

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Thursday, January 19, 2012

3:00 p.m. - CSU 204

APPROVED MINUTES

In attendance: Jim Grabowska (FA President), Mary Visser (FA Vice President), Daniel Swart, Lynnette Engeswick, Angela Monson, Barbara Carson, Kelly Krumwiede, Dick Liebendorfer, Georgia Holmes, John Seymour, Becky Schwartzkopf, Gregg Marg, Kevin Parsneau, Ellen Mrja, Danae Quirk Dorr, Diane Witt, Emily Stark, Queen Booker, Nancy Fitzsimons, Kirsti Cole, Hans-Peter DeRuiter, Ron Nickerson, Ed Clark

Meeting called to order at 3:03 PM

1. Minutes of previous meeting (Unapproved Minutes –January 05, 2012)

Carson/Nickerson: Move to approve: Passed

2. Call for Additional Items/ Reordering of Agenda

3. ITS Ed Clark – (Time Certain 3:10 p.m.) - Ideal IT support system consists of 3 layers: Consultation, Translation, and Infrastructure. Translation includes desktop support, web design, etc. Data is stored in the infrastructure layer. For the Consultation layer, we hope to develop a tech consultant for each college/area. We don't currently have the specialists to do consultation. As to the funding of this program, MnSCU has giving all the campuses in the system funding to keep their systems current. This was legislatively appropriated. \$500,000 went into our ITS coffers this year. MSU is tied for 1st place in technology. The question is how to reinvest this funding back into the system to support the faculty. We haven't had many assessments on the 2nd two layers. We are developing a questionnaire which we hope will help develop a baseline so that we can monitor improvement.

An idea we have taken from the University of Minnesota is to use student technology fees to fund course improvements. This is how GA's would be funded, but would require MSSA agreement. We have heard that students want faculty to use the new technology, but they don't understand how difficult it might be to develop and use the newer technology.

(Question): This is the first time we've heard this, but it sounds like a good idea. The consultation piece has been missing. You may find that some colleges have more needs than others; you may want to shift the help to those who need it. (Clark): This model is used in the Big 10, and we want to be on the cutting edge. And yes, different colleges need different levels of help.

(Question): Information coming down from Deans that the colleges may be funding these consultants, at least for half. We have some concerns about money going toward consultants instead of toward faculty. (Clark): I have found out that ITS funding can be used to hire these consultants, but I haven't figured out how continued funding will be managed. (Booker): How this is funded is going to be different for every college. (Mrja): You can't assume that every college can give a half-time faculty line.

(Grabowska): If this is going to be discussed, our position is that we want to be a part of this decision making process. (Clark): We don't have an idea on how much these positions would cost, much less how they would be funded.

(Question): How will the decision be made about how many consultants each college gets? (Clark): I don't know how to decide that, but I am open to suggestions.

(Question): I think it is clear that you have described the need very well. However, the funding, etc., are different topics, and we need to keep these two ideas separate. Perhaps we need to ask each Dean how these consultants will be funded, and let's see how many stories we hear. (Grabowska): This is just a

model being proposed, it isn't that solid yet. (Clark): We have assigned a pilot project in the Allied Health and Business colleges to test out this model. I am paying for the trial because it is my current staff.

(Question): Are these positions for helping faculty incorporate technology into pedagogy? (Clark): Part of the consultation is the pedagogy, but the other parts are specific: simulations in nursing, midi in music, etc. It isn't just for pedagogy.

(Question): So there are two pilot programs, these are being funded by ITS right now, but further funding hasn't even been discussed yet? I would like the funding split to be the same for every college.

(Question): The consultant may look entirely different in each college; you can't write a position request that covers all of them. (Grabowska): We may be looking at MSSA to fund these consultants via their technology fees. (Clark): We might be able to hire GA's from the colleges to be directed by the consultants.

(Question): So right now, you are piloting in two colleges and you will at some time get feedback from Deans or colleges on whether to go forward? What is the next step? (Clark): I will be talking to the whole business faculty and hopefully there will be some feedback. (Grabowska): We need to make sure faculty have some input.

4. Student Writing Task Force Report - Kristie Campana (Time Certain 3:45 p.m.)(Sent by email to executive on 01.09.2012)

We sent this report, but we want to go over it to make sure everything is clear. We want to get your support. A 13 member task force worked for about a year looking at 3 key areas, and we make suggestions for these 3 areas. (Review of Document)

(Question): If you move the writing requirement away from general education, how does that effect the transfer requirements? (Nickerson): We would have to have some language to accommodate transfer students.

(Question): You're recommending keeping the two general education level courses, and adding another upper level? They don't come to upper division writing well right now! (Campana): "Do we have the resources" is the key question. We need to approach this problem from from this direction.

(Question): We could really use two upper division courses in our program, is there the possibility of having more than one upper level writing requirements for majors?

(Question): Is the decision to take these out of general education finalized? (Nickerson): We are moving forward as if it will be passed.

(Question): Is there some recommendation for class size? If we are concerned about how they are writing, we need to limit the number. (Campana): Our recommendation is 20:1 student to faculty ratio, but we can't require that.

(Question): What is the next step? (Campana): The Taskforce doesn't have any power to do anything, so we want the next step from you. (Grabowska): One next step would be to tell the Administration at M&C that we support this idea. (Nickerson): I suggest that we send it to M&C saying that discussions on implementation need to go back to the SM&Cs.

(Question): This is to be a faculty line, what department would it go under? (Nickerson): It would be a half-time from any college. Funding would come from the Faculty Development Center.

(Question): All of the success depends on the faculty person. Does a half-time appointment seem enough? Faculty are ultimately doing the teaching? Do we know how many writing intensive courses aren't being offered anymore? If you're not going to get sufficient credit (FTEF) why would a department want to do this?

(Question): What is happening with the higher education commission goal that we were going to improve our writing? Is this going to give us some leverage with the administration? (Nickerson): I am hoping so.

(Question): We need to know how many courses aren't being taught anymore because of the low FTEF levels. (Booker): We are generating a list of writing as well as purple and gold courses that aren't being offered anymore due to being cut for low FTEF. I'm working on it.

(Question): What happens if a major doesn't have a writing intensive course, and the course nearest in content has prerequisites that our majors don't meet? (Campana): Good question; we haven't looked at that. (Booker): Also, what about majors that can't add a writing intensive course because it would cause the major to go over the 120 credit cap?

(Question): With a half-time faculty, in which department does a person get tenure? This has been an issue in the past. (Campana): This is another issue that needs to be addressed.

5. Creating Waiting Lists for Student Registration – MSSA President Matt Lexcen and Vice President Moriah Miles - (Time Certain 3:05)

We still don't have enough faculty and course spots. Right now all we are looking for is a dialog. We have 5-10 classes that use the waitlist system. Feedback would be useful.

(Question): If you want to open your section up to a specific student, they can't enroll because the class is waitlisted. They can't enroll until the last minute, after the wait list goes off-line.

(Question): I like that system. I wish that students wouldn't be told by the Registrar that faculty can give them overrides. We can't really.

(Question): What controls who gets on the waitlist? (Clark): It is by order of enrollment.

(Question): We have issues with students holding course spots for others.

(Question): If we could have a way to enroll majors into waitlisted classes that would be helpful.

6. FACULTY ASSOCIATION – STILL NEEDED –Fall 2011/Spring 2012

- a. COB Extended Learning – Business (1 year replacement needed for Brenda Flannery)
- b. FA Nominations & Election Committee Spring 2012 – (Need Business)
- c. COB Rep on LTR 1 Year Replacement –
- d. Faculty Working Group (Charge: To carry on some of the work that Advising Task Force established) (Still Needed from– A&H, AH&N, Bus, Educ, SBS)
- e. General Education & Diversity Replacement for Spring – Lib/Unaf Needed
- f. Faculty Development Committee Replacement - Education

7. STATE IFO/MNSUC COMMITTEES (IFO APPOINTS 2 NEEDED STATEWIDE-

- a. MnSCU Student Affairs Council
- b. MnSCU Academic and Student Affairs Policy Council

8. FACULTY ASSOCIATION APPOINTMENTS TO BE CONFIRMED/SELECTED

- a. MnSCU Academic Affairs – Andi Lassiter (Approved by IFO Board 01.13.12)

Quirk Dorr/Nickerson: Move to confirm Lassiter: Passed

- b. MnSCU Academic and Student Affairs Information Technology Council (select 1) – David Georgina, Scott Fee

Nickerson/Booker: Move to confirm Fee: Passed

9. Discussion Items/Action Items

- a. Proposal Draft for Packaged Courses (Attached)
- b. FA Constitutional Amendments (Paul Hustoles) – Recommendation sent to Executive 01.17.12 by email. (Yellow)

c. Electronic Voting Process – Georgia Holmes - A request was put out with companies that produce electronic voting. The one that was selected was Valid Point. We are negotiating a contract with this company.

Do we want our local elections to be part of this bid? We would need to decide this within the next few weeks. (Grabowska): There are costs to bear if we go with local electronic elections. (Carson): I heard that the IFO would pay for local elections if they were electronic. (Monson): I heard it was only IFO. (Holmes): My understanding was it is supposed to be rolled into one contract, but I don't know if the money would come from the local FA or the IFO. (Grabowska): If there is consensus to wait a year, then no action is needed.

Visser/Marg: Propose that we continue paper ballots for another year: Passed

d. Academic Data Summary Ad-Hoc Work Group – Queen Booker - We requested adding information on online as well as accreditation to the data summary. For example, if you are accredited, there are certain requirements that you have. There is no written history of how the FTEF level was developed. We want to find a peer measure of what are levels are acceptable.

e. Action Committee

10. Meet & Confer Agenda Items — Thursday, January 26, 2012, 9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. – CSU 204 (FA Chair/AD Agenda)

11. Informational Items

- a. Next FA Executive – Thursday, February 02, 2012 @3:00 p.m. – CSU 238
- b. Next Meet & Confer – Thursday, February 16 @ 3:00 p.m. – CSU 204 (FA Agenda/AD Chair)
- c. Delegate Assembly Resolution Meetings – Tuesday, February 21, 1:00 – 2:30 p.m. – MH 240B and Wednesday, February 22 9:00 a.m. – 10:30 – MH 240B
- d. Delegate Assembly – Friday, March 23 & Saturday 24, 2012 – 1st General Session Begins at 10:45 a.m. - Radisson Hotel – 2540 North Cleveland Avenue, Roseville, Minnesota

12. Faculty Association Committee Chair & IFO Standing Committee Reports

- a. Assessment & Evaluation (Kirsti Cole) *The Assessment and Evaluation Submeet is gathering at 10am on the 20th for our first meeting of Spring semester. Our agenda includes discussions of Program Review and Tracking, Developing Comparison Groups (Peer and Aspirant) and a report on the Academic Summary Group, and their recommendations. We will also discuss the Writing Task Force's report.*
 - b. Budget (Ellen Mrja) *Members will meet on Thursday, Jan. 19th at 2 p.m. to discuss Facilities Review Process and plans worth discussing for 2012-13. Verbal report to follow at the meeting.*

(Mrja):Budget SM&C is in the process of reviewing step 2. We have 16 proposals of in excess of \$4 million. There is only \$2 million set aside, so there will be some hard decisions to make. We are really pleased with how this system is working this year compared to last year. It is stunning how well this is working. We would like to tell the M&C that if there is going to be funding added back, we want input in the process (reverse retrenchment).
- c. Extended Learning (Danae Quirk Dorr) *The Sub-Meet and Confer will be meeting on Wednesday, January 25th.*
- d. Faculty Development (Diane Witt) *The Faculty Development Committee met on 1/17/12 to plan the Tenure and Promotion workshop. The date has not yet been finalized. We are tentatively looking at 3/23/12 from 1-4 pm.*

- e. Faculty Improvement & Sabbatical (Emily Stark) *The spring round of FIG grants are due by Friday, March 16th.*
- f. General Education & Diversity (Queen Booker) *Nothing to report.*
- g. Graduate (Nancy Fitzsimons) *Committee met on January 18, 2012. Discussed the new FA policy on missing 3 or more committee meetings during an academic year. Discussed Academic Affairs proposal to change some of the due dates for submitting PDRs to April. Committee members were encourage to provide Jim Grabowska with feedback. Discussed and unanimously agreed to put forward a proposal to the FA to change the committee name to Graduate Curriculum and Academic Policy (GCAP) Committee to be in-line with UCAP. Reviewed a draft of the revised Graduate Committee charge. Will review a revised draft based upon feedback from committee members at the February Graduate Committee meeting. The FA Charge document disseminated earlier in the year lists UCAP as "University Curriculum and Academic Policy (UCAP) Committee". Discussed concern about "university", given graduate education is part of the "university", but not part of UCAPs charge. Faculty chair will follow-up with FA Executive Committee and UCAP faculty chair. Discussed the meeting conducted by Interim Dean Ries pertaining to graduate education and research. Good ideas generated. Will discuss any outcome from this meeting at the next Graduate Sub Meet and Confer. Discussed the role of the Graduate Committee is to provide input, generate ideas, give feedback to the Graduate Dean; not to implement the ideas/perform tasks associated with implementing a plan. Discussed the 19 proposals reviewed. Reviewed the preliminary results from the survey about the Graduate Research Conference. Will recommend that the email soliciting faculty participation be sent a second time. Results from the survey will be discussed at the next Graduate Sub Meet and Confer.*

(Fitzsimons): We need clarification that our role is to give feedback on tangibles, but it doesn't seem the goal of the Graduate Committee to institute these goals; that is up to the graduate college. Is it possible at a new M&C to find out if the graduate dean going to be an interim? (Grabowska): It looks like they are going in the direction of a two year interim. (Fitzsimons): is the FA Executive Committee consulted, or is it the administration's call? (Grabowska): It is the administration's call.

- h. Planning (Mirian Porter) *The Plng. M&C is in the process of reviewing Step 2 proposals and listening to presentations. There were 13 Strategic Priority proposals and 26 Big Idea proposals submitted for the step 2 process. It is expected that applicants will be notified of the President's decision regarding proposal funding by Mar. 1, 2012*
The Plng M&C has also started to gain input on a process for evaluation of new academic programs for base investment.
- i. Research (Hans-Peter DeRuiter) *The FRC spent the December meeting discussing the FRC grant process and in particular how this process can be made more user friendly. A sub-group of the committee is exploring an electronic submission system that would not only eliminate large amount of printing, but also allow submitters to get feedback about their proposals. In January the committee will be discussing the Faculty Scholar Awards for 2012. The committee is exploring ways to make the work of the Scholars more visible to MSU-Mankato Students and faculty.*
- j. UCAP (Ron Nickerson) *UCAP continues to review course/ program proposals for the 2012 – 2013 bulletin. We currently have taken initial action on ALL of the proposals received by the committee's first deadline (November 4th) and have taken initial action on all of the other proposals we have received except for one college which will be completed by January 24th. REMINDER – January 27th is the deadline for proposals to be included in the 2012 – 2013 bulletin. The committee has also reviewed several key policy revisions this year including, Academic Probation/ Suspension, Graduation Requirements, English 101 Placement, Academic*

Honesty, and Grading Policy. We have also participated in the revisions in the Application for Graduation Procedures that have recently been adopted by the Registrar's Office and are working with the General Education and Diversity Committee to change the current Writing Intensive Requirement from a Gen Ed Requirement to a Graduation Requirement per the recommendations found in the recent FA Writing Task Force Report.

- k. Unit Representation - AH&N – Kelly Krumwiede; A&H- Dick Liebendorfer; Bus- Georgia Holmes; Educ- John Seymour; Lib/Unaf- Becky Schwartzkopf; SET-Gregg Marg; SBS- Kevin Parsneau
- l. State IFO Representatives (Paul Hustoles; Angela Monson; Barbara Carson)
- m. Other FA/IFO Committee Rep. Updates
 - 1. IFO Academic Affairs – Penny Knoblich *We have not met in awhile, so I have nothing to report. (Academic Affairs)*
 - 2. IFO Negotiations – Donna Brauer - *I do not have a negotiations report for this Exec. meeting because the team has not met since December. I updated everyone at the General Meeting on Jan. 5th. Negotiations Team is meeting Thursday, Friday and Saturday (19th, 20th, 21st) so I hope to have something to report at the February meeting.*
 - 3. IFO Multi-Culture – Maurella Cunningham - *I suggested that the Anti-racism training be held at MN State University, Mankato for the Spring 2012 semester. The workshop is a full day session (ex. 9-5). The presenters come from the Cities & St. Cloud (Debra Leigh). The IFO MIC paid for all costs when the same event was held at SW State last year. I spoke with Pat Arseneault, and she said that the MIC would probably do the same for Mankato. We would need to send an estimate of costs. What the MIC needs from Mankato is :
 - 1. *the commitment to the concept of anti-racist programming (it is hoped that participants go on to conduct the workshop on campus, at later dates)*
 - 2. *a day that faculty will be able to participate, and*
 - 3. *a location on campus (to hold a maximum of 50 people)**It is hoped that faculty will participate, and that there will be a couple representatives from the administration (president or provost), student body (MSSA officers??), and community members.**
 - 4. IFO GRC – Abdalla Battah; Martin Mitchell
 - 5. IFO GLBTA – Maria Bevacqua - *I missed the GLBTA fall meeting, and I'm still waiting to receive minutes. I will provide an update as soon as I know what happened at that meeting!*
 - 6. IFO Salary Equity – Ihsuan Li
 - 7. IFO Feminist Issues – Annelies Hagemeister - *The IFO Feminist Issues Committee (A. Hagemeister, MSU Mankato rep): Met in the fall on Sept. 30, 2011. Agenda items discussed included: Review Salary & Hiring Fact Sheet for New Hires; MnSCU BOT Policy 1B.1 Review; Preparation for 2012 Delegate Assembly, Committee Goals (Long Term), Urging IFO Board to look at sustainability issues, Discussion of Retrenchment data re: equitability; Begin discussion of review of campus compliance with federal and state law for lactation rooms and how information on availability of space is disseminated to faculty. Announcements have been put forth with calls for annual Feminist Issues Committee Awards. Deadline for these is Jan. 23, 2012. Next meet with take place first week of Feb. 2012.*
 - 8. IFO Action Chair – Leah Rogne – Will Contacting Action Chair – Monte Bute
- 13. Officer's Reports
 - a. Vice President/Grievance Officer (Mary Visser)
 - b. Treasurers Report (Lynnette Engeswick)
 - c. President's Report (Jim Grabowska) –
 - (1) Delegate Assembly Delegates 17 still need – does not include any for alternates.

Adjourned: 5:05 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel J. Swart
FA Secretary