Senate Meeting 8-24-15

**Attending:** Mike Hamman, Donna Pawlowski, Brian Donovan, Paul Kivi, Heidi Hansen, Francois Neville, Janice Haworth, B. McManus, Mark Lawrence, Pat Donnay, John Truedson, Christel Kippenhan, Porter Coggins, Kris Nei, Judy Olson, Keith Gora, Jan Heuer, Cheryl Byers, Bill Joyce, Joann Fredrickson, Tim Brockman, Drew Graham, Debra Sea, Pat Conely, Sarah Young, Mary Fairbanks, Jennifer Atteberry, Larry Swain, Jeff Ueland, Keith Marek, Sarah Taurtis, Tom Fauchald, Rod Henry, Carolyn Townsend.

**Apologies:** Andrew Hafs

Meeting start: 4:02pm

Approve minutes from May, 2015.

Motion- Tom Fauchald

Second: Rod Henry

Approved.

---

Jeff Ueland- Welcome back; there are a few items for action.

We have a new contract- don’t confuse it with contract that was just ratified. It’s not.

Along with that we have some new folks that self-nominated and Senate needs to confirm. Larry Swain (BSUFA Exec VP) and Mehdi Sheikholeslami (Treasurer).

Motion to approve- Brian Donovan

Judy Olson- second

Passed.

---

Lib Ed director position. Sept 1st is deadline. If interested, please put name forward.

---

Russ Stanton visit. Retirement benefit seminar. If you’re considering retiring, can get an individual meeting. Important to note for new faculty is that they have a year to choose their plans. Likewise for newly tenured faculty, they have options to change their plans.

---

M& C. there are some issues that will be discussed and I will bring them to you for discussion. There aren’t many yet, because it’s early in the year.

Talk to us at any time if you have any questions, the items/agenda etc. will be on the BSUFA website.

---

At last BSUFA Exec we put together a motion, which doesn’t need a second. Sometimes it seems as if deans are holding on to curriculum proposals longer than they should. We have an interest in finding ways to crack the whips in some ways. What the Exec came up with, and we hope to discuss here, ([see link for curriculum grid proposal](#)). What I’m hearing from folks is that it becomes a little bit like Keystone Cops- who has it and when? Where has it gone and when? The clock starts running and the process is transparent. It comes from Exec so it doesn’t need a second.
Porter- would the tracking date grid go along with the proposal?

Jeff- online there is a chart on the registrar's site. What we want to ensure, is that the minute a dept. puts a proposal forward, we know about it. Don’t want to create a lot of work for folks, just a simple date, with a brief note. Another column that would basically address these issues.

Brian Donovan: I have two questions on the resolution itself. I question the use of the indicative “whereas” ... should it be “the curriculum process “should” be controlled by faculty?

2nd question: what of proposals that are not returned but are not put forward either?

Jeff- if I may speak for the Exec (yes). There is a little bit of leverage there. As for the first one, this is how the president says this phrase, and it sometimes feel as if we don’t, and if the body here wants to change the language, we can.

Rod- relative to the second point- it’s impossible to make a claim that a dean is not expediting curriculum proposals unless you have some sort of record. Similar to problems with salary equity we ran into years ago. This generates a record, so that deans are held accountable.

Christel Kippenhan- who fills out the dates? Curriculum co-ordinatator?

Jeff- I believe is Robin Gullickson.

Christel- the Curriculum co-ordinatator (CC) doesn’t see the proposal until after the dean has seen it. Do we need to change the flow?

Jeff- I think Robin is cc’d on every email re the flow, and there might be a reason why the flow is the way it is?

Christel- my concern is that it won’t be recorded on the grid because the CC doesn’t see it?

Mike Hamman- is there any way we can get an electronic date on this so you don’t have to worry about the grid? Like a D2L shell for depositing them?

Tom- it’s really critical, in M&C we had to dig it out of the provost, they will actually fudge on the dates.

Jeff- this doesn’t need to be punitive, just make the process transparent. We don’t want good ideas (curriculum) shut down for arbitrary and capricious things.

Tom- also forces them to make a decision.

Paul Kivi- I am in favour of killing the pocket veto.

Passes

Jeff- will take this to meet and confer

Jeff- update on stuff happening in downstate IFO. We went down over the summer for a “change leadership” workshop, which really wasn’t about Charting The Future (CTF), which it was supposed to be about. Was quite interesting. My understanding is that CTF is still supposed to come to campus. The whole process still feels nebulous; we have been assured it will be above board and proper.

There is also something called the “preferred name initiative”. Lets students offer the name they want- issues re transgender students being discriminated against. Long time in coming, students should be able to utilise the names they want whilst on campus.
Salary equity. We were told in August that this was started. They are so far behind. Was supposed to be done in 2011, another one is supposed to be done in 2016. The IFO presidents are behind this. One of the hold ups is that campuses aren’t providing information (rubric of experience when salary worked out). This is what we’re being told by central office, if you ask our HR, they’ll say they’ve provided. We have been told that the yearly ones have been started, not the big one.

Over the summer we held two grievances, all others abeyed, these are big ones.

Adjuncts – we got what we wanted. The crux of this grievance was positions had been hired as adjuncts that were permanent positions and this goes against contract. Mike Murray did digging and found positions in depts. and they have been green-lighted for the future.

There has been some wrangling, getting some flak from deans, saying they can’t hire as much, but there are ways to hire around this, there are a number of ways to still hire adjuncts - if they’re a temporary nature. Don’t let the deans tell you they can’t hire adjuncts because of this grievance.

See Resolution of Grievance

Mike Murray- the positions that I found were the ones that I found looking at five years of data. Don’t take my word for it- look for yourself, or talk to myself or Jeff and we will sort it out. Don’t take the work I did as the be all and end all- it’s not the end of grieving the issue. We can still look at other departments.

Jeff- Course evaluations- Tadlock's comments at start-up lead me to believe that we won’t see these again. This was just a bad idea all around, and was reflected by how faculty opposed it. I will keep you informed as to how this progresses.

Tom Fauchald- Negotiator

You received a letter from Jim Grabowska about it. He hit the economic parts about it. A big part was the chancellor and his evaluation- he’s being evaluated this week.

2.2% across the board. Across the board is a critical thing. Why? We are trying to keep the adjuncts up with us. New hires- they are hired at a step above. Not a step for returning faculty. Second year we go up across the board 1% and then everyone gets a step. Adjuncts are going to get the same amount as returning faculty.

Keep in mind- promotions and current career step language is maintained.

Adjunct rate- this was a big one. Instructors are going to be placed at a minimum of Step 5.

Keep us informed if they start talking about combining departments to save money.

If you take sabbatical and are about to retire, if you come back for a full year you only have to come back for one semester.

Tom : Enrolment. We are doing OK.

Everyone with the exception of online programs, traditional on the ground students are off 5%. We are kind of maxed out on the online programs. It’s a long term problem, but it’s going to keep coming up. Administration didn’t address at start-up how they are looking with freshmen.

Tom- when it comes to instruction, we are incredibly efficient.

Mike Murray- I don’t have the number off the top of my head, but what’s the support from the state?
Tom- about 60%

Tom- we are going to be short, about 1.3+ million. Looking at double digits for health insurance premiums this year and next year. All tuition is frozen, and we’re probably looking at the number being higher.

When your deans talk about not having enough money, tell them get it from somewhere else.

Rules Committee

Larry Swain

The proposal/motion from Rules is, that as Nursing is now part of CAS, just remove the nursing line from committee structure, as they will fall under CAS. This will change the By-Laws.

Tom- 2nd the motion.

When we went through the list of committees, not every committee had a rep from Nursing.

? What are consequences for nursing accreditation if they don’t have separate structure within the committees etc?

Jeff- this is our internal union committee, so is separate from that.

Tom- we have to have a chief nursing officer who is an administrator and that has been set up. I don’t think it’s going to be a problem.

Sarah- the committees go by numbers anyway, right?

Larry- it depends on committee.

Sarah- nothing stopping nurses from running on committee?

Carol- can we see the percentage of faculty/depts. to ratio of committee representations?

Jeff- all of these things are open, and can go to Rules.

Larry- speaking of committees we need people on Rules.

Keith- reiterate what a great job Rules has done, and the number of people who are on these committees, it’s like arguing over a half a position. Senate is the place where faculty are represented by number of faculty. It goes by department, so Nursing is represented there/here.

Heidi Motion: to Call the Question.

Passed.

Motion that now Nursing is part of CAS, just remove the nursing line from committee structure, as they will fall under CAS. This will change the By-Laws

Passes.

Old business or new business?

Adjourns: 5:03pm.