Senate Meeting, May 11, 2015.

Attendance: TBD.

4:08pm

Tom minutes approve

2nd Keith

Minutes approved

M&C discussion

Jeff Ueland: Breakdown of M&C. One of the things we asked about was the success of the course evaluations- 22% return rate of course evaluations. Still haven’t heard back from president on Step 2 grievance. Is a bit longer than I’d expect, need to check if they’ve missed deadline.

Parking proposal- looks similar but one thing they have done- they were surprised about the overselling of lots, apparently they follow Best Practise re overselling, but I will make sure that if they sell a parking spot, there will be one available.

AAR travel allocation. Last time we talked, they pulled the stipend for this, now they want to bring it back. They are concerned that no-one will want to do it, but there is a catch, the amount they WERE doing was $225 and now they want to do at half that rate. Welcome a motion that it’s sent back to be put at the $225 per session (Original amount).

Tom Fauchald moves

Bill Joyce 2nd

Deb Peterson- is this tied to the concept of only working half a day, we’re only paying you the half day?

Jeff- no, the AAR days in summer are fully covered, plus the stipend.

Tom F- these are mainly during the school year.

Cheryl Byers? In the past, this has been just the 225 and not a duty day/paid.

Tom- if you’re a chair contract, this is just your day.

Andrew Hafs- the way I read it, was that you just get a duty day on the sheet.

Deb- to be truthful, I am paid during the school year, the fact that they give me anything over my salary is a nice year, and there are things that we do simply because we’re faculty but to be truthful, meeting with students and signing them up for classes, we have opportunities to make contributions to these students’ lives, to sway them to take particular course. I’m embarrassed, that they pay me to do that, I want to go on the record with that.

? – This goes to our IFO funds, yes, it’s not a paycheque amount
Cheryl Byers- I would like to go on the record as agreeing with Deb, I think $100 is realistic.

Andrew- I agree with everything that was just said. It came up in Biology. We only see 3-5 students in that morning. If you make it 20 students, then it’s made worth it for our time. If they could restructure to make it worth our time.

Mark Lawrence- I do think it’s important to maybe puncture the balloon, ideally the academy is about doing something that is noble and heartfelt, and if we could do it for free, then it’s nice. But there is a thing called exploitation and it’s a slippery slope.

Motion passes.

Request to ask about enrolment and recruitment of NA students

What was mentioned was there wasn’t a sole dedicated effort, they have a recruiter but it’s not their sole focus to recruit NA, they do other things as well.

Tom- one of the things that we need from bringing this up, is this person underutilised, basically Parker talked about this individual who is paid for by MnSCU special money, and we need to say that we have concerns.

Jeff- Parker provide information about where we are and how it’s changed, but the numbers aren’t matching up.

Bill- there was concern that there would be retaliation if we brought this up in Senate. The turnover of NA (of employees) has been higher than other populations. Includes student workers (work study).

Jeff- anything we want to do with this further, wait until next year?

Heidi Hansen- not exactly clear what we’re trying to do with this? What’s the question here?

Jeff- the way it was discussed at M&C was about students in particular. Our goal for student population. We got information back, but they weren’t at the MAP level goals, so what happens next?

Heidi- you’re asking for feedback on the issue?

Jeff- yes.

Cheryl- I’m unclear why the Senate is getting involved in this? Is there a committee from all the tribes related to student involvement and retention? So why are we getting involved?

Tom- I think next year, if there are problems, we can set up a meeting with Exec and some of the people who have concerns. The problem is we didn’t get our ducks in a row before M&C came up. The other thing going on that we could pursue, is there has been a huge change in the last 30 years, if you looked back a lot more NA involvement, and a lot of our emphasis has been on freshmen rather than transfers. I think we can let it go, but when it comes up again address it.

Two more timelines.
Got the timelines pushed out for the two different timelines. Two included in this packet- sabbatical and non-renewal timelines. They seem to be changing, and it’s not contractual, but they’re changing some of the mechanism for non-renewal. If you can look at that and send comments in short order. The contract is very open, you can set up your policy, president approves it, comes to M&C, gets approved and that’s your contract. What they’re proposing is that if can be started anywhere along the chain- the dean can start it etc., it’s very different to how we’ve done it in the past. Please look at it and let folks know. Non-renewal is a difficult thing, should be a rigorous process. I would ask that the people look at it, send for feedback and get back to me.

Heidi- so I read it that the dean could send a faculty member a new contract and doesn’t have to go to department?

Jeff- that’s how I read it, yes.

Tom- we’re seeing a lot more of this than we’re seeing before and they want to get a little militant about it.

Carol Nielsen? Why are they considering changing this? What’s going on that makes this change?

Jeff- they want the flexibility to create a non-renewal at any stage along the way. That would be my best guess at that. I’ve only talked to Patrick Guilfoile about it at different meetings and that seems to be his way “it conforms better with the contract”. I don’t think that there’s anything wrong with what they’ve put in a technical sense, but having a non-renewal affects depts. in a big way.

Tom- the issue is that if this plays out, it could be that the dept. thoughts could be different how the dean feels and could lead to a grievance.

Jeff- there are some things that are non-grievable, but Process is. How Process reads is very important because it will affect our ability to grieve.

Grand audit conflict of interest policy

Found out during an audit that we don’t have a policy. So now they do. There is a form, and policy. This can also be part of progressive discipline, the form they used, and policy is borrowed from Mankato, so it currently exists in the system. I took a peek and didn’t see anything glaring, but I encourage those who do a lot of grants to take a look and see if anything needs modifying. That will be coming forward as well in some way, shape or form.

Two items president talked about in his forum-

Flattening and free tuition. If you look at the notes, there’s some info but very little information is given. First we were told there will be a proposal, and it seems like they’re eyeing implementation for the following fall. The main objective is to “try to create the very excellent residential experience again. To really focus effort on the residential experience”. There were three points that he outlined, call high retention. The residence hall experience would be part of the three points, used phrase “socialise freshmen differently to how we do now”.

?
Flattening administration would be part and parcel of this, for a couple of reasons. Try and make those numbers a little more even (some deans have 100 faculty under them etc.).

No firm proposal was given at this point.

Tom- if you read the notes, we tried really hard to get him to spill the beans on this stuff. The big instructional issue to this is the chair contracts. The other one that came up was actually a key thing, was the last dollar plan. You just can’t take the $6,000 and multiply by freshmen, and that’s how much you’re short. Basically it’s the Pell and state grants and how that plays out.

Heidi- where is the money coming from? And where does the new building fit in to this? The classroom only building? I have concerns that it will destroy the relationship between faculty and students.

Jeff- good news from the senate, the contract passed. Is set to go to the house, where by all accounts it will get a straight up and down vote. The contract is actually done on Tuesday, so we need a new one!

Old business.

AB grading.

Jeff- where we left off was postponing, was motion of plus minus and rank. I don’t believe it has to come off the table, as it was just postponed and not suspended.

Mass communication – would like more information about the ranking process. We were unclear and unfamiliar, and wondering if it could be optional.

Another question Mass com – what other MnSCU schools doing? We and Winona are the only ones who don’t do plus minus.

Porter- Prof Ed- nearly unanimous in favour of plus/minus.

Janet Heuer- criminal justice opposed.

Cheryl- Social work supportive plus/minus, opposed to ranking.

Paul- against ranking, supportive of plus/minus.

English - no further discussions since last meeting.

Carol Nielson- can I split motion in two? So that one is plus/minus and one is ranking?

Motion- want to look at plus minus and ranking separately.

Keith Marek 2nd

Any discussion on splitting motion?
Approved.

Keith- students will complain about ranking, and also about plus/minus

Professional Ed- discussed vast difference between an 80 and an 89 percent.

Tom- it would be optional because if you don’t have it in your syllabus, then you don’t have to do it.

? Then that really skews the GPA.

Keith- how many time shave you dropped the percentage down from an 87 to an 85, so it already happens to a certain extent.

Jeff- motion on the floor.

Bill- with respect to the plus/minus, could we consider a grade, then a plus, so it is A, A+, B, B+, etc., so is still within the four point system.

Carol- would the faculty member be the one who determines the plus/minus?

Jeff- yes. Students wanted plus/minus, and admin said they were open to whatever we have consensus on.

Heidi- in the past didn’t the senate vote to have a plus/minus structure and then didn’t do anything with it?

Jeff- yes

Donna- do the plus/minus go down to the D?

Jeff- it’s up to the faculty, but the ability is there to do it.

Paul- I had 2 students, one was a 70, one was an 80 and they are both B students in the books, but not the same calibre of student.

Jeff- all in favour of supporting plus/minus grading.

Passes

Jeff- question of supporting rank as secondary piece.

Fails.

Jeff- I will put our wishes forward.

Any new business?

Bill- at the student safety task force meeting, Hanson said one way to fund might be through his office, to eliminate the mini-grants to fund the recommendations to faculty grants. Would like to keep an eye on that.

Andrew- I would be very much against that, with 24-credit teaching load I need and use those grants to do my research.
Tom- he’s looking at using that study to justify some changes in the student body??

Jeff- I wold hope that if they are going to make changes to that they will bring to M&C. Thank you Bill, for bringing to our attention.

Tom- good job this year, Jeff (general applause).

5:00 adjourn