Senate meeting Dec 4, 2017

Attendees- Samuel Jones, Jan Heuer, Pat Donnay, Carol Ann Russell (guest), Sheila Paul, Brian Donovan, Ryan Sayer, Tiffany Hommes, Mike Hamann, Elizabeth Rave, Halbana Tarmiz, Francois Neville, Keith Marek, Sarah Tarutis, Katie Peterson, Bill Joyce, Christel Kippenhan, Rucha Ambikar, Kerry Openshaw, Debra Sea, Heidi Hansen, Joann Frederickson, Andrew Hafs, Mike Murray

4:05pm

President’s report

Derek has stickers and signs, avail yourself.

Issue with technology, and no catering. First world problem

Bill Joyce motion to approve minutes

Ryan S second.

Approved.

DW- board last week, one issue on some campuses- workload remind you, 24 credits is max. You can have 23 credits and still be paid the same amount, same as 22 credits. Some other campuses have classes cancelled, go from 24 credits to 21, and the dean says “oh, your class was cancelled, so you can do another project for me”. Nope. Alternate assignments must be mutually agreed upon.

ER- the lawyers said they can assign you another CLASS, but not a project.

DW- yes, or they take a class from an adjunct and give it to you.

DW- Delegate assembly, March next year. Look on IFO website, then click to delegate assembly. Brief description of DA on the website. At DA, there are various things that happen, like approving the budget, dues increase or decrease, major things like that. Resolutions come forward and get discussed and they go to the negotiations to help with contract negotiations. Anyone who is a member can submit a resolution. So can senate, and so can the exec committee of each campus.

Each campus has delegates based on the number of members. Our number is 21. Some peeps go automatically- president, negotiator and board members- that leaves 17. Question to senate- there are 21 departments, what if we have one rep per department?

Rucha- I am the only person in my dept. and don’t think I have the time

DW- if we have extra people, we will open it up.

KM- does this include the TRIO, SAS, library.

KP- we already have two depts. Who can’t go, so we are only one person away, right?

DW- yes

HH- I would like to go, but if you’re the only person from maths going….

DW- the other way we can do it is to have an open call. Easiest thing
Brian Donovan- motion to have an open call to fill seats for DA

HH- second.

Motion approved

--

DW- don’t expect much to happen this spring, including contracts. (Politics in St Paul)

Officer’s reports

AH- we have $7200 in our account and we spent $63 on phone, and a $293 faculty appreciation event

DW- that reminds me, if you go to DA, you share a room. If you want your own room at DA, we will pick up the extra which is $58 per delegate. That will affect our balance.

AH- we are $2k ahead of same time last year

MM- move that BSUFA picks up the extra cost of accommodation

KM- second

Motion passed

KM- it ends up being about $900 if we send a full slate of delegates.

---

BoT teaching award

DW- at last meeting you were supposed to bring back to depts. And bring departmental feedback back to Senate.

VV- our dept. decided we didn’t have an opinion either way we are fine either way

DW- same as ours

BJ- accountancy found it would be detrimental, pitting one against another, one dept. against another and so we were opposed.

DW- it looks like St. Cloud is going ahead with it, based on email exchange with other FA presidents. Some are saying no thank you, majority of campuses are saying no thank you. One problems is there’s probably not even enough time because it’s such a burdensome process, and need special committee to vet.

AH- I don’t think that faculty should be choosing. The university scholar system was set up better.

KM- is the default that we participate?

DW- MZ just wanted a yes or no to participating. There is no default

KM- do we need a motion?

DW- we need something either way.
TR- is this a cash reward? A negative is that it could have negative impact on morale, and peer evaluated.

AH- it pits us against ourselves

TR- if we distribute amongst ourselves, is a nice little handful of cash. But I don’t know if I can vote on it, because I don’t know how it’s going to be set up, if it’s just a popularity contest amongst ourselves, then no..

MM- as your negotiator, the university scholars, that is in our contract. MnSCU wanted to do it for the longest time, and we said ok, and we got stuff for that. Would argue no on teaching award because if they want to do this, they can take it to negotiating table and they can ask for it and we would get something for it. I would vote no for that, if they want to do it, they can negotiate for it.

Brian Donovan- before we vote, need a motion

MM- I motion no, for that reason

BD- I second, for the reason of the single word “invidious”. Look it up.

CK- we can actually set up our own procedures, and how they are nominated, so we could set it up how we want to. The negotiating part, is something possibly worthwhile considering. If we have more time we can make ourselves smart about it.

HH- speaking for the motion to say no.

CK- I would agree in that we need more time to look up to see how we set it up. I would say no, with the caveat that we look into it for the future

AH- don’t want to say yes or no straight out

MM- amend the motion to say not this year because of time constraints

HH- second

BJ- if we turn this money, are we just giving it away?

DW- no, every campus can use the process. However the cash only goes to two people who are nominated from all of the people from all of the campuses

HH- so we would spend all that time recognizing someone who might not win the money

TR- how many are participating?

DW- don’t know yet, and would be community colleges as well. Any further discussion?

BD- point of order, voting on the amendment

DW- thank you Brian!

Carried.

Amended Motion also carried
CK- I want to make a motion- that either PIG or Exec look into it on how to proceed next year so that we hit the ground rolling.

BD- I move to commit matter to PIG for their feedback back to senate, report back by March meeting

MM- second

RA- can we add to their work without asking them?

DW- yes

KM- do we want to put a time stamp?

Motion with friendly amendment

Motion carries

---

Negotiator

MM_ meeting Thursday, Friday, sat of this week. We had a pretty positive sign that we might get done around Dec – February we might get stuff done. Obviously we aren’t going to rush to settle, because it’s going to get stuck in committee, we anticipate a good meeting this time too,

HH- we are fine working with MnSCU, it’ just the legislature

Mm- it’s been very positive, it just gets stuck in legislature (Joint Subcommittee on Employee Relations, JSER)

DW- JSER just met last week and voted down those contracts again

KW- do we think MnSCU might want to settle quickly because it will get shot down by legislature

Mm- I don’t think so. I don’t think he’s rushing to wait (Chris dale)

Mm- we also need more delegate assembly resolutions.

---

College reorganisation model

DW- final version was presented. It’s been revised by alphabetizing. We also pointed out that they didn’t do anything after all of the forums and the feedbacks.

According to the contract we have 10 days to give feedback. What they do with it is up to them, but we have opportunity to give feedback.
CK - the moment I looked at it, I cannot verbalise here what my thought was. Personally I feel that we all wasted our time. That it’s done because they can.

DW - it’s something that we are watching with this provost, as it’s his first major thing

CK - did I give all this feedback, in various forms, washed down the toilet. I was disappointed about the outcome, and how this looks.

ER - I agree. We brought this up at M&C, that none of our suggestions were taken into effect, he said he did, but in his mind this was the best. Nothing was changed except the alphabetizing.

MM - we could vote this down, for the reason that we gave all the feedback and they didn’t do anything. This body has been able to get things done because the administration listens to us.

RH When he came and spoke to us, he said he wanted to be about people and not issues, but when I met with him, he said it was about issues and not people. This doesn’t allow us to streamline at all. With early childhood being back on the table, it makes no sense. He wasn’t consistent with the message that he requested with the design, it’s supposed to be about processes and not about issues, but it’s not followed through.

DL - Dennis Lunt- it’s frustrating to go to town halls and not see the plans changed in any way. They seem pretty zeroed in. We will have to provide an alternative plan.

CK - the extra layer of complexity that is added by splitting up doctrines. Now he makes our work all the more difficult because more of our work has to occur outside of the colleges than occurs inside the colleges. When he was giving feedback to me, he zeroed in on one comment I made, and everything else was ignored.

SP - my concern about the deans just managing faculty and doesn’t really matter the content matter that they manage. Setting ourselves up for disaster and more responsibility on dept chairs. Nursing: we have a dean who knew nothing about nursing and we spent three years educating her about nursing and it’s been very difficult.

KP - in a couple of years, will it change? How long is this going to last, and the longevity of this model?

ER – I move to vote this model down, because the model was not revised after submission from faculty, He (Provost) hasn’t demonstrated that, beyond the numbers of balancing the numbers, what is the impact for the combinations of faculty and programs in terms of how it will strengthen or improve the work of the university.

MM - second

? What is his vision as to the impact? He hasn’t demonstrated that, beyond the numbers of balancing the numbers, what is the impact for the combinations of faculty and programs in terms of how it will strengthen or improve the work of the university.

AH- does anyone here think this is better than what we have now?
M Hamann- CAS is a little big. But this is an inefficient model, especially for biology- two deans having to work with biology. You’re just committing more resources to these college models, because they’re going to be inherently inefficient.

Dennis- I think spreading out the lib ed programs is a great idea, but if we’re not prepared to give him a plan as an alternative, but what about giving a mechanism. Propose a mechanism

CK- suggestions were brought forward,

Dennis- but not a mechanism

Joann- were the other suggestions sent to faculty so that we could see?

DW- no

DW- my fear is that some of them will contradict each other

JF- but can we have that conversation here?

Pat- has the horse left the barn?

DW- yes. The dean search is about to go ahead

Pat- it will take something really strong from us to convince him

DW- this is our problem- for two months we haven’t had cohesive approach

Motion carried unanimously

Dennis- we propose a- formally surveying each dept. on their relationships with each other and b- providing at least two additional models and the accompanying rationale for each, to the senate for consideration, to present to provost.

SP- we need to put in a holistic approach- it can’t be just about the numbers it must be about content areas

KM- I would like to see if this goes forward, a list of the guiding principles that he’s using and we can suggest some guiding principles and how he can use them

Mm- we can come up with our own guiding principles, our own ad hoc committee and THEY can come up with their own structure.

CK- I have the guiding principles (get from CK). I’ troubled by stuff that wasn’t included, shared curriculum, shared issues, common challenges, internship requirements, knowledge that the dean has re accreditation etc. . He did not take into account

CN? My concern in infusing liberal arts into three colleges is that we are being watered down

Dennis- formally makes motion as above

MM- second

Pat- is it two additionally, or current?
DW- two additional
SP- we provided him with a second model two-college model, and I don’t want that to count as one?
DW- it wouldn’t
Bill- we went through this accreditation process, and it was a process, and seems what we are doing is tweaking the final result, and it’s the process that’s been flawed it needs to start from the beginning, and establish guidelines, and we reject it the way it is, and needs to be restarted with the focus of the process being addressed before you get to the end result.
ER- call the question
Motion carries.
MM- I move all the curriculum
Ryan Sayer – second
Motion carries.

Adjourn 520