

FA EXECUTIVE MEETING

Thursday, February 18, 2016

CSU 238

Approved Minutes

In attendance: Mary Visser (FA President), Bobby Bothmann, Barb Carson, Kirsti Cole, Dan Cronn-Mills, Anne Dahlman, Steven Gilbert, Patricia Hoffman, Kelly Krumwiede, Jackie Lewis, John Lindberg, Gregg Marg, Marty Mitchell, Kari Much, Roland Nord, Luis Posas, Joseph Reising, Timothy Secott, Roger Severns, Daniel Swart, John Thoemke, Teri Wallace, Lynne Weber, Gwen Westerman, Paul Wyss.

Meeting called to order at 3:06 PM

1. **Call for Additional Items/ Reordering of Agenda**
2. **CONSENT AGENDA**
 - a. **Minutes of previous meeting (Unapproved Minutes - January 21, 2016)**
 - b. **Search Committee for Recruitment & Retention Advisory (1 Needed) Kellian Clink – Lib/Unaf**
 - c. **Fellowships Advisory Board (One from each Unit) A&H - Alisa Eimen, AH&N - Megan Mahowald, LIB/UNAF - Jenny Turner, SBS - Emily Stark**
 - d. **Co-sponsorship "Women of Color Faculty Navigating the intersections of Race and Gender in the Classroom" (S. Miller) Electronic Vote Passed 02.12.16**
 - e. **Search Committee for Director of University Security (1) - Carl J. Lafata – SBS**
 - f. **Search Committee for Associate Dean of the College of Science, Engineering and Technology (1 from each department needed) Biological Sciences – Gregg Marg, Chemistry & Geology -Trent Vorlicek, Integrated Engineering – Rob Sleezer, Physics & Astronomy – Thomas R. Brown**
 - g. **Search Committee for Dean of University Extended Education (2 to Reappoint)– Laura Pelletier – A&H, Jacob Swanson – SET**

Marg/Severns: Motion to Approve: Passed

3. **SELECTION OF APPOINTMENTS NEEDED FROM EXECUTIVE**
 - a. **University Course Scheduling Redesign (2 Needed) Penny Knoblich, Youwen Xu - SET, Matthew Sewell – A&H, Rachelle Fuller (Hodges) AH&N**

Swart/Marg: Motion to Appoint Knoblich: Passed

Krumweide/Bothmann: Motion to Appoint Fuller: Passed

- b. **Diversity Initiative – Proposed Steering Committee and Pilot Project Learning Beyond the Classroom – M&C Item from 02.04.16 #2 b. (Need Two Volunteers)(Handout sent to Executive)**
No action needed
 - c. **Search Committee for Dean of University Extended Education (Select 1) Aaron R. Deris – EDUC, Kathleen Blue – SBS, Karla Lassonde – SBS (Volunteered b/4 but were not selected)**

Lewis/Much: Motion to Appoint Deris: Passed

4. **ORAL COMMITTEE REPORTS FOR THURSDAY, February 18, 2016 - **Target Time 3 Minutes Each****
 - a. **Faculty Development – Lynn Weber**

We have two missions; run the Tenure and Promotion Workshop and review Teaching Scholar applications. We are now reviewing the Teaching Scholar application procedures. We are waiting to hear from CETL and CSR as they have asked for time to speak with us.

b. Faculty Improvement & Sabbatical – Kari Much

We have not met yet.

c. General Education & Diversity – Dick Liebendorfer/Anne Dahlman

We are finishing student appeals and facilitating faculty groups to analyze the data for Goal Area 7 and 8 collected last year.

d. Graduate Curriculum & Academic Policy – Barb Bergman/Tim Secott

Discussed what is going on with HLC assurance. We found out that there is very little in the document about graduate education. We have been trying to goad the Dean into providing some information on that. We are thinking about using some information provided by Lindberg to tease out the difference between MA and MS. We sat down with GCAP and discussed the GA issues: a tuition waiver of up to 9 credits for missing undergraduate requirements. As a group, it seems that 3 or 4 would be reasonable, but any more may not be. There may be changes coming. Graduate Faculty Status – 35 people who did not apply for status or renewal.

e. UCAP – John Lindberg

Finished all proposals except for a handful. We felt that there were problems defining learning outcomes, we are going to have links on CDS to the suggestions for how to write learning outcomes. We also put together some distinction between BA and BS. That material will be put out for general comments; we want to put them out on the CDS webpages. Far too many proposals were not consistent.

(Question): With most proposals done, is there some time to work on CDS. When you go from pre-reqs to no pre-reqs, there is no way to do it on CDS. (Cronn-Mills): We are aware of the problem.

(Question): Is there a way to do a database search for a CDS proposal? (Cronn-Mills): not at this point.

f. IFO Salary Equity – Dan Cronn-Mills

We are still working, next meeting in March.

g. IFO Multi-Culture – Jose Lopez

WE had a meeting about 3 weeks ago. We discussed the possibility of reviewing a proposal that is sun-setting this year. It wasn't very well prepared, but we are going to try to come up with new language for something similar. There were 3 people who were found to have been hired under false pretenses, regarding their American Indian heritage.

(Marg): The Multicultural Committee is sponsoring a workshop in Mankato April 12th. We may need to pay some out of our funds in the short term, but we will be fully refunded.

h. IFO GRC – Marty Mitchell/Fred Slocum

March 7th, Fred Slocum will be representing us at the Democrat House and Senate Fundraiser and I will be at the Republican fundraiser. Our priorities are contract ratification, supplemental \$21M rolled into the base,

and ensuring the bonding bill priority list from the Governor gets funded including phase 2 of the Clinical Sciences Building.

* **i. Planning – Pat Nelson (Every Meeting)**

Handout

* **j. Unit Representatives (Every Meeting)**

(Gilbert): We met last week for 90 minutes, the lion's share of which was engaged in a discussion about Academic Partnership and the upcoming Supreme Court Case. AP: We agreed that Academic Partnership's Proposal is outsourcing in structure utilizing non-MnSCU, non-State of Mn employees. Nursing clinicals may be a precedent, but they aren't classroom teaching. We have strong concern about oversight. We are also concerned on the impact on our nursing faculty – how this would affect their working lives may get lost in the discussion about pedagogy. There are alternatives to AP which may be investigated. We agreed on a bottom line: the FA needs to decide whether AP is a slippery slope and proves an existential threat on the Union. If it isn't, then we need to decide how much political capital would be lost fighting it.

Regarding the Supreme Court Case, if the Court has a 4/4 split, the lower court ruling stands. It is possible that they may put it on the docket for the next session. There was a general agreement that this ruling is an existential threat to the Union. We may not just see fair share members leave, but there may be full members that leave too. We need to have more discussion on this, and perhaps have Grabowska come to talk to us.

(Visser): I want to move into Academic Partnerships for just a minute. In your packet there is a proposal that was given to us at Meet & Confer requesting faculty to work on workgroups and the timeline is May 2nd. We concluded that we should come up with 3 to 5 core concerns we need answers to. If we are just against it completely, even putting people on the workgroups is a waste of time. However, we don't want to be obstructionist either. If we decide that the coaches must be union members, I think it will sink the idea under the weight of the cost versus their business model.

(Question): The whole key is whether these coaches are adjunct faculty. If they are willing to put 100 people in a class and pay them adjunct rates, I'm not sure we can stop them.

(Question): We looked at UT Arlington site, and there is a link on their website for interested coaches which goes directly to an outside provider.

(Question): If they aren't our adjuncts, we can grieve.

(Question): My concern is that this effects all of the IFO not just at MSU. I was concerned that Grabowska wasn't as concerned as we were. I don't know why he isn't.

(Question): I don't know a lot about this, but my gut feeling is that I am adamantly against it. It is the privatization of our main mission.

(Visser): We have been asked for an answer, what is it?

(Question): I hear no one in favor of this initiative. My position is that I oppose.

(Question): Perhaps a strategy is that we request an added launch group on whether it is good for us to privatize before we even get into the nursing issues.

(Question): I think the discussion goes beyond the union. What if we were nonunion? I'd be saying the same thing. It is a means for an outside group to take advantage of a short term shortfall that is an unfunded mandate.

(Question): There are a couple of points we are skipping over. If they are State of MN employees, the union can't stop them. Even if they are Adjuncts, they are suggesting a massive increase in the use of Adjunct faculty instead of tenure-track. I think we have two reasons to say no.

(Question): If they were going to do this through adjuncts, there may be a way to decide that they are time-limited hires to deal with a one-time State staffing problem.

(Question): There hasn't been any good faith effort to help us develop these types of courses ourselves, and we have still done it without the resources.

(Question): I think we can make a strong stance that we are against it. I think we can say we are against it, but we'll still work in these workgroups.

(Question): I think the approach is that we set a different group than what they have set up. They don't talk about fiscal feasibility until the 3rd group.

(Question): Do we have assurances that if the nursing faculty say no that it ends? (Visser): No.

Mitchell/Carson: I move that we oppose Academic Partners because it compromises the mission of a State institution in delivering education in a nonprofit context: Passed

Secott/Severns: I move that we remain a part of addressing the workforce problem even as we oppose this particular solution involving Academic Partners: Passed

5. REPRESENTATION STILL NEEDED

- a. Fellowships Advisory Board (One Still Needed from) BUS, EDUC, SET
- b. Search Committee for Director of African American Affairs (1 Needed)
- c. Search Committee for Associate Dean of the College of Science, Engineering and Technology (Still Need 1 from each department) Automotive & Manufacturing Engineering Technology, Computer Information Science, Construction Management, Electrical & Computer Engineering & Technology, Mathematics & Statistics, Mechanical & Civil Engineering

Severns/Thoemke: Motion that Visser be able to appoint people and approve at next Exec. Meeting: Passed

- d. State IFO Action – Spring Semester 2016 (1 Needed)
- e. Representation Still Needed For Spring 2016

1. ALLIED HEALTH & NURSING

FA Assessment & Evaluation Committee – Spring 2016 Replacement

2. EDUCATION

FA Budget Committee – Spring 2016 Replacement

6. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS

a. Friedrichs Supreme Court Case - Visser

b. Proposal for the Creation of a Textbook Ad Hoc Taskforce – Clink – Time Certain 3:30 p.m. (Proposal Send With Agenda)

I am proposing that we determine what textbooks are for, how much they cost, and how students are using them. At the reference desk, students are adamant that they get an ILL loan for a textbook. I don't have any vested interest in the outcome. The timeline I anticipate is about a year and a half.

(Question): We need to have students involved in the taskforce.

(Question): Are you looking for an action item to come out of this taskforce once it has completed its research?

(Question): I think this identifies the problem and collects the data so that we can brainstorm possible solutions. (Clink): It may be only parts of research, perhaps only affordability, perhaps different portions.

(Question): Do we have any real hard data other than some students are complaining? Do we know how much an average student pays for textbooks?

(Question): We also need to be careful that the students don't say they don't have the money, when they do have the money but they'd rather spend their money on something else.

Wallace/Mitchell: Move to create said textbook ad hoc taskforce to sunset end of spring 2017: Passed.

c. Commencement Update – Hustoles – Time Certain 3:45 p.m.

<Handout> I think what we have works, but I think it could work better. I know that some of these ideas are controversial. I will tell you that there is a committee under AP Fleishman looking at this issue. Discussion of handout.

(Question): For 11, you may have to massage that because invitations have already gone out.

(Question): 5 and 6a: do students think that's ok? How much do they want a speaker in their college?

(Question): The DJ is a good idea, but submission of pictures to be displayed on the big screen might also be a good idea.

(Question): How solid is the idea of 6b? It sounds like it will take a lot of time? What is the practicality; sometimes the student doesn't actually show up. (Hustoles): The Graduates are carded, so it would not be too difficult.

Mitchell/Secott: Move to support the ideas outlined in the Commencement document: Passed

d. Third-Party Extended Education Partnership Progress Report – M&C Item from 02.04.16 #2 d. (Handout sent to Executive)

e. 20th Annual Dan and Ronnie Burton Dinner – Saturday, March 19 – Table of 8 \$500.00

f. FA Secretary Position 1 Year Appointment – This would get the FA back on the correct rotation. (My mistake – I did not put out on Nomination Ballot for Spring 2016)

Wallace/Thoemke: Motion to add 1 Year Appointment of Secretary to the Ballot: Passed

g. Proposal for AD Hoc Multi-Cultural Committee – Visser

h. Faculty Meeting with Local Candidates – Visser

i. Transfer Pathway Update and Information – Marg

<Handout> Legislatively mandated process. Could be considered a super articulation agreement. Guaranteed transfer from 2-year schools. They will very soon be looking for volunteers for these new teams.

j. HLC Visit Update – Pat Nelson

7. MEET & CONFER

- a. **FAAD Meet & Confer – Thursday, March 3, 2016 @ 3:00 p.m. in CSU 245 (FA Chair/ADAgenda)**

8. BRIEF WRITTEN REPORTS – February 18, 2016

- a. **Assessment & Evaluation – Carrie Chapman**

- b. **Budget – Roland Nord**

Oral Report: The Administration has identified \$3.8M worth of cuts at this point, but VP Straka did not say what those cuts were. Visser: the “tax” in our college was \$165K, and next year will be 500K. Nord: I don’t know why that information cannot be told to us directly, but it will be going through the Deans first. My guess is the remaining \$1.2M will be made up through bridge strategies. Any savings through BESIs will only affect FY 2017. There will be three open forums on the budget, expect them before spring break. VP Gustafson talked to us about partnerships and budget, but didn’t have any budgetary information to share other than 50% tuition goes to the partners.

(Visser): My understanding is that the coaches need to be paid as adjunct rate if they meet the requirements.

(Question): Why the sudden secrecy? Did VP Straka give any notification as to why we weren’t part of the discussion? (Nord): He simply chose not to share it.

(Question): Haven’t we had the opportunity to take part in the discussion before the cuts are announced?

(Nord): We know the Deans were requested to develop a cut strategy. How the money gets divided up among the colleges, I don’t know.

(Question): Are we getting to take part in these discussions? (Nord): As we’ve asked these questions, we’ve been told that it is handled by the Deans. The Master Plan is being used to make these decisions.

(Nord): The provost isn’t present at the budget Sub-Meet, but I think she will be at the forums. Perhaps we need to ask her there.

Carson/Swart: Request our leadership meet with the Provost to ask why the FA was not included earlier in the discussion of how budget cuts would be allocated: Passed.

(Question): It was reported to me that the Provost mentioned that the Master Plan was used to define programs to grow, programs to shrink, and programs to shut down. This sounds like Retrenchment may still be on the table. Was this talked about? (Nord): I didn’t hear it.

- c. **Extended Education – Paul Wyss**

- d. **Research – Teri Wallace**

- e. **IFO Academic Affairs – Patricia Hoffman** - The Academic Affairs Committee met via Webx on Wednesday Feb. 10, 2016.

- Information Item: The two standing IFO committees Academic Affairs and the Academic Technology were merged into one committee effective this fall. The IFO Operating Procedures were amended to note this change and the charges of the committee were integrated.

- **Discussion:** The IFO is exploring ways to encourage greater participation from the faculty membership on all campuses on statewide committees so representatives discussed the following questions related to their campuses:

- o Most campuses learn of statewide committee openings through their local FA communication channels
 - o Faculty are interested but concerns about time commitment, scope of the work, time in the Twin Cities away from campus and responsibilities related to campus work duties are often unclear

There is a concern that requests for participation do not come in a timely manner so faculty can make plans. Statewide IFO is encouraged to try and find out about statewide appointments as early as possible.

About half of the group had statewide joint MnSCU committees experience and noted some subcommittees of the Councils are very active (i.e. Faculty Development).

- **Discussion: Key academic concerns on campuses**

Transfer Pathways

The group discussed a need to bring together the IFO representatives to discuss principles and concepts related to transfer pathways including: backwards design for instruction/programs, relationship to existing articulation agreements, how this may impact unique campus programs and teaching and learning in the future.

o Committee Members were in agreement that Transfer Pathways was an academic issue that needed tending on a statewide level and that the

Transfer Pathways should be explained again to campuses

o Maythee shared a possible model that would allocate some of the resources currently assigned to the statewide Academic Affairs Coordinator to serve as the point person for IFO on Transfer Pathways which members agreed would be useful and should be discussed with the Executive Committee

Academic Planning at the Local Level

o This year, in the recent past, and next year many of the universities have or will have new academic provosts and will have new presidents. At some universities the academic leadership has come up through Student Affairs leadership rather than Faculty/Curriculum/Dean paths. This is a concern for some faculty especially as these leaders implement new strategic planning efforts

o Question: What if anything can be done to emphasis that academic leaders at the campus and system level should have broad academic planning experience?

• **Discussion:** Ideas to increase the connection between local academic affairs issues and statewide IFO issues?

o In what ways can we work to drive the academic agenda rather than react to legislation, initiatives?

o How does Academic Affairs tie in with GRC? Should this committee help frame some of the talking points/discussion related to Academic Issues? o How can we work on best practices in academic affairs rather than surface issues?

o How do we work to keep the unique diversity of our campuses and programs and still work together on issues?

f. **IFO Action**

g. **IFO Budget Oversight – Avra Johnson**

h. **IFO Feminist Issues – Leah White**

i. **IFO GLBTA – Shannon Miller**

j. **IFO Negotiator – Dan Cronn-Mills**

9. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

a. **Next FA Executive Meeting Thursday, March 17, 2016**

b. **Delegate Assembly – Friday, April 1 and Saturday, April 2, 2016 @ Radisson in Roseville. MSU Mankato has 21 more delegate openings of the 44 for MSU Mankato**

c. **Reminder about rejoining IFO**

d. University's Policy - Consultation and approval process includes two review periods during which members of the University community have the opportunity to read policy drafts and suggest modifications. The second period, entitled "formal review," results in revisions of the final drafts based on the comments received.

In accordance with the review process, the following policy drafts are presented for formal review which will run from February 9, 2016 to April 4, 2016.

A. Revised Policies

- Alcohol and Other Drugs
- International Student English Speech Placement (Previously: Assessment of English Language)

- Proficiency of International Students)
- Non-Motorized Vehicle and Electric Mobility Devices (Previously: Bicycles)
- English Composition Placement (Previously: English 101 Placement)
- Fire Safety and Protection
- Grading
- Grilling
- Mathematics Placement
- Non-Motorized Vehicle and Electric Mobility Devices (Previously: Rollerblades/Skateboards/Personal Assistive Mobility Devices)
- University Equipment and Property

B. New Policies

- Acceptance and Evaluation of Transfer Credits (New policy that incorporates Transfer of Credits from Technical Colleges)
- Information Privacy and Security (New policy that incorporates Campus Information Technology)
- Protection of Animals in Research
- University Data Governance

Copies of all policies under review may be accessed at <http://www.mnsu.edu/policies/whatis/review/>, within the “Policies Under Review” section.

Comments may be provided electronically (lynn.akey@mnsu.edu) or in writing (Lynn Akey, Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment, 315 Wigley Administration Center). **Please submit comments no later than Monday, April 4, 2016.**

10. OFFICER’S REPORTS

- a. **President (Mary Visser)**
- b. **Vice President/Grievance Officer (Gregg Marg)**
- c. **Treasurers Report (Bobby Bothmann)**

Meeting Adjourned at 5:04 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel J. Swart
FA Secretary