BSUFA Senate Agenda – March 4, 2019

Present: Rucha Ambikar, Steve Carlson, Pat Donnay, Brian Donovan, Joann Fredrickson, Dean Frost, Mike Hamann, Jan Heuer, Brenda Mack, Samantha Jones, Christel Kippenhan, Paul Kivi, Dennis Lunt, Keith Marek, Mike Murray, Francois Neville, Sheila Paul, Katie Peterson, Elizabeth Rave, Gary Rees, Travis Ricks, Miriam Rivera-Hokanson, Debra Sea, Veronica Veaux, Derek Webb, Kari Wood, Sarah Young, William Graves, Holly LaFerriere, Halbana Tarmizi, Baozhon Tian, Sachel Josefson, Hamdan Alabsi, Janine Wahl, Gabriel Warren, Peter Nelsen, Zhe Li, Young Seob Son, Soohoon Park, Valerie Wallingford

1. Call to order
2. Course Caps – guest Provost Tony Peffer
   a. Derek Webb calls senate to order at 4:02 pm. Webb introduces Tony Peffer (VP of Academic and Student Affairs) as guest to the senate and invites him to speak about the proposed Enrollment Cap Policy.
   b. Provost Peffer:
      i. I came to BSU in 2017 and looked at course caps. There was no clear order to them, when examined holistically. This variety in caps is not good for students and not good for hiring decisions and is unfair to faculty. The new policy is designed to create a university-wide structure and to make things more consistent and orderly. A protocol will then exist for hiring adjuncts, which we lack now.
      ii. This is the fourth iteration of the policy and we now welcome any counsel on it from the BSU Senate.
      iii. The Provost then asked the senators if they had any questions about the proposed policy.
      iv. Rucha Ambikar (Sociology): asked the provost what comments he had received from students and to present any collected evidence.
      v. Tony: Derek and I went to a student senate meeting and had heard comments from them regarding difficulties in finding courses open that were required for
graduation. When we started this process in August, the faculty senate asked us to go to student senate. It represents different majors and is a big group. Derek correct me if I’m wrong. Two things struck me.

1. They were not interested in class size as long as they were comfortable.
2. A number of students shared how that they were not able to get classes and how it affected their graduation.
3. Derek: The focus was on access to the class.
4. Jan Heuer: I think we all would agree that perhaps we shouldn’t make important decisions quickly. Can we slow the train down and have a well-developed plan that the majority can agree to or that at least makes sense to the majority. We’re still not sure what the problem is? I know that in our major, it’s because that students who have priority like seniors, have issues getting into classes because they didn’t register when their window opens. It doesn’t define the problem. Can we slow this down?
5. Tony: I appreciate what you’re saying. I have to say from my perspective; I’ve been working on this since August, so stop the train no.
6. Jan Heuer: I said slow the train, not stop. Maybe spring would be better? This feels punitive.
7. Tony: We will consider that idea. That still may be a bit too slow.
8. Jan Heuer: With the Hagg Sauer move and everything, we may need more time.
9. Dean Frost: I have a question on the policy in regard to enrollment caps of optimal and doable levels. If I have a 4000 level course that is moved to doable enrollment, is that number now the optimal level after 2 years?
10. Tony: No, that would oppose the protocols. The doable level must occur three consecutive times, then we need another section of a course. We don’t want to do this forever. If you have multiple courses that are hitting doable, that is strong evidence that you need another line. If you’re going to doable all the time, we don’t want that.
11. Dean Frost (Business Administration) asked what assurances the faculty might have that once a section had been opened to the “doable” cap level that the course title would now be assigned a new “optimum” cap at that higher level. There’s nothing in the draft statement that reassures me
that if I hit the doable limit you won’t use that number as the optimum limit in the future. What can you offer that will convince us that is case.

12. Tony: When a section reached the maximum doable level the enrollment management committee would consider opening a new section of that course title and that the Provost would consider hiring another instructor (e.g., an adjunct).

13. Tony: We can add a statement and work with you for the wording regarding that concern.

14. Samantha Jones (Geography): How faculty provide feedback on whether their courses should be considered for special enrollment caps. The Provost said that the enrollment management committee would consider room, equipment, and writing assignments in making enrollment cap decisions but that a faculty member could also communicate with the Office of Academic and Student Affairs too.

15. Tony: This model is not perfected. Our team will consider all ideas presented and we will share another iteration with IFO. I’ll be happy to answer questions you may have.

16. Tony: I appreciate what you’re saying. Please understand the process from my prospective. In August I invited the faculty to join a task force to work on these issues. The faculty elected not to do that. So we moved on to an administrative team which is another way to do this. We are to give you a draft and allow you to respond and then respond with another draft. I supposed people can email me as well, but I can’t remember all the ideas shared. Is there’s a formal process for senate?

17. Derek: On February 6th this proposal came to M&C and we negotiated a response date longer than 10 days, March 6th. I received many ideas from faculty. This document has been circulated and it will be discussed after the provost leaves. It will then be provided to the Provost after we agree on it.


19. Derek: 30 minutes is what I have listed for this topic unless you want to meet again in 2 weeks.
20. Dennis Lunt: Thanks for discussing this and coming here. I’ve spoken to my department and the consistent concern is that this policy is very substantial and we need more substantial evidence. It changes the relationship of creating course caps from the dean to the registrar. This changes our work-load dramatically and it goes beyond one student senate meeting.

21. Tony: Thanks for what you’re saying. I think if you have other ideas about caps, or doable levels, I’m open to hearing those. I respectfully disagree with the idea that we wait a year.

22. Paul Kivi: 1) Historically economics has been taught at 40 we went from 5 to 2 faculty, and then enrollment went up to 70. The optimal level is 40 (and had been for 60 years). 70 is doable, it’s hard but I can manage. 100?! I don’t think I can do it. I think the students would suffer as a result. Some classes are at the doable level. Is there a way we can accommodate that reality? 2) Course caps are inconsistent and that’s bothersome. Traditionally, we’ve worked with the chair, dean, and professor. We present our ideas and now we present that to you?

23. Travis Ricks: I appreciate the work and effort in addressing the inconsistencies of course caps. I’d like to see more flexibility to faculty. Access to rooms and checking with other faculty and make sure our classes are not overlapping. We are limited on what rooms and equipment are needed. You are not aware of other types of classes that are time intensive or research heavy. We only have 10 research options. Pedagogy differs in courses where some classes need to be more hands on. We need to be able to have high quality. We may start losing students if quality suffers. The faculty, while making all of these decisions, we get contact with our students. But with this draft, administration makes changes without faculty input, we’ll have a less inviting and less customized method to meet the needs of the students.

24. Tony: Thanks for your response. The draft envisions a process that instead of the deans in an individual manner making decision, they will be collectively with faculty. Writing and speaking intensive classes will not be adjusted the same.
25. Travis Ricks: What about hands on research?


27. Val Wallingford: I would like a better understanding of what the issue is besides inconsistency? There are other differences other than course numeric levels like 1000 vs 2000. Some are very research intensive. What is the urgency?

28. Tony: It shouldn’t be a 2-year project and from my prospective, it’s already almost a 1-year long project. There is not a mandated class sized higher than 40. Doable goes above that and historical caps were set before I got here. You can do team-based with 40. There are some pedagogy that can’t do that, but 40 is not a large class.

29. Katie Peterson: Are you open to more exceptions like writing and speaking intensive. What about swimming, online sections, and seminars? As faculty know our class and content we should have input into that. Different teachers teach differently so inconsistency does makes sense. Our work load will change and it will change the way we teach. We can give more multiple-choice exams cause we’re forced into 140 in a class.

30. Tony: Good multiple-choice exams take a lot of work.

31. Brian Donovan: Rushing into decisions has led to poor decision making. It has lead to the destruction to this building of 50 years. Do you like your job?

32. Samantha Jones: Following up on intensive classes examples, field based or lab based courses are not writing or speaking. I can’t take 40 students into the field and teach effectively. If I’m the only one teaching that class, too much of my time is redirecting students that missed a click. I think setting course caps at true optimal for other reasons makes sense.

33. Joann Fredrickson: Thank you for coming today. First, it’s very important to us to understand the reason behind this. What is the problem so we can have a reasonable response. Could you re-state it?

34. Tony: Three issues come to mind. 1) There are tons of variety of course caps here, more then there are different pedagogies, and it seems unfair to faculty. 2) It creates unnecessary problems for students to get classes
to graduate, and 3) it makes it difficult to make accurate decisions on faculty lines. If a faculty tells me that our classes are full all the time and they need another section, but maybe the caps are too low.

35. Joann Fredrickson: Instead of an enrollment manager, is it possible have an enrollment manager anticipate what demand would be and communicate it to the dean and the faculty so we can put forward a pedagogy that can address these sizes? We’ve negotiated to do larger sections so we can protect our senior sections of 16. We’ve always been told to shoot for 25 in a class.

36. Tony: If I felt that worked I wouldn’t be here.

37. Joann Fredrickson: It doesn’t matter if enrollment is below the optimum, but it does if it’s above?

38. Tony: I have nothing to do with those caps that are above, so it seems to me that I didn’t tell you to put the caps to where they are, someone did. But I have to start from the perspective that you made it work. I believe strongly in outcomes based assessment. If there’s evidence that a cap size is hurting student learning, that is a good reason to change.

39. Mike Murray: You believe in evidence-based outcomes, that’s great, but every year we are supposed to submit assessment-based evidence each year for each program, and we have 5-year external reports. In those reports they lay out what works what doesn’t, what the faculty need, and cap sizes. In 2016 our review was not read by a single administrator. You could have read those reports and what was said is that we need more sections and faculty. Also, there’s value in diversity of opinions and perspectives with more faculty. There’s need there, but instead of providing more sections, you’re raising caps. So you’re choosing not to read evidence-based reviews. The administrators I spoke to said they haven’t read them and they said they are in a file cabinet. You have things there to use to make program level, evidence-based decisions.

40. Tony: Are they based on learning outcomes?

41. Mike Murray: They typically are.

42. Christel Kippenhan: There’s a German saying that this sheers everything over the same comb. Meaning, this does not consider the different needs
for our courses and programs. There could be two classes that are totally
different animals, but they both are 3000 level classes and therefore will be
treated the same with this policy. All different programs have all different
needs and this lumps everything into the same pile if the numbers are the
same (across 3000 levels or 4000 levels). That’s why you see the different
disparities. A 4000 psychology class cannot equate to an exercise science
4000 level class. You cannot just treat all of them the same.

43. Dennis Lunt: Colleagues say taking a year would be wise. This is not
playing the time line game. 1. You’ve mentioned data sets and I’ve not
seen any of them. 2. It allows us to respond more intelligently to that
evidence. It’s a harder process, but it puts the resources where they need
to go. The Philosophy classes I’m always teaching are waitlist courses. If
this policy goes into effect, then I’m teaching doable in all 4 of my classes.
If we take our time we can put the resources where they are needed.

44. Tony: A second year doesn’t make sense to me. But there are elements
that you are saying that I am willing to consider.

45. Dennis Lunt: Which ones?

46. Tony: I don’t remember them (Laughs).

47. Dennis Lunt: the departments could work with administration to create a
more evidence-driven process, why not do that?

48. Tony: It’s only my second year, what I witnessed last summer was asking
to add more students and faculty saying no. I was in the position to say
raise the caps. This ad hoc approach has not been affective. I’m not willing
to wait another year. I am willing to consider what optimum and doable
are.

49. Pat Donnay: Can you be more specific on which offices and/or who is
considered enrollment management staff?

50. Tony: All enrollment management is doing is implementing a policy
enforced by academic affairs, they are not making decisions. They are
only looking to see if the room will hold the people or if equipment needs
are adequate.

51. Pat Donnay: It seems like there’s little, if any, discretion with a course if
it’s a protocol that’s driving the decisions.
52. Tony: There’s discretion in establishing exceptions with the deans. Enrollment management should not be the ones making those decisions. Enrollment management says we’ve hit the ceiling and we need to take some action to raise the caps. So optimal and doable will guide that process but within that I am willing to work on that. Should doable be incremental, if it says 20% do we do the whole 20% or do we do 5% and go from there?

53. Pat Donnay: I’m struggling with all these offices trying to determine if it meets the criteria of writing/speaking etc. It will be very hard to have a “rule” to enforce for every class and this will be messy for a very long time.

54. Tony: This is not an uncommon approach, especially in universities.

55. Joann Fredrickson: Are you open to feedback regarding the 20-30% doable amount. Can we pull it down to closer to what we’re accustomed to?

56. Tony: Yes, I’m open to that.

57. Joann Fredrickson: Will you reconsider the part of the draft that suggested that online and on campus courses will be the same size given the 1 on 1 contact needed and the time intensive communication that is needed?

58. Tony: I’ll consider it. The only caveat I have is that the research on distance education is evolving and with technology improving, there are a lot online courses offered at higher caps and the Learning Outcomes have not been affected with higher number.

59. Joann Fredrickson: Our certified online/hybrid courses are very intensive to specifically demonstrate that they are not self-directed. Are you willing re-consider those courses for your policy?

60. Tony: The accreditors are silent on class size due to the variations in institutions. That’s not a useful bell to tap everyone else is doing everything.

61. Mim White: Analogy- For Hagg Sauer, the data was wrong about how much this place was used and it was a bad decision (you’ve said this). We can’t go back, and this something different, but we are talking about
students, student learning, and optimal settings. Teaching is personable. We are touching kids’ lives forever. We have a huge effect on these students. We have an important job and we do it right because we don’t have 600 students in our classes (even online). Step back and look at all the pieces so we don’t look back and go, well this was a mess.

62. Tony: I don’t disagree with everything you said, but it doesn’t lead us to a solution. I believe absolutely in evidence-based assessment in student learning, if you need help in how to develop that type of an assessment that gets to that issue, I’m ready to help. If a cap is hurting student learning, it’s a no brainer, but we need to know that.

63. Rucha Ambikar: We’ve only her anecdotal evidence and students do not always know what they need. What is the possibility of enrollment management getting in touch with the chairs and communicating those roadblock classes? There seems to be insufficient evidence to point to the urgency.

64. Tony: You asked me to go to the Student Senate. Yes, they did that last year.

65. Paul Kivi: Follow up, A big fear that we come back we’re coming back this summer and our enrollment cap of 70 goes up to 100. Can we please have some prior knowledge before the enrollment goes up?

66. Tony: Yes, enrollment management. They are not negotiating

67. Pat Donnay: They are negotiating. They can’t do it without the dean or your blessing?

68. Tony: No, they go to the dean, chair, and faculty. If there’s an AAR, and they know what students are coming, and we don’t have enough seats for x, they can’t take a week or two to get the answer.

vi. Motion to end this discussion after this last question by Mike Murray second by Christel Kippenhan, Motion passes

1. David: What if the inability to communicate to students due to higher enrollment is on the faculty evaluations?

2. Tony: That makes sense but student evaluations doesn’t equal assessment. We don’t have a process in an institutional system, so that’s my quick answer. Thank you for inviting me.
c. Derek: March 6th is the deadline for the course caps response document so there’s only two days left.

d. Dean Frost: I move that the faculty senate take a vote on the current proposed draft in course caps. Second, Elizabeth Rave.
   i. It’s important we go on record and have a voice in this.
   ii. Joann Fredrickson: If we vote No, would that be the first sentence in the document
   iii. Derek: You’ll need to decide that, any more discussion?
   iv. Unanimously failed to support the original draft provided to the senate.

e. Paul Kivi moves we extend 10 minutes, Joann Fredrickson seconds, Motion carries

3. Approve minutes from (Push to Next Make-Up Senate meeting)
   a. Approve minutes from February 4, 2019
   b. Approve minutes from February 18, 2019

4. President’s Report (Push to Next Make-Up Senate meeting)
   a. Bargaining units update
   b. Guard your intellectual property. If there is a sharing of intellectual property due to MinnState $ support, then create agreement ahead of time.
   c. Campus Support Staff Guide Final
   d. NEW Position Updates - 2-27-19 - Attachment A

5. Officers’ Reports (Push to Next Make-Up Senate meeting)
   a. Treasurer’s report
   b. BSU-FA Negotiator’s report
   c. Grievance report

6. Old Business
   a. Course caps response document
      1) Dennis Lunt: Motion to add that we “officially and unanimously voted this draft down” in the course caps response document letter after the section named “overall position” at the end of the first sentence?
      2) Keith Marek seconds.
      3) Approval of response document to caps draft with the added detail regarding the senate vote.
      4) Discussion- please add the president to the list of ccs.
      5) Letter from CEL, Biology, and Communication studies also have attachments added to the emailed response.
6) Friendly amendment to the motion to also approve the letters from CEL, Biology, and Communication studies.
7) Motion carries unanimously

7. New Business
   a. Curriculum Report VI:
      i. Recommendation from Curriculum Committee to approve
      ii. Christel Kippenhan: Grad committee recommends approval for all grad studies curriculum reports.
      iii. Motion carries to approve curriculum report
         1. 17.INST_18-19 vFinal3
         2. 18.HON_18-19 v2 Final CP
         3. 19.INST.CSS_18-19 v2 Final CP- REVISED
         4. 20.SPAN_18-19 v2bFinal CP
         5. 24.NRSQ_18-19 vFinal CP
         6. 26.BUAD_18-19 vFinal3 CP
         7. 27.POL_18-19 vFinal2 CP
         8. 28.SPED_18-19 vFinal2a CP
         9. 29.NRSQ_18-19 vFinal.CP

1) Kari Wood motioned to adjourn meeting. Keith Marek seconded it.
2) Meeting is adjourned 5:25

(Push to Next Make-Up Senate meeting)

b. Proposed online class policy change (supplied Friday, March 1st)
c. Development of Athletics Program strategic plan
d. Professional Improvement Grant application process
   i. Direct PIDC to conduct survey to assess faculty needs
   ii. Consider different categories or condensing categories
   iii. Consider offering more grants that are smaller (currently $1,200/$1,500)
e. Teacher Education Committee – is there still a need for this committee?
f. MinnState Online Strategy Implementation
   i. One of the two IFO reps on committee was Valica Boudry
g. Safe Links – Microsoft email security feature. Activated in December, 2018
h. New position updates
i. HR Responsibilities
j. Respectful Workplace taskforce members

8. Other (Push to Next Make-Up Senate meeting)

Based on a survey of faculty conducted by the committee, the following areas have been identified as of primary importance. They are listed in priority order:

1. Travel for confirmed presentations, performances, and exhibits
2. Research travel
3. Research supplies
4. Continuing education
5. Collaborative research/projects with students
6. Interdisciplinary research/projects
7. Curriculum development
8. Degree completion