Senate Meeting, Monday April 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 2018

4:00pm Hagg Sauer 107

**Present:** Rebecca Hoffman, Sarah Tarutis, Tammy Bobrowsky, Paul Kivi, Francois Neville, Veronica Veaux, Bill Joyce, Debra Sea, Joann Fredrickson, Sheila Paul, Janice Haworth, Rucha Ambikar, Sachel Jofeson, Dennis Lunt, Kerry Openshaw, Christel Kippenhan, Jan Heuer, Heidi Hansen, Nancy Hall, Keith Marek, Katie Peterson, Travis Ricks, Samantha Jones, Tim Brockman, Steve Carlson, Derek Webb

**Call to order 4:06pm**

DW- Just a quick review of the rules of senate. If there is someone in the room who is not a senator, please raise your hand and asked to be recognised; if you’re not an IFO member, you cannot participate.

Ryan Sayer: **Motion to approve minutes**

Keith Marek second

No discussion or correction.

Carried.

**President’s report**

DW-

a. **AAR.** Every year, they tweak it a little bit, and they want your feedback. Please email Michelle Frenzel so that they can improve.

b. **IFO election.** I get updates from downstate on the number of faculty who have voted. We are at 18 faculty who have voted. That is last place among all seven institutions. Please vote. Only one candidate, but there is a write-in box; please vote.

c. **Call For Positions.** This call went out last week. Full disclosure, I did self-nominate for president of BSUFA. The Call will be open for the remainder of this week, then there will be a BSUFA meeting next Monday to close the call, in HS 107, at 4pm.

d. **Emeriti Policy Update:** At M&C they didn’t give a final version. It was kind of funny, some chairs have already been asked for self-nominations. President Hensrud clarified a little bit, and all the department chairs need to do is send an email to the president etc. and that you nominate someone for emeritus.

JF- it has to come from the dept. chair, so does that mean it has to come following a faculty meeting?

Dw- FH said “it’s murky”, they’re pretty lax.

HH- Is there a timeframe?

Dw- It’s murky.

e. **Our Contract** was approved, there was an email about this. The legislature passed labor contracts, almost all of them, maybe two of them are still outstanding. This was last week and we had strong support from both sides of the aisle, don’t know why, but it went smoothly. The salary increase of
1.6% for faculty, including adjuncts, is retroactive to beginning of FY18, so that includes overload, includes extra duty days, might be a little difficult to calculate, and MMB said it should happen some time in the middle of May. The downside they also said that the dental benefits will happen next year, and seems like there won’t be a special enrolments for dental, which is disappointing.

f. Delegate Assembly. For those of you who went, please stand up. We had 17 attend. Two highlights: the fiscal 19 budget/dues was adopted. Is hard to know what the fallout from Janus will be. We will lose membership/dues. Any questions? An email came out from Jim Grabowska today—might need to check your spam for that, since the new email came online. Under Janus assumption, it’s close to revenue neutral, just where they come from is different. Everyone under the new dues structure will pay 1.3%; previously the faculty making the most, paid the least, and the people making the least, paid the most.

Treasurer’s report- AH- will have one at the next meeting.

Negotiator’s report- currently we are not negotiating, will start up soon.

Grievance report- not much we can say, we do have an active grievance, and we are handling it.

Old business-

Draft Constitution and By Laws

DW- These documents have not been updated for years; the constitution talks about by-laws, and they’re now operating procedures. We also changed language that doesn’t force us to have elections in April.

AH- Are these done to the best of your abilities?

DW- These are from the Rules Committee.

AH- I call the question.

DW- any dissention?

(Dissent heard)

Vote to call the question passes

DW- Then it’s presented to all the members via email and then vote at the BSUFA meeting in one week.

DW- all those in favour of proposed changed to the constitution.

Motion passes

Sheila Paul Abstain

Operating procedures

DW- there is a motion on the floor to approve because it’s coming from the Rules Committee, but this body can unilaterally vote to approve the changes.

There are actually some changes to the number of members in committees. Changes language so we can run elections in April.

JanHeuer- I don’t see where it says the date for elections.
The constitution has that. Although it wasn’t in there originally, so this is just to align with the constitution. Next change removes reference to a website - we omitted the reference because websites can change. There’s also a tweak with the number of seats for senators, except worded for departments of 20 and above. We might have a department someday that’s bigger than 24, so we put it at 20 and above. Allocation of senate seats otherwise didn’t change. Also, with the college reorganisation, the departments aren’t reorganised, so it was not affected.

Because of the college reorganisation, we have three colleges that are the same size, versus what we had previously (one college proportionately larger than the others). So we changed to “one member from each college” which is basically what we did for each committee that had this structure.

My question is about nursing - it was in there because it was the School Of Nursing, and now it’s a regular department, so I’m wondering if it should be taken out.

This was done when we were reorganising and they haven’t been in the committees as their own entity there for a while.

also the name of the colleges when they are finally decided upon will need to be updated.

Can we just give permission for you to change all of those once we know what they will be? Do we need a motion?

We can approve all of these changes and then get a motion to give me permission to do that.

I raise the question - are these committees large enough to get the work done, given curriculum etc.?

If you want to change to two seats, that’s fine, but it’s difficult to fill the seats for even one committee member.

Government Relations - we took this committee and made it smaller. It’s probably a much more efficient committee with one member per college.

Graduate Studies - I don’t think we had to touch because it’s prescriptive to programs. We reworded the at-large position to make it clearer.

Can I make a suggestion for that one, can I make a caveat that it has to be a graduate faculty member?

It’s there already, that’s a good thing to have.

Lib Ed - We did leave this one a larger committee, as it gets more interest and participation than the Academic Affairs Committee, so has two from each college.

I’m on the MAP committee and the provost has indicated he wanted to change the name of Liberal Education, and so can I make a suggestion that when that happens …

Debra Sea - I’m on the Lib Ed Committee and we have also talked about changing the name as well

The suggestion needs to come from that committee and it has to come to the senate for approval.

On the Rules Committee - any interest in separating nursing and athletics? (none)
DW: Contingent Appointments Committee. The IFO created this state-wide, and we were asked to create language so that the local and the state paralleled each other. The charge mirrors the charge from downstate, and by the way I’m talking about fixed terms and adjuncts.

JH: So if they don’t teach in the spring, they can still serve?

DW: Yes.

KM: Aren’t we being asked to run our elections in the spring?

DW: Yes, we are talking about that.

KM/DW: We might have to run this election in the fall.

DW: To bring you up to date, there is a push from downstate to run our elections in the spring so that we hit the ground running in the fall; we may need to run some calls in the fall to take care of the elections.

CK: The state-wide contingent committee, is it only populated by contingent appointments?

DW: Yes.

CK: I’m just curious how this committee that only runs for a year, how without having some more stable person on the committee how well it would function.

PK: It might be nice to have someone with institutional knowledge on there? Can I make a motion to amend?

KM: second

DW: BSUFA president as an ex-officio member?

JH: I’m thinking in the future, but could we give the president a little bit of wiggle room, could you change to “or designee”?

KM: I’ll take that as a friendly amendment.

PK: Motion to amend the motion that came from the Rules Committee

Motion carries

DW: Now back to the original motion to approve the changes.

Motion carries

DW: I make a motion to change the college of Individual and Community Health to whatever it changes to in the fall.

PK: Second

Motion carries

NEW BUSINESS

Co-directorship of leadership studies

DW: Randy Westhoff/BSUFA received four nominations, with materials. We have an agreement with administration that for this type of call we can choose to give feedback or remain silent.
DS- How many of these are members?

DW- two are- Dennis Lunt and Virgil Bakken; not Kierstin Hoven or Randy Ludemann.

JH- Can we support Virgil and Dennis because they are IFO members? Or do we need to evaluate all four?

DW- You can give any kind of feedback you want.

Rebecca Hoffman- what would be the benefit of supporting people of only IFO membership?

DW- it ignores the qualifications, if that’s what you’re getting at.

RA- Can I ask Dennis as current director what they actually do so we can make ..... 

CK- The student leadership is actually an academic program, so that academic employees should be the leaders of an academic program.

DL- There is some conflict of interest because I’m one of the applicants, but in general you are convening council of faculty and sometimes non-faculty members in leadership opportunities on campus, advise students, organise a lecture, keep track of a tiny budget, director isn’t required to teach, merely to find instructors, but the reality is it is usually the director, we have had Jesse grant lecture for us

VV- Also, curriculum revision, and SLOs and creating documents that most of us are familiar with.

SP- This is a co-director currently?

DL- yes, I am Co-director with Vivian Veaux

SP- Are Kierstin and Randall connected, so if you vote for one, you vote for both?

DL- I asked Randall how he wanted that to go, and he said they should be regarded as separate applicants even though the letter came from them both.

RA- I would like to make a motion that the directorship should be filled by faculty holding probationary lines.

TR- Erika has the flexibility to recruit faculty, and if we go ahead for this, my concern is creating a rule that might restrict us in the future.

HH- Clarification- is it both of the co-directors who are up for or just one?

DW- Both.

AH- Our recommendation is on just this case.

DW- Just this situation.

HH- I second.

JF- I would argue that I don’t think a probationary is a necessary qualification, but this might restrict a Fixed Term position in this.

RA- I am happy to amend to allow a Fixed Term.

HH- I withdraw my second, that wouldn’t allow for continuity.
TR- Can we just vote, or do we need to restrict it? No offense, RA.

RA- I put forward the motion because I was worried about the curriculum not being addressed. I withdraw my motion.

CK- I would recommend that we support the nominations of Virgil Bakken and Dennis Lunt for co-directorship.

HH- Second.

LH- Question on co-directors- who gets the two-year term, and who gets the three-year term?

DL- It was my understanding that Randy Westhoff is going to decide that.

Motion carries

b. 80/20 models. They don't like the models, the way they were created or implications budget-wise, so they're going to rework them, so they're going to come to M&C with some new draft proposal. That being said there are some 80/20s out there, Biology in particular, Social Work as well, and I recommend that they discuss it with the provost.

Rebecca Hoffman- We met with him and we had all of our 80/20 money taken from us and put in the dean’s budget and that account is now zero.

Sam Jones- can we recognise Jeff Ueland?

JU- In Geography, we have an 80/20 and it’s been sustainable. The end game was supposed to be a tenure track position, I spoke with Andy and Liz regarding Biology, and we would still pay for the tenure track out of the 80/20, and if the program was sustainable it would … I would like to see the senate put something forward that these programs are grandfathered in or discussed case by case. It’s starting to seem very systemic.

RH- We didn’t get a tenure track position and she’s been extremely successful.

SP- Nursing had three 80/20 models and we were told that at end of three years, we would get a probationary line and it would fold into regular line of nursing, we were able to do with one, but with change of administration, we were able to transfer two probation and we knew was coming we used our 80/20 for a skills lab. We no longer have 80/20s that roll into a department.

DW- The problem I see is that each situation is a little different, so I don’t know what recommendation the senate can give.

RH- They are similar though, we can draw down funds for this year, but won’t be able to keep… we did get a probationary position but only covers own campus… there are similarities.

SP- If you go back to the original Master Plan it’s not very prescriptive, and what happened with Nursing, we lost the fixed term lines that were attached to the 80/20 so we gained a faculty member and lost a faculty member.

DW- There are some 80/20s out there that don’t have funds attached.

JU – I went back over the original agreement, I don’t know that it has contractual teeth/language. There’s a throwaway line on their side where they can make a change any time, they have a CYA where they can change these. However they had faculty who did this work in good faith and there is
expectation of delivery of courses even outside the programs, and they really don’t want to close these down in a way that’s unfair for students.

DW- There’s an MOA?
JU- They called it an MOA or a LOU.
DW- Can I get a copy?
JU- Yes

AH- We found a contract, and it was signed by Patrick Guilfoile and it said all changes must be agreed to by all parties.

JH- don’t you get into a situation where IFO can’t negotiate for ourselves outside the contract, so we need to be careful where individual programs/departments are entering into contracts/agreement.

RH- Can we get help with an exit strategy so that our departments don’t get penalised and lose faculty lines as a result?

DW- That’s exactly why I think this needs to be a case by case.

SP- We think we are going to grow, but there’s no institutional support.

DW- does someone want to make a motion? Do you want it on the senate agenda for May?

RH- Propose that we work to create an exit strategy if the 80/20 model is not replaced to the agreement of the IFO.

AH- I have some issues, the Biology department doesn’t want it to end.

RH- There should just be support if a department wants to end it they aren’t penalised.

DL- Given that we are still doing fact finding, is the next logical step a motion requesting the administration meets with each 80/20 department, then report back so that we know where each agreement stands?

JH- Maybe next step is Executive Committee needs to get heads around MOAs, LOUs, agreement.

DW- Motion to extend?

HH- I make a motion to extend Senate by five minutes.

KP- Second.

Motion carried.

PK- I make a motion that everyone who has an 80/20 needs to contact Derek and provide details/paperwork for collation and report to Executive.

TR- I would amend to include “had” to include past agreements.

FN- Second

KP- I would be interested in learning more about its deemed currently unsustainable. Would like clarification.

TR- Psychology made a lot of money off it.
KP- That sound unsustainable to me.

SP- 20% goes back to university, 80% goes back to program

DW- Any further discussion on the motion?

Motion carries.

DW- Details within two weeks, please.

JH- I Move to extend senate meeting by five minutes.

JF- second

Motion carries

**Center for Sustainability –**

DW- CEES merged with Geography. We were told at M&C that administration would be OK with the new name if we are ok with that name also. I think JU is here to talk about that.

JU- You will see some curriculum that deals with sustainability, we are trying to find a way to talk about ourselves with identity. We would ask for the support of the senate to help us approve this name.

KP- We spoke at the last meeting about centers vs schools contractually- is there anything we are worried about?

JU- We are currently a center, and we are ok with that.

DL- I Move to approve the new name as is.

SJ- Second.

DW- It's my understanding that Erika Bailey Johnson is OK with the new name (sustainability being used in this fashion)

Motion carries *unanimously.*

**Campus climate study**

DW- There is a survey coming out in late April, we’ve had these in the past. There are some questions on this one so they can do longitudinal analyses. MZ wants to know if you have any questions. If you’ve looked at it and have questions? Is more of an FYI.

JF- Have you received the list of coordinating and directorships and reassigned time that comes with that?

Dw- It is still forthcoming.

CK- I make a motion to adjourn.

HH- Second

**Adjourn 5:25pm**