

BSUFA Meet and Confer  
07 September 2005

<p><u>BSUFA Members present:</u> Dave Larkin, Chris Brown, Elizabeth Dunn, Deb Peterson, Rose Weaver, Derek Webb, Rod Witt, Carol Milowski.</p> <p><u>BSU Administrative members present:</u> Jon Quistgaard, Joann Fredrickson, Robert Griggs, William Maki.</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Meet and Confer began at 4:00 pm with a reordering of the agenda such that Items 7 and 8, **Information Technology Name Change** and **Information Technology Reorganization**, were discussed first.

Robert Griggs, Associate Vice President, introduced the proposed reorganization of computer services as outlined in the Draft Organization Chart dated 08/19/05. Griggs indicated that he had been working off the five-year review in computer services as well as with faculty members from the computing committees to develop the proposal. Griggs pointed out that the new Technical Support area is a combination of the Academic Labs and Computer Support areas, that the former Webmaster position has been reconfigured into two new Web Developer positions reporting to the Associate Vice President, and that the entire area has been moved out of Publication's. The new name for the area will be Information Technology Services.

In discussion, Griggs indicated there is funding for only one of the Web Developer positions, that Griggs is still heading up CEL (50% of his present position), and that some of the Web development is presently being done through a contract with the company that now employs Tim Salm. There was some concern expressed about how academics, distance, and the Web will be integrated, as they are separate lines on the organizational chart. (See Addendum I)

Griggs left the meeting, and the group returned to the agenda, adding parking, response to Hurricane Katrina, and the Revised Work Plan to the agenda.

BSU President Quistgaard addressed Item I, the **Planning Process**, by stating he felt there was agreement on the issues the Dan Rice Report had highlighted, namely that the campus was committed to a planning process that made use of people's time and talents, got results, and was easily understood. However, Quistgaard went on to say that he had never seen a planning process work on campus in twenty-five years, and certainly not the present model as it is "too heavy." Quistgaard indicated that the campus would be "best served" with a new planning model.

Quistgaard indicated that in discussion with individuals on campus and bargaining units other than the IFO that he had been "requested" to propose a new planning model. To that end, he will present a planning proposal to the campus in October 2005 for implementation in January 2006. He indicated the planning model would be based on the "big picture" issues impacting BSU.

Elizabeth Dunn asked why BSU was buying into the "consumer mentality" for running universities; Quistgaard responded that Governor Pawlenty's appointments to the MNSCU Board made it imperative that universities be able to defend themselves in business terms. Rod Witt expressed concern that we were again setting up a structure for planning before identifying the issues we need a planning structure to address. Carol Milowski asked how Quistgaard was going to do this in such a short time frame.

Quistgaard said he had “not really decided,” but that he will “consult.” He said there is “no time for extended discussion” and that we will all have to “trust” each other.

Joann Frederickson said planning should evaluate our position in the external environment, and Quistgaard said he might start with the University Plan.

IFO President Dave Larkin indicated that President Quistgaard was welcome to come to the Senate to announce his planning proposal, but overall, Quistgaard’s announcement was taken under advisement.

Dave Larkin introduced Item 2, **the Start Up Message and Areas I, II, and III of the Master Agreement**. Larkin indicated that the President’s message at start-up emphasized Area V exclusively, calling on faculty to redirect their efforts in the community and the region. Larkin felt the message was misleading because it appears that for promotion Area II is all that “counts.” Quistgaard admitted that he emphasized Areas IV and V in his start-up message, but said we have to do Area II to “grow the reputation of the university.” He further stated that Areas I, II, III are the “heart of what we do” and that faculty must address all areas. Various IFO Executive members expressed displeasure at hearing the “old balanced plate” metaphor, seemingly requiring faculty to make equal effort in all areas. They reminded the Administration that while there needed to be some activity in all areas of the PDP, faculty had the ability to emphasize certain areas in the PDP. Quistgaard repeated the fact that faculty must address “all areas.” In discussion, the IFO labeled Area II the “catch-22” for faculty; there was no consensus on the matter.

Vice President William Maki gave Item 3, the **enrollment update**. Maki indicated that the “head-count” as up by 2 %, but the FTE and credits generated were down by 1%.

Under Item 4, Provost Fredrickson distributed **lists of classified and unclassified searches for academic year 2005-2006**. In discussion, she addressed only the new or unfilled positions, such as the Admissions Representative, the Director of Marketing, and the Assistant Professor of Sociology on the unclassified list. The lists were taken under advisement. (See Addendum II, and III)

Derek Webb addressed Item 5, **the search process at BSU**. He indicated the process was too slow, resulting in failed searches. Fredrickson responded that the math position had been held up, as the transition of the position from computer science to math hadn’t been fully completed. However, she had no opposition to setting up positions in the spring so they are “ready to go” in the fall. She did not see the fault here as “all on one side of the fence” and felt if we can get a “heads up on retirements” it would be helpful. Larkin recounted his experience attempting to literally walk the paperwork for a position from office to office in order to expedite the process and still being unable to do it. If one person who needed to sign was out of the office, the process simply stopped. There were no alternatives.

Dave Larkin thanked Bill Maki for his attention to Item 6, **Emergency Plans and Procedures**. Maki revised and updated all the plans for each building on campus and has distributed the revised plans to Department Chairs. He says there is a “need to get the information out.” Maki was asked specifically about a plan for Hagg-Sauer; he said the plan exists and is in the hands of chairs.

Rose Weaver addressed Item 9, **the Master Facilities Plan**, and how it related to the proposed Events Center. Quistgaard responded that even though BSU has now

acquired the old High School site, the City of Bemidji has eliminated that site for the Events Center, as it is “not large enough for a regional community events center.” Quistgaard expressed a preference for the downtown site for the center, and reminded the group that BSU’s Hockey Program would be the “prime tenant.” When questioned, Quistgaard said he was unsure of what the cost would be to BSU at this time.

As for the old high school site, Quistgaard said BSU might consider building new residence halls there, but in any event, the site represents “the future” for BSU.

Rod Witt expressed the general frustration that faculty have to read the *Bemidji Pioneer* for updates about building decisions rather than having a conversation on campus. Most importantly, the campus has never discussed the need for a new hockey arena.

Elizabeth Dunn addressed Item 10, **Campus Construction**, specifically Bridgeman Hall. There is limited walking access to Hagg-Sauer from the west and the south. When the Union closes at night, the only walking access is outside along the lake in the dark. She emphasized it’s a question of safety and liability. Maki said he would look into the matter.

Carol Milowski indicated that the RFP for the **Centers of Excellence**, Item 11, had been issued and, given the requirements, there didn’t seem to be much room for BSU. Quistgaard said Governor Pawlenty recommended the priority areas. In addition, there is a preference for existing programs and a requirement that state universities partner their programs with two-year schools. Quistgaard said the Nursing and Applied Engineering programs at BSU have looked into applying to be a Center. Nursing has rejected it, but the Applied Engineering Program is going forward.

At the end of the day, Quistgaard said we could try to follow the Center initiative or go our own direction. He feels it is better for BSU to go its own direction and take advantage of the Center of Excellence program where possible.

Frederickson introduced Item 12, **the Master Academic Plan**. (See Addendum IV) She said that Draft 2 of the plan had been issued to Department Chairs for comment. She also requested “an invite” to the Faculty Senate to discuss the plan. The request was taken under advisement.

Maki addressed **parking**, the first of the additional agenda items. There was general discussion of parking on campus, and the opening of the new restricted lot. This lot opens to the public at five o’clock; however, this does not accommodate faculty who teach evening classes. This was not the original understanding of how the lot would operate; Maki will investigate.

Larkin addressed BSU’s response to the **Hurricane Katrina**, and whether or not we would take in displaced university students, the second additional agenda item. Quistgaard said that the Chancellor had agreed the system could take in 300 students, but the individual campuses would have to cover the costs. This appeared to end the discussion.

Fredrickson addressed the **Revised Work Plan**, the final item added to the agenda. (See Addendum V) Members of the Executive reminded the Provost that the revised plan needed to go through the formal review/acceptance process and that there were portions of the Work Plan that had never been accepted by the Faculty Senate as they appeared to violate portions of the IFO Master Contract. The Work Plan will be placed for review/acceptance.

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5: 50 pm.  
Carol Porterfield Milowski, Recorder.

Addendum to print version:

- 1) ITS Restructuring Chart
- 2) Unclassified Personnel Searches
- 3) Classified Personnel Searches
- 4) Master Academic Plan
- 5) Revised Work Plan