

Meet and confer 11/1/17 4:02pm

Present- Keith Marek, Steve Carlson, Derek Webb, Elizabeth Rave, Sheila Paul, Andrew Hafs, Megan Zothman, Jesse Grant, Faith Hensrud, Tony Pepper, Mike Murray, Karen Snorek, Deb Peterson, Sarah Tarutis, Lainie Hiller, Randy Westhoff

1. Retrenchment

DW- are you considering retrenchment?

FH- no.

Are any faculty members currently under investigation? Nature of investigation (no name needed).

DP- not currently, no.

Have any investigations been completed? Results?

UPDATES

1. Facilities update

ER- Thank you for addressing HS100

2. Positions update

MZ-Open positions posted. Lots of excitement and lots of position.

DW- Can we please have that list emailed?

MM- can you please make a note on which ones are converted from FT to probationary and which ones are new lines?

MZ- yes

DW- anything else on positions?

3. Budget update

DW- budget

KS- No real update at this time. I've been monitoring it quite closely, and FWM and the way we are doing the new roster, and making sure people are being coded to the right place. We are starting to throw out some new numbers and what FY19 will mean.

MM- what are instructional costs?

KS- We don't have that yet.

MM- When you get that can we please get them?

KS- We are working on the instructional cost study and hope to have that by Nov 21. We have a new business manager starting Nov 15. Comes from other higher ed. Ron Vextra (sp)

MM- remember you emailed that spreadsheet to Jeff and me? Can you please email me when you have that updated?

KS- Yes

4. Enrollment update

DW- Any enrolment update?

KS- Michelle Frenzel is not here, but I can give general. We are the only 4-yr institution that was up when it comes to undergrad, we are along with metro also up with regards to grad program.

AH- Are our spring numbers retention-related?

KS- I have not looked at them.

TP- Right now it looks too early, they looked fantastic frankly, but they are too small to mean anything.

DW- I heard something alarming. SouthWest enrolment for fall is down double digits by 40%.

KS- I haven't seen anything down 40%. Maybe they might not have their PSEO in there.

RW- I've seen the numbers and nobody is down that far.

KS- Let me look. As of Monday, we were up 1% when it comes combined, we were up 2.8 FYE. SWS shows them combined at under and grad, down 5%, down 4.5% wrt undergrad, and down 9.4% when it comes to grad. Down 82 FYE.

TP- seems to be off by a decimal point

DW- I will convey that information 😊

5. Strategic Plan Update

DW- Strategic Plan

FH- We received comments over a full week period. We received lots of comments, met this afternoon and looked at categorizing the comments and putting into themes. Karen and Michelle are working on it, and have identified responsible individuals for each goals and activities and looking now at budget implications for these goals and activities. Meet next week as a committee and identify what our importance and urgency for goals and activities, and then determine Year 1 activities vs Year 2 and 3. Moving along with it, and have lots of work to do.

DW- Based on feedback see any major changes?

FH- Not based on feedback, no.

CARRY OVER AGENDA ITEMS

**1. Restructuring Colleges
25-17**

**Carry over item from 8-30-17 9-
Tony**

Attachment A

Open Forums:

11-7-17 – 12:00 – 1:00 p.m. – Crying Wolf Room

11-8-17 – 3:00 – 4:00 p.m. – Crying Wolf Room

DW- restructuring colleges.

TP- I want to open up for questions and comments just a few words about the overall goals and what we are trying to do. In the current structure, the CAS literally in terms of full time faculty, is 50% larger than both the other two. For the job of a dean, it's the job of the FT faculty that drives the workload. Each FT faculty member represents a PDP, PDR. Recommendation and all those things, so the driving force behind the effort was to try to create some semblance of balance between the three colleges especially in relation to FT faculty. Then a couple of other elements, even though it may look this way, I really didn't divide into three. I was startled by how balanced it was. Another priority was that we limit the name to three identifiers otherwise the name would be huge. That was a guiding principle, and then there be a logic as to why a department is in the college there may be other logic that put them in other places, but somehow there is a way that a department can explain why they're in a college. I was trying to stay away from overly esoteric names, the third one is bit esoteric, but the best illustration, and it might be my ignorance, but I can make up a meaning for human ecology, and I'm assuming that it's right, but I tried to avoid those kinds of names.

MM- So to me this looks expensive, since we are underfunded with the use of adjuncts. What I did, I looked at the structure of the college structure at other MnSCU universities. For example Mankato, 85 faculty under a dean, and no assistant dean. If they can make it work, and be functional, can we?

TP- My approach, was that we have three colleges and there were other suggestions to make four, and I didn't want to increase costs. No college would have an assistant dean, so that is one position... I guess I don't know the answer because I don't know Mankato's structure...

I wonder, is what how much administrative support those colleges have compared to ours. There may be some savings, but if you cut one bigger salary and you have to add smaller salaries...

MM- I will admit to being naive, as I don't know what the workload of a dean is, but I see Mankato and they have 85 faculty under one dean and have been able to create efficiencies, so there must be a way. It is always instruction that gets cut. I invite you to look at Mankato's programs/structure.

TP- I don't know enough to answer that. In our context at least this strategy would result in not insignificant savings. It wouldn't increase cost.

DP- One of the things I see at Mankato, they are highly focused colleges. I think that when you have a highly focused environment, it adds to a dean's ability to successfully manage a college.

SP- This has been our concern for nursing- it has a high learning curve for deans. When you look at what's included here, there's a lot and it is more than just the health areas involved- I'm concerned with the variety of programs.

TP- I appreciate what you're saying, for me, there's more than one program that would have disciplinary national accreditation, and probably speaking from my own preference having been a dean, the variety can be stimulating, it's how many that becomes much tougher.

DW- I have one other broad question- how did restructuring, at least this proposal, fit in with the Strategic Plan? Was there at least some thought on that?

TP- The Strategic Plan does not call for restructuring, so at that sense it doesn't I can't think of any way it's at cross purposes with the Strategic Plan. It's a need that predates the Strategic Plan.

FH- This is a need that has existed when I stepped in the door and well before that. A balance that can be achieved by a better distribution of faculty and programs is essential.

MM- some of the CAS chairs are concerned with their untenured colleagues and how that would affect them.

TP- That's a very good point. One of the things I've been working on with the deans is consistent set of expectations. And approach to evaluations. One of our deans has announced her intent to go back to the faculty.

FH- Whenever you have a dean changing, it's a factor.

KM- I'm wondering about rationale of placement of some of these, there are a few that "just one of these things is not like the other". i.e., Professional Ed and Business with the sciences. What was the logic for those two?

TP- My own feeling is that colleges don't necessarily have to have a credible disciplinary coherence in itself, the work is one more at the dept. level. One of the things that maybe I should have added as a priority with the approach is I did not want to silo the liberal arts and the programs. I think that creates what is often an unhealthy division, so I wanted to infuse the liberal arts into the colleges rather than create one separate. And so I was trying to hint at that with a logic, and so the logic as to why business and science are together is not disciplinary, it's the name says business science, and that's how you explain they're together.

DW- Anything else?

MM- Is there a time frame?

TP- Next fiscal year

MM- Contract language for restructuring?

RW- Contract is with regards to departments, not for colleges.

TP- It would be implemented by July for next academic year

**2. Master Academic Plan
25-17**

**Carry over item from ~~8-30-17~~ 9-
Tony**

DW- Item 2.

TP- I don't have a lot new from the last time. We will be developing work groups and looking at different aspects for the planning, but as the Strategic Plan is finalised, it informed the Master Academic Plan, so will be getting going in the MAP fairly soon, but not immediately.

**3. HLC Criteria Committee
25-17**

**Carry over item from ~~8-30-17~~ 9-
Randy**

DW- HLC

RW- We have co-chairs with the committees. Right now there is call out to faculty to populate those committees up to four faculty per committee. We are encouraging certain faculty to volunteer who we think would be good at those positions; hopefully all will be in place in the next few weeks.

**4. Scantron
25-17**

**Carry over item from ~~8-30-17~~ 9-
Derek**

DW- Scantron

KS- We are still working on it, we are not going to take it way, trying to get prices and get things going. We are not taking it away yet. When we do, it will be out in the colleges, so it won't leave BSU if that makes sense.

DW- So you don't have a formalized pan?

KS- No, not yet.

ER- We thank you for leaving it..

5. Academic Calendar changes – AY 2018 – SS 2023

Update

Randy

DW- Calendars?

RW- They haven't changed from the last time you saw them, will be out soon. There will be five years' worth on our website and will send an email saying "here they are".

KM- Have you received anything?

RW- Student Senate wasn't happy about classes the week of Thanksgiving, but they liked the three-day weekend.

DW- Item 6. Prior consideration.

MZ- Prior consideration- we have now had a pretty standard practice as far as how we have conducted it. In the most recent years we also have the stage where the deans will open up to review all candidates in the pool and then the candidates would progress. This came up in discussion in deans' council meeting as to how could this work better for us, whilst still giving the incumbent the same contractual rights as they get now? Could we do it better? It's from our perspective so we don't know your perspective obviously. Part of it is how can we be more timely for all- the incumbents and the external candidates. This is an idea of how we can do that, meshing the timelines together. I had a conversation that this might not be something that everyone desires. How can this be a good process, but understanding that we do have an incumbent?

RW- This stretches the search out longer with a prior consideration search. Drags it out for another month.

MZ- Not only looking at the IFO, and there is very particular language we have to adhere to, but also want to make sure that the campus hires the best candidate. We have the expectation for our permanent positions that we are hiring the best candidate for that.

MM- One question- when the contract was bargained on this, it was to allow the incumbent, if qualified, and everyone likes, they can be hired without any other candidate to be considered. Would you rewrite to allow for that?

MZ- We can adhere to that as long as we understand that we also have local policies that we need to adhere to, that still needs to apply in this case. No, I don't think that we would ever know that we are hiring the best candidate for the position.

ST- There is very little or no communication to that incumbent and that bothers me terribly.

MZ- Bring that to us, we want to know more. The person who is the incumbent, we want them to know how that is going to look.

ST- We are hiring professionals, and want to treat them as professionals, there are places that want to hire them!

TP- I want to be clear. I gee 100% that the principal that the qualified incumbent should be a finalist in the position. The worry for me is, I lost track a long time ago how many searches I've done, and in my experience the number one factor in losing people other than \$, is length of time of the search. Secondly, it seems to me that if we have an incumbent and we still like the incumbent but we still want to do a national search, it puts the incumbent at a terrible disadvantage because they're competing against people who are fresh off the interview, and their own interview was six weeks previously.

KM- Is there a clear ownership on where the holdup is?

MZ- I think it comes from both avenues – search committees or dean? I could do a search and look into it, but I think it's coming from all areas. I don't think it will happen this year, given who we have in

charge of all of the searches. We have switched to an online format, versus the big travelling packet that used to go around.

SP- When we searched we had FT faculty who had been with us for a long time, and we turned some into probationary positions, without the Prior Experience, if I was told that I had to now compete for the position, I would be rather upset.

MZ- We would communicate this in the period of hiring. We would be very clear about the terms of hire.

SP- An off-topic side tweak. In the nursing dept., we have found ourselves short of FT faculty, and have to rely on adjuncts. Is there a way to backfill the FT positions?

AH- I want the policy to give me flexibility and I'm concerned that this doesn't give it to me. If we have someone great in our dept. who has been doing the job, I want to end the process as soon as possible.

DW- As the policy is written, we have to grieve it. Are you standing behind the current policy the way it's written right now? If you're willing to rewrite the policy, if you're not, and you're standing by the wording of the policy, we will grieve it.

MM- And we will win.

MZ- We can certainly tighten our timelines, but I think that what we have been doing for a series of years....

MZ- Just because we have a diverse candidate on campus, does not mean they are the best candidate for that position, we don't only hire based on meeting an affirmative hiring goal.

So in response to that, the proposed item is least desirable and what would be more desirable, whether grieved or not, how can we in the interest of all candidates, how can we work to really tighten those timelines? To hire the best candidates in the fastest time. Ashleigh and I have been talking, and we'd know in advance when the prior consideration candidate search is coming along. We can communicate to those candidates better, and ways to condense that timeline more.

DW- If that prior consideration incumbent, and went through that quickly, and the hiring authority agrees, will the search be over?

MZ- No

MM- We aren't going to take this process to senate, seeing as though we are grieving it.

DW- This is happening across all campuses and this will be a test case.

DW- Here is the grievance, with a data request that goes along with it.

7. Post-tenure Sabbaticals (DRAFT)

Attachment C

Randy

DW- Item 7. Post tenure sabbatical

RW- Right now in the contract, the year after a person is tenured, where they are guaranteed a sabbatical and then that window closes until the 11th year. Requests for faculty to postpone, and good reasons for the most part, is kind of becoming a nightmare for us to keep track - maybe it makes more

sense to let them wait until they are ready and then apply the year before. We feel this language would make them feel comfortable and assured that they could apply. I took the language that is currently in the contract.

DW- We appreciate that proposal and like the spirit and will get back to you.

8. Internet Guardian update

Karen

DW- Internet Guardian

KS- What would you like to know? I don't know why it says there is a draft, and three pages, but there are only two. We are implementing it starting on Friday of this week. What it will do is protect us from going to malicious or phishing internet sites so that we aren't putting anyone's computer or network at a risk. It's going to go in on what is called a monitor state- we will be monitors and receiving a report based on our servers if there were any websites accessed that could have had malicious or phishing software on it. We won't know the individual computer, but just that BSU had a computer on the server. When we switch over to protective mode, and hope to do that over winter break, at the protective mode, if it were to reach a malicious or phishing link, you'd get a popup, and get similar message to that in the draft that's passed around. It will have the MN state logo, not BSU logo, and you'll be blocked from entering that site. If it's a site that you need, for any type of research or academic teaching, anything in your instruction, anything like that, you can simply make a request and we will allow you to go into that site. The system office, not us, will allow you. We at BSU don't have the ability to allow you to that site. The request goes to the system office. There are 14 institutions that are on the protective site, and to date they've had about a dozen requests of sites. 99.99% of all sites are good.

DW- It sounds like if someone gets one of these messages, they call or IT office and how long until it's resolved?

KS- Minutes.

DW- Will the forms go through the same process?

KS- Yes.

DW- At Winona, the CIO at Winona said if there is an information request from the Central Office to Winona's IT office, then Winona first vets the request with their legal team before complying. Do we have that sort of check?

KS- I have not heard of that.

DW- It's Winona exerting authority on data.

FH- We don't have our own legal staff....

AH- What would happen if someone asked for search history on a faculty member here? Is there a policy?

KS- Depends on the situation, and depends on who is asking for it.

KM- Who developed the software?

KS- Cisco.

KM- All the data collected belongs to us?

KS- It's called Internet Guardian, in case they switch to another vendor. It's really the umbrella service through Cisco.

9. 80/20 update

Randy

DW- 8020 update

RW- we have several programs that will be in their third year.

AH- We brought up the 8020 question, and how the finances we allocated after they were viable and made money, the previous agreement biology made was 80 would go to biology and 20 to university, and wanted to put on your radar as well, protecting our investment into that program. We spent a lot of time in our dept. setting it up, and investing.

TP- I will look at this and Randy will help.

AH- One more thing to add, that we were assured that it would continue after the faculty was tenured, if Andy arsham, switched to tenure track, would still say 8020. We are fortunate to have the same dean who was told all of this to us. It's what we were told.

RW- The money doesn't necessarily go back to the dept., goes back to college.

ER- That is not what we were told.

KS- Does it take into consideration the losses before, is it 80% after the losses?

AH- It would make sense that we would pay back the losses.

RW- it's 80 of the revenue, not the profits.

SP- When nursing had 8020s, the profits came in to that account specifically for the use of the department. We were successful right from the start, when those programs moved into the program, the whole 8020 just shifted and came into our program.

AH- That just doesn't sound right

SP- We need to make sure we are equitable throughout the university.

MM- If you look at the minutes from the academic retreat august 5-8 2013 from? It says

"2. Budget/Budget planning. 80/20 models – reviewed criteria for funding model, intention is that resources follow the growth programs, does not include existing programs, have had conversations about establishing baselines for existing programs to allow for growth b. Responsibility-based budgets – money goes first to schools and colleges; services are paid by the college. Match academic authority with financial responsibility. Eliminates need for constant negotiation beyond the college. Allows funding of plans that align with university mission and goals. Will great greater transparency – i.e. how

much a college pays for services beyond instruction. Should a task force be developed to provide stakeholder buy-in? Group would also need to determine incentives, framework, developing a model – include faculty and deans from CBTC and SON. Run a pilot/shadow year in FY15 and implement FY16. Bill reviewed current budget model, tuition is frozen for next two years, received state appropriation to fill in. Enrollment is biggest driver of revenue, also state appropriation and tuition. Summer profits – portion to academic affairs to fund bottom dollars (additional dollars for faculty costs beyond load), initiatives. Also receive restricted revenue, i.e. 360, Optivation, AOS funds and differential tuition. Personnel is largest expense (75%). Connection between budget and enrollments – will be explored in Strategic Enrollment Management committee that James is coordinating. What is the optimal enrollment, for each program? Including graduate and off campus enrollment numbers. Discussed ability to run programs for small niche markets vs need to remain profitable”

DW- We are at a critical point in the programs where they are transitioning

10. Diversity Informational Items

Attachment D & E

Deb

DP- We would like to create a possibility for all employees at BSU to obtain some diversity training, and upon completing of 15 hours they would receive a certificate. One of the things that many employees are looking for are professional opportunities and this could be included in some of their plans. I don't need it to be inclusive of only BSU faculty programs, just need some evidence that you participated in such a thing and the number of hours it took in order to award the certificate.

DW- Should we bring it to senate?

DP- It would help if you have ideas on how to implement, it would be great. The committee is going to bring it up when we meet again in November.

DW- If senate has feedback?

DP- Bring it to me.

11. Other

12.

DP- We would like to create an Affinity Group, or campus wide diversity groups. If they want to call themselves an employee research group, they can forward to their appropriate channels that they would also use through bargaining units. Any feedback to me.

DP- The very final thing wasn't on the list but I'm going to pass around- workshop on how to deal with recognizing and dealing with microaggressions.

DW- We have reached "other".

MZ- Only thing I will add is we are definitely interested in knowing if BSUFA will participate in Board of Trustees' excellence in teaching awards?

DW- I sent you an email on that, we will be talking about that in senate.

MM- At our last M&C, draft policy was going back downstate regarding Letters of Expectation, and senate is looking for a report from me. I honestly thought it was a well thought out and clear coherent

policy, we think it would have been a good idea, and you said it would go to Chris Dale. What do you want me to tell them? I have to tell them something?

RW- We changed our mind.

MM- If I tell them that, they will say the administration is hiding something from us. I can throw MnSCU central administration under the bus, but I need to know what you want me to say.

RW- Throw MnSCU under the bus.

TP- Something to the effect on advice of legal counsel we don't feel it wise to move forward.

MM- So you're not going to move forward on Letters of Expectation?

TP- Not formally. I can instruct deans to use them in particular way, but that would not be a formal policy.

MM- Nobody want to have rogue deans, we want all policies to be applied evenly. I would assume that there would be at least internal policy and it's kind of troubling that there isn't a consistent policy.

MZ- This isn't in our contract, it's not disciplinary. If a dean was working on something like this, they would come through Tony's office and my office, so there would be some sort of understanding of that - no one goes and disciplines someone without going through HR.

MM- I can report that under our contract this isn't a disciplinary.

MZ- You can get a letter of expectation daily, and it's not disciplinary.

MM- I will report they will all go through HR with some sort of dialogue with the faculty member.

TP- There won't be a formal policy, but there will be an understanding between the deans and me as to the appropriate way to use letters of expectations and to how to use them.

FH- To avoid the rogue.

MM- You can just draft an email or something, and we can meet at another time? But can we use that wording?

TP- I don't know.

MM- We just don't want to give the impression to faculty that MnSCU or this administration is hiding something?

MZ- Does everyone understand what a letter of expectation does? It's not predisciplinary, it is a clear way for the two people involved to say there is a clear expectation- the employee and supervisor- it isn't a trick or trying to get to discipline and I think it's become that on our campus.

MM- It's popped up and been misused on campus.

TP- My concern is that if I put something in writing, it's become a policy.

MM- Can you at least allow a faculty member after initial dialogue, can you let them know that BSUFA rep can be present at that meeting like any other type of meeting?

RW- It's not a contractual right, but culturally on this campus we have allowed it, if faculty say they feel more comfortable. It wouldn't be a contractual right because it's not disciplinary.

MM- Randy used the word "coaching" last semester.

MZ- Can we agree if you get a letter of expectation and I don't have any examples of anyone getting a letter of expectation can they come to my office.

MM- I know of four, and three of the four have been misused.

MZ- So bring them forward.

MM – People know about them.

AH- When you described them, they sound a lot like the PDP and PDR – so why do we have them?

MZ- Might fall outside the timeframe

ST- Then call it something else.

AH- We have the PDP process, why do we need anything written down? Why can't we just have a discussion with the dean, that goes in a folder and be misinterpreted later on?

MZ- This is a more transparent way to reflect a conversation that occurred, as the notes of what we talked about in a meeting.

AH- Would you recommend for faculty to type up a note and keep their own notes?

MZ- Sure

MM- Would letter of expectation allow for a response and be put in the same file?

TP- Yes

DP – Some of the things that I have become aware of, that get written into letters of expectation are part of the PDP process, it's the yelling at people in the hallway.

ST- That's disciplinary and we should do that

DP- I remember being on exec and saying how much I hate letters of expectation, but I understand from a coaching standpoint, from a desire to talk with a faculty member, sometimes something is going on with their life, it's an eruption in an otherwise stellar ..

ST- It's verbal first, right?

MZ- Are those letters coming as we have sat down, we chatted, two-way conversation? Does that conversation occur and this is a follow-up?

MM/ST- No, it's coming as a disciplinary.

MZ- Then this is a way to memorialise a conversation, so we come to an understanding (yelled at the students in the hall for example) and we discussed... if there's no conversation and you're just getting handed a letter, then that's not the way it should be.

SP- It had been explained to me that the letter of expectation is part of the disciplinary process.

TP- The answer would be no- the letters of expectation are not a part of the disciplinary process. The recommendation is often write a letter of expectation. If you write it and there is no meeting, the meaning becomes mysterious.

KM- I seem to recall cases being mentioned in a disciplinary investigation that didn't come up with enough evidence to pursue anything, and then a letter would come back saying we expect you to not do the thing that you were just totally found innocent of doing but here's a letter.

KM- We should probably clarify that the appropriate file for the faculty response is not File 13.

Adjourn 5:58pm