BSUFA Faculty Senate

September 20, 2004 – a continuation of the September 13, 2004 meeting.


Called to Order: 4:05 PM

Old Business (Or some better heading?)

Larkin: Correction to the minutes of 9/13: Dan Rice has been consulted as a prospective consultant for the Planning Process Review – he has not been hired. Regarding discussion last week about whether or not VP Fredrickson should be invited to Senate meetings, it should be in the form of a motion.

Donovan: Move that VP Fredrickson be invited to attend Senate meetings when appropriate at the discretion of Senate

Milowski: Second

Discussion:

Rosenbrock: I suggest it should be more generic. Wolf: Give our President latitude to extend an invitation rather than leave it to Senate. Larkin: It should be Executive Committee. Brouwer: What do we have to hide in these meetings? Milowski: I have an idea that discussions would be different if the VP was always there in the back row. Rosenbrock: I’d like to amend the motion to make it more generic – Move that members of the Administration be invited to attend Senate meetings when appropriate at the discretion of the Executive Council.

Wolf: Second

Milowski: Call the question

Amended language carried.

Discussion on amended motion:

Haworth: Will they be surprised by this vote? Larkin: No, they’re not expecting to routinely come to Senate. It would be a waste of their time. Fredrickson made a well-intentioned offer; there will be no ill will.

Amended motion carried.

Board of Directors Report

Milowski: At the most recent board meeting, the following were covered:

1. MnSCU gave us 3 copies of their Election Resource Guide (839 pages, copied on just one side of the paper). One is in the BSUFA office in Memorial, one on the shelf in Hagg Sauer. Where should the other one go? Perhaps the library. BSU is listed in the guide but no IFO funds went to develop the book. Our state senator and state representative are not even listed.

2. Delegate Assembly Resolution #443 calls for a Taskforce on the Equitable Distribution of Benefits to all Faculty. A call will be going out for 2 representatives with insurance experience.
3. Strategic Communications Objectives: Christine Roberts had been hired as the MnSCU communications consultant. They have the beginnings of a plan that isn’t the plan. There will be a 5-year plan but that hasn’t been developed as yet. The goals seem lofty and laudable but the language is homogenized. You can’t tell the difference between the CC/TCs and the Universities. And again, we have one representative to their 20. Roberts has been told that the Universities aren’t adequately represented, but to her the differences don’t matter. This topic will go to State Wide Meet and Confer.

4. Business Practice Variations: This addresses business practices in the system that “presumably don’t have an impact on academics or curriculum” but really do. See # 63 Calendar as an example. Three different start dates exist for the institutions – many ISRS functions are driven by start and end dates. Again, We have one faculty member representing all the state universities and are very outnumbered on the committee.

5. The Chronicle of Higher Ed contains and item about Minnesota and salaries. We are losing ground nationally. There are going to be two joint IFO/MnSCU taskforces. 1. Joint Task Force on Faculty Salary Competitiveness. It will “assess all aspects of alary competitiveness and shall submit a report to the IFO and MnSCU Board no later than May 1, 2005.” 2. Joint Task Force on Costing Teaching Workload and Other Faculty Assignments. Its report will also be due May 1, 2005. Both Taskforces will consist of 8 IFO and 8 members from MnSCU. We are starting to lose ground and MnSCU thinks it will drag its feet. A call will be going out for 1 person for each campus. It’s going to be 8 of them, 8 of us. We will need good, committed people – you could be in for quite a commitment.

6. Distributed Article 29, Section D (page 109) from the current contract addressing fixed term positions. Some of the IFO Board members were surprised that this language is in the contract and has been for some time. Many fixed term faculty on campus join IFO and pay their dues. Those who don’t are assessed fair share. However, the IFO is charged with representing both equally. We fear that there will be situations where we are asked to grieve on both sides of this issue, so we are reminding campuses of the contract language. BSU does

We do have issues with Fixed Term contracts. The language states that if you hire a fixed term person and then a tenure track position opens up, the fixed term person has the right to prior consideration if he/she applies and is minimally qualified.

**Wolf:** Move to accept the report  
**Webb:** second  
Motion carried.

**Larkin:** Regarding this fixed term issue, Frank Conroy spoke about it.  
**Brouwer:** You mean you don’t have to conduct a search?  
**Larkin and Milowski:** It is handled like any search in that you must convene a search committee, they develop criteria. But, if the Fixed Term hire is minimally qualified, the search goes no further.  
**Haworth:** Why is this good?  
**Milowski:** Historically, we have fixed term or NTT people who were never offered a tenure track position when one became available.  
**Larkin:** this suggests that you need to be very careful when making fixed term hires. McManus: An op ed piece in a recent Washington Post suggested that we need to look at the issue of tenure – that tenure would only be awarded to a very few exceptional faculty. This could be a problem. Milowski: We want full fledged faulty. We have the same responsibility to all faculty, but if fixed term people are fair share, they don’t help with governance and they can be a burden on the rest of us.

**Committee on Committees Report**
Larkin: We met this morning with Sharon Gritzmacher, Al Nohner, Ivan Weir, Belinda Lindell, Jerry Winans, and Joann Gardner to discuss the proposed survey of the planning process. Ed Driscoll had been invited but didn’t attend, and Sharon Rebers also declined. All want to participate in the survey. Gritzmacher, Nohner, Lindell, Winans, and Gardner will address University Council next Monday. There is a push to complete this before Dan Rice, or whoever starts his review. Copies have been made of Dan Rice’s vita and are available by contacting the BSUFA office.

Summer Session 2005 Calendar
Milowski: Move to adopt the proposed 2005 summer session calendar
Webb: Second
Discussion: Brouwer: what is the difference between draft and proposed? Answer: just different terms, they mean the same thing.
Motion carried.

Modern Language Fixed Term Position
Larkin: Kathy Meyer cannot be present this evening. She would like to postpone discussion.
McManus: Move to postpone discussion on the Modern Languages Fixed Term position until the October Senate meeting.
Welle: second.
Motion carried.

Work Plan
Larkin: VP Fredrickson made hard copies of the 2002 – 2007 Work Plan available. It isn’t on the web yet. The status report is also available and on the web. If you want copies let me know.
Milowski: Point of Information, we asked Administration how the Work Plan fits into the Planning Process. They seem to be parallel processes. Larkin: Administration asked that faculty generate questions about the planning process to give to the consultant. That seems to be a good one. Kippenhan recognized Karen Branden: Is the master academic plan related to the work plan? Welle: There is a master academic plan, but for environmental aspects we are referring to the Master Plan for the physical environment. Larkin: Please forward all planning questions to me and I’ll compile them.

Student Engagement
Larkin: Distributed a copy of the College Student Report 2004. We need to do this for NCA, but it will be done in the residence halls, NOT the classroom. Wolf: The limits the audience, there are many BSU students who live off campus. Larkin: There will be multiple delivery methods.

Environmental Advisory Board Report
Dada recognizes Branden: Three action items: 1. Request that Faculty move to ask President Quistgaard to sign the Talloires Declaration. 2. That BSU construct no new parking lots. 3. An endowment be developed through the Foundation for environmental sustainability to support student scholarship and projects.
Wolf: Item 1 so moved.
Webb: Second.
Discussion: Milowski: Have we seen it? Branden: it is on the website. Welle We passed the Environmental Policy Statement. This is no more stringent. Branden: This could hook us up internationally. Milowski: This is like the recycling issue. There is interest and then it wanes.
How has this gone through the planning process? Branden: We cam here first. I wanted to know the opinions of the faculty before I took it forward. Welle: This isn’t a planning initiative so we wanted to go to the bargaining units. What goes to Planning? McManus: What must go to Planning? Brouwer: Do faculty know about this? I want input from my department. Branden: This is a draft, it is a building document. Milowski: My inclination is to say yes, but this resolution speaks to many other issues. Branden: We don’t know what the process is. Signing this won’t have anyone holding us accountable after we sign the document. Welle: Parking should go through the process, but for this and the 3rd item would demonstrate out commitment and would be a morale booster for the students. Dada: We want to education students – lets consider this. Brouwer: Call the question.

Item 1 carried.

Branden: I’m requesting a motion that BSU construct no new parking lots on campus.
Milowski: I move we postpone until a later time
Brouwer: Second
Discussion: Papanek-Miller: we need clarification. All previous research indicates that Bangsberg is under utilized. Lee: I parked at the south end of Bangsberg this morning. There were perhaps 20 spaces. Parking is a master plan issue. Issues need to be dealt with whether they are perceptions or reality. This is premature. Milowski: There is always a problem – we have lots of anecdotal “facts.” My experience this morning is that Bangsberg had some spaces. We need balanced parking between both ends of the campus. Dada: we had this discussion last year. We don’t need new parking lots. Nielsen: According to Ken Weeks of my department there is a question about the under use in the current parking statement. They may find some under use when Diamond Point Park is open to parking, but I doubt they are underused when that is closed. I am unsure I see the environmental friendliness of not building more parking lots and having people park all over in the City Park instead. I think if parking is underused, it is because people are parking in the City Park. I also think a shuttle bus service that would allow people to park in the Deputy lot or the field house lot and get a ride would also be helpful in alleviating a perceived parking problem. However, I don't think the lots are underused and therefore we need no additional spaces. Brouwer: We can’t say no more parking, we need to grow at BSU. Wolf: This discussion is out of order. There is a motion to postpone.

Motion to postpone discussion on the parking item defeated.
Lee: Lets move on the item 3.

Branden: I request a motion that an endowment be developed through the Foundation for environmental sustainability to support student scholarship and projects. Welle: We think that we can tap into different resources for this. Milowski: The money will go to the students? And we will have higher energy costs because of wind energy? Wolf: Why come to Senate? Other departments go to the Foundation. Branden: Any document is stronger if you have departmental support. Lee: This can proceed with no action on our parts. I support scholarship, this is a good idea and I support the idea, but there is a better body. Donnay: How much interest would this entail? Between $200- $300 dollars. We could say that “this building is powered by wind energy.” $260 pays for 100 kilowatt hours. Brouwer: We should send this through the Park House. Branden: This will go to the Foundation.

Motion carried.

Constitutional Review
McManus: Last spring Constitutional Review was asked to draft amendment language addressing the role of Planning Committee members with respect to the will of the Senate. There is probably not time to discuss it tonight. We will discuss it in October. There will also be language coming about elections, and language about amending the bylaws which currently can’t be amended because there is no language to do so.

Adjourned at 5:15 PM
Respectfully submitted,
Sharon Gritzmacher
Secretary