Meet and Confer Minutes December 4 2019

Present; Keith Marek, Steve Carlson, Derek Webb, Dean Frost, Jan Heuer, Lainie Hiller, Allen Bedford, Karen Snorek, Megan Zothman, Faith Hensrud, Tony Peffer

4pm

DW- is the administration considering retrenchment?

FH- no

MW- are any faculty currently under investigation?

MZ- will answer by the end of the meeting, yes, but don’t know the number

DW- have any investigations been completed?

MZ- no

HLC update

FH- very positive. Received the final report, and it didn’t change that I could see. We now have a 2-week window and see if we are going to write a letter of response or accept as written and then it goes into the official files and we are reviewing one last time to see if there’s anything we want to refute, everything is still the same.

JH- are they lengthy documents?

AB- about 90 pages

FH- one thing we need to get a better understanding of is when we can share it more broadly. We will know more in spring when it goes to next step, but everything in the report points to being approved again and being able to choose the open pathways.

TP- any refutation will be small, and minor.

FH- it was all very good. Board of Trustees update, excellent response. They all just felt we did a really nice job, loved the AIRC and being able to engage with students and faculty, loved the lunches, and the tours of NTC and the watermark for dinner and we had our Bemidji chorale perform and then they got to join the trustees for dinner as well. The chef came out and said what they had prepared and Inge said “we need to invite them to stay for dinner” everything was very very positive. They loved all of the food, and thanks to everyone who participated, or encouraged others to participate and our faculty and students who did a great job.

Campus diversity officer update. I have several handouts for you. I’m going to start with organisational structure. The org chart some intended changes. What you see is our proposed direction with the campus diversity officer, and takes deb’s position and actually adds some reporting units to it. I’ll speak first to the one where it says Heather Latvatt, and it was a search that was just completed recently. Heather is going to be joining us, and we are very excited to having that position filled. Heather is a local lawyer who will be joining us. It will help reduce the burden of the workload.

The AIRC position is currently vacant interviews on campus next week. Three finalists the idea behind the other positions. We thought it would strengthen our emphasis for equity and inclusion under one umbrella under the campus diversity officer. We haven’t had any resistance from anyone
on campus to this. We feel this is a structure that will help the institution in the long run. The next thing is the actual position description for the title ix coordinator, and it’s a revision of deb’s duties and also has the title ix and civil rights investigator position. Looking for your feedback. Also please look at the doc for timeline for organisational restructure. The first two items: what this basically outlines for you is that we have had multiple cabinet discussions where we reviewed the COPD and org structure changes and we are sending out this afternoon and invite to have some additional discussion about organisational structure at upcoming leadership council. We will talk more about that later. Today, we are presenting the draft CDL and org structure changes that we are proposing and we would like to receive your feedback in the 10-day period. If you look at 10 day comment period, we would get your input and feedback by the 18th December. In the meantime, MZ will be reaching out for a SAC so we can move after the 1st of the year the idea is to fill the position so that it would ideally be overlap with June with Deb in her position. The other thing is that this would not take place until the new person comes on board on July 1st with the exception of Heather Lavatt’s position.

DW- the org chart you handed out pertains to
MZ- only the CDL. There will be later
DW- extra about curriculum- ask Derek.
MZ- yes we put that in the PD to cover that
DF- you don’t mention teaching experience. Given the idea of equity by design, that would be a preferred qualification I would suggest
MZ- writing that down, thank you
FH- they key is to have that in the preferred so that you’re not totally shrinking the pool
FH- we would like comments and feedback on that.
DW- Strategic Plan update?
FH- do not have one, I just don’t have one. I need to get one to you. We are working on it and moving forward on it
DW- MAP
TP- I can’t remember the date, but some of you were there we presented in a forum an update on the progress and it’s my understanding that the presentation is on the academic affairs web page if you want to access that’s my only update.
DW- facilities update
KS- First of all, as we are entering winter I have to give standard speech for proper shoe etiquette. We need to wear proper footwear etc. Also, as we are finishing up the energy control project, some offices are seeing different spikes in temps please fill out work orders and let us know what temps you’re seeing. It will usually fluctuate between two numbers- what it is and what it should be.
KM- those are supposed to work?
KS- Yes. And please try and avoid the space heaters.
JH- are you planning in sending a facstaff out about that two number fluctuating?
KS- I wasn’t planning on it, if people are cold in their office they should turn in a work order.

KS- HS they are laying brick. We hope to be laying brick in December, it’s looking good and we hope by Feb to have a roof. We can’t predict the weather. Those of you that have bookshelves, we hope they have been arriving, that they’re available etc. Please let us know if you need more. We can update. We met last week with music group last week. Met with architect

KS- NextGen. There were four vendors,

Ks- We are in a non-operational budget year.

MZ- positions update. If you ever need an update, ask Teresa Hanson if it’s a search questions. We have met with dean’s council and I want to share with this group, and in the IFO chair training which was super helpful was that by part of the IFO agreement, when we are going through the search process the dept. as a whole is able to offer a recommendation for the search. We know that our process we have SWOT, and we have all of our pieces and we see this as one more piece of the puzzle. Teresa will be helping to communicate to the search chair unless you want to also include the dept. chair, that they should be working into their timeline what that will look like with the final interviews so that we can have a very tight timelines so that we can have depts. Putting forward a recommendation and it doesn’t delay the offer stage. If you’d like us to include the dept. chair if they aren’t the search chair, we can include them as well but they need to be thinking ahead what those schedules look like so that we can move quickly with the offer.

MM- the FT geology position that i brought up last month from my dept. heard that initially... can you tell us the status on that?

TP- we renewed it as FT. I believe that’s right

Mm- that needs to be conveyed to the dept. because we haven’t heard a peep nor has our dean.

MZ- when I was meeting with HR this week, we are pulling together all FT appointments for this AY and going through to include additional letters we haven’t in the past. We are sending them letters to say that the next AY is in a FT. I think that will all overlap to see a clear picture for next year.

MM- she just needs to know if she will be employed the following year.

TP- I went through the full slate of decisions with each dean, so if we or I dropped the ball with that position I’m sorry, but it was approved as a FT.

Mm can I relay that to the faculty member?

TP absolutely

MZ- facstaff notices regarding wage theft that come out. It’s super easy as part of the system, it’s required by MN state law. We have about half that are outstanding.

JH- I went out moments after the facstaff was sent, and went online and did it and hit submit and there was an error message so I went back and did it again. I had to log out and come back in.

MZ- clear cookies and cache etc.

FH- we have failed search for exec dir. of enrolment management. We are in process of looking at org structure as result of that, and thinking about what we might do differently. We would like to provide an opportunity for the campus to provide a discussion and dialog. We would like to hold a meeting on Dec 11 at 830 in the BA ballroom for opportunity and give brief presentation and
roundtable looking for ideas about org structure. And related to enrolment management and also other areas. Will provide some options and look for input. I want to turn your attention to the timeline document and you’ll see the Dec 11 in the document. This refers to the PLC at BSU from 830 and we will do something similar at NTC and taking notes, and also sending out a survey via facstaff. A pretty short timeline, until the 15th at 5pm. then talk more in cabinet after we get that feedback, and then providing a couple of options for me to consider and then giving feedback on 20th. We would then be revising the enrolment management PD and posting that on Jan 20 or Jan 27. Once the structure and the PD are put into a draft format, goes to bargaining units on Jan 6, and 10-day feedback period.

MZ- one of the things we’ve talked about as we draft the facstaff, is to try to make the language clear and not use concern. We are not looking at faculty depts. Or those things, this is coming about because of the enrolment management and Deb’s position, and the conversations at the roundtable can be anything anyone wants to bring forward but we want to make sure faculty don’t think it’s talking about a faculty restructure.

DW- the executive committee already has a recommendation for reorganisation.

DW- we have specific recommendations. I want to make sure you understand this is from the executive committee we haven’t had time to take it to our senate.

FH- thank you I really appreciate this

DF- I would add that the media is running stories about MN Duluth, that they are laying off 29 faculty and 13 GA instructorships. We will mention at senate that this is reorg of administration, but that kind of media attention will generate rumours.

TP- it occurs to me since this is mentioned that I could repot that BSU has just hired new Institutional Research, Robert Wilkinson, who is extremely well experienced in IR. It’ a really good hire for us. That unit will be at full strength.

MZ- we had a lot of bargaining unit and determination assignment issues with this one, we had a 2-yr. FT for this one, and some time in there will be doing a new search for a permanent. We selected to move forward with this option which gives us a little time and certainly office is working to clarify bargaining units for us.

FH- thanks for the early feedback.

MZ- we are starting some monthly all supervisor meetings, which includes our true definition of supervisors, but also those who are all practical purposes supervisors. We are making sure we can connect and that we are meeting the needs of the supervisors. Sometimes, our supervisors do work with partnerships, where some of these meeting topics may be relevant to these individuals, and if you like I can put all of dept. chairs on there, or you can leave as is and let the information get to them via the leadership committee. I can send to you what those agendas look like

JH- historically sometimes dept. chairs were put in positions by deans, which is a violation of our contract. They aren’t supervisors. They aren’t mini deans, or to do the deans’ work. So I guess I’m a little hesitant to say just send to the chairs and they’ll figure it out because we could stir up some historic issues

MZ- I agree. And in the areas where it’s working well, it’s working, I’ll maybe let it lie and see how it goes. The same question is out there for NTC so there’s less staff overall. I just wanted to let you know that if you’re hearing things that you think could be of value that would be relevant to be
presented to our supervisor group, this is where I’m getting a lot of my information. It’s just a way to make sure our supervisors are getting what they need to take care of their employees. Feel free to send them forward. I will get them on to agendas.

DP- would it be appropriate for someone from the exec team to attend

DW- follow up with me with an email

MZ- training. I have sent to DW and I think it’s been dispersed to dept. chairs. We’ve been working up a baseline. We’ve gone many years with no training, and one year is OSHA training so this is major issue. And this is just to clean it up. I appreciate those who have taken the time. We have to just start at some point and get things rolling.

MZ- this is just something that we have to do. It’s OSHA. Please send feedback.

KS- Some of the feedback that Erin has received has been nasty. This is not ok.

MS- HRTSM (human resources transactional service model. It was a positive update at the board. We have gone through a lot of different phases with shifting, and not just HR but how people experience their pay and benefits and process. I have pushed more for benefits administration and whether we can see if we are truly successful. We are looking for that to be measured. Also, the conversation has come up as “how does that all work?” and as you’re working with your course schedule, the dean’s office, and you can see “it was nailed down, and now it’s gone astray” please reach out to us and let us know. Let carol know she is really good. Once it’s entered into schedule, it all auto feeds into everything. It goes right to the service centre

KM- so it is them screwing it up

MZ. Yes, and I don’t mean that in a pointing finger way, but in a way that means we don’t have control

JH- we have been told to check every couple of weeks.

KS- And check where your direct deposits are going. We have had hacks. Make sure it looks right.

MZ- reorganization of hubs. Since Eric Davis has been on board, he’s been visiting campus and hearing that things aren’t right. I think everyone in the HR community is in support of the structure. It puts under more streamlined system. One branch for universities, one for colleges, and more individualised branches. As a campus that does both, we understand how having all lumped together creates complexities, this will streamline the reorganisation shouldn’t change much about what the staff is doing.

DW- equity 2030. I don’t have anything specific, but I’m wrestling how we can focus on this and keep it on our agenda. And have different topics come to M&C.

FH- the chancellor is about to announce the fellows. Two from the 2-years and 2 from the 4-years.

DF- There will be five fellows. The Strategic Planning position was split into two positions: one position for the universities and one for the colleges.

AB- course caps. Policy addendum. We have question come up recently regarding the courses in the summer which are accelerated courses and so we addressed as courses that are running in faster format. The question is how do we apply caps in the summer and as you all know, there has been
pushback, which you brought to us at previous M&C and we’ve been working hard to figure out solution met with the joint committee that was recently convened for the unusually speaking writing intensive courses and we have asked that committee to provide help. The provost suggested a way to help handle this, we brought to the committee, short turnaround time, and it was informed by the joint committee, but not enough time for them to make a recommendation. They are aware of what has been circulated and are on board with much of it. An important piece to note, April 20th is the date we are using to differentiate between the area in which doable could be done, after April 20th we would use the system that was developed recently with the conversations between the dept. chair and the faculty re the course cap. That is the policy. The students will see the course sections starting on Dec 15th and so we are eager to put this policy in place so that faculty will see their course caps for the summer. It’s just for this summer as we didn’t have time for anything moving forward. Very likely this policy wold be nuanced going forward, but this is the policy we’d like to have for summer.

JH- are you saying anything that’s “fewer than 8 weeks” is the 20%?  

AB- the April 20 window applies to any course. That doable window date is for any summer 2020 course. In terms of the 20%, we are starting at 7 weeks or fewer, and treating courses that are longer than 7 weeks like a semester course.

TP- this amendment protocol is not strictly for summer it’s for all terms but the time constraints we are focusing in having something in place for this summer that we will keep looking at so the idea of 8 weeks or fewer, and that would include half a semester, and so I think what faculty senate would note is that this is an approach that I support and that the joint taskforces seems comfortable with in general and will keep refining as we go.

KM- I spent about a half day on draft that was sent out. And this version goes in the complete opposite direction.

AB- I read it all. There’s very good feedback there and very good suggestions we want to consider but we are up against this summer’s offerings so that won’t be ignored, but we have to have something that’s going to dictate what’s going to happen.

KM- it just seems like it wasn’t just ignored, it’s going in the opposite direction.

MM- you don’t have to implement it this summer. You could implement it the following summer and the look at all the feedback it seems like you have a rushed timeline that you’re up against

TP- I did not look at any of the feedback. The alternative would be to leave things as they are.

FH- we don’t want to have you cancelling classes and affecting students negatively and our bottom line

BSUFA – we don’t want that either

TP- this seems like a workable thing for this summer

DF- my concerns about what is in this 3rd paragraph. I will personally get up in senate and talk about this, what you have written in the policy is that the office of academic paired with the deans, and the dept. chair will overload instructors’ courses. For someone like me, I’ve gone from 16 to 30, potentially up to 36 for capstone course and now I’m facing prospect of combined weight of these authorities forcing last minute more students into my course. I will voice my concern with the faculty senate. I don’t know why you’re doing it
TP- I’m not sure I understand what you’re saying
DF- to put it bluntly, you’re bullying us.
TP- I completely disagree. I’m not sure dean what you’re talking about. April 20th honours the 30 day agreement we already put in as addendum to the protocol
DF- I’m talking about this loophole that you can overload
TP- you said one thing that was untrue. I don’t intend to overload your courses at the last minute the protocols apply to summer we have always had since before I got here -a process of negotiating with faculty about overloading courses but that there’s nothing intended here beyond what the protocol says.
FH- it all talks about a conversation with the instructor.
TP- this is a direct literally copy and paste from the protocols that are already in place
DW- we will take this under advisement and will have a response in 10 duty day. Will the joint committee be meeting within this 10 duty days?
AB- I don’t think so no
AB- there actually is a meeting scheduled on Dec 11.
DW- that may influence what we do
JH- is that meeting going to affect policy
TP- the committee will have opportunity to consider what others have suggested and they may suggest changes I may consider.
JH- is this going to change over the 10-day period, then it has to come back to M&C.
TP- then the answer is no. we will make the 11th meeting a refinement policy meeting.
DW- I can’t say this will not encourage them to not cancel courses. This is a not motivation to not cancel classes.
This doesn’t incentivise them to not cancel classes.
TP- we will cross that bridge when we come to it. It was not designed as an incentive one way or the other, the idea was it would apply to fall and spring also if faculty wanted to offer condensed formal courses
KM- what was the rationale going from 10 to 8
TP- I can only tell you my own. A semester is 15 weeks so half a semester is 7.5, so if you do a course that is designed to run until mid term or from midterm to the end, it would fit. That is a 10 weeks course, or a quarter, we used to do quarters, they’re not sufficiently condensed really.
KM- so if you’re accelerating beyond 1 mile an hour, you can get a ticket. So any shortened class is accelerated. So a 10 week you’re teaching in two thirds of the time and that’s a sufficiently reduction teaching the class
TP- it’s not a reason to reduce the class size. 10 weeks is standard for quarters. They’re not treated any way in enrolment as condensed.
AB- the joint committee has been fantastic. I feel very blessed to have worked with them,

AB- resolution on the grievance re the new adjunct form.

MM- the grievance committee will have to review this before we consider it settled.

TP- this is in response to a settlement of the grievance.

AB- two substantive pieces to this form. First is with regards to this form- that the three reasons in the contract are identified. I’m also working with the deans’ assistants that may end up on the back of this form, for FWM, that need to be clarified and aren’t on this current form. When it gets to me now, I’m having to do a lot of guesswork with regards to course credits, payroll etc.

This new form is making an attempt to connect all the dots, to make sure we are following all the 1, 2, and 3.

JH- my suggestion, is that chairs don’t approve.

AB- good catch

JH- the grievance committee will review

TP- the idea is this form should help both Allen and you.

FH- you’ll make that one change to “submitted by”

AB- yes I’ll change that

KM- one thing that came up, when we submit our schedules, there’s a column for adjunct, and the deans approve that, why can’t all that stuff be put on the form. why can the additional information on the form (reason, faculty replaced) just be entered into the spreadsheet? i.e. is the form redundant?

AB- I love that suggestion. I think it’s brilliant

JH- will it capture all that information?

KM- you’d have to add a column 6a, 6b etc

TP- historically when I got here we tried to figure out why we hired an adjunct when we did the report and we didn’t always know

JH- wouldn’t we need this form before it’s scheduled?

AB- as I understand the process, you wouldn’t really know you had the need before you filled out the spreadsheet, you have to start building somewhere. I take your point, but I think what KM is suggesting, it would resolve it.

KM- would it be easy for you to capture the information?

AB- so much easier

TP- the purpose for the deans’ signature is to make them consider the contractual reasons for the hire which hasn’t always been the case

Adjourn 528