BSUFA Senate Meeting- December 3, 2018

Attendance: Samantha Jones, Rucha Ambikar, Miriam White, Sue Rickers, Halbana Tarmizi, Amber Fryklund, Sarah Young, Bill Graves, Sheila Paul, Nancy Hall, Francois Neville, Heidi Hansen, Baozhong Tian, Dennis Lunt, Bill Joyce, Paul Kivi, Season Ellison, Ryan Sayer, Christel Kippenhan, Travis Ricks, Holly LaFerriere, Elizabeth Rave, Joann Fredrickson, Jan Heuer, Janice Howard, Steve Carlson, Gary Rees, Debra Sea, Derek Webb, Kari Wood, Sheila Paul, Lainie Hiller

4:02pm

Motion to approve minutes from November 5

Move: Keith Marek

Second- Jan Heuer

Motion carries

President’s report.

There have been three meetings between heads of unions on campus. I am really optimistic; this is exciting and never happened before, and we are meeting and discussing strategies and improving working conditions for our members. Winter social event next Wednesday.

Officers’ report. Nothing to update re treasurer.

Negotiator- not much to report.

Grievance report- we have an adjunct grievance that was settled in August 2015 and is dispute as to whether settlement was correctly followed. We don’t think so, we met with president about 10 days ago and we are waiting to hear back what comes from that, if we aren’t happy goes to Step 3.

Also filed a prior consideration grievance. It went to step 3. Will keep you updated.

Old business.

Earlier in semester there was discussion to send DW and Provost Peffer to student senate meeting to talk about caps. Students brought up some items. Provost wants to know if you want to work with him on course cap guidelines. Students bought up classroom scheduling, this was an issue- put small classes in small rooms and big classes in big rooms. Student to faculty ratio is looked at, according to senators, when they shop around for universities to attend. They don’t look at class sizes, but more so the ratio of student to faculty. Popular classes need more sections. Big thing- students want more accessibility if there is a popular class, they either want the caps to go up, or another section. Students want engaging pedagogy. Classes that are key prerequisites fill up quickly. They like flexibility. They talk about wait lists. If the class has cap at 30, and wait list is 5, they want class cap to go to 35.

Does this body have any interest in working with the provost, or let provost do that on his own and react?

Joann F- did we have a policy on this?
Derek W- it’s been a while, but about a year ago there was some unilateral change of caps, and classes were changed and faculty weren’t consulted. We weren’t happy and I wrote a frank email to Tony and he knows we were not happy. We were unhappy that the schedule was put together between dean and faculty, published and then changed without consultation.

Keith M- do you think that working with us will be genuine or he will just publish his own document?

Derek W- He has his own ideas.

Dennis L- I would rather be involved at the beginning, than reacting afterwards.

? Re guidelines

Derek W- I think Tony is aware that guidelines cannot be universal.

Paul K- Is this discussion about cap sizes in general, or increasing if there’s a wait list?

Derek W- Both, and all of the things they’ve noted.

Derek W- Do we request Tony put together a small group?

Joann F- What if we put together a process and give to him?

Derek W- So we come up with our own and send to him?

Joann F- So we negotiate... I would propose that the limits that are established and proposed along with class schedules, along with class limits, so that they are passed on curriculums, history of offerings, based on what has happened in the past. And based on faculty complement. If there are some pressure points with classes on campus, then the dean would talk with the chair and address if there is an issue.

Jan Heuer- I like that idea. I think we have all have experiences, and that happened to me this fall, and it wasn’t taken into consideration of the classroom capacity. Also, suggest that if the provost wants faculty involvement, that the call is put out to BSUFA to be on that group, so that we have a nice cross section of people from colleges.

Derek W- Couple from each college and library?

Sheila P- If they are guidelines, what type of enforcement or consequences to follow? If they are just guidelines, we already have those. Is this going to have any meaning?

Derek W- I don’t know.

Dennis L- perhaps a way to address the more immediate concern, small group, and only going to work on guidelines on courses that are already published, address problems already happened, but for guidelines that will happen in the future, is a bigger question. Encourage them to split the issues up- historical and future.

HH- Has this been discussed in chairs meetings at all?

Rucha A- No.

Travis R- It has come through a personal meeting- Ritter sent us a signal that it’s coming and work out a plan to address it.

Katie P- This is all at odds with Gardner institute.
Katie P – A committee (two from each) process to create a checklist/procedural steps to be used when administration proposes a cap increase

Dennis L second

Motion carries

Misc. rate. $65. Final course form (handout). This is where it ended up, is pretty decent, isn’t prescriptive. This is also related to misc. rate, because that is on the form. There was some discussion about the fact that in the contract, the misc. rate, the language is about package or correspondence courses that we don’t offer, but we have historically used this rate to pay for courses we do offer on line. So there are years of precedent for using this payment rate inappropriately. In discussion with our legal team downstate, we decided not to grieve that. Separate process in negotiations. The administration is not going to proactively use that rate for payments, is what I’ve been told. They shouldn’t be paying you the misc. rate, but if you have a class of four students that would otherwise be cancelled, you can opt to be paid that rate. You can also say “I’d like to offer this course and be paid the regular summer rate”. The ball is in your court on this one.

Rucha A- Does administration ever tell us “this is the only thing we will pay you”?

Derek W- They might threaten?

Rucha A- In which case what do we do?

Derek W- You could try to call their bluff. e.g., last summer, a dept., there were four courses with low enrolment offered and they were part of a package from a program, and administration expected us to take the misc. rate, and we said “go ahead and cancel”, which would have destroyed the program. So they paid.

Kari W- But it has happened where classes are cancelled too, so there is no rhyme or reason.

Heidi H- I was given another form than this one.

Derek W- There are problems with that, I’ll talk to your chair.

Derek W- Curriculum report III. It comes from curriculum committee, doesn’t require second, and is a motion on the floor.

Heidi H- It’s a drop of courses and we (the graduate committee) approved.

Motion carries

Derek W- Update to Operating Procedures. This comes from executive committee, doesn’t need second. Keith M- They should be at large, not ex officio

Derek W- Good catch.

Christel K- Currently depts. are represented in the senate, so my dept. has one member. Should one of our faculty members be one of those caucus reps, suddenly for stuff that is not caucus-related, has another vote, our dept. would be over-represented.

Rucha A- Do you think that LGBTQ person would have concerns about curriculum and I object to that thinking (check with Rucha that this is correct).
Christel K- Curriculum might have been a bad example.

Rucha A- Somehow these are seen as flavours of things, rather than concerns of faculty.

Derek W- Academic Affairs – we thought it made sense to put an at-large person in. It gives another opportunity for one more person to serve. Discussion?

Derek W- Didn’t change Academic Computing at all. Or Action. Budget added at-large to that committee. Curriculum committee didn’t change. Governmental Relations, not add at-large, but had to clean up the language for two downstate people.

Christel K- I want to clarify that ex officio doesn’t automatically mean that they don’t have voting rights.

Derek W- Graduate Studies, not touched, Lib Ed, one at-large member added. Prof Ed Dev committee, added an at-large, and Rules, didn’t touch that one. Teacher Education, not touched. We removed language on Equity committee, we struck the whole thing because the caucuses are taking the place of the Equity committee, so no need to have them in there anymore. A reminder it takes a two thirds vote to update the OP.

Motion carries.

Derek W- Adjunct PIG grant process. New money for adjunct prof development. PIG grants. Parallel process for adjuncts. It’s there for your information. We are open to tweaking, as it’s brand new money, we haven’t gone through the process yet. We may revisit this.

Katie P- How many people applied, how it was used?

Derek W- We do have some information from this first go around. I need to talk to Val Wallingford to see how that went.

Derek W- Profit-sharing model. The provost office put forward a new “8020 model”, will use the old name for context. This went to M&C in October. It’s here for your information.

Jon Bohn. IFO governmental relations

John Persell decided by 8 votes. He is stuck at a county office overseeing the recount. He sends his apologies. We will invite him back in the future.

Does anyone have any questions about the elections? I sent a brief election overview, change in leadership in the house, Dems won 18 seats and will have majority. Found out Connie Bernardi will be Higher Ed Chair, I met with her last Friday for 90 minutes and her family has a long history in this state in institutions, her family, they “are us”. We have Senator Paul Anderson, is a freshman, I’ve never spoken with him, I know he’s a very nice man and that’s all I’ve heard. I’ve heard that he has a very clear understanding of the value that our institutions provide around the state. Obviously we have a new governor, and we have been talking with the transition team about all kinds of things, we have been giving feedback on names that have been put forward, and have suggested our own names too. We are suggesting diverse candidates, and people who understand and will advocate for campuses, and make sure the office of Higher Ed aligns with our values and helping with all of the problems on our campuses.

2019 legislative priorities list.
Most important- first is the 252 million, we are a little higher than the system office request. We want to get back to the goal of the two-thirds of the cost of public education.

State funding for tuition free funding program.

HEPA 150 million for this, usually bonding request includes this, but this year we are coming in for just HEPA requests. Things like new roofs, cooling systems, general maintenance on existing classroom structures.

5:12 adjourn pm