

FACULTY ASSOCIATION MEET AND CONFER
Thursday, November 10, 2011
3:00 – 5:00 p.m.
CSU 204
(Faculty Agenda /Administration Chair)

NOTES

Attendance:

Faculty: Jim Grabowska, Mary Visser, Daniel Swart, recorder, Barbara Carson, Paul Hustoles, Kelly Krumwiede, Richard Liebendorfer, John Seymour, Becky Schwartzkopf, Gregg Marg, Ellen Mrja, Danae Quirk Dorr, Emily Stark, Queen Booker, Miriam Porter, Ronald Nickerson

Guest: Clark Johnson, Roger Severns

Management: Richard Davenport, convener, Scott Olson, David Jones, Ed Clark, Henry Morris, Warren Sandmann, Becky Barkmeier, Rick Straka

Guests: Lynn Akey, Doug Mayo

The meeting called to order: 3:03 p.m.

1. Information Items--

a. Reorder/Additions: None.

b. FA President's Report (Jim Grabowska):

FA President Grabowska: I am ceding my time to Clark Johnson. Clark Johnson: I am here representing the Student Relations Coordinators and the students regarding student policies on satisfactory achievement. We support a system where students who are completing their warning semester and have not achieved SAP, but have achieved a 2.5 GPA and 75% should be allowed to continue to work toward meeting SAP. However, the new federal financial aid rules contradict this system; if a student does not meet SAP in the warning semester, they will lose their financial aid. This puts a burden on students who need financial aid and creates a two-tiered system; those that need financial aid and those who do not. If this is what the financial aid ruling says, and we are told we cannot override it, we should obtain a legal opinion on situation. We need to bring these policies into a cohesive whole. FA: So you are supporting the academic policy, not the financial aid policy? Clark Johnson: Yes. Provost Olson: I know that the federal government has laws how financial aid is awarded which supersedes our needs. A few years ago we were fined for not following the federal rules. Clark Johnson: I think we should get a legal opinion on this situation; we have a chance to take a lead on getting this policy changed at the federal level. The fact that there are two systems based on means is unfair. President Davenport: This may be more than a single institution can change, but it is worth looking at. FA: Would it help to look how the other institutions policies are aligned? Vice President Straka: Basically our policy is the MnSCU policy. Clark Johnson: We should find out if there is a waiver process on the federal rule.

c. MSU President's Report (Richard Davenport):

President Davenport: Thank you for supporting the Big Idea campaign. We are considering a matching gift program, but it hasn't been defined yet. We are going to step up our efforts now that we are at 76% of our goal. We are working on different kinds of angles to wrap this campaign up.

There was an interesting *Chronicle of Higher Education* article: Where does our freshmen class come from? This article tracked students in Minnesota from 2006-2010. The University of Minnesota decreased in the number of Minnesota students accepted by 5.4% (and thus accepting more out of state students). Minnesota State Mankato increased our share of Minnesota students by 13.3%. This is an indicator that we are on the right track. We really need to step up our efforts; we are in the best position of all the state schools, but the other schools aren't standing still. We all have to work hard on enrollment management.

On Saturday, November 12, at 1:00 p.m. the renaming ceremony of the Earley Performing Arts Center will take place.

d. Provost & VPAA Report (Scott Olson):

Provost Olson: Staffing requests have now gone back to the colleges. Departments should be hearing back from the Deans soon. Administration funded twenty-seven probationary and twenty-five fixed-term positions. The FY13 budget does contain a \$2 million cut in salary dollars, and while less than the \$6 million that was projected a couple of years back, this is still a decrease in our budget.

Allied Health & Nursing and College of Education Dean searches are underway. Facilities Management search is also moving along. Several other searches for administrators are ongoing.

The Higher Learning Commission site visit of our off-campus facilities gave us very positive reviews.

e. Human Resources Topics (Becky Barkmeier):

Director Barkmeier: The Remembrance Day and National Role Call will take place tomorrow, November 11. Benefits open enrollment and Journey Well survey are ongoing.

2. Discussion Items--

a. MnSCU/Legislative Relations (Standing):

President Davenport: The Bonding project is in review. The Viking stadium issue is now center stage in budget talks. If the Vikings move, we won't be having a training camp on campus next year. We don't hear much about a special session since the Republican Party is split on their support of a special session. However, I am hearing from the legislative leaders that a special session is going to happen.

b. Budget (Rick Straka) (Standing):

Vice President Straka: Things are going well; enrollment is good. We are waiting a little on the MMB negotiations and how they will affect our budgets, as well as any tuition rate increases. We will await the November tax forecast to see where we wind up. I don't see us needing to run another round of reduction any time soon. Provost Olson: We had a good discussion in Planning Sub Meet and Confer on how base budget increases might be set up, process-wise.

c. Undergraduate Differential Tuition (FA – Roger Severns – 3:05 p.m. - Time Certain)(Emailed information):

Roger Severns: Last year, we started to look at on campus use of differential tuition (DT). We presented our findings a few weeks ago at FA Executive, and now we are presenting here. How might differential tuition be used on our campus? Our conclusions: Since we don't even have a procedure for undergraduate differential tuition, we should modify the current procedure to allow the possibility of undergraduate differential tuition. This would be more consistent with what is happening at other campuses. Our group also focused on accountability of DT. We think each differential tuition situation should have a separate accounting line: This is currently the situation, but is not part of policy. Our expectation is that, as this goes through the review process, it will draw a lot of comments, but we have to start somewhere. Provost Olson: The Board is taking great interest in every line of the budget, and Chancellor Rosenstone says that we need to hold the line on tuition. Vice President Straka: A new change this year is that we will have to calculate differential tuition into the cost increase of overall tuition. There will be a great deal more scrutiny on this calculation. FA: Aren't we the outlier at not using differential tuition? Roger Severns: Yes, but we don't have a procedure on how to even think about DT for undergrads. There are departments interested in DT, but there is no mechanism. FA President Grabowska: The FA Executive has supported the idea of forming this policy. FA: Was there any more discussion of banded tuition at the Board? Vice President Straka: There is only one school that doesn't use banded tuition. The Board will not allow us to band or un-band just to increase our tuition total. The net total needs to remain neutral. Associate Vice President Sandmann: So if the Board said 0 tuition increase, does this mean no DT? Vice President Straka: I would think that it would be unlikely to get new differential tuition past the Board. The Board only focuses on changes from one year to the next.

FA: So regardless of politics upstream, we should recommend that a policy be formed? Roger Severns: This is what the committee is recommending. Having consistent policies and procedures to outlast political weather is a good institutional approach. FA: What type of "review" is meant in section E? Roger Severns: It isn't defined in the current policy, so we didn't discuss it at length. If this policy goes to formal review, I am sure that people will comment on this.

d. Presidential Scholarships:

FA Vice President Visser: Faculty have always been very involved, but we were shocked that last year there was only one Presidential Scholarship to be given. We want to ensure that faculty time is being best used. Provost Olson: Admissions Director, Brian Jones, wanted to be here today, but he did give me some notes: Of the thirty-four students entered into the Honors Program, twenty-seven were Presidential Scholarship reviewees. There is another level of benefit to this process than just the scholarship. Vice President Mayo: There will be five scholarships this year. We weren't going to offer them unless we are sure we have the funding. Funding still isn't at the level we want, but it is getting more stable. President Davenport: It is harder to get money for brick and mortar changes; people are more apt to donate money to help students. Our next campaign, a major focus will be on scholarships. FA: Do we know what the retention rate of the Presidential Scholars? Vice President Mayo: It is 93%. FA: Perhaps this should be renamed High Ability Student Scholarship interviews instead of Presidential Scholarships? President Davenport: We could present this in a different way.

e. Revised Process for Position Requests (FA):

Gregg Marg: I heard some discussion that at Deans' Council they might start talking about position requests earlier. They would start the position requests in the spring for the next year, so that by the end of September we could have position allocations. At the FA Executive, we supported this move. Provost Olson: It was discussed at the Deans' Council: A while back we tried a twice-a-year approach, early for known positions, and later for what else sprouted up. We did talk about bringing back the spring round, and that it may become the primary round. President Davenport: There doesn't seem to be a downside. Provost Olson: We like this change because, right now, staffing completely overlays the Article 22 process. I will bring this back to the Council of Deans.

f. Timing of Non-renewal Feedback (FA):

FA President Grabowska: This is a procedural issue. There are two decisions that we make that can be devastating – for no-renewal and against tenure. Policy now states that the only statement for non-renewal comes from the President. We would like this to mirror tenure, where non-renewal is mentioned by Departments, Deans, and then at the Presidential level. We think that moving the non-renewal process in this direction is beneficial to everyone. Provost Olson: I am very interested in hearing your ideas on this topic. President Davenport: I think this idea has merit and it may answer some questions before documentation gets to the President's Office.

g. Informal Review of University Policies (Lynn Akey)

(Copies of all policies may be accessed at <http://www.mnsu.edu/policies/whatis/review/>, 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 December 8, 2011.

A. Revised Policies (Review runs from November 4, 2011 to December 8, 2011):

1. Academic Honesty
2. Contracts
3. English 101 Placement
4. Grade Appeals
5. Grading
6. Lost and Found
7. Outdoor Music Events

8. Posting
9. Priority Registration
10. Statement of Student Responsibilities
11. University Undergraduate Graduation Requirements
12. Undergraduate Admissions
13. Web Publishing

B. New Policies:

1. Assessment of English Language Proficiency of International Students

C. Expedited Review (Single Review Period of 30 Days, November 4, 2011 to December 8, 2011.)

1. Academic Probation, Suspension, and Reinstatement for Undergraduate Students
2. Student Financial Aid Eligibility: Satisfactory Academic Progress (SAP) Standards
3. Last Day of Attendance

Expedited Review Note: Existing policies may undergo limited changes to ensure compliance with MnSCU policy, adherence to state and federal law or to revise language due to current practice. Such changes occur through a more limited process than the full review required under the Policy Consultation and Approval Process. This “expedited review” process provides a shorter period of time during which responses are received and reviewed. These updated policies then are forwarded to the President for approval.

There will be three expedited reviews forthcoming. Feedback of informal review goes back to originators for modification.

h. One Time Investments:

President Davenport: A number of proposals have come forward: Thirty-five for Strategic Priority Funding, totaling \$3.5 million, seventy-one for Big Ideas, totaling \$16.6 million, and twenty-six for Facilities Reinvestment, totaling \$5.1 million. All proposals are available online for review. The evaluation process is underway. The Planning Sub Meet and Confer is in charge of the SPF and Big Ideas; Budget Sub Meet and Confer is in charge of Facilities Reinvestment. Everyone will receive notification for step 2 of the process by November 30.

i. Technology Update (Ed Clark):

Vice President Clark: We have moved the Computer Repair Shop to the third floor of the Library. We will expand the Computer Store to twice its size. We will be holding a Technology Fair, where faculty can see new services which will be available. Finally, we are just starting a project at 7700 France which will expand our telepresence capabilities. FA: There was a limited utility to this telepresence system to groups larger than six people. Vice President Clark: There is a new system using half circles that allows 40 students to use the system. FA: How much did this all cost? Vice President Straka: In order to extend our lease, we required a percentage to be paid by the leasee of the building for improvements. FA: We still need mentoring for faculty for using this equipment. FA: It would be nice to have a review on how to use this equipment during Professional Development Day. FA: Perhaps equipment choices should be made in part by the faculty who actually use it so that it will actually work for us.

j. Graduation Applications (Clark Johnson): Applications for graduation are backlogged. As of this week, the Registrar’s Office has not been giving a review of graduation plans. There doesn’t seem to be a plan on where students go to get that definitive statement of whether they will graduate or not. Advisors, chairs, and SRC’s will be being asked by the students to do this work for them. They will get multiple answers from each source. Associate Vice President Sandmann: The Registrar’s Office will be going back to the old system, effective immediately. They made this change without notifying anyone. They need to come up with a new system that

works for everyone.

The meeting adjourned 4:41 p.m.

Next meeting: Thursday, January 26, 2012, 9:00-11:00 a.m., CSU 204 (Faculty Chair /Administration Agenda)



Warren Sandmann
Reviewer for Management



Daniel Swart
Reviewer for Faculty