BSUFA Faculty Senate

October 4, 2004


Absent: P. Donnay, V. Boudry, E. Hoffman,

Excused: Pat Welle, P. Rosenbrock, S. Bland

Called to Order: 4:04 PM

Brown: Move to reorder the agenda to accommodate the Birch Lane Neighborhood Association and the proposed Constitutional Amendment.

McManus: Second

Motion carried

Birch Lane

Éric Lund, faculty member, and spokesperson for The Birch Lane, Bixby and Calihan Avenue Neighborhood Association referred to an email statement previously sent to faculty, voicing concerns about expansion of BSU parking. (Several other members of the Association were present) He offered to have additional copies printed for faculty who had not seen it. Lund distributed a list of members of the Association and a handout detailing ideas for parking around BSU. They will also meet with the other BSU bargaining units, the Parking Committee, and Student Senate. A brief history of the Association was given. The Association was dismayed and insulted at the prospect of the land being bought up piece by piece. They want to see the neighborhood preserved. They requested a meeting with BSU administration, which was granted. Quistgaard, Maki, 3 city council members, 2 county commissioners, and 30 members of the Association met to discuss the parking issue. The Association believes that its voice is now being heard. Quistgaard asked the Association to draft ideas about parking. The floor was opened to questions.

Henry: Did your neighborhood have any concern for the house that was torn down or are you just concerned for your homes?

Lund: We wish the integrity of the neighborhood had been maintained.

Fauchald: What about revenue flow. Where will the money come from We charge a flat fee for lots.

Lund: Administration has started a shuttle this semester. $40 per semester. Not a lot of use yet. Students are bussed from outlying lots.

Witt: We are a land locked university. We may have to expand. My concern is that there is a “not in my neighborhood” mentality. How are we going to address that?

Danae Lund was recognized. There may be legitimate needs in the future. It is a good question. A good case could be made. But, acquire all the property at once, not bit by bit.

Witt: Press for that issue. There are issues beyond just this one.

E Lund: It is much more expensive to build up than out. Maybe we can bring pressure on MnSCU. MnSCU doesn’t want ramps, but we are a landlocked campus.
**McManus:** Do we actually have a parking shortage? What we have is a parking inconvenience issue. Do we sell out all permits and we want more?

**Dada:** What about the former high school? We had looked at that at one time.

**Milowski:** Twice the state approved the sale and the school board wouldn’t sell.

**Fauchald:** I would agree about the perception issue. A Noel Levitz survey said the number 2 problem on campus was parking. The other issue is how to we resolve this. We are down 5% in enrollment; that will help with the parking problem, but I don’t think that is the best way to solve it.

**Dunn:** We don’t want to make that correlation. Research says that our parking problem is no worse than our competitors. I also don’t think they are done with the High School property.

**Milowski:** Has your group been invited to have a representative on the revision of master plan document?

**Lund:** Yes

**Donovan:** What action is being sought on the part of the senate. We could go to Meet & Confer putting forth proposal.

Lund: We would like input into the 50 Year Plan. Please consider our concerns.

---

**Proposed Constitutional Amendment**

**McManus:** Presented a proposed amendment to the BSUFA Constitution addressing the issue of faculty members on Planning Committees acting in conflict with the will of the Senate. The amendment reads: “BSUFA members serving on university-wide committees represent the BSUFA as a whole. Since the BSUFA Senate represents the highest authority within the BSUFA, in any issue taken up in a university-wide committee process on which the BSUFA Senate has issued specific instructions, BSUFA members serving on such university-wide committees shall follow those instructions.” We don’t have a discipline clause; we expect good faith from the members serving on these committees. This is meant to be advisory.

**Fauchald** what do we need to do.

**McManus:** Vote. It requires a 2/3 passage in the Senate. Then make faculty aware of the issue and have referendum.

**Discussion**

**Fauchald:** This is a good idea, especially in light of reallocation of resources. Things are going to get serious in the next couple of years

**Kippenhan:** Why is it stuck in this subsection, not a different subsection?

**McManus:** Well, we just tried to figure out the best place to stick it.

**Weaver:** I’m confused. I thought we were elected by our college to represent them.

**McManus:** This is the philosophical question. Within the context of the BSUFA committees we do represent our departments. On Planning Committees you have a multi-bargaining unit body deliberating process. There you represent BSUFA as a whole.

**Milowski:** I don’t agree. Even on the IFO committees we represent our colleges. We send people to the Planning Committees from BSUFA committees. This amendment addresses that level of representation.

**McManus:** The logic is that Senate can instruct BSUFA committees; they can also instruct committee membership vis-à-vis policy.

**Lee:** This goes beyond letting members listen to the other Planning Committee members and make logical and reasonable decisions. Members should be empowered to reason.
McManus: I agree to a certain extent. The language is quite specific. But, this language refers only the circumstance in which a specific directive has been given. It is this body that must decide what our positions as a body will be. There is no end to the slippery slope. I would be opposed to a discipline amendment. This is intended to be a statement of principle.

Milowski: Ideally what would happen is that the person would say ‘The Senate has taken a stand on a specific issue. I need to bring this issue back to the Senate.’ They say to Senate, ‘Maybe we were a bit hasty and perhaps we need to modify that position’. That would be the ideal situation. What we found was that people on the committees were disengaged from the Senate ideas and were taking positions opposed to the will of the Senate.

Milowski: Years ago I asked Senate for instruction. If it is important enough, I need to bring it back to Senate to get direction in University Council and in Meet and Confer. I feel obligated to come back to this body. I think we will see this more and more as the money goes away. We don’t want to see faculty turning on one another.

Hauser: There are a couple of things here. Origins. Why are we dealing with it now? These are advisory instructions, why does it say ‘shall?’ I also want to comment on Tom’s comment. We need to do this so that the faculty don’t turn on each other. I believe we can disagree and still get along. Things will come back through Meet and Confer. The will of senate is expressed through Meet and Confer and to the President.

Milowski: I disagree. Structurally, Senate is the governing body of the faculty. All committees are committees of this body. We send representatives to these committees. They are very much plugged into this structure and into Senate as the governing body. This is one of the reasons that we are having problems. This was supposed to be shared governance. This body is the governance group of the faculty. That shared governance is directly tied back to this body. It came about because some members.

Dunn: The nature of representation is that when you elect a person to another body, you are asking them to use their best judgment. This is contrary to system of representation. This has the potential to further clog things. People need to represent the will of the Senate but also use judgment.

Fauchoald: Now and in the future is a lot different than even a year ago. Today BRAC met. We are looking at 1.1 million of an additional shortfall. We need to give inducement to have people come back to Senate and report stuff. But, if we are going down 1.1 million, that money is coming from somewhere. Students are furious about tuition. We are higher than any other school in the state. This will be an inducement to get Planning Committee members to come back to Senate to ask for direction. What about people sitting on committees who could directly benefit by a decision that the make?

McManus: I may have made a secretarial error and recorded this in the wrong place. As to the questions of shall or should I would have no problem.

Witt: I remember an incident of a woman who served on a committee. She had a very strong reaction to the will of the Senate. She was unsure that she could represent the Senates will. She almost resigned. But, this is directed right at those kinds of decisions.

Brown: We have voted for this on 2 separate occasions, not as an amendment but as an action. Maybe we should create a new section for this. But, this is the body that reflects the opinion of the faculty as a whole.

Hauser: The will of the Senate is reflected through the Executive Board, Meet and Confer and to the President. It’s scary that in a democracy we can’t have dissent. I move that we change will to shall.
Fauchald: Second
Substitute language, no discussion.
Motion carried.

Kippenhan: Can we move it to the relevant article? Section E, subsection 2
Lee: Second
Vote on the Constitutional Amendment that reads: “Article VIII Section E Subsection 2 - BSUFA members serving on university-wide committees represent the BSUFA as a whole. Since the BSUFA Senate represents the highest authority within the BSUFA, in any issue taken up in a university-wide-committee process on which the BSUFA Senate has issued specific instructions, BSUFA members serving on such university-wide committees are encouraged to follow those instructions.”
Motion carried.

Approval of Minutes
Wolf: I move that we approve minutes from 9/20/04
Webb: Second
Approved

Officers Reports
President’s Report
Larkin: I have no update on the VP for Information Technology and Extended Learning. Student Senate. I met with Julie Gronquist, President of Student Senate. She wants a copy of all information sent out of BSUFA to Senators. I will comply with this request.

Committee Reports
Grad Committee
Kippenhan: Presented a report to Senate. We went through strategic planning sessions. Graduate FTEs are the only FTEs that have increased.
Wolf: I move that we accept the Graduate Committee report.
???: Second
Motion carried.

Kippenhan: Please approve the strategic plan so we can move on.
Drago: So moved.
Lee: Second.

Discussion
Fauchald: Are we going to establish a separate graduate school? Will there be a new dean?
Kippenhan: There is inconsistency in language between Office of Graduate Studies. Marketing the School of Graduate Studies sounds better. Graduate Studies tends to get forgotten. We want consistent language and give Graduate Studies more visibility and structure.
Motion carried

Academic Computing Committee
Richgels: Passed out a handout detailing the Planning Committee initiative addressing the moratorium on wireless access. Mike Smith looked at wireless access. He has found a way for us to have wireless access that is secure. We propose that BSU purchase, install, and maintain the service. This will cost about $20,000. It won’t give points of access, just the structure to allow us to add access points. The establishment of wireless access is an attractive feature for people who
want to have conferences here. You won’t have to log out and log back in if you walk across campus. It is a convenience. Wireless access is slower. Multiple users make it drop again. It isn’t a way to do a lot of data transfer. It might also be an instructional issue. Wireless access points cost about $1000. We might want to pursue it ahead of time. Purchase equipment in conjunction with Computer Services so that we have consistency. This opens doors for access. It will cost between $200 - $250 thousand to do the entire campus.

Wolf: If a department buys a wireless point, will Computer Services maintain it?
Richgels: Yes, that is our understanding.
Brown: If we are going to be a part of the administrative plan, so we decided to kick in the money, is there a chance of recouping the dollars? No.
Richgels: This is the same as the ITV model. If you want to go faster than the administration can move, it will cost you money.
Fauchald: This is exactly what I wanted to bring to Senate. $20,000 is it first priority? Are we saying that if we vote for this, it will take priority over some other project? There is not first priority?
Richgels: I am not suggesting that. They did get some heat because there were some conferences last summer that wanted wireless and we didn’t have it.
Larkin: are you considering this to be a motion?
Richgels: So moved.
Fauchald: Second.
Donovan: Are we voting to approve expenditure?
Fauchald: Not if the money isn’t there.
Donovan: I want the minutes to reflect that.
McManus: This is squishy logic.
Lee: Senate can’t expend. We think this is a reasonable expenditure to consider.
Fauchald: If Maki says is this your topmost priority, I would say no. This way we can say if the funds are there without cutting any programs of faculty then go for it.
Brown: we are putting our blessing on it. We could actually get an initiative through. It is cheaper than the physical structure we have how. I would encourage the Senate to support. Motion Carried.
Richgels: The Academic Computing Committee did a self-evaluation. The second sheet is for information purposes. We also asked CTLR to do a self-evaluation. University Council is starting to own the evaluation of the planning process. If you have questions or want to talk to us on the committees, we would be happy to discuss this with you. If you have feelings one way or another let us know. The web master has been given VERY specific direction. If you think something isn’t right, please communicate that to me. We are having a hard time evaluating whether or not he is doing his job.
Brown: What happened to our recommendation supporting a web master? If this planning thing is supposed to be shared governance, is this a sham?
Richgels: University Council recommended a WEB MASTER. I don’t know what happened. We can’t have marketing precede academics. If it does you are selling something that doesn’t exist. Right now the priority of the academic web page is at the bottom. Maybe in 2 or 3 years.
Milowski: I can answer the issue of how web master became an external person. After it all went through, we heard at Meet and Confer that there was a changed job description and a changed job title. We protested mightily that this undermines the planning process. We were told that NO IT DOESN’T.
**Some Senator Whose Name I Forgot to Record:** Can those of us who aren’t involved in this process, can we get some notion of that? This came up at IFO academic affairs regarding academic integrity. We think it should be on the web page. Can we call on this person?

**Richgels:** He receives directions, approval, etc. from Al Nohner.

**Wolf:** I move we accept CTLR & ACC self-evaluation reports.

**Donovan:** Second

Carried

**Fauchald:** I move we extend the meeting time by 10 minutes

**Brouwer:** Second

**Liberal Education Committee**

**Donovan:** I am next on the agenda. I would like just a couple of minutes. You have before you a written motion from the Liberal Education Committee. Please review and consult with your constituents. It involves a proposal to set up a task force backed by constituencies beyond BSUFA to move forward with a revision of our general liberal education program. We will discuss it at our next meeting.

**Get out the vote**

**Fauchald:** Lets get that going.

**Dunn:** Packets have been delivered to the buildings. There are lots of forms for people to take to their students. Answers to common questions have been provided. This is a federal mandate.

**Gritzmacher:** Will you please have packets delivered to Sanford Hall also? There are 3 faculty who teach in Sanford.

**Dunn:** Yes.

**Fauchald:** Next Monday is the Candidates Forum. Frank Moe, Doug Fuller, and Adam Steele have been invited. Packets were mailed to them containing IFO questions. There will be questions from the floor. All bargaining units are invited. Snacks will be served. The student senate will have its own forum. October 7 the Minnesota State Senate will be visiting in the AIRC at 1:00 PM. It will be Democrat oriented. We need a good turnout to offer our input.

**New Business**

**Larkin:** Shannon Nelson wants 10 minutes with this body to discuss Desire2Learn.

**Milowski:** Yes, this is a good idea. There are problems for the students and faulty. This is part of the MNSCU centralization problem.

**Donovan:** Speaking to guests to the Senate, were hoping that Dean Erickson be invited to be present in the chamber during liberal education discussion.

**Adjourned:** 5:23 PM

Respectfully Submitted

Sharon Gritzmacher