

**BSUFA Meet and Confer
9 February, 2005**

Dunn, Milowski, Weaver, Brown, Witt, Gritzmacher, Larkin, Fredrickson, Maki,
Quistgaard

Called to Order: 4:05 PM

Dunn: Thanks for the sidewalk clean up. Once it was in the Meet & Confer minutes the sidewalks were much better.

MOA-SOAR

Fredrickson: I gave Larkin a proposal of an MOA for SOAR including a spring stipend and a summer stipend.

Brown: Senate met and discussed the MOA. There are concerns about the notion that this would reduce duty day pay for some faculty. This could reduce or eliminate their participation

Fredrickson: Last year we paid two duty days for 1 day's work. This MOA would reduce the overall budget and facilitate the process used by Michelle Frenzel. It isn't intended to reduce pay, but to stabilize the budget and to help her plan, not to eliminate anyone. The ½ stipend for April days is that we are already paying for people the day they are scheduled to work. This is an additional assignment although you will still do some of your originally planned work.

Brown: There are problems splitting up stipends.

Fredrickson: There is new language regarding stipends.

Brown: Why not start at the top range?

Fredrickson: We took an average of what people were being paid.

Brown: Senate wanted additional information. And, regarding summer, there is disagreement about what we are being paid for. We get a reduced rate in the summer. Things beyond teaching (SOAR) should be an additional duty day.

Quistgaard: When do you start hiring summer SOAR people?

Fredrickson: It is ready to go, but we need to resolve this first. I will get clarification on summer for you.

Positions

Fredrickson: Distributed position vacancy lists.

Maki: On the unclassified list we have the *Interim Associate Vice President for Information Technology and Extended Learning*. Finalists have been identified and released to the campus. We are looking at late February and early March for interviews. We hope to have someone in place in March. As for the *Hobson Union Director*, we are advertising nationally. The vacancy notice has gone out and we will be collecting applications until mid-April. We anticipate a July 1 hire. *The Vice President for External Relations* was a failed search.

Quistgaard: Two people turned it down because of compensation. We are pursuing this with MnSCU.

Fredrickson: In *Industrial Technology*, the position vacated when Leon Nelson retires will be probationary, as will the *Nursing* position vacated by Joelyn Scriba. And, there is an anticipated probationary position in *Criminal Justice*. As for Math, we've been

looking to move a fixed term math to a probationary position. We are looking at the source. There is an unfilled Computer Science position.

Brown: What we understood was holding one of the fixed term positions as it is and converting one fixed term position to probationary.

Dunn: Senate didn't want that because the contract allows some flexibility.

Fredrickson: I think there are two options. 1 is to move probationary positions within seniority lines. 2. The other is to eliminate one probationary vacancy while creating another probationary line. I'm proposing moving that vacant computer science probationary line to Math. If we need a new Computer Science position in the future that can be advocated for in the future.

Milowski: Are the two departments aware of this?

Fredrickson: The dean is in conversation with the departments. But I'm bringing it here as a formal proposal.

Witt: What happened to the fixed term position?

Fredrickson: It is still there. (Fredrickson drew diagrams to explain her rationale and the way the positions are being shuffled)

Witt: How did these positions get linked?

Fredrickson: Conversations with the dean of that college. If she has a vacant probationary position the dollars are behind it. This is a neutral resource solution.

Brown: This didn't come up at our last department meeting. That is a concern

Milowski: So the math position is still alive and well? And what about the failed search in *Mass Communication*?

Fredrickson: I have a meeting set up with the dean and the department.

Classified:

Fredrickson: Under classified there is a ½ time information technology person to do data input for Admissions.

Program Indicators – Update

Fredrickson: Distributed a handout. This has been discussed several times. We discussed it in August looking for a new way of evaluating new positions, program reviews and connecting those indicators of Good to Great (Collins) and Dickeson. As we are moving forward I'm still seeking faculty input into the process. It was suggested at two Meet & Confer sessions to meet with group to address program indicators. That is what this handout is an attempt to do. It's one thing to say we want excellence, but what data are we looking at? We don't want to use just a number score. We can look at rankings instead. We are trying to put objectivity to what has to be a subjective process. We are looking at ACT data (what high school seniors want) by region, by program interest, by college. We can get an idea of what our competitors are doing. We are also looking at pull through programs, unemployment records, and employment records. These help for program planning. We look at demographic. For example, ages versus how many are graduating and projected health care needs - this was for nursing. The 5-year program reviews contain many indicators and outcomes, etc., etc. We would like to identify a way for faculty to have input and feedback. We are starting to see some connections with data that already exist.

Witt: The really difficult thing will be weighting these.

Fredrickson: They are currently all being weighted equally. The deans and I are doing this.

Witt: Weighting is a black box, a moving target.

Dunn: Why aren't these things going through the Planning Structure?

Witt: We will get back to you

Web Advisory Group (WAG)

There was mutual agreement that the WAG discussion be unofficial and off the record.

Signature Themes

Fredrickson: We are returning to this from the January Meet & Confer.

Dunn: There was a discussion at Senate on Monday. Faculty have a great desire to move the University forward, but there were significant issues raised about these themes. Comments fell into three groups. Something bordering on resentment regarding the content was expressed. But more important were issues raised about the process that was followed, and there are concerns about way the themes are going to be implemented. Are they going to be incorporated into job descriptions as we have heard? The **Insider** comment from the president that "each member . . . of the community will be charged to apply these themes" was disturbing. Many perceive the themes as vacuous – they don't have meaning or substance. On the other hand, the content is also viewed as innocuous and not threatening.

Milowski: They are not threatening until they are in job descriptions and until we are changed with putting them into each and every class.

Dunn: It was a serious discussion. We want to move the University forward, but feel that these have been dropped on us.

Milowski: Are they just advertising themes going to an external marketer?

Dunn: Are they going to drive curriculum and hiring? Do they infringe on academic freedom?

Fredrickson: The next part of the **Insider** paragraph is more what I'm thinking of as our next steps. We want to draw on everyone's expertise. These are important concerns, but the biggest concern has to do with the content. Meet & Confer is important, but it isn't a good way to engage people in dialogs. We want to hold multiple conversations. We have a planning process. We find your concern with the content worrisome.

Dunn: There was mixed response. There was a whole range of responses from innocuous to bad stuff.

Milowski: Some people had been at all the discussions and aren't sure how these themes were distilled. But, had the themes been put into the planning process. . .

Quistgaard: The planning process was held in moratorium last year.

Dunn: There is a sense that this is a done deal.

Quistgaard: It isn't a totally done deal. I want to get a group of faculty. I didn't want too much definition. How were they distilled? When you use focus groups this is often the way that things shake out. The themes are based on those themes that came up over and over. How can we move forward? I'm open to tweaking and modifying.

Dunn: Let's move to the Dan Rice thing.

Dan Rice Visit

Dunn: Until we have a planning process that works this will happen over again and again. We have an exemption for the Master Academic Plan, but we can't continually do this. The core issue is fixing the planning process.

Quistgaard: Since I've been here there has never been a process that has worked. We need to develop something successful.

Fredrickson: Dan Rice has signed the contract. We hope the first visit will be before spring break. He will meet with bargaining unit heads, planning committees, and whomever else he wants to. We need to start the process of setting up a system for his visits. We anticipate there will be 3 visits.

Larkin: My sense is that the faculty and bargaining unit heads want to meet with Dan Rice when he is on campus. The sooner we can meet with him the better. I also want him to meet with faculty senate and with the members of the BSUFA Executive Committee.

Fredrickson: How do we set up a campus schedule?

Witt: Pick a date so that people can change their plans around his visit.

Quistgaard: We need to make this work. We can't change the past; we need to move forward.

Witt: There are almost 2 universities, the faculty and others. We don't have a good fit or link. We don't have the slack that we had a couple of years ago.

Quistgaard: Part of the challenge has to do with fast pace and legislators and boards. They don't want to hear about process. This is where the signature themes came from. We need a strong identity. I want to be in front of this so that we can make decisions rather than have decisions made for us.

Witt: The process for change is so difficult. The Citizens League doesn't think universities can change. How can we develop a system where we can get information to you?

Bush Budget & TRIO

Quistgaard: We are very well aware of this issue. We are already initiating contact with our legislators. This is extremely important for TRIO and Perkins issues. We don't think our legislators will have any problems with this.

Gritzmacher: I would like to ask you to encourage action by constituencies within the University that would be affected if TRIO and Perkins funding was lost. It is important for Administration to lobby for TRIO and Perkins funding, but we need others to demonstrate support also. Upward Bound certainly brings dollars to BSU, but the service it provides can't be measured in dollars. If Upward Bound and Educational Talent Search go, Student Support Services and McNair will be the next on the chopping block. SSS serves over 350 of the most highly at-risk students at BSU. If we are gone, those students won't be served. That has significant implications for our retention statistics.

Parking

Fredrickson: Distributed the parking proposal.

Milowski: I don't see the Decker Lot on here.

Fredrickson: That is called the Birch-Linden lot.

Milowski: There will be no commuter parking behind Decker?

Maki: That would be filled by the Rec Center lot.

Larkin: What we didn't do is put where the faculty can park. We are meeting Wednesday to offer suggestions. I will take those suggestions to the parking committee members. We will make changes and get back to you

Seniority List

Fredrickson: The D-Light Program is web based instruction. It was close to the Metro program. It is being funded through CEL and will start rolling into probationary positions. We are looking at what the seniority lines would be. A D-Light seniority line?

Milowski: Would they be their own category?

Fredrickson: If it became a seniority line they would be their own line.

Witt: We will get back to you on this.

Fredrickson: We also need to be looking at the women's line and men's line in PE. It is historical and antiquated. Perhaps PEHS and athletics?

Milowski: I think we begin with a conversation with the people in PE. They might like to divide athletics out of PE, or not.

Quistgaard: Fredrickson will be tasked with looking at library.

Milowski: I'd like to return to the previous. Two job descriptions were discussed at Senate where the signature themes were written into those descriptions. What is the next step?

Fredrickson: One question affects the other. We do see this as being incorporated into some positions, not as the themes themselves, but there isn't a dean that doesn't see a way to incorporate them into one program or department.

Milowski: We could see it as a part of a descriptor of the University rather than in a job description.

Larkin: I heard you say that we should get together with a group of faculty to discuss the themes.

Gritzmacher: who is going to organize this group?

Quistgaard: Yes, I want to see a group come together.

Larkin: I will get a group going and get back to Joann.

6:00 PM