BSUFA Faculty Senate

November 1, 2004


Absent: J. Haworth, R. Lee, R. Koch

Excused: S. Bland, V. Boudry, C. Brown, S. Young

Guests: Joann Fredrickson, Deb Peterson, Julie Gronquist

Called to Order: 4:04 PM

Approval of Minutes

Larkin: We will hold off on approval of minutes until members have forwarded their corrections to Gritzmacher.

President’s Report

Larkin: Introduced Julie Gronquist, President of Student Senate

Gronquist: *It’s been a busy fall. Donnay and Dunn helped Student Senate in a voter registration drive. HUPB also had a get out the vote drive and there will be voting contents among the residence halls. Hopefully we will have a high student voter turnout tomorrow. *We have established a leadership council made up of the Student Senate president and vice president and presidents of various clubs and organizations on campus. 10 clubs were involved in the first meeting and we have been contacted by three additional organizations. This will be an opportunity to discuss issues on campus. We would like to have a service project where all clubs and organizations work toward a common goal. This fits in with the administration push for civic engagement. *System wide, MSUSA is advocating for a tuition freeze. We want the legislature to fully fund MnSCU. *Thanks to those faculty who have let us to come into their classes to talk about Student Senate. *We would like a faculty representative for SAFAC. The committee is made up of five students plus a chair. We are near the cap on student fees, and will have much to discuss about programming this spring. *Student Senate is involved in setting goals for improvements in the Union.

Dada: We would like to get greater student involvement in the annual freedom walk. Recently there were only about 20 students, and many of them were international students carrying the flags of their respective countries.

Papanek-Miller: What about student voting on campus. If they take their BSU ID, they can vote in John Glas field house. What about if they don’t live on campus.

Dunn: GET INFORMATION

Donnay & McManus: I don’t remember getting an email from you.

Welle: We do want you to come in to both sections of People and the Environment.

Larkin: Introduced Provost Joann Fredrickson

Fredrickson: I want to discuss the Master Academic Plan (MAP) and make sure that we are heading down the right road to approval by faculty senate. I can propose a structure for your input, or you can offer suggestions. This plan will tie into and drive much of the planning on campus. Our current Master Facility Plan was developed with acquisition of the high school
property and co-location with NWT in mind. We have a capital campaign, but raising funds needs to be driven by something. That should be the MAP. We have a 5-year goal statement, assessment plans, dimensions of student learning. None of these will be inconsistent with what we put in the MAP, and will provide focus to what we are doing at BSU. Fredrickson discussed the process of development and the structure of the MAP. She tied in Quistgaard’s campus forums and other meetings from last year and emergent themes. The dominant one was “transforming student lives.” Quistgaard plans to address the campus about the results of these meetings in the near future. Regarding input and development, it will be on two levels, academic affairs and the college level and at both levels will cover a broad and inclusive range of topics and concerns.

**Henry:** Of all the models that you looked at, did you consider the parking issue?

**Fredrickson:** Not in the academic plan, but information received through development of the academic plan could indicate a need to address parking.

**Milowski:** Will you email this to faculty and to senate so we can take a closer look at it?

**Fredrickson:** Yes.

**Milowski:** You and the deans, do you constitute a central steering committee that will help develop this plan.

**Fredrickson:** I am looking for feedback – the deans will be involved, but more would be better than fewer. At meet and confer you invited me to discuss this with Senate.

**Fauchald:** You would encourage faculty to contact their deans?

**Fredrickson:** Yes.

**Milowski:** Perhaps each College should have a steering committee

**Fauchald:** That exists with the department chairs.

**Fredrickson:** I can come back every time we come up with a new version. I don’t want to get too far along without you knowing what’s up.

**President’s Report Continued**

**Larkin:** I sent you all a report regarding the last board meeting. Do you still want to get this? I don’t want to inundate you, but writing it kept me on task at the board meeting, and I thought it might be beneficial to you.

**Senate members:** Yes it is a good thing; keep it up.

**Committee Reports**

**Curriculum Committee**

**McManus:** Curriculum Report 2 includes program modifications for computer science and an economics modification. It is straightforward and we recommend passage.

Motion carried

**McManus:** Curriculum Report 3 is controversial. Proposal for modification of criminal justice program, new course and course mods. I think there is a problem with Departmental collegiality at stake. It seems not a good thing that one program or department creates courses that can be expected to co-opt enrollment from another Department or Program, especially when that program or department is regarded as a "service" group providing such courses that other programs rely upon. Some call doing this departmental insularity. Something along these lines happened last year between the Physics and the Math Departments. It is also happening in this very proposal between the Criminal Justice and Philosophy Departments. Both of those cases were resolved by agreement between the respective departments. In this case, the two Departments, Criminal Justice and Sociology, have not reached such an agreement. Frankly, part of the problem here is the lack of any clear sense of the administration's guidelines on the
criteria/goals departments should pursue to prosper going forward. FTEs may be very important. With this uncertainty and given the lack of agreement between the two programs, I do not think the Curriculum Committee, or the BSUFA Senate for that matter, should be in the business of deciding that one program or department can create a course that may injure another in this way.

McManus acknowledged Deb Peterson:

Peterson: Don Bradel and I have met with Womack to try to resolve this issue. There are concerns with the way that the proposal was developed and presented. There is a concern about whether the proposed course is substantially different from one that we teach. CJ wants to offer the course at a 4000 level. We were never asked to offer a course at that level. We weren’t informed of POST changes and we feel somewhat caught. We don’t want to prevent departments from expanding their curriculum, but we have asked that departments offer courses that are NOT sociology courses. CJ says that this is an applied course, but it will be primarily a lecture class and will have tests and papers. This doesn’t seem “applied” to us. We asked that CJ make changes in their minor, and they did agree to that. We have also asked this course be more applied.

Witt: We appreciate your comments. I think we aren’t so far apart. We are talking about CJ diversity 4103 Sociology 2230 is a race relations course. We are bound in part by state agencies that dictate what we need to teach for POST. Diversity is an issue in CJ. I don’t suggest that there are no similarities between the sociology course and ours. But there are differences. 1. We are being asked to teach about the way that people in the field are going to have to deal with people who are under influence of alcohol and drugs. 2. We also have to deal with people who have mental problems or are mentally incapacitated. We aren’t looking at underlying causes; We are concerned about our graduates who will be dealing with people who are different in terms of race, gender, sexual orientation, drugs, alcohol, and mental illness. How do they deal with people in these situations? As for being at a 4000 level, we want our students to have our other courses before they take this class. We want students to have our other classes before they take this class. There is also a big difference between an 18 year old and 22 year old. Within 6 months, they will be out with a badge and a gun. We want a maturity level. There is also a practical reason. Our program will be offered in Duluth and Hibbing as a kind of 3+1. The students will need to have a certain number of upper division courses for them to graduate.

Peterson: This explanation helps, but I wonder if the problem might have been truncated if it had originally been presented this way. We are largely a service program. This may have a negative impact on our department in terms of FTEs. We are trying to protect turf to a certain extent but don’t want to stand in the way of your department.

Dunn: How will this affect your department?

Peterson: About a 15% LOSS in Ethnic and minority group relations enrollment. 2230 will still work in the minor.

Witt: Unfortunately Bradel couldn’t be here. Our view is somewhat different. I would point out that currently 2230 is an elective in CJ. A department must be able to control its electives. I think this is in our best interests for your people who minor in CJ, and vice versa. This isn’t the first time its come up. That was Criminology; we were asked to drop it. We will still keep it in our department. Does the department have the ability to control its own nature? Is this class significantly enough different than 2230? We also wanted someone with experience in the field to teach this class.

Fauchald: Rather than forcing this to a vote in the senate I’m hearing the potential for compromise. I don’t want to force a vote in the senate. I don’t know much about this.
Peterson: I’d like it to go back to discuss this.
Witt: If you withdraw your objection, I’d like to talk to you about this.
Welle: I’d like to hear more about this. This is happening in a pool that I represent. We have been working toward a course in applied ethics. We have a proposal in for an endowed position, but Philosophy didn’t feel they could go with it. Have you discussed this with Philosophy?
McManus: Departments control their own curriculum within limits, Senate controls curriculum in a broader sense.
Brouwer: I suggest we pass this.
Drago: I just heard that Peterson and Witt want to meet. I think they should meet.
Schmit: If there is going to be some kind of a deal made, does curriculum committee have other concerns with this package?
McManus: We give lots of consideration to departmental autonomy. We wouldn’t vote against a proposal once there was a deal. Its up to the department to make those decisions.
Welle: It seems to me we are setting a precedent. We are going to have more decisions based on funding problems. We are going to have more need for departmental collaboration.
Witt: We are due to start teaching this next semester. We are running up against the wall. The dean has ensured staffing for this class.
Motion carried

Unfinished Business

Meyer: several months ago, I had brought forward a request. It has been to meet and confer. We have a position filled over the last 8 years. We have had to reconfigure that position. It has varied between 2/3 and ¾ time. Contract language reads that we cannot do that. We want to continue hiring the same person.
Fauchald: What did Frank Conroy say?
Larkin: Conroy spoke in opposition to this request. He says that the position should be moved into a probationary status.
Meyer: I emailed him and he didn’t get back to me.
Hauser: Does probationary have to be full time?
Larkin: No.
Meyer: Administration says it is very unlikely that new positions would be created.
Milowski: I would argue that this isn’t a new position. The person has been in it for 8 years. She would tell you that she has been in the position for 11 years. The sentence in that fixed term portion of the contract says that for the good of the University, the president may make an exception to the restrictions put on fixed term appointments. If you have long-range staffing needs, . . . This is very serious. I speak against it.
Brouwer: That’s powerful, but we need to hear what Meyer is saying.
Donovan: Isn’t there some mechanism in the contract that fixed term defaults to probationary?
Meyer: Two points. 1. This position isn’t as long-term as you think. It started when we had only one tenure track position in Spanish. We now have two. April was filling in for the second tenure track position. 2. The funding for this position comes from summer school money, not as a line item. That is where our part time and overtime positions come from.
Dada: Listening to the Provost, the dialogue re: curriculum change as well as re; fixed term position, I am of opinion that we have at least three elements to look at. 1, position/program (FTE), 2, person/faculty, and 3, (adm) procedure. Keeping in mind what we learned from the Provost, (BSU providing world class education) it would be hard to imagine preparing our students for "knowledge economy" without 'modern' languages component, especially without
Spanish being that it is already an informal second language in the USA. It is enough to dial ATT and learn that. Second, we already have faculty teaching beyond "fixed term"; it has been mentioned a moment ago that it is 11 years - 11 years of devoted service to BSU. Third is related to procedure. If I understood Dr. Fredrickson well, she as Senior VP for Academic Affairs needs to know content - curriculum preference in order to charge Foundation with a fundraising assignment. Thus, I am proposing that we vote for modern languages, for securing funding, and for defining status in a faculty friendly, respectful manner. Thus, we need to be respectful regarding all three elements opting for quality program with strong modern languages department, for devoted faculty who already teach here, as well as for flexible administrative procedure that is acceptable to all.

Dunn: If this turns into a full time position, will that have an impact on the possibility of bringing French back?

Meyer: I've never been given any indication that we will ever get a French back. This isn’t about lack of respect or about the person. It makes it very difficult to do this. I’ve talked to Hauser about coming up with a 50/50 position in Spanish and English. I have no objection to having April in a tenure track position.

Welle: I'm torn. Language has been hit in the last decade. But this is an important precedent. If it doesn’t apply here, what sort of situation would it apply to? Maybe this is what Frank Conroy was considering?

Fauchald: We fought hard to get the 4-year rule. That’s why Frank is adamant. It has helped across the system.

Welle: Then we can’t cave on this. Our result is to try to call their bluff.

Schmit: There still isn’t enough meat relating to ft. I’ve seen abuses over the past 15 years. There always seems to be a way around the contract. I think we should be looking at how to put more meat into the contract. What we have in place right now doesn’t really work. It doesn’t really help these people get into our system.

Hauser: I move we extend to 5:30.

Wolf: We have a long agenda. We have to meet next week, lets deal with it then.

Motion defeated.

Adjourned: 5:15 PM