BSUFA Senate Meeting (continued)

Date: April 21, 2008

Present: Tammy Bobrowsky, Chris Brown, Cheryl Byers, Sue Cutler, Marsha Driscoll, Elizabeth Dunn, Tom Fauchald, Mark Fulton, Mike Herbert, Christina Kippenhan, Ivy Knoshaug, Russ Lee, Keith Marek, Brendan McManus, Kathleen Meyer, Darren Olson, Deb Peterson, Mark Schmit, Kathryn Smith, Richard Spindler, John Truedson, Derek Webb, Pat Welle, James White, Marty Wolf, Sarah Young

Excused absences: Brian Donovan, English; Susan Hauser, English; Richard Mayer, Accounting

This is a continuing meeting from April 7, 2008.

Meeting called to order at 4:00 p.m.

Preliminary item: Approval of Maureen Gibbon as CAL representative for Professional Improvement Grant committee. Moved by Kathleen Meyer and seconded by Marty Wolf. Motion carried.

Local election results were announced: Chris Brown—president, Doug Leif—vice president, Derek Wolf—negotiator, and Deb Peterson—IFO Board Member. A position for a second board member will be announced for fall call.

Bill Maki was not available today, so Elizabeth Dunn asked if Senate would agree for the deans to be present to answer budget questions. There were no objections.

Tom Fauchald moved that the rules be suspended to allow recognition of speakers who are not Senators for a period of 20 minutes from 4:05 until 4:25 p.m. Seconded by Chris Brown. Motion carried.

Provost Fredrickson, Deans Rogers, Erickson, Neilson, and Griggs entered meeting.

Question and answer session:
1. What was the logic behind the 3 college structure? The 2 models put before the university last fall included this model which is fairly traditional. It includes a college of arts and sciences that supports the liberal education mission of the university. It could also include as many smaller colleges as needed over time. These currently include specific a college of professional programs that are accredited and may pursue those professional accreditation. The second smaller college is business and technology.

2. The original proposal was only 2 models, and we came up with additional proposals that have not been discussed. There is still a question of what is wrong with the current model. Those that have been discussed have come from the elected committee. There was one model that included a STEM college model. It was
considered, but there have been some issues of difficulty searching for deans, then some issues that the reorganization needs to advance an identity for the university. This model does seem to actually reflect the shared vision of the university identity. What is wrong with the current model is best answered by understanding that looking at smaller changes moved to discussing the larger context of making university wide changes. Priorities include accrediting departments as appropriate, integrative learning, and establishing the identity.

3. **There is a double reorganization and that increases the fears of departments and faculty. Is my department going to be advantaged or disadvantaged? Is my program within a department going to be advantaged or disadvantaged? What may happen in the future?** Fear is very powerful. It is also contagious. People are afraid of both smaller and larger colleges. Is there some way we can shed light on things and avoid the over-reaction about the changes. We have been changing over last 6 years and will continue to make changes. The truth is that whether we reorganize or not, there will be changes. There are no plans at this time to lose positions. The budget is set to 2010, and it doesn’t include cutting.

4. **The budget committee met today and had a couple of questions. The numbers suggest that there is $20,000 discrepancy. Is this going to come from instructional cost? If the backfill is adjunct, then there is no discrepancy, if there is fixed term, then there will be a discrepancy.** The proposal says fixed-term/adjunct. If the need is demonstrated, then there will be a fixed term. There is always some question about replacing someone who is leaving temporarily with someone who would be permanent. This would follow the same model of how we use people in temporary positions now. Addendum to the minutes from the Budget Committee, for clarification: The proposal for funding the Associate Dean in Arts & Sciences reduces faculty money by at least $20,000 if (the replacement is) fixed-term, but the reduction in faculty support will be even worse if the backfill is through adjunct.

5. **Is the dean search going to be a clean start or just whoever is there now will be there in the future?** The current permanent administrators, Bog Griggs and Nancy Erickson would not lose their positions. The other, interim deans, would not. There would be a national search.

6. **There is some concern about getting a dean who is unrelated to the disciplines in the college.** No question, and no comment.

7. **Will the resources follow the departments? How will things role forward?** The search will go forward for the new associate dean. The budget will include faculty, resources follow the existing programs into new departments, and into new colleges. Plan to do this while Jerry Winans and Sandy Rasmus are on board.

8. **What will happen with associate deans?** The associate dean for education will continue after BOT accreditation this fall, then start work on NCATE. The eventual accreditation work will go back to the department. That position will return to a faculty position. Previously accreditation was done with reassigned time.
9. **How does reorganization actually help with departments getting their accreditation?** We do know that our current structure has not been helpful. We have had education professionals in the dean’s position, but we need more than what we have had. The faculty voted to go for accreditation. But you also need a dean who has understanding the culture of accreditation. **There was some disagreement from the education department. Kate Smith stated that the administration has not been helpful. There has been less discussion than in the past.**

10. **What is the justification of reorganization before hiring the deans?** Marty Wolf suggested that we hire the deans first and then do the reorganization. Dr. Fredrickson suggested that having the current deans in place allows us to continue functioning. She sees this as a model like the one when Dave Carlson was interim in student affairs while putting things in place.

11. **Are you going to push forward the search for deans?** We hope to start the search in October and get them involved in the changes. Arts and Sciences split with professional programs. The problem would be that the current professional college is untenable, and we need to solve the problems. We see this next change, not as permanent, but as one we will assess. If this doesn’t have all the benefits we hope for, then things may need to change again. We shouldn’t wait for the next financial crisis.

12. **Departments should consider their changes as ones that would be assessed. Do you consider the same for colleges?** Yes, probably 2-3 years at least for trial period. Elizabeth Dunn said that there is no assessment in any other university. **Will there be a concrete plan for assessment?** Yes, and it should be a shared faculty-administration plan.

13. **Are there benefits to the sciences that there is to arts? How would the sciences be hurt?** No one in that college sees their job as only serving the lib. ed. Requirements. The benefits are to allow the social sciences to connect more easily to both humanities and sciences. **The more focused identity would be a lot of “lib ed.” College three doesn’t even have a name.** There is a request that mass communication would consider joining that college. Mass comm. thought that if it was merely industry focused they wouldn’t be interested. By not naming it, they decided to wait to see exactly what it is. It includes connections to industry, but it will also include communication arts.

14. **Reorganization doesn’t stand by itself. It occurs in the midst of departmental reorganization and liberal education changes as well.** There is an issue of momentum. It is a good time because we have a new strategic plan. We have an awareness that we need to do some things differently. It is a tremendous effort. We’ve been doing it for nearly a year now, and if we don’t do it now, when will we do it? It won’t hinder the new lib. ed. We have now already changed a lot about departmental reorganization. The only departmental reorganization is on the line for next March. If we slow down, we are going to be crushed by the weight of the conversation.
Administrators left Senate Floor.

All departments have now responded to the questions on departmental redefinitions. The only departmental reconstitutions possible this year have now been done. The next round is off the table until March 1, 2009 according to the contract. There is no such language on college reorganization.

Ivy Knoshaug moved that the Senate recommend that the college reorganization not occur. Kate Smith seconded.

Discussion followed.
Christel Kippenhan, Mark Schmidt, Pat Welle, Tom Fauchald, John Truedson, Kate Smith, Brendan McManus, Cheryl Byers, Rich Spindler, Darren Olson, Sue Cutler, Ivy Knoshaug,

5:15 p.m. Tom Fauchald moved extending meeting 10 minutes. Brendan McManus seconded. Motion passed.

Discussion continued.
Kate Smith, Darren Olson, Russ Lee

Rich Spindler called question. No objection.
Voice Vote.

Division of the house.

For 13; Opposed 10; Abstention 2

Motion passes.

No Budget committee report now.

Chris Brown reported that the Contract was signed by Governor Pawlenty.

Elizabeth Dunn announced that V.P. Lisa Erwin would consider the grade challenge policy changes. She will include a time for faculty response to challenges, the inclusion of students in the grade challenge process, and the maintenance of grade challenges separate from conduct board even in cases of academic integrity.

Derek Webb moved to postpone the motion regarding the inclusion of faculty on the BSUF foundation board. Tom Fauchald seconded. Motion passed.

Adjournment. 5:25 p.m.