BSUFA Faculty Senate

Date: March 7, 2005


Absent: Donnay, Hoffman, Meyer, Schmit

Excused: Boudry, Weaver, Young

Guests: William Brauer, Julie Gronquist, Justin Perreault

Called to Order: 4:03 PM

APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY 7 MINUTES

Brown: So moved.
Milowski: Second
Motion carried.

STUDENT SENATE REPORT

Gronquist: 1) A delegation from the Minnesota State University Student Association is going to Washington DC to train students from all over the country in lobbying. Tuesday we will meet with elected officials from Minnesota. 2) We have recently passed a referendum to ban smoking in the dorms. We needed 330 votes for passage, and that is exactly what we got. There were several recounts to make sure the number was accurate. 3) As you may know, many students are ordering their textbooks online to reduce the cost. The problem is that they don’t have the list of required books until the beginning of the semester. It may be as long as 3 weeks from the time of order until they get their books. Senate would like to see the book lists out online much earlier so that students can still get cheaper books, but will have them on time.

Milowski: Are students putting up a website for the information?

Gronquist: I don’t know where we are on this. I would like to yield to Justin Perreault.

Someone: I recognize Justin Perreault.

Perreault: The Webmaster is going to link the BSU website to a student website. Faculty would turn in booklists in to a student coordinator to make it easy on faculty.

Welle: Many faculty submit our books to the bookstore electronically; we could send that to the student coordinator to make it easy.

McManus: There may be a fly in the ointment. Sometimes the bookstore tells me that a book won’t be available. Students may have found it used online and buy it even though I will not be requiring it.

Gronquist: Yes, we recognize that this may occur.

Perreault: The Recruitment and Retention Committee has been working on a Volunteer Advising Center Proposal all year. We have arranged for space in the terrace lounge. We will have phones and an intake desk. We want all undeclared students to have a place to go to get the best advising. We want to staff it with faculty who love advising.

PRESIDENT’S REPORT

Larkin: The GLBTA committee will have its last meeting on April 15 at the Atwood Center. We still have no one who has come forward to be a part of this important committee. If no one volunteers, I will attend the meeting.
Milowski: There are important benefits issues being addressed. It is important that we be represented.

OFFICERS REPORT
Dunn: I have two items. First, there will be a survey coming after spring break on civic engagement. The survey, developed by Deb Peterson, Colleen Greer, and me has three purposes. 1) It will yield information needed by the Provost for accreditation. 2) The Center for Professional Development wants information to use in the development of new professional development programs. 3) Greer and I are looking for additional grant money for projects involving civic engagement. Second, the Provost has indicated that she would like to come to Senate on a semi-regular basis to ensure that there is adequate communication between administration and faculty.

Milowski: We've had a discussion at executive council and brought it here. The decision was made that the Provost should make her desires known and then we will make time available. Absent a formal request from the Provost, there is no action for us to take.

Dunn: This is that request.
Larkin: I recall that Senate gave me the authority to invite the Provost when it is appropriate.
Brown: Wanting to meet with us regularly is a problem. Lots of people who want to talk to us. We have to run a business meeting.
Witt: The way it was couched, it seemed that this was a way to get around senate and meet and confer.
Donovan: We have means of communication with Administration; it is the executive committee. If that system is broken, let's fix it, not invite the Provost to avoid that system.

COMMITTEE REPORTS
Joint MnSCU/IFO Taskforce on Costing Teaching Workload and Other Faculty
Papanek-Miller: (Distributed a handout) The second taskforce meeting took place February 4. There was a reiteration of the charge to support the bargaining team. We are charged to propose and deliver a recommendation. Possibly, it will be a joint recommendation from IFO and the MnSCU representatives; perhaps two recommendations, one from each side. This meeting was far less hostile. One of the recommendations that are surfacing is that this process will require far more investigation. The American Association of University Professors has recommendations on minimum and maximum workload. Their website is www.aaup.org. This could be a tool to discuss excellence in teaching as well as fatigue. The final meeting is April 8. Our goal for that meeting is to prepare and assemble the recommendation to the bargaining team at that meeting. If you didn’t submit information about your workload before, you still have the opportunity to do so now.

Kippenhan: Move to accept the report.
Wolf: Second.
Motion carried.

Curriculum: Curriculum Report VII
Brauer: Curriculum Report VII includes a new Health proposal for People and the Environment and a graduate proposal for a Masters in Counseling. We recommend passage of both.
Kippenhan: Move to divide Health from the graduate proposal and deal with Health first.
Donovan: Second.
Motion carried.
Donovan: Liberal Education committee also recommends passage of the Health proposal.
Welle: We in People and the Environment are glad to have it.
Motion carried.

**Kippenhan:** Regarding the New MS in Counseling Psychology, the Graduate Committee also recommends approval.

**Donovan:** What new resources will be made available for this? We tend to expand without contracting elsewhere and we spread our staff thinner and thinner. Are you getting new faculty, dropping courses, or what?

**Fauchald:** Related to Brian’s question, I didn’t see that new resources were addressed in the packet.

**Kippenhan:** That was also a concern in Graduate Committee.

**Wolf:** After discussing this proposal with our department. There seems to be a need for one and a third to one and a half new positions. Either this is going to come out of hide or there will be a new faculty member. There has been no discussion about that possibility at the chairs level. That kind of discussion is essential. Psychology would also benefit from knowing what plan the Dean has to ensure that the program is supported with the right level of faculty. **I move that we table this until after the dean has made her position clear.**

**Webb:** Second.

**Lee:** We have been working on this for quite some time and it will need one new position. This isn’t a request for a position, but a request for curriculum. I would prefer that the curriculum of this program not get tied up by this body.

**Milowski:** The worst-case scenario is that you get the program but not the position.

**Lee:** We expect to have a fixed term position for two years so we can show our stuff. This is a way to attract new graduate students.

**Welle:** I’ve been asked by faculty to ask Curriculum and Academic Affairs about the curriculum process. We seem to have a new process to screen proposals in Academic Affairs. I understand that there are two proposals that have sat in the Academic Affairs office. Did Psychology get some indication from Fredrickson that there would be resource support? Also, regarding the course in Ethics: were people in philosophy contacted to see if they wanted to teach that course?

**Dunn:** I have concerns about the process, exactly the issues that Wolf raised. The reality is that if we make curriculum external to staffing concerns this creates a concern.

**Rosenbrock:** Discussion at this point should only be in favor of postponement.

**Brouwer:** I move we defeat Marty’s motion and consider what Lee has said. We need to look farther out there. We have to open up this college to new programs or we will die on the vine.

**Brown:** The communication issue is a huge. There needs to be a concerted effort toward resolving our enrollment. They are removing positions in some programs. I think it is good to get growth in a growth areas. But, we need to address the fact that the Dean is not communicating with the college. BSU is showing a decline in enrollment.

**Lee:** Could a philosophy person teach our ethics class? Sure, but it wouldn’t be the same. We would be happy to welcome someone in, but that person would need preparation. Resources is a double-ended question. I can only get the resources if I have a program. They may say they can’t fund this at all. The senate should be a part of that discussion. But, if you deny me curriculum you deny me a voice with which to speak to Dean and Fredrickson.

**McManus:** First, my understanding is that if additional resources are required they should have been included. If they haven’t been included, it should be turned back. The dean’s signature means that the resources will be fought for. Second, one of the things we have heard from Fredrickson is that there are lots of courses for which there are no resources. We are encouraged
to should remove them in the name of honest advertising. But there is also a logic in keeping them as an argument for needing more faculty.

**Hauser:** I speak against postponing. There are always problems with the process, but we shouldn’t hold up this proposal.

**Kippenhan:** This proposal came as a result of a legislative initiative saying that you only need a masters for licensure. This would bring students in and help with our growth. I would speak against postponement. If we postpone we kill the chance to bring in students.

**Donovan:** The Dean signing off is where the system is broken. We need to address that through Meet and Confer. The deans aren’t realizing that their signatures are a commitment. We are better off not postponing.

**Brown:** I want to see it passed, but I also want to see the procedure addressed. This proposal says nothing about you needing a new position.

**Wolf:** In each of the new course forms is the “note well clause” stipulating adequacy of existing resources. This document doesn’t demonstrate that existing resources are adequate. There should be a commitment from the Dean before we approve something that might be pulled in two years.

**Witt:** The issue is clearly not the quality of the program. The only issue faculty. We can include this on Wednesday night at Meet and Confer. How much would a short delay clog you up?

**Lee:** You are arguing two opposite things. First that I got this under the table from the Dean. Second, that I didn’t get support from the Dean. This is about a legislative initiative. The Dean will give us a fixed term position. I’ve worked within the current rules. You can’t change the rules at this point. Should you change the rules? Yes, as soon as you vote on this proposal.

**Welle:** We need to use this as leverage. It doesn’t address the issue that two departments in my area have put forth two innovative proposals and they haven’t had a streamlined process.

**Gritzmacher:** If we don’t pass this today, will it slow the process of MnSCU approval?

**Lee:** The proposal was submitted to MnSCU at the same time for their feedback, but if this body doesn’t pass the proposal, it dies.

**Milowski:** I’m confused. We have official documents before us saying that no new resources are needed but you are saying that you have an informal agreement with the Dean. The documents aren’t transparent. This should be addressed at Meet and Confer.

**Lee:** No, but they are accurate. We could work this out with an every other year cohort using existing faculty.

**Milowski:** So, do you have an agreement with the Dean?”

**Lee:** Yes

**Hauser:** Let me speak to the process. First, the stop in the Academic VP’s office with the current tracking has been there for years. Second, to hold this program hostage is a big mistake. We could use an approved proposal as leverage.

**Brown:** If we could do this pending an explanation by the administration of how the resources will be delivered.

**Bland:** What is the process for getting this information to faculty?

**Hauser:** It is on the web.

**Brouwer:** Point of order. This discussion is off track.

**Fauchald:** Call the question.

**Hauser:** Motion carried.
A restatement of Wolf’s original motion: I move to postpone action until the Dean has brought forth the position through appropriate channels.

Dunn: Friendly amendment that we postpone until our April 4 meeting.

Fauchald: Second.

No clear voice vote – division of the house.

Motion to postpone failed.

Dunn: I propose we pass the Graduate Psych proposal pending the outcome of Meet and Confer on Wednesday.

Brown: Second

Welle: The flow chart shows that curriculum proposals goes to the Academic VP. Past practice was that Wendy passed them on to the relevant committees. The VP is exercising a discretion. This needs to be addressed.

Fauchald: We need to bring that to Meet and Confer. Deans often say to departments that “it’s at the VP’s office.” The VP needs to be put on notice. That is a separate issue from the Psychology proposal issue. We need to approve this and talk to VP about holding curriculum because of resources. When we look at the deans, they don’t seem to follow the same rules. When we apply for sabbatical, etc., some departments get a fixed term replacement, some get adjunct, some get nothing. There is no uniformity.

Dada: The Department of Social Relations and Services (Comprised of Anthropology, social Work and Sociology) wants to congratulate the Department of Psychology for being on the cutting edge of preparing graduate students for clinical practice. At the same time, there are two major concerns regarding this new program: 1. How does it relate to BSU’s overall planning process? 2. What are the financial implications for other departments within the college? Faculty in our department believe these issues should be discussed by Senate as a part of making an informed decision prior to accepting the proposed curriculum committee report.

Milowski: I speak to passing the Psych program and taking the issue of the Provost and deans to Meet and Confer.

Donovan: I move the previous question.

Oldham: Second.

Motion carried.

Vote to accept the Psych portion of Curriculum report V11.

Motion carried.

Brauer: Curriculum Committee wants me to inform the senate that there is no examination of the resources when a proposal comes to us. The proposers and the Dean have signed off. We have received differing instructions by the deans regarding resources. Curriculum Committee looks at the catalog to ensure that there isn’t duplication of courses. We don’t believe that we should be examining the issue of resources. That should be done at administrative or departmental levels, not by the Curriculum Committee.

Government Relations Committee

Fauchald: Distributed a handout. The Governor gave MnSCU an increase of 8.5 million over biennium. 50 million is going to campuses. IFO will work to increase base funding for the institutions. There are specials that have fences around their money are so the IFO cannot use the money for pay increases: centers of excellence, competitive salaries for centers of excellence, MN view, nursing, farm and small business management, and a MnSCU innovation fund. IFO wants that money. If it goes into specials, we can’t negotiate for it. We are doing better with the exception of K12. Other agencies were hit very hard. We lost 11% in last biennium. This won’t
make up for that. This summer there is a chance that the legislature will lock up. Democrats are going to come out with a budget with a tax increase. Governor will veto it. Then we are locked up. It will be emotional and controversial. Bonding: we should know by the end of the week. Paul Bunyan Trail, Bridgeman Hall, Red Lake School are the potential projects. Hockey is off the table in both the Senate and House. There is only 2.5 mill for land acquisition in all of MnSCU in the Senate. That isn’t in the House bill. We might get one of the three projects. Red Lake School is in Skoe’s district. I don’t like that we have to complete for funding. All three projects are in the same county. We can only get so much.

Kippenhan: **Move to accept the report.**

Wolf: Second.

Motion carried.

**Parking Committee**

Larkin: I’m sending out information as it comes available. Thanks for the feedback. I’ll keep you in the loop.

**Constitutional Review Committee**

McManus: The Constitution has serious problems. Amendment 1 deals with elections. We have electoral procedures that aren’t, haven’t been, and won’t be observed. If people run unopposed, why should they be balloted? Constitutional Review has met to simplify elections. The handout circulated deals with these changes. Amendment 2 allows us to amend the bylaws, something that now requires a vote by the entire BSUFA. The by-laws relate to procedure and it makes sense for Senate to be able to amend them. I would propose that these be sent out as two questions. If we change only some of the language then we will have greater problems to deal with.

Gritzmacher: I speak for approval of these amendments. The election process, if followed as stipulated in the Constitution is unnecessarily cumbersome. The reality is that putting out a call and developing ballots falls to one person. It is terribly time consuming.

Brown: **I move to accept the report.**

Fauchald: Second.

Hauser: **I move to postpone discussion until next senate meeting. We have not seen these documents.**

Larkin: We will adjourn and reconvene in two weeks, on March 21 at 4:00 pm. It will be a continuation of this meeting. Then agenda will include the following.

MnOnline Report – P. Rogers
- SOAR Request – BSUFA Exec. Committee
- Russ Kreager Invitation – BSUFA Exec. Committee
- Program Indicators Handout – C. Milowski
- Liberal Education Director’s Position

Adjourned: 5:15 pm.