

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Thursday, September 15, 2011

CSU 285

APPROVED MINUTES

In attendance: Jim Grabowska (FA President), Mary Visser (FA Vice President), Daniel Swart, Lynnette Engeswick, Paul Hustoles, Angela Monson, Barbara Carson, Kelly Krumwiede, Dick Liebendorfer, Georgia Holmes, John Seymour, Becky Schwartzkopf, Ellen Mrja, Danae Quirk Dorr, Paul Wyss, Emily Stark, Queen Booker, Nancy Fitzsimons, Miriam Porter, Kirsti Cole, Hans-Peter DeRuiter, Ron Nickerson

Meeting called to order at 3:05 PM

1. Minutes of previous meeting (Unapproved Minutes –August 25, 2011)

Hustoles/Visser: Moved to approve: Passed

2. Call for Additional Items/ Reordering of Agenda

3. IFO STANDING COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS NEEDED

- a. IFO E-Voting Task Force (1 Needed) – SET – Dean Kelley
- b. IFO Presidential Election Committee (1 Needed) – BUS - Georgia Holmes

Hustoles/Carson: Moved to confirm the above: Passed

- c. IFO Treasurer’s Advisory Committee

4. FACULTY ASSOCIATION – STILL NEEDED –Fall 2011

- a. COB Extended Learning – Business (1 year replacement needed for Brenda Flannery)
- b. FA Nominations & Election Committee Spring 2012 – (Need Business & Education)
- c. COB Rep on LTR 1 Year Replacement –
- d. FA Writing Task Force – Queen Booker

Hustoles/Carson: Moved to confirm Booker: Passed

5. FACULTY ASSOCIATION APPOINTMENTS CONFIRMATION NEEDED

- a. President’s Diversity Commission (3 Needed) – A&H – Heather Hamilton; Mika N. Laidlaw; SET – Shekhar Patil; In-Jae Kim

Hustoles/Queen: Moved to confirm Hamilton: Passed

Mjra/Hustoles: Moved to confirm Laidlaw: Passed

Stark/Quirk Dorr: Moved to confirm Patil: Passed

- b. International Program Advisory Council (IPAC) (1 from AH&N – Jon Lim & 1 from Bus – term 2011-2013)-
- c. Academic Standing Committee (SCR Rep. + 1 more Needed) - (SET) Angie Bomier (SRC) – AH&N - Lynnette Engeswick; SBS - Karla Lassonde

Stark/Carson: Moved to confirm Lassonde: Passed

Nickerson/Quirk Dorr: Moved to confirm Bomier: Passed

- d. ADA Advisory Council (2 Needed) – AH&N – Suzannah Armentrout; Sherry Folsom-Meek; EDUC - Carol Burns; LIB/UNAF – Nancy Rolfsrud

Visser/Quirk Dorr: Moved to confirm Armentrout : Passed

Hustoles/Monson: Moved to confirm Rolfsrud: Passed

- e. President's Commission on the Status of Women (3 Needed) –A&H – Leah White; Lib/Unaf – Nancy Rolfsrud; SBS – Annelies Hagemester; Janet Cherrington-Cuore/ Ihsuan Li; Jenelle Haddad (New);

Carson/Hustoles: Moved to confirm Hagemester: Passed

Porter/Quirk Dorr: Moved to confirm Li: Passed

Hustoles/Leibendorfer: Moved to confirm White: Passed

- f. COE FA Planning Committee Spring Replacement for Scott Page on sabbatical - Kitty Foord

Hustoles/Nickerson: Moved to confirm b and f as above: Passed

6. Discussion Items/Action Items

- a. Center for Faculty Development (Miriam Porter)(Sept. 1 Meeting)

Committee met earlier this month and looked at four proposals. Facility considerations include space for reception, both low and high tech workspace, a space to conversation, comfortable furniture, and security. A 3D plan of layout is being reviewed.

(Question): Where is this located? (Schwartzkopf): In ERC of Library right off of elevator.

(Question): Is access restricted to only library hours? (Schwartzkopf): Yes, but these hours are very generous.

(Question): Is the Center to have a strong online presence? (Grabowska): That is what we are expecting; this point is very important. (Porter): Ideas concerning online presence are good suggestions.

(Question): Is it true that they will be combining CETL and CESR, etc., with a single point of administration on top? (Grabowska): It is true that they will be combining, but they will not share a centralized reporting administrator.

(Question): Is this the best space or just the only space they could find? (Grabowska): It is not just simply the only possible space.

(Question): Is the back door in the 3D plan just a fire exit, or an access? (Schwartzkopf): Those are fire exits.

- b. Differential Tuition and Accountability (N. Fitzsimons)

For the first time we've had Differential Tuition, this is the first time that faculty had any input into how the money might be used. Should the Differential Tuition Committee be looking at exactly how this tuition is being used to ensure it is as intended, or how other entities are controlling how the money is spent? There should be a way to monitor the cash use to make sure that it is being used correctly. How do we pose these questions? (Grabowska): These questions go beyond the scope of our Differential Tuition Committee. However, this point is important, and we should have a conversation on how the money is being used. (Hustoles): Perhaps this needs to be brought to Meet & Confer and ask that some steps to accountability be imposed. (Grabowska): We will suggest that as an agenda item for the next meeting. (Nickerson): These items are related: if we have expansion of Differential Tuition into the undergraduate curriculum, it may become easier for entities to siphon off the money. (Carson): Differential Tuition for Continuing Education should also be monitored, as it's supposed to be funneled back to rebuild online learning. (Quirk Dorr): There is a new proposed formula for calculating the distribution of online Differential Tuition money. The FA Extended Learning Committee is concerned with this because the money goes back to the deans, not to the departments/programs.

- c. Work Meeting to develop responses and proposals for the funding lines that the FA received at the last M&C.

- (1) Budget's Discussion on the DRAFT 0.5 Proposed Non-Base Investments 2011-2012 – (Yellow)
(Emailed 09/14/11 and attached)

(Mrja): We have been given some information from Straka: the first column is to be \$500,000.

Administration has not settled on total for all 3 categories, but looking at approximately \$4-5 million. Reinvestment funding is for facilities and campus of the future. (Grabowska): We've been assured that nothing is off the table.

Discussion ensued

Results of discussion centered on the FA opinion that this money should be largely dedicated to academic programming. To this end, the following recommendations were made:

- The demolition of the Gage Towers should be removed from all discussion regarding dispersal of this money. In conversations with the Administration, the Gage demolition seemed to overshadow the dispersal discussion because said demolition would use up all the money. Demolition of a building is a bonding issue, not a non-base investment.
- The ratio of Academic program investment to Facilities investment should be 70/30.
- The three targeted "categories", scope, and eligible submitters are satisfactory, with the following changes: academic programs should be added to the eligible submitter list for category II, and should become the preferred focus of that area.
- Monetary limitations should be removed from all three categories. In this way, given a proposal that spans two or more categories, reviewers could shift a proposal to another category to ensure the project receives funding.
- The Review Process for all three categories should be identical, and should follow the Strategic Priority Funding model (category I) as used in the past. Process caretaker for all three categories should be the Planning Submeet. This review model has a history of working very well, and the FA is dedicated to operating this process in a timely fashion.
- Applications for all categories should be 1-2 pages, with reviewers able to ask for supplemental information when needed.
- The submission date for proposals in all three categories should be common, and be set for November 1, 2011, with decisions made by March 1, 2012.
- Amounts to be funded in each category should be releases to the campus community as soon as possible, and should not fluctuate after being set.

7. Informational Items

- a. Next Executive Thursday, October 13 @ 3:00 p.m., Armstrong Hall 303
- b. Delegate Assembly – March 23 & 24, 2012
- c. Policy Committee – Hustoles: If there are any policies that need attention, please tell me. The policies being brought forward by Tomany have a very tight timeline.

8. Faculty Association Committee Chair & IFO Standing Committee Reports

a. Assessment & Evaluation (Kirsti Cole) *The Assessment and Evaluation Sub-meet convened on Friday, September 2nd. We had a very productive and informative meeting. With Lynn Akey, we reviewed the history of the committee and our charge, the changing Pathways Assessment through the Higher Learning Commission, as well as few new data gathering options that Lynn's office is working on with IT called SharePoint PowerPivot. We decided that because our charge covers not only student learning and success, but also institutional assessment, that we would divide into two subgroups, one that focuses on assurances of student learning, and one that is focused on institutional effectiveness.*

Our next meeting is September 23rd, and we will be discussing the HLC Assessment Academy projects, as well as Action Items for the newly formed subgroups.

- b. Budget (Ellen Mrja)

c. Extended Learning (Danae Ouirk Dorr) *The Faculty on the Extended Learning Comm. met on September 14. The Sub-Meet will be having its first meeting on September 28th at 3 pm.*

d. Faculty Development (Paul Wyss) - No Report

e. Faculty Improvement & Sabbatical (Emily Stark) *Nothing new to report from the Faculty Improvement and Sabbatical Committee.*

f. General Education & Diversity (Queen Booker) *The GEDC met on September 9th.*

During our meeting we discussed Academic Affairs desire to not publish a hard copy of the bulletin. Topics on the agenda for the 2011-2012 academic year for the GED Committee include improving the process for preparing purple and gold proposals, reviewing a request by the administration to develop a way for students to get diversity credit for study abroad/international study, and incentives to increase interest in writing intensive courses.

g. Graduate (Nancy Fitzsimons) *The Graduate Committee met on September 13. The committee is overseeing the process for selecting the Midwestern Association of Graduate Schools (MAGS) thesis that will represent MSU, Mankato. Deadline for submitting thesis to each college's Graduate Committee representative is Friday, September 16, 2011. Graduate committee members will be meeting with College Curriculum Committees to introduce ourselves and to discuss ways the College Curriculum Committees can help to circumvent program and course proposals being sent for additional information/clarification by the Graduate Committee. The Graduate Committee approved two documents designed to help faculty develop course proposals: 1) Writing Graduate Level Student Outcomes and 4xx/5xx Level Courses: Ideas for Delineating Graduate Level Requirements. The documents were originally presented at the spring Graduate Coordinators meeting, with a request for feedback from faculty. The Graduate Committee will be asking to have these documents posted on the Graduate College webpage, CDS webpage and will be sharing with CETL and UCAP. The documents are a resources for faculty; not prescriptive guidelines. The Dean of CGSR would like to review the Graduate Faculty Status Policies and Procedures to clarify the policy and, if possible, simplify the process for faculty. Recommendations for changes were made last year by the Graduate Committee, however they were not implemented. The letters for faculty with instructions for reapplying for graduate faculty status were sent by the Dean of GSR using the old procedures. The Graduate Committee has agreed to discuss, review, and recommend revision. The Graduate Committee is requesting that the committee no longer be asked to review incomplete Graduate Faculty applications. In the past the Graduate Committee has had the responsibility for determining if applications are complete and then directly requesting information from faculty. The Committee believes that this is a clerical function that should be performed by the Graduate College or other designated entity. The Graduate Committee will review completed applications to ensure that applicant's meet the stipulated criteria for the rank requested. The Committee discussed a desire to have a role on the President's proposed Graduate Task Force. The Committee is requesting that when the Administration puts forward the purpose and charge for such a task force, that the Graduate Committee have the opportunity to review to determine if the Committee can fulfill the charge or at minimum have Graduate Committee members on the Graduate Task Force. The Committee is proposing April 3, 2012 as the deadline for submitting proposals through the CDS system to the Graduate Committee. The Graduate Committee discussed a concern put forward by a faculty member regarding student-related forms for the Graduate College getting lost, delayed, and the time-consuming process of completing paper versions of materials. The Graduate Committee will be discussing this issue at the first Graduate Committee Submeet & Confer with a request for moving to an on-line system – fill-in fomrs, e-sign, e-submit. Bobby Bothmann has agreed to represent the Graduate Committee on the Writing Task Force.*

h. Planning (Mirian Porter) *The Planning Committee will be meeting Sept. 29th.*

i. Research (Hans-Peter DeRuiter) *The Faculty research Committee has no updates for the September 15 Meeting. The next meeting will be held on September 23rd 2011. During this meetings goals will be set for 2011-2012.*

j. UCAP (Ron Nickerson) *UCAP has been working with Academic Affairs and the Gen Ed and Diversity Sub-Meet to agree on curricular deadline dates and Curriculum Design System (CDS) start-up dates for the 2011 – 2012 Academic Year. Letters will be coming out for both, along with a CDS training letter, early next week. Faculty can continue to work on and save curricular proposals in CDS prior to the system's September 16th restart. UCAP has also been working with Academic Affairs to develop a one-time more streamlined process to upload course outlines for out lower division non-General Education courses per MNSCU's mandate to publish all course outlines online. We need to upload lower division courses this year and upper division courses next year. This effort is part of the Students First initiative. More will be coming on the process in the near future so departments can begin to provide the necessary information. Current thinking is that revisions to the outlines posted through this initial effort can occur gradually as departments make changes in their courses through CDS. The first Sub-Meet will be September 20th and will be devoted mainly to an initial discussion of several proposed academic policy changes largely stimulated by changes in federal financial aid requirements.*

Meeting Adjourned at 4:58 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel J. Swart
FA Secretary