BSUFA Faculty Senate

Date: February 7, 2005


Absent: E. Hoffman, R. Oldham,

Excused: V. Boudry, R. Koch

Guests: Ivy Knoshaug Jake Overgaard, John, Truedson, William Brauer

Called to Order: 4:00 PM

Approval of Jan. 10 and 24 Minutes

Larkin: Is there a motion to approve the minutes from January 10 and 24?

Wolf: So move.

Marek & Webb: Second.

Welle: Please add a statement indicating that some faculty want a post-Labor Day start so that students can earn additional summer income prior to the start of the academic year.

Motion carried

Student Senate Report

Jake Overgaard: Lobby Day is this Wednesday. A message on the list serve contained some confusing information about excusing students to attend. We would request that faculty consider excusing students to attend Lobby Day. There is a goal of having 5000 students from all the 2- and 4-year schools attend. BSU is taking two buses; we will leave early in the morning and come back late. We would also like to report on concerns regarding a parking proposal that will be coming out. Senate is concerned with an increase in the price for a parking permit. We are not sure that this will help with street parking congestion.

President's Report

Larkin: I would like to recognize Ivy Knoshaug who will be making a report on commencement.

Knoshaug: As the University’s Marshall, I want to extend an invitation to the members of faculty senate and to all faculty to participate in commencement. While some faculty do participate, we would like a larger number to take part. You design the programs and the curriculum; you have an active role in student development and the academic environment. You should be there to watch as the deans recommend to President Quistgaard and Vice President Fredrickson the conferral of degrees. We want to make commencement as student oriented as possible. If you have questions or concerns about commencement, please email me and I will answer them. A concern that I’ve heard is that regalia are expensive. They are expensive to rent, but there are now better quality “day-trippers” available that could last between 15 – 20 years. They contain the entire outfit, including the cap, gown, hood, and tassel. The PhD model is $90.30 and the MA is $74.36. That is about the price of 2 year’s rental and they are paid for. The Bookstore will have order forms for these. March 10 is the deadline to order the regalia in time for graduation.
Bland: And they are tax deductible.
Donovan: Can we sell these to each other?
Knoshaug: Depending on your university, you might need to get a new hood. I wear Schnabel’s regalia. It was made for him.
Donovan: Could we have a clearinghouse to connect buyers and sellers?
Knoshaug: I could do that.
Hauser: There are other sites. I got my regalia that way.
Knoshaug: If you want to get it through the Bookstore, it is a complete package, and it is affordable.

**Officers' Report**
Brown: Negotiations are beginning this week. If you have any questions, or comments, let me know.

**Committee Reports**

**Curriculum Committee**
Brauer: We recommend passage of Curriculum Report VI, the Biology and Nursing proposals. Curriculum Report VI passed.

**Council for Profession Education (COPE)**
Truedson: The Governor is proposing an increase in the higher education budget, but $10,000,000 is targeted for Centers of Excellence. One of those Centers would be for professional education. The problem is that the money would go to one 4-year school and two 2-year schools. MnSCU wants a teacher center with collaboration but the Governor’s proposal would not support collaboration. There is also $500,000 proposed for alternative licensure programs. Pat Rogers is our Teacher Representative. Deb Japp was also at this meeting. The IFO Board is supportive of this. There is the possibility of developing a special education licensure with on-line components.
Fauchald: MnSCU can’t offer a degree. How would they support this?
Truedson: Only one institution would be the lead institution. On another topic, they are again looking at changing the science education licensure rules because of a shortage of science teachers. This is an FYI.
Donnay: Linda Baer wanted a center of excellence?
Truedson: Baer supports the collaboration model rather than the center of excellence model.
Larkin: The IFO Board sees the Center of Excellence being tied very closely to performance pay. That is troublesome.
Young: I move we reorder the agenda to discuss the SOAR Memorandum of Agreement.
Brown: Second.
Motion carried.

**SOAR Memorandum of Agreement**
Young: My main concern is that under this agreement some people would be receiving less for a SOAR day than they do now. It is seen as a stipend rather than extended duty. SOAR days are usually during the summer. I question what other extra duty days will be set up as stipends. I don’t like the redefinition of duty in this MOA.
Brown: This is a slippery slope. MOAs are typically one-time exceptions to the contract. They are nonbinding with regard to anyone not specified in the MOA. If you come in to work, that is a day and you should be paid for that.
Fauchald: Currently, if you are teaching summer school Monday through Thursday and SOAR is a Friday, you can’t do SOAR because you are already working. The second problem is that some
senior faculty are getting paid at a rate of more than $300. This would pay them less. That opens the door to a lot of other things. Is this coming from administration?

**Larkin:** Yes

**Brouwer:** Is administration saying that they don’t have enough money? I’ve been on Recruitment & Retention since the beginning and we know that the quality of advising is directly tied to retention. This will take the older, experienced faculty out of the loop. While it will bring in new, younger faculty, it is a double-edged sword. Those faculty aren’t as experienced.

**Young:** One option is to offer a minimum, or if you are paid at the higher rate, then you get your full duty day rate.

**Lee:** A solution that wouldn’t save money would be $150 or the regular duty day pay.

**McManus:** Clarification: If you currently aren’t teaching summer session you could be paid for SOAR?

**Larkin:** Fredrickson indicates that people who did advising on a duty day didn’t get extra pay. However, Marilyn Lanners says that Jankowski approved that extra duty pay. But, only 11 people got paid extra, even though more than 11 worked SOAR.

**Fauchald:** I quit SOAR because of this issue.

**Larkin:** I don’t think Fredrickson understood this. I’d like to take it back to Fredrickson, explain it, and ask her to reevaluate.

**Welle:** We need to look at principles. We have a salary structure. This is a dangerous departure from that. It should be the departmental faculty who determine who works SOAR, not the administration.

**Wolf:** Two issues. 1. Somebody makes the decisions about who will be at SOAR. I’ve been rejected. Apparently, there is some flexibility. Evidently, administration already has this option. 2. I don’t understand the problem they are trying to solve through this memo.

**Larkin:** They want to save $$$.

**Wolf:** I recognize Truedson

**Truedson:** I’d like this put in a larger context. We have problems with other duties. I’d like to see a package that will address many of these other issues

**Donnay:** Remind Fredrickson that the addition work that comes from SOAR isn’t the day, but the 60 extra advises.

**Milowski:** They did try to dress this up. Duty day people would get extra pay.

**Fauchald:** Move to postpone to the March meeting.

**Brouwer:** Second.

Motion carried.

**Unfinished Business**

**Signature Themes & Branding**

**Brouwer:** You brought this up in early January for later discussion. Why is this already in the BSU Insider? It would appear that it is a done deal.

**Milowski:** You are right, based on the December Meet & Confer discussion; Quistgaard does believe that it is a done deal. There is no debate. It has come from the top down. You all got the message that Quistgaard will sign the Talloires Declaration and that we are building this environmentalism into EVERYTHING we do including courses, etc. We need to take this back to Meet & Confer.

**Fauchald:** Larkin, Peterson, Reitmeir, and I want some guidance. University Council wanted to vote. We stopped the vote. It probably is a fait accompli. This all sounds good, but when they do the marketing campaign it will include this as well as lots of other stuff.
Brouwer: Are you advocating that we should go on record opposing this?
Fauchald: Is a fight with the president worth it? We need to pick our battles.
Brown: The themes are laudable, but the process was wrong. Now these themes are being put into job descriptions. The administration needs to be aware that there are steps to follow to get faculty on board.
Witt: Enrollment is down 4%. BSU needs to have a response to that. Our response seems to be the signature themes. They are broad enough to mean anything to anybody. This doesn’t seem to me to be a successful recruitment tool. I think it’s a diversion from what we really should be doing. I’m concerned about that, but would like input as to whether this is the time to pick a fight. But, our primary concerns should be drawing people to BSU and that we don’t believe that these themes are productive.
Donovan: If the president proposes to interfere with conditions of employment and overrule the principles of academic freedom, I could incorporate the theme of environmental stewardship into my classes by including a statement in my syllabus saying, “smoking is not permitted, and neither is defecating on the teacher’s desk.”
Drago: I see three issues. 1. Three years ago we paid between $ 50,000 - $ 100,000 to Russell and Herder to examine similar subject. Senate agreed to that project and contract. What were the recommendations? We didn’t seem to follow the recommendations of that report but it appears now that signature themes are, in part based on the report. 2. Earlier last fall, senate also supported principles of the Talloires Declaration. And now we are opposing our previous decisions on these two issues. This leads to a third issue: What do we want? A fight for the sake of fighting? But, perhaps we should consider the recommendations of Russell and Herder and approve signature themes and branding.
Milowski: There are 2 points of view. Some see the themes as innocuous feel good statements and there are those who are concerned with the way they will be implemented. We need to be cautious. This Wednesday at Meet and Confer we will get information on program indicators for the Master Academic Plan. It will be interesting to see how these signature themes play out in the Master Academic Plan.
Welle: How about “Good to Great,” “What are we best at?” Quistgaard did hold three open discussions that faculty were invited to. Are these three themes a proper distillation of the results of those discussions? Perhaps there were preconceived ideas on the part of the administration. Drago mentioned Talloires – we did discuss this.
Fauchald: Something similar is coming with the dialog about being more student-centered. What do we want to do? Quistgaard has invested a lot in this. A year from now our argument will be that not all programs are being marketed equally. We have been through this before. I think we need to let this go. Technically all Quistgaard has to do is bring an item to Meet & Confer. We have 10 days to respond and then he can still do what he wants. He has to have something to give the marketing people for a marketing plan. There is a need to get more specific. I think they’ll bring in a consultant. I move that senate approve the signature themes and branding. Schmit: Second.
Donovan: Regarding the inconsistency of senate discussions and votes, I encourage the Vice President to include environmental stewardship into the Master Facilities Plan. But, I think it isn’t right that I be expected to teach a class in Greek tragedies and include environmental stuff. Dunn: I am conflicted. The themes are innocuous, but it is worrisome that they will be included in job descriptions. We should hold off because the themes and brands aren’t in final form.
Lee: My department says that the themes are good, but do our classes capture them? No. This is advertising – it isn’t supposed to make sense. I’m against it. I’d rather it was hugely more meaningful.

Milowski: I speak against this motion now and in the future. (Much laughter) It may be that we are stuck with these themes. There isn’t any reason that we can’t discuss them without rolling over. We don’t have to put a stamp of approval on them.

Drago: It seems senate has deep concern about the effects of the themes/branding on the subjects of: i) employment/job description, and ii) academic freedom. The themes/branding are, as Russ mentioned, of importance to BSU marketing. For this reason it seems reasonable to decuple these two subjects from the subject of the themes/branding. In other words we should approve the themes/branding for marketing purposes.

Dada: Dreams are very important. However, in order to accomplish what we aim at dreams have to be inclusive, shared, and achievable. If we take a deep look at all three signature themes we may observe that each of us has a unique way to interpret it. We may further observe that there are many positive, great examples of “already being there and doing it”! On the other hand, from individual to regional/national/international/global level/s, we may observe a rather disturbing reality. Every successful project starts with solid assessment, a close look at where we are at this point and a projection (dream if you will) of where we would like to be 5 – 10 years from now. Thus, in order to move forward, to grow, we first need complete and impartial evaluation of everything and everyone, as well as a very egalitarian, transparent planning process in which ALL participate, and input from everyone is equally welcome! No preferential treatment, no secrets, no “behind the scene” agenda – what is good for most, almost all, on a long run will be good for BSU and every single individual. Such approach has been successfully implemented and I can share a great example with you. I speak because I have to be true to myself, and (as some of you know) because I have experienced the other. I can give you quite a testimonial. Opting for positives I can share previous managerial experience, and a great number of “dreams” that have been successfully carried out. So, if we don’t develop creative partnership we may end up having a large number of very unhappy and very stressed people who do not picture themselves as part of the project, for whom most of what is proposed has no connection with their day-to-day reality, in fact they may perceive it as no sense, non – sense!

Meyer: What are we doing by approving the themes? Saying we like them?

Fauchald: You would be directing the four faculty in University Council on how to vote.

Meyer: Then I would speak against anything being put into job descriptions. That is interfering in curricular and academic matters.

Brouwer: Is there anyone who helped write these? We have a leader, but we haven’t properly debated this in this hall.

Rosenbrock: No one is speaking in favor of this motion. I move we call the question.

Webb: Second.

Motion carried.

Motion that senate approve the signature themes and branding defeated.

McManus: There was input from the faculty in the forums. As difficult as the planning process is, I find it interesting that there would be this other “process.” History is against this because the planning process was not followed.

Schmit: My department found this to be vocational bashing, but also felt that the themes are so warm and fuzzy that we can accept them. But, again, we are upset that this is top down.
Administration is being directive and removing our departmental autonomy and input. We can still be talking about this next year. It is a done deal, and we can pick the next fight.
Brown: This is already on the Meet & Confer agenda. We can direct that Executive committee to handle this on Wednesday. It isn’t that we want to speak against this apple pie stuff; it is the process that is the problem. This is a violation of process and grievable. This is a violation of the contract.
Rosenbrock: This is exactly what I would suggest. Have Exec take it to Meet & Confer.
Donovan: Second.
Motion carried.

New Business
Larkin: We are still looking for a representative for GLBTA Committee. The will only have a couple more meetings, the next one on February 18 in St. Cloud. We need someone to do this. Gritzmacher has said she will do it, but she is rather overcommitted.
Gritzmacher: Yes, I don’t want to, but this is important. We need someone to take this on.
Larkin: I also want you to know that the parking committee recommendations are here. They are on the back table for you to take.
Fauchald: I will need an electronic version of parking information.
Drago: I move we extend the meeting by 2 minutes.
Fauchald: Second.
Motion carried.
Drago: I would like to address the statistics presented by Peterson in the January meeting. I take issue with this. Of the students surveyed 48% voted against the earlier start of the fall semester, 18% voted in favor of the earlier start and the remainder did not vote or were of neutral opinion. This outcome tells us, very loud and clear, that BSU students are against earlier start of the fall semester. To claim the opposite and say the outcome is inconclusive is simply wrong. A claim like this can not be justified statistically/scientifically but can seriously harm the decision making process.

Adjourned: 5:18 PM