Bohnenblust enters the room)

Larsson: We have a guest. Welcome back! We will skip to item 8C, issues Steve wants us to consider.

8c. Steve Bohnenblust – Advisory Committee. Bohnenblust: We have had issues in CESR regarding authorship of papers: who gets to be on the paper, the order of authorship, etc. CESR is a support service but several people have asked if we could be listed as author on their journal authors. What action should I take? This is an unresolved issue. Also, in students' works, who should be the first author? Perhaps the FA could establish a group or special task force or one of the submeets to look at these issues, make a recommendation to the Executive Committee and go from there.

Larsson: In work with other authors, their own disciplinary groups may have guidelines. How does that affect your issue? Bohnenblust: That's why it would be good to have a group from different disciplines. Larsson: Why are people asking for CESR staff to cosign? Black: Are you doing significant parts of writing? Bohnenblust: Not on writing but on research design, product development, data analysis. Involvement varies. Some are simple, but we also helped tweaked a formula. Level varies. As a support service for faculty, should there be circumstances where the director of CESR would be on a publication? Tappe: When we talked before, it wasn't so much about CESR but faculty have come with an issue on this topic; is that correct? Bohnenblust: Yes, that's correct. Larsson: This is an issue of intellectual property. The more substantial the resources, the less

likely the faculty member can claim ownership which must be considered as well. Lewis: Each discipline has these policies. Initiating research or involvement in creative project is dealt with. It is a legitimate issue, especially as students become involved. Bohnenblust: I'm not sure if each discipline has the same clarity. Grabowska: In the humanities, most articles are single authors. This discussion isn't an issue in humanities. Severns: In my discipline, single authors are less common. Some may have 3-4 authors. Sometimes the work is broken such that some authors don't even look at the others' work. Sometime the work is cumulative but sometimes it is an idea and it is hard to judge the relative value of that.

Larsson: These are good questions. They may help us avoid nasty issues in the future. Steven and Mark, would the research committee be a good place for this, would that be appropriate?

McCullough: Yes. Larsson: You could create a designated subcommittee. Would that work for you, Steve? Bohnenblust: There are multiple ways this could be done, whichever seems best is okay.

Bliesmer: There should be a call to faculty about how they have dealt with this in the past. We need to review the history of guidelines. We want to be safe and fair. Teams often decide who should be first author at this point. We need feedback from the entire campus. Gilbert: I heard Steve talking about guidelines but do such guidelines already exist at other universities or professional association? In the spirit of not reinventing the wheel, we should check these out.

Bohnenblust: Yes to both questions. Universities, professional organizations and journals Gilbert: The only issue is multiple sets of guidelines that may be in conflict? Larsson: We must recognize disciplines, those should be the standards when they exist. McCullough: Traditionally that committee has been involved with grants, does anyone have any other ideas? Larsson: We can call for an adhoc.

Severns: A subgroup of research would be the best. Larsson: Is that agreeable to all? Group Response: Yes. Bohnenblust: Yes. Thank you.

Larsson: Now, back to the President's Report (Bohnenblust leaves)

3aiii. Exit Interviews - We recently had a situation where a Dean who had never conducted an exit interview for a faculty member who was leaving requested the department chair to handle it. HR clarified that exit interviews of faculty must be done by deans.

iv. IFO Treasurer - Cathy Summa, from Winona, has served on several IFO committees and most recently Treasurer. She has resigned for a new position. So IFO treasurer will be appointed by Board of Directors. Roger Severns has agreed to have his name submitted.

3c. Treasurer Report – Visser: We have \$791 in the account. We are expecting another quarterly payment soon. I have concerns that less money is coming from the State and about what we are spending it on. About 30-40% is for food, 30-40% is support of office, and 20% is miscellaneous stuff. We have less money than before and we must be careful about what we spend it on. I feel like scrooge but, do we really want to spend so much on food? We're doing better like having an open-ended order for the ice cream and that is good but...

Larsson: Donna has taken good steps at keeping us frugal. It was her suggestion to go from a barbeque to an ice cream social. Visser: We have expenses now that encumbered for at least half of our account. Things are a little bit lean. Larsson: Allocation of IFO has gone down but will go back up slightly in the future because of adjustments in the allocations. They are now doing this on a quarterly basis. We need to watch how the money comes and goes. Thanks to Mary for helping with that. Any other recommendations? Visser: No, I just want us to be careful. The comptroller has access to our account at all times. There are no secrets. Don and I both have to sign all checks. Larsson: Things will be tighter in times to come. A new budget will be set up and probably discussions about re-appropriation of dues, flat fees or structured. We are facing a number of retirements across the system or through retrenchment or lack of renewal of budget lines. These all

could have serious implications that will ultimately come back to us. Visser: All of us want to feel good. How would our members feel about this? In shrinking times, how do we want people to perceive how we spend our money? Larsson: The roles of university presidents are changing. They are far more involved in fund raising and not as involved on campuses. Probably true for us as well. We will be doing our own “friend-raising”. Severns: At the state level, there will be increased costs of grievances and increased amount of legal help we will need. The implication was clear that this will have budgetary impact which will trickle down from the state to the local campuses. If I can reiterate what Mary said, being frugal is going to be increasingly an issue. I think we will see more grievances. Larsson: Also, more meetings at the state level and that costs more money. IFO is trying to use internet for meetings but this may change.

4. IFO/MnSCU Opening for State IFO Consideration – Larsson: Open committees get continually posted. MSU needs a voice at the state level. We need to get folks to fill these positions. Same thing is true for on-line and academic services committees. There are important issues to be covered. We have been ahead of the game on IT issues and intellectual properties but we need to have a voice at the table. I urge you to find people to fill these positions,

Discuss nominating procedures, *I will call for a motion to approve the slate. Grabowska so moved.*

Blom: As a reminder, the ones we select for the state IFO are not automatic. These are suggestions for the state IFO board to vote on. Larsson, all the more reason to get our campus in early. Lewis: Kellian is already on Assessment and Evaluation and so she can't be on the Graduate Committee. Nickerson: It would be her choice to step down. Severns: Is her term coming to an end? Larsson: We will remove Kellian's name for this vote. Blom: There are also issues about John, I just stuck his name on there. Nickerson: I do know that Kellian is interested on the graduate committee. Larsson: We will seek confirmation from Kellian and John later.

Severns second motion to accept slate of nominations as modified. Motion passed.

Approved Representatives:

Single Search – Queen Booker (Bus)

Graduation Planner – Gretchen Perbix

Honors Program Curriculum Committee – Ron Nickerson (AH&N)

Extended Learning Task Force Co-Chair – Deborah Jessman

8. a. FA General Meeting

Nickerson: We get a good bang for the buck for refreshments. I appreciate Mary's comments but this is very visible. How much can a few sheets of cookies cost? We haven't been extravagant with refreshments. We do have to manage food for us. I think this is one that members see and that's important. I suggest we give Donna flexibility to do what we've done in the past. Schartzkopf: What have we done in the past? Blom: Cookies and punch. Schwartzkopf: What about just one or the other? Blom: It may be too late. The order needs to be in two weeks before or we will have to pay a \$25 penalty. Black: As a faculty member I count on those cookies, punch isn't so important. But one question is why food service has us over a barrel? A cookie is a treat but we need to talk to someone about how food service treats us. Nickerson: The costs are unbelievable. McCullough: Is this the only meeting? I would rather see our group cut food for selves first, rather than cut cookies for general meeting.

Nickerson: That was my underlying theme, I would rather see us sacrifice. Gilbert: Maybe a difference can be made between social functions and meetings. Just do away with cookies. Second

point, I assume the rationale is that it attracts more people to come to meetings. We don't know that works. Larsson: Something related is the issue of the general meeting as well, attendance has been declining. Even when talking about a strike vote several years ago there was good attendance but not "packed to the gills". We need other means of improved communication. I see both sides of the issue. Some may see it more of a social session than business meeting but membership is ruling body of IFO. Carson: I suspect we will have larger attendance at this and subsequent meetings because of the issue of retrenchment. People are very frightened and angry right now and I think they will come out to these meetings. Blom: I don't tell anyone that refreshments will be present. In the fall, we have a full blown retreat that includes all committee members, administration, and chairs. We had a meal for everyone. By the way, I would appreciate it you would not wait to make the decision about this. If it could be decided in March or April it would help me. Billing costs go up in the fall. We served about 100 people in CSU 253 when we did the lasagna this past year. Larsson: We can put that on the agenda for the Feb. meeting. We have already trimmed back. We used to have the meetings at Old Main. I do think it is a great benefit to have these groups together. We have scaled back but nothing gets cheaper. Is there a motion on this issue?

Nickerson/Grabowska motion to give President and Treasurer discretionary power to decide about serving cookies and punch at the upcoming general meeting.

Nord: Does this also include the discretion about the late fee? Larsson: It authorizes but doesn't compel. Engeswick: How much money are we talking about? Visser: About \$100. Blom: cookies are \$7 a dozen, punch is \$9.35 a gallon and coffee is \$16.95 more. They don't charge for water, yet. Engeswick: As the oral health guardian, nobody needs punch, it's just corn syrup. We are going to have heavy legal fees in the future. McCullough: How do the President and Treasurer feel about discretion? Visser: We don't have to discuss every expense. I think we all eat too much anyway. But to say to faculty that 40% goes towards food? We are missing the picture of shrinking funds. Nickerson: We have already made reductions. We already are doing a buffet today instead of breakfast. We could do apples but it is a good will gesture towards the membership. By the way, we are spending 20 minutes on cookies. We have already taken steps to correct the big things. Grabowska: This opens a broader discussion. Part of the problem is the focus on the product; the broader perspective that food is a vehicle for creating community. Could be an interesting discussion, we have almost the poorest participation rate at IFO. What can we do to develop or attract within the community plus the broader community and improve the relationship with the administration? I would love to have that discussion. Cookies are a relative easy issue but discussion needs to be on purpose. Bliesmer: I call the question.

Motion to authorize Don and Mary Visser to figure out refreshments for the spring meeting. Voice voting difficult to determine. President Larsson called for a show of hands. 6 in favor and 11 oppose. Motion Failed.

Visser: Jim's comment is accurate. It isn't about the cookies but the sense of community. We do need to take a look at what we are doing. We do have the lowest participation in the State. We need to look at what will work. We should consider this in a more meaningful way. Larsson: This goes hand in hand with delegate assembly resolution process with 2-4 year planning. Let's take a break:

Reconvened 10 minutes later

8b. Honors Program Development Committee update Presentation by Chris Corley–Corley: I am part of a special development committee to redevelop the Honors program. Over the years the

honors program has had more downs than up, for a variety of reasons. All agree we need a program and it is important to develop to attract students and this could affect many departments. The program was shut down 3 years ago and the last students are graduating this May. Many have been very active on campus. Many faculty have been involved in the planning of a new program as well as Provost Olson and Anne Blackhurst. I came in the summer to direct the program. I wouldn't be here if it wasn't an honors program. An honors program helped me. Honors is a fast moving movement across the country. Many similarly situated schools have honors programs. Many regional, state comprehensive universities have honors programs. So here is what the committee has been doing. Last year, we identified 3 core competencies for the program (see handout): leadership, research, and global citizenship. These are skills needed regardless of a major. We focused on program flow; what would a student do from year 1-4. We drafted a position description for director and conducted a search. Currently, we have an honors learning community that has 11 students. These students will graduate under next year's catalogue. Our committee has two groups, each having 15 members: organization (to help entrench the program into the university) and curriculum. We have also focused on external marketing and recruitment. We visited high schools and guidance counselors. We also met with high school students, most of whom knew nothing about honors programs. We developed a website, brochures, and spent much time communicating on campus, speaking with deans and college meetings, director of admissions, athletic director, marketing, provost, meeting with MSSSA, and attended open houses. Two more honors learning communities are planned for next year. Students this year focused on culture and communication. They studied Latino and Hmong cultures. They attended the Nobel Conference in St. Peter, went to many campus events and did service projects. Many did very well this past fall. The honors program is to be a competency based learning program. It doesn't just focus on obtaining credits but on developing skills. The program brings students together with introductory learning experiences inside and outside the classroom. Then, they are provided more integrated seminars bringing the 3 goals together. They develop competencies and then conduct a demonstration project at the end. They start doing this with portfolios at the very beginning of the program and then in a capstone experience they "defend" their portfolios. Learning communities work well at MSU in that they helps with retention and help students identity their roles on campus while exploring their own interests. As students move to their junior and senior years, there is more focus on own majors. They work on honors competencies by working in majors. Here is an Honors curriculum map. Language training is essential part of global citizens; we recommend students minimum competency intermediate low language skills (repeat 202 level plus one more course, the BA requirements). We will propose having Honors sections of gen ed courses. Honors program would pay for these by paying for adjunct to teach course. We will propose two honors seminars and a capstone course. This year, honor students will be meeting with state leaders to talk about immigration and social services. The Capstone experience will cover the 3 areas. Students will work one on one with a professor and present their program. It will be recommended that all participate in some type of study abroad or culturally immersive experience in the region. Classroom and co-curricular experiences are demonstrated in the senior portfolio. It will be recommended that students take 15 honors sections of gen ed., 2 honors seminars, and 1 senior portfolio. Most of the program can be done within gen.ed. 7 credits are outside of gen ed. Some majors are tight but this model can serve vast majority of students.

Any comments? Okay, so what are we doing now? In January, I am meeting with Gen Ed, UCAP and CDS (curriculum design system) team. We are still working on recommendations for who should lead this in administrative sector. We may recommend an honors council that might work like a submeet. This is something executive committee should think about. Rather than one person this would have administrators and faculty working together. After I get formal recommendations from the committee, I'll get back to you on this.

Another point is they would like to develop a formal process for faculty to propose honor courses. We will be back to FA when we have a proposal to make. I hope to have these things in place by mid-April so we can get it functioning next year. Also, a general meeting of the faculty association would be a good place to present all of this information to the faculty.

Motion to put discussion of Honors Program on agenda for upcoming General Meeting, Severns/Nickerson.

Larsson: Discussion? Visser: What other bodies has this information gone to? Corley: Deans, and UCAP members are on the committee. It will go to the others soon. I think we should go through submeet process. We have many pressing things to talk about at General meeting. Is the timing right? Larsson: At least as a heads up. This is important to share with the membership, perhaps in an abbreviated form. Nickerson: I agree. I went to forums and they were mostly attended by SRC's. It's hard to get faculty to come. But I also agree that it should be limited. Otherwise it is difficult to get people to come. Anyone else who wants to come or if you want to send comments, please do. Corley: It's really a Curriculum Committee issue. Black: How are students identified, at orientation, or what? Corley: The reason we have 11 is because things were working late. It was advertised at orientation. But now we have institutionalized recruiting with admission. Any applicant for Presidential Scholar gets our materials. Also, admission distributes information to anyone with an ACT score of 26 or higher and people in the top 25% of their class or other students who have demonstrated special talent maybe identified. We have sent an e-mail to current students who have a high gpa.

Black: So people can come in their sophomore year? Corley: We really take into account students who are late bloomers, those who may be better at college than high school. Also, we need to find transfer students. The fastest growing group of honors programs are at community colleges. Maybe we could set up some type of line with other schools. Carson: If this gets presented at the General Meeting I think you should be prepared to deal with questions about why are we adding extra, small classes during times of faculty retrenchment. Corley: Actually this is a great time to start because if it can start at this time, it can last through anything. Nord: People who will be attending the general meeting are going to be very concerned about retrenchment. I suggest you keep the presentation short, even less than 15 minutes. The presentation is good but maybe a web site link could be provided. Larsson: I agree, Let's try to make this about 10 minutes. Nickerson: The honors committee would try to deal with students coming into phases. First priority would be new freshmen, second, sophomore, third group, and then transfer students. In light of retrenchment, the honors program gives us a means for attracting new students to campus. This is a body on campus that are not served. This year 10% of freshmen could have been placed in Honors. Larsson, call the question.

Motion to put discussion of Honors Program on agenda for upcoming General Meeting. Passed

Larsson: A problem with the honors in the past has been question of curriculum; I like the focus on competencies. I would like to move on to item g.

8g. Enrollment caps for Packaged Courses – Larsson: It has come to our attention that there may be enrollment caps for packaged courses in extended learning. This is a cap of 30 students on packaged courses. This process should go through information sharing and will be discussed at next meet and confer.

8h. Administrators Evaluation for AY 2010 (Deans). Larsson: Administrative evaluations will happen soon. We decided to exempt interims deans. Blom: Earlier there was mention of putting this on Zoomerang, Paper costs us money. Would you want to send this electronically?

Larsson: Can it be anonymously? Blom: It would all come back to me. The answer would be yes. The nomination ballot is being sent on the 15th of this month. If possible, I would like to send the preliminary ballot electronically?

Grabowska/Engeswick. Motion to use electronic surveys for administrative evaluations.

Severns; Did the IFO buy a subscription for electronic surveying? Larsson: Yes, but mainly for IFO use. Severns: We had subscription for Zoomerang but it expired. Corley: Are the administrators okay with this? Severns: We have always given them the opportunity to review their evaluation form. Larsson: If there is a change in format we should let them know. Other discussion? Call the question.

Do electronic surveys for administrative evaluations. Motion passed

Larsson: Donna's second question is in regards to posting of candidates for FA positions electronically.

Grabowska/Tappe. Motion to post candidates for FA positions electronically. Motion passed.

8i. Resolutions procedures for Delegate Assembly. Larsson: Resolutions need to get to Donna by mid-March. Blom: A local committee reviews them and then sends them to the state office to get into packet form. Larsson: A committee meets and reviews these to avoid overlap. For the next meeting I'll draft a timeline for that process. Bleismer: Can you put a link to the state level so people can see what is already there? Larsson: I'm not sure if that is fully public right now but we can see. Blom: It may be on the IFO webpage already.

8j. FA Constitution/bylaws Review. Larsson: Connie Howard has been reviewing local campus constitutions to see if there is conflict with the IFO Constitution. Ours was in good shape but needs some clarification. For example, all campuses must have local committees replicable to statewide committees. Changes in our terminology are needed and probably, this won't require constitutional changes.

8k. Campus FA elections. Larsson: Donna already addressed these issues.

8d. BESI/Budget/Program Closure/Retrenchment Larsson: Jim and I met with Warren Sandmann and Provost discussing the proposed metrics. It evolved from the Planning meeting last fall. To repeat Provost Olson, program closure does not mean retrenchment and retrenchment can occur without closing a program. This is to decide which programs should be targeted. Right now this is informational but I don't expect many changes. This will be announced to campus soon. Timelines are at the end. This will happen very quickly, in less than 2 months.

Step 1 sorts out those programs mandated by Governor, legislature or Chancellor. Carson: Do we have a list? Larsson: Not yet, these will require documentation.

Step 2 viability cost and enrollment. Programs will fall into 1 of 3 groups: 2a) Programs likely to be eliminated, 2.b Programs likely to have reduction in program and staffing budget, and 2c. Programs unlikely to have substantial cuts at this time.

In regards to Cost Measurement, we asked about comparisons at different schools in different states. They responded that MnSCU has data for in state schools and it might be hard to get this from other

states. Enrollment measurement includes growth trends in the future, both in the State or the discipline.

Step 3. Mission centrality, they put this at the top, and then quality and employability. Quality, accreditation or program review. Article 22 related excellence, consistently high achievement, scholarly output, grad school outplacement, and other national awards. Employability is difficult to track. Schwartzkopf: I thought at this point there was consideration of students who were going to graduate programs, but not going to employment right away. Larsson: This is addressed by grad school placement. McCullough: Why is Article 22 included if this is program evaluation? Larsson: I'm not sure either but it affects departmental reviews. Grabowska: The anticipation is that they will not eliminate entire programs, it will be individuals. This is the importance of the seniority roster, will be working from the bottom up. At the individual level, Article 22 may become important. Programs will be affected, not closed but individuals in the program may be affected. Corley: So they can pick and choose?

Grabowska: No. But in a program where people were hired at the same time, they may use Article 22 to distinguish between faculty. Corley: But after tenure, the line stops? Grabowska: Yes, but they could remove an entire program. Larsson: That brings up the issue of seniority rosters. Severns: There is tenure and super tenure. Larsson: Departments do have potential to respond and can provide additional data. But the response must be in 2 weeks and limited to 600 words. Corley: And the FA approved of this? Larsson: You can point to existing data sources. Grabowska: This information needs to be in the hands of departments. Encourage departments to note this now. Larsson: Step 4. 1st paragraph. Some programs will be recategorized and this relates to seniority list. Cuts this year through BESI will be included, but cuts prior to this fiscal year won't be credited. Carson: Will phased retirements count? Larsson: The contract allows for phased retirements. This university is one of the strictest. Probably not but it is a good argument. Larsson: Types of reduction vary. For example, at Winona, modern language is not a major, only a service department. Full scale elimination means phased change, so that students will still be able to graduate. The timetables are short. Full scale elimination, means phased. By January 28 we will have the list. The dates are contractual deadlines. While officially, fixed terms do not have to be notified in advance, we will try to give as much notice as possible.

Bleismer: Have any discussions included the impact of having a reduction in the number of students? Larsson: I think that would only be targeted in a sub program. Grabowska: 65% of the revenue is through student credit hours and 35% is state appropriation. Reduction of student numbers is cutting off source of income. Schwartzkopf: Perhaps this is for general meeting. We will need lots of time for discussion. Sometimes things get pushed to bottom but that shouldn't happen with this topic. Can we do the announcements in some other ways? Bumgarner: Who developed this? Larsson: Provost Olson, Warren Sandman and Deanne Snaza. Bumgarner: Step 2 is the provost's language. Larsson: Probably so. Nickerson: I think steps 2 and 3 are backwards. If we do it the way we have laid it out, it is an economic business decision not what we are supposed to be as an educational institution. We need to talk what is important to our mission, but I'm not sure I can affect any change in this. At the top of priority is budget but mission central. Now making primary cut based on costs. On page 2 it describes low cost high budget not how they are central to the mission. I realize that probably won't happen. Larsson: It's important to bring this to discussion. As Jeff suggested, these are important things. Money is the real problem. Money is the real problem but we are not a money making institution. Carson: My department had high FTE's and so, at the urging of our dean, we gave most members research release time. Now that decision will be held against us. Nickerson: We were able to increase writing incentive courses by having the administration reduce the equations and now this will work against departments. Larsson: Limitations of space affect this and have resulted in one college renting space in the movie theater. On page 4 are definitions. Page 5 describes the cost study process. The main unit is the CIP code. There are 7 or 8 different ways of identifying a

program. The CIP number appears to be objective but it is far from perfect. But that is what they are using. This is where seniority rosters become important. Bleisner: A faculty member stated we have made many cuts at the university but are there any other options? Should we take furloughs or other ways to deal with costs? Larsson: These questions keep coming up and we will hear more of it. The savings of furloughs are questionable but may actually cost just as much or more. To do a furlough would require a Memorandum of Agreement or a Letter of Understanding with MNSCU, but could local campuses do this? I suspect not at this point. Bleisner: March 1 we know what happens so we might have time to do something. Are there other options besides furloughs? Larsson: Some departments are generating larger enrollment courses or teaching on line. By eliminating low enrollment courses, by reducing reassigned time--there are trade offs. These are hard choices. Severns: Reassigned time is required for accreditation but makes it a more expensive. We need to have some discussions. It is prestigious to have a certification but makes us expensive. Nord: Are there any comparison of matrices with other state schools? Larsson: Moorehead did not retrench. We are not anticipating a huge number of program closures. Some programs only have 2-4 faculty. Bleisner: Moorehead accepted no doctoral students in their nursing program this year. Larsson: The only one doing well in enrollment is Metro which is different for many reasons. Any other comments about the metrics? I encourage you all to look these over.

8e. Seniority rosters. Larsson: We are trying to bring the IFO attorneys to campus to talk about seniority rosters. They get posted twice a year and we have until March 1 to redefine the rosters. If the program is not on these rosters, there will be no changes. There are a number of cases where a department has several rosters. The administration has a free hand in redefining rosters, if they desire. There are many problems. For example, there are rosters for departments that no longer exist. Most of these faculty are also rostered in other departments. This can get messy.

Johnson: I get nervous when I see phantom departments on a roster. Grabowska: It isn't that it's been done but that the rosters have never been changed. Retrenchment was not on the radar prior to now. It is neglect of making changes. Severns: It gets more complicated, or less, because some departments predate other administrative departments, such as colleges. Some of the problem situations are individuals who have supertenure, 20 years or more of service. McCullough: You said we need to define programs and create new rosters? Larsson: Hypothetically, a department could be assigned new rosters. Corley: Can this happen? Larsson: Yes. Grabowska: This is why submeets have started to talk about definition of a program. The administration decided to go with CIP codes. Departments with one roster may have one or more CIPs. McCullough: That wasn't clear to me reading their definition of academic program. I didn't realize they could redefine programs. Corley: The IFO position is that we have no recourse? Larsson: They have to bring it to meet and confer and meet deadlines. Grabowska: The employer is always ready to assign work but we can't do that. Larsson: For people who believe they are improperly listed this can be done. Carson: What about a faculty who teaches in more than one program? Larsson: This faculty may have more protection, we have some faculty who may be listed in more than one roster. Severns: What happens with CIP and faculty who teach in both CIPs? This gets very complicated. Carson: Can we get the proposal to chairs? Larsson: it is going to department chairs on Tuesday. Grabowska: If it is stated that it is draft metric, it can go to departments. Larsson: Once it gets to us, it gets to everybody. Carson: Can you send them out? Larsson, we'll check on this. McCullough: Is there any way to identify a new program? Could a person continually lose all seniority? What is the list supposed to do if administration has power to create programs? Larsson: No, it has to go through curriculum process. Severns: Where it gets fuzzy is a track not specifically designated as a program but has its own CIP code. Bumgarner: Did the deans see this? Grabowska: Yes it was discussed in council last week. Visser: Back to Becky's point. I think there will be a big crowd, this will be the big thing. We need to focus on this topic. Larsson: If Chris agrees, let's put Honors later on the General Meeting agenda. Tappe: I agree. Visser: People need to address this.

Larsson: thank you for the spirited conversations. Blom: Thanks to Don and Jim for supporting my need for personal time. Larsson: Thanks to you Donna doing so much even when you were dealing with family concerns. Meeting adjourned.