Senate minutes January 13 2020

In Attendance: Bill Joyce, Steve Carlson, Bill Graves, Holly LaFerriere, Mike Hamann, David Frison, Egypt Grandison, Pete Nelson, Jan Heuer, Prabin Lama, Joann Fredrickson, Larry Swain, Paul Kivi, Samantha Jones, Christel Kippenhan, Dennis Lunt, Nicky Kay Michael, Tammy Bobrowsky, Heidi Hansen, Miriam Webber, Julie Curtis, Tricia Cowan, Ryan Sayer, Porter Coggins, Miriam White, Travis Ricks, Amanda Longie (for Rebecca Hoffman), Rucha Ambikar, Drew Graham, Sarah Young, Baozhong Tian, Kathryn Klement, Thomas Dirth, Derek Young.

4:05pm called to order

Larry Swain- Motion to Approve minutes from December 2019

2nd Jan Heuer

Approved

President’s report

Vote from Beltrami county commissioners to ban refugee resettlement.

Larry motion that we adopt the statement, as approved by John Bohn

2nd Nicky Michael

Motion carries. Nay one

Motion- DW- would the senate grant DL and DW the authority to consult JB about best way to broadcast the message

2nd Travis

Motion carries. Abstain one, nay one

Update on BoT awards process

DW- Stopped and didn’t go past this campus. Had discussion with FH on process and where we were at, and then sent email to review committee and all people who nominated and were nominated, explaining what happened. Many difficulties along the way, put us in untenable position, and not cast us in the best light if we’d submitted materials to BoT we stopped and will regroup. Work with MZ on a timeline and way to do things better. Reasons given for process failure:

1. Decision to participate was made in early fall which created a short timeframe within which to conduct the process.
2. There was a delay in process due to difficulty finding enough faculty volunteers to serve on the review committee. This resulted in a lack of gender balance and faculty diversity on the constituted committee.
3. Call for nominations was not well advertised and not disseminated broadly enough.
4. Materials required from nominators was not well delineated nor articulated.
5. Review committee did not fulfill its obligations in the creation of portfolios for nominees as spelled out in the guidelines document attached. Specifically, item 2 on page 8.
6. Faculty teaching philosophies were not requested of all nominees (item 3 on page 8).
Larry Swain - motion to move into Executive session

2nd Jan Heuer
Approved.

Jan H - motion to move out of executive session

2nd Larry
Motion carried

DW - Reminder re committee obligations - our constitution says you need to meet at least once per semester. Please send minutes.

Treasurer's report

BJ - Current balance $6457.87

Savings account requires us to have a balance of $10

Prepaid account -$165.25. Want to add $200 to that account.

DW - approved for organising event, Feb 14th contract ratification day event. Back pay on that day.

Grievance report

JH - Nothing really going on, couple of things going on. Faculty have been taken to office of dean, discipline happening, you always have the choice to have BSUFA representation or not, these faculty have elected not to. It's not a good choice, it's a very dangerous choice so if you or anyone you know is being hailed to the dean's office/hr etc., you have the right to union representation to ensure the contract is not violated.

DW - I would like to jump to new business, reorder agenda. Affirmed.

Curriculum report.

Approved.

New business

DW - summer caps - this will be on Feb 5th at M&C.

DW - next senate meeting Feb 10th due to M&C date change - need to be able to have a senate meeting within 10 days of M&C.

DW - old business.

Change of constitution/operating procedures.

DW - Operating procedures changes.

HH - I move to accept

JH - 2nd

DW - the rules committee was in agreement

Jo Fred - did we make the change about faculty with disabilities?
DW- we left it as originally presented.

PK- that was discussed at the meeting last week in some detail

JH- I recall the discussion as we decided to leave “as is” so there was continuity.

DW- the phrase up here (on screen) is supported by that caucus

Motion carried

DW- proposed changes to the constitution

DW- recap there is a proposed change to the makeup of the exec committee to allow for one caucus rep on the exec committee. Nothing has changed about this since the last two times you’ve talked about this at senate. Other change would be whether or not to change language about term limits. Two versions that the rules committee considered. In blue without strikeout is what constitution currently says. 2, 2-yr. term limits. One option was to strike that which leaves with no term limits, the other option which was considered by the rules committee is the change that leaves the terms limits in, but 3 consecutive term limits. The rules committee does not agree on these two proposals, so there is a split.

Rucha- can we split the two questions so we remove the caucus from the term limits?

JH- made suggestion to leave it as if there are nominations these term limits stand, but if no-one is willing to serve the limit should not be enforced.

CK- put forward the motion that we approve the changes to the exec changes re caucus,

HH- 2nd

DW- this is for one seat to the exec committee, representing the caucuses.

Motion passes

DW- With the 2/3 vote, it goes to the membership. Thank you to the body for making this change, I’m proud of this change, and it’s a step forward to increase diversity, representation, and good work.

DW- suggested change re term limits.

HH- I like the idea of three consecutive terms, but important to consider to have the negotiator and grievance office to serve longer for historical reference. Some faculty in the math department noted that having a pres. from our dept. for too much times takes away from our dept.

TD- what happens at the end of three consecutive terms, how is it different to 2 years? What is the mechanism by which if there are no takers, what do we do?

LS- Make a motion to negotiator, chief grievance officer, IFO board members, no term limits for those positions, and move that there are 3 consecutive 2-year terms for all other positions. Refer back to rules committee for clarification regarding situation where there are no nominations

DL- 2nd

CK- speak against it. We are trying to foster inclusiveness and diversity, and starting with the statement at the beginning of the senate meeting, and it is not enough to have just enough a caucus
rep on there and to say we are working towards inclusiveness and I feel that changing the term limits, makes meeting this more difficult.

MH- I agree 100%. I don’t think we need to mess with this, everything should have term limit across the board. It’s vital we have that turnover in the union, and our problem here isn’t term limits, it’s getting the culture of individuals in those positions, and that’s what we need to be working at and not providing unlimited terms for those people who will be consistently voted in again and again. We are making significant changes to our constitution, and not just throwing out motions. Not only am I against removing term limits, I’m against making changes to our constitutions without seeing it in writing.

PK- wouldn’t Larry change be more easily adapted if we change the word “article” that’s capitalised to “paragraph”.

KK- I think it’s still valuable to have term limits on negotiator. It’s also important to keep those relationships moving, and this isn’t against any one person- the problem is we have a mentoring problem, a recruiting problem, there should be active recruiting so that the new person coming in understands the context- shadowing, mentoring etc.

JF- speak against the change of term limits. Reiterate some of the comments from last week- it was one of the best meetings I’ve been to. If participation is key to ownership, and ownership is key, then more participation should be our goal.

DW- any further discussion on the motion on the floor?
One aye. All nay.
Motion fails.

CK- move to keep the term limit as is, to vote down both versions.

DW- we don’t need to do that, if this body makes no change, it stays as is.

DL- makes sense to me to leave term limits, my dept. was very torn in this, personally I’m leaning towards leaning 3 2-yr. terms.

PK- if we left it at 2 three-yr. positions, and exempting the board, grievance, IFO board.

DF- move that if any senator wants to change the constitution and write out the proposed change and attach to senate agenda attachments and we vote on it at the next senate meeting.

RA- 2nd

JF- if we do that, do we need to have the all meeting with faculty again.

DW- no.

JH- move to extend by 7 minutes.

LS- 2nd

Carried

DF- friendly amendment- move to have changes sent straight to rules committee, in writing, and the rules committee brings to senate.

JF- does that mean we wouldn’t see the changes?
DW- yes

KK 2nd friendly amendment

HH- I don’t think we need the amendment because it’s how we normally operate.

DL- to simplify, perhaps we should down this amendment on process and vote on what came out of the rules committee.

JH- move to extend until 525.

HH- 2nd

Carried.

LS- Withdraw amendment.

TD- when we do that, talk through it, it’s not having it in writing, or is there a way to type it up and have it in writing?

DW- the rules committee brought forward two options- no term limits, or 3 2-yr. terms.

DF- withdraw the motion.

LS- I move to send it back to Rules.

PK- 2nd

Motion carried.

Aye 16

Nay 15

Adjourn 5:25pm