

## Meet and Confer

### Administration – Faculty Association

December 13, 2007

CMU 203 3:00pm

**Present: Administration:** President Barden, Ed Choate, Brittany Goodman, Ron Jeppson, Dan Kirk

**IFO:** Wayne Alexander, Oscar Flores, Ted Gracyk, Paul Harris, Steve Lindaas, Michelle Malott

**Guests:** Melody Chang, David Crockett, Wendy Frappier, Jane Giedt, Jean Hollaar

**1. Changes or Additions to the Agenda** – CP: We haven't had time to review the November APAC so we are not adding it to the agenda.

**2. Agreement on M&C Minutes**

CP: September 19, 2007 minutes served as a reminder of a follow-up on fall orientation. The only correction is the spelling (Ted Gracyk) On Page 3 in M & C. Regarding fall orientation President Barden commented on the resurrection of the work group that used to plan orientation and that Veronica Michael will chair that group. Is there anything new on that?

REB: We'll start that in the spring.

CP: Concerned that it will be clear to all the colleges & departments before end of school year what the schedule is. Other than the spelling, we are in agreement with the September 19<sup>th</sup> & October 4, 2007 minutes.

**3. Information Sharing Updates**

A. **Faculty Association** – CP: 1.) Regarding the Board of Trustees Teaching Award, have had thus far three volunteers out of the five faculty representatives needed. Has a notice gone out to the faculty? I had the impression we were going to get a hard copy and I'm not sure if the electronic notice was the official copy.

REB: We will send out a hard copy.

CP: We will appoint one representative from each college and one from a combination of the Library, Athletics, Counseling Center, & Corrick Center. 2.)

We want to note that Dr Strong is retiring 1-15-2008. We certainly wanted to acknowledge her for her long years of service as a faculty and administrator.

**B. Administration**

VP Kirk: Regarding the Capital projects, we are making progress and are on schedule with the Wellness Center & King Hall projects. We have reinitiated the design development planning for Lommen Hall. You may recall we received funding to go partially through the design phase of Lommen Hall. MacLean Hall is substantially complete. We are ahead of schedule. There will be additional work on the front entry doors during the semester break. Re-dedication for MacLean Hall is Friday, Feb 1. There will be several speakers and a DVD of wonderful photographs (historical). 2:30 p.m. is the ribbon cutting in the area near where the dragon is in the floor at the entry to MacLean. 2:40 will be lunch in the Forum lounge. And for the last piece, replacement of windows will occur in the

spring when the weather is warming. Otherwise we are working on routine things like graduation, planning for 4<sup>th</sup> of July, and routine management.

VP Wiese-has student situations that are taking his time today.

VP Midgarden-REB: Dr. Midgarden is at the 60/120 work group in the Twin Cities. I believe they have a statutory expectation of reporting to the Legislature. The Foundation of Excellence project is moving along. Various dimension teams are meeting. Some are done and waiting for feedback from Dr. Barefoot. We are anticipating some faculty will join the efforts.

CP: We are in accord with the appointments to the Foundation of Excellence that were provided.

Pres. Barden: 1.) State Representative Brita Sailer (MSUM alum from the department of Art) is going to be our commencement speaker one week from tomorrow. Carol Wenner from Alexandria will give the welcome on behalf of the Trustees, and Gail Olson, General Counsel to the Board of Trustees, will give the greeting, from the Office of the Chancellor. 2.) (The FY 2009 Budget Planning Scenarios - Draft was distributed).

Hollaar: The **FY 2009 budget planning scenario** has been shared with the Student Senate, University Planning and Budget Committee & the Chairs meeting. The budget planning parameters that we have been given from the Finance Committee was that we were to use a cap of 3% on any tuition increase with a 1% tuition revenue buy-down. The 1% tuition revenue buy-down funds were to come from base funds at the Office of the Chancellor level. The demographics from west central Minnesota indicate that we are still facing declining high school graduates in our primary service region. However in FY 2008 we were able to hold our FYE enrollment. With the focus we've had in recruitment and retention, we are hoping those numbers will hold for spring semester and we can be a bit more optimistic looking forward to FY 2009. Given those parameters, you can see the tuition revenue projection is \$33.4 million. The projected base allocation to MSU Moorhead for planning purposes was run by the Office of the Chancellor using the system's allocation model; MSUM should receive just over \$30 million. The Trustees' tuition buy-down of 1% would be just under \$331,000. The other revenue, which represents administrative fees to our auxiliary and revenue funds operations as well as some miscellaneous fee income, totals \$800,000 for a total revenue projection of \$64.7 for FY 2009.

General University Expenditures are those items that are generally not discretionary, (a few accounts are discretionary). In projecting general university expenditures for FY 2009, they total \$11.5 million, but we do not yet have settlements in either of our faculty unions. The assumption we are using is to size the unclassified settlement the same as the classified settlement, which was 3.25% but they also received step progression, thus the change over the first year of the biennium is 4.5%. So subtracting the general university expenditure from the available revenue to be allocated leaves just over \$53 million. We are looking at a budget correction of just over \$600,000, given the 3% tuition increase and no tuition enrollment change. The Finance Committee of the Board of Trustees is meeting on Monday. We hope to have further direction for planning parameters from the Board with regard to the tuition increase and the 1% buy down as well.

CP: The base allocation, \$30 million, how does that compare to last year's base allocation?

Hollaar: Last year the base allocation was \$29.4 million. It is an increase of about \$660,000. As was the case in FY 2008, and will be the case in FY 2009, the increase in base allocation will not even cover half of what we're looking at in labor negotiations settlement and that doesn't take into consideration inflation.

REB: In the current year we have \$1 million in new funds, roughly half which came out of the allocation process and is in the base. About ¼ is fenced for access and opportunity, and ¼ is fenced for technology. We don't know what else we will get in the fenced area. Fenced means it has to be spent at the direction of the Board of Trustees. So those are planning scenarios we shared this morning at the Budget & Planning committee. The general structure of the budget is there. Those labor contracts that are negotiated by the State of Minnesota (by DOER) are closed. Those contracts negotiated by the Board of Trustees are not closed. Those are the ones we are waiting for. That is a variable and enrollment is always a variable. The real message here is that recruitment and retention is everyone's job. In our system, if you aren't growing, you will be reduced, budgetarily speaking. It's very clear that the campuses in the Twin Cities are growing. Those campuses that are growing are getting a little more funding at the expense of those campuses that aren't growing. Our planning will be updated as we know more.

CP: I don't dispute any of your numbers. But, I am concerned by a characterization that carries with it an implication that faculty face the blame for our growing budget. We feel that faculty salary increases are important for competitiveness, hiring good faculty, for accomplishing the mission of the university. I don't know what percent other things are going up, as far as expenses. I know that wasn't your intent, but it appears that way. Certainly faculty salaries are a part of the potential shortfall, but other expenses will increase also.

REB: My budget office is simply interested in identifying decision points; what do we know, and what don't we know.

Hollaar: (Copies of the **Strategic Plan** were distributed.) Regarding the Strategic Plan, the background on the process to this point is that we started well over 1 ½ years ago when President Barden invited faculty, staff and students to comment on the original Strategic Plan that was adopted in early 2003. Given the feedback that was received, in the spring of 2006 a work group from the University Planning and Budget committee was appointed. That work group consisted of Brittney Goodman, Brian Kota, Nancy Kruse, Barb Matthees, Cliff Schutte, Lee Wilson-Matson (student representative) and myself. We met often last academic year and came up with an outline of our ideas in terms of reformatting the new strategic plan as well as adding some things to it. Once the group completed that work, Suzanne Williams wrote the plan, completing the process this fall. Since then we have given the draft of the Strategic Plan to the Administrative Council & University Planning and Budget committee. Feedback was received from that process and the work group met again right before Thanksgiving to update the draft. We are looking for final comments, or any edits. Once the M & C process has been completed, comments will be brought to the work group again in January and the Budget Planning committee for final decision on January 24th.

REB: This flows from the Board of Trustees. We are given some discretion, of course. This is a general statement of strategy. I've been pleased with the number of people who have been commenting, including those who have read the Plan on the MSUM webpage.

Gracyk: I have an informational question, regarding how the university reaccreditation was done. The HLC poured a lot of suggestions into their report. How were those integrated into this strategic plan?

Hollaar: In terms of the recommendations in the self-study specifically, our strategic plan is broad enough that we can fit any of their recommendations in here. We didn't specifically write those materials into this plan.

CP: How was that decision made?

Hollaar: Part of it was timing. At the time the HLC Team was here, we already had our draft. The draft of our Strategic Plan was provided to the Team.

Goodman: I do remember specifically, because the work group had the Self-Study report "in hand", there were many times that we would refer to the Report to find language to make sure it matched our self-study.

Flores: What's the use of this? Are we doing it because we have to? What are departments supposed to do?

REB: This is the most general statement of our Strategic Plan. The next level will be the formulation of work plans for the year. Under that comes the targeted guidelines for strategic initiatives, seeking new funds for new ideas, new programs. Then operational groups tailor the plan to their own programs. For accountability, we can show the board that we are following their direction.

Flores: I think the main area is strategic initiative grants.

REB: Yes. In terms of the discussions each year that lead to a work plan, there are always more good ideas than there is funding. It does get chewed up in the priorities.

Hollaar: The work group would like to hear from the departments.

Flores: Where is the academic affairs component in the past couple of years, when we have written goals?

Hollaar: This is the strategic plan for the university. Each division in the university has a master work plan which ties to this plan and to the plan of the university system.

CP: We had a concern with what I might refer to as the tone in which some of this is written. Illustration: under Strategic Direction #5, #7, the word "provide" tone starts in a basic belief in shared governments. "Provide" suggests we are graciously being given the opportunity to, whereas we believe that certainly faculty are an inherent part of shared governance.

Gracyk: It gives the implication that it could be withdrawn by anyone.

Lindaas: "Important" could be replaced with "all". The other issue is "faculty, staff and students;" unless staff specifically includes administration, it changes the meaning.

Harris: The 3<sup>rd</sup> priority under direction #3 refers to "customized education and training for our region". I'm wondering when you say "provide", are you opening a way to committing university resources to subsidizing rather than making a self-supporting venture?

REB: That priority is an affirmation of our intent that that activity can grow. Its expenses are covered by its revenues. That priority is an affirmation that, if in fact we can be more helpful and compensated appropriately, we would be happy to do so. “Customized” means that the contractor is involved in the definition of, for example, the agenda and content of the workshop.

Gracyk: Under Strategic Direction 3, we are concerned about the 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence, i.e. “Our commitment is evident both in the classroom and in successful faculty efforts to engage students in critical thinking, research and service activities outside of the classroom,” which closely ties students to this Direction. Do we have any duty to do so, if you in fact direct the faculty to involve students?

REB: We are continuously encouraging mentors to use student mentees in their activities

Gracyk: This language seems to go beyond encouraging, to say this is a matter of policy, which seems to be a stronger statement.

Harris: We feel some of us are involved in research where it would be appropriate to use students, and some of us are involving students.

Gracyk: #5, what does that mean? We have very few programs that could be described as professional programs, so what would “support and facilitate the integration of pre-professional experiences” mean? This seems to be a mis-characterization of the nature of our university.

Hollaar: I believe the conversation the work group had around #5 focused on Service Learning and internships.

Gracyk: That might be more appropriate language to use. #8, what does that mean?

Hollaar: Work group had extended discussion about #8. The word used the “Arts” and some felt that was too exclusive. One of the ideas that came out of the work group was to use something more comprehensive in terms of creativity.

Gracyk: Seems so generic that it isn’t useful.

Hollaar: And the other part of the discussion was if you list, where do you stop listing?

CP: I have no idea what that sentence means. What are we trying to address?

Lindaas: Everyone has their own definition of what an educated person is. What comes to mind is “work force learning.” Students don’t want the arts, they just want to get a job. Let’s say we are educating the whole person. I think that’s what you’re trying to get at.

CP: It didn’t dawn on me that it had anything to do with the arts. When I read it, it seemed like, it was critical thinking. I think it should be reworded.

Hollaar: Please send me your ideas. We struggled with that.

Goodman: We started a list, but where does it end? It’s everything.

CP: Then, it’s a matter of what are you trying to say? It sounds like the Dragon Core.

Hollaar: Exactly, we want the well-rounded student. we want them to be exposed to things other than their major. This in particular was a sentence in the previous strategic plan.

CP: The final item, #9, “Strive to maintain an efficient, organized, and appropriate organizational structure.” We were wondering if there is in that an implication

that everything now is efficient, organized and appropriate. That may be, but it needs to be reviewed from time to time. Change “maintain” to another word. Also have a problem with the word “innovate”.

#### **4. Continuing Topics**

##### **A. E-mail update**

Status of Current System – Kirk: In the past month, the e-mail system has been more stable. We are hopeful that will continue. We have tweaked the system, and upgraded some things. Concurrently, our task force broadly represents the university constituencies and has been meeting since October. They are doing a wonderful job. There has been lots of information handling. We’ve heard presentations from 3 vendors: Microsoft, Groupwise and Zimbra. The recommendation has been to go with Zimbra as the new email system and MSUM will implement that recommendation ASAP. The task force will be talking to staff and students about support available to Zimbra’s Products. As part of the process, I asked the director, Les Bakke, to make a recommendation based on technical info; he also wants Zimbra. I’ve been reassured that the support that comes with this product will give us a lower chance of problems. We are concerned with the interface between MnSCU and Zimbra. We are concerned that it has only been around about 4 years, but has been growing like wildfire. Zimbra has an open system’s architecture. The committee did cold calling of Zimbra users. In all the reports that we have seen, there is not one complaint about the service and support. So, given all of that, it’s the direction we should take. Our plan is to move ahead with implementation in the next 2 – 5 months. Contractual issues have to be worked out with the vendor. As far as budget – we anticipate the staffing and costs associated with the migration will be within the budget.

Goodman: One other consideration that members of the task force had was that we have about 1/3 Mac users on campus. Campuses with the other products, other than Zimbra, had a very different experience for the Mac user.

CP: A lot of what you said sounds like what the people said about D2L but it hasn’t been that way.

Goodman: Almost all of that has to do with scalability. Universities and corporations larger than us are able to use Zimbra. I thought the problem with D2L was that it was recommended for the entire state and the server couldn’t handle it.

Kirk: One of the parameters is that we’ll be able to scale to 30,000 users in the future. One other reservation I had was, early in the process Phillips asked me to make sure we consider PINE. None of the 3 products have interface with PINE.

CP: When we were under the totally non-functioning email we were concerned about down time. Could the change be made on either spring break or summer? If faculty members knew when, it would be helpful.

Kirk: Once we do the basic groundwork, we will put together and distribute a schedule for the changeover as well as management protocols on how to empty trash and how to store email.

##### **B. Summer Session**

CP: We had 2 questions. 1.) Progress on Getting Faculty Contracts – REB: Contracts are expected to go out in January or perhaps February. As always, there will be some staff appointments later because the entire summer schedule is not clear until perhaps April. There has been some conversation about allocation formulas. Allocation is uniformly a little smaller than what people are used to based on the experience in recent years. Money, in the area of \$30,000, is being held in reserve while we see actual student enrollment, then the reserve will be available. Also, a bit of the cash allocated is used for marketing and promoting.

CP: I raised this question. We heard that it would be about the same as in the past. Bette has explained that last year was not a normal year because she added additional funds for summer school. Also, we were not aware that there would be an impact based on salary differentials to the colleges. We seem to be having fewer sections available.

REB: There was a withholding of several percent of the funds for marketing and a reserve, but the rest gets distributed out. The model is sensitive to the fact that on average, instruction in some colleges costs more than other colleges.

CP: We had an email from our chair suggesting that we had to change our schedule because of less money. We make sure that we understand it so that we're better prepared.

Gracyk: We will want to visit very early next fall to see how we have done in the previous summer compared to the St. Cloud model. We strongly look forward to seeing the data from this experiment.

REB: This model will be easier to reduce to an analytical form. We look forward to that too.

C. Education and Humans Services Consultant Report – REB: Doesn't have a copy yet. It was sent to the college. Nursing has seen it. It is a public document and a copy will be sent to Cindy Phillips.

D. Voluntary System of Accountability - CP: We're in accord with trying to convince the Trustees that the Voluntary System of Accountability would be an altogether more useful document than it appears they are developing, for many reasons, not the least of which is cost in providing the information. Also, Minnesota students will be able to compare Minnesota institutions with those of other states.

REB: Nationally, the Voluntary System of Accountability has been accepted by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities and the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges. It may quickly become the "national currency" for accountability information.

## **5. New Topics**

A. APAC – CP: We have reviewed the October 23, 2007 minutes. We have one general question and that is, that we have repeatedly asked, if the minutes refer to a policy, for the minutes to include the policy. Jo has done that, but she sent a "Cindy" version. We had hoped that the official copy will be archived. Another question is that the October 23 meeting included presentation and discussion of the calendar and there appeared to be no action. We wonder the status.

REB: We have gone to meet and discuss with the students, still sticking with the recommendation of the 5 day duty assignment in the week leading up to the start of school in August. The student program will be rearranged a little bit and the faculty programming will be laid out more systematically. The group will be meeting to consider the changes to the orientation that faculty want.

CP: You are presenting a calendar to us?

REB: It's in the APAC document part and parcel. MUSAAF M & C schedules this item directly, but IFO M & C takes it up after APAC makes a recommendation.

Gracyk: We waive on all except this item of the minutes.

REB: There are people desperate to go to press on this thing. The draft Calendar for 2008-09 has been commented on a lot. It was discussed by a very large group at APAC, as you can see.

Gracyk: I wasn't there. I'm basing comments on what came to us. The main thing was the number of people felt, despite their commenting, it didn't change.

CP: I've heard some of that and I guess that given that there was no action at APAC on this, I didn't think it was being presented to us for that kind of comment. I'm concerned that if I had drawn this to the attention of the faculty, that it would be a topic of discussion today.

REB: A lot has been reviewed. Concern and suggestions have been expressed on the 5 duty days. What we have been aiming at, since these comments were made, is to be sure that this work group, as we have talked to you about, Cindy, gets formed, does its work, and prepares a good plan. Then Veronica Michaels, who is the orientation coordinator, will guide the implementation of the revised plan. My thinking is that, we need to do this one more cycle and give ourselves a chance to carefully plan those 5 days and put a good structure in place.

Malott: My recollection as a member of the Calendar committee was a meeting right before APAC. I was unable to go to the meeting at APAC because I was in class. Ironically, it was hard to schedule a meeting with the calendar committee. I didn't hear anything back from the Calendar Committee after that. During the Committee meetings I attended, one of the issues was lab time because of constraints with the MnSCU start dates. It's hard to work around those. I've heard that faculty want more grading time, after the end of finals and before the day grades are due. I understand there were some constraints having to do with financial aid. I know we talked a lot about lab times, when non-instructional duty days fell, and also, the days prior to the beginning of the semester.

Lindaas: What tends to happen is you end up with fewer days to teach. I do like starting on a Monday, for labs.

Gracyk: I was not involved in any of these conversations, but some faculty have suggested, for example, moving Fall Break to a week-long break over Thanksgiving. Some students don't come to class Monday and Tuesday.

CP: I have heard a question of why it is that grades are due on a day that's not even a duty day.

Malott: I thought that had been dealt with for after this semester.

REB: "Final grades due" is kind of a notice that if they aren't in, we will call you.

CP: First concern is, let's make those first 5 days count.

## **B. Four Year College in North Metro**

CP: What is the extent of our participation in offering four year degrees and 300 and above level courses in the Twin Cities area? What is our intent regarding faculty for these courses?

Jeppson: We're doing a BioTech emphasis now. We have 2 classes this fall. We're hopefully going to offer 4 classes this spring semester.

Grayck: What are the enrollments in those 2 classes?

Jeppson: One was full. The other had about 10 students.

CP: Is it our plan to deliver everything that is necessary for the baccalaureate degree down there?

Jeppson: It's a combination. We are offering Upper Division courses that they need down there, but we hope that some students come here to accelerate degree completion.

CP: The intent is to deliver the entire major down there?

Jeppson: Over time. We don't have the facilities right now. They are building some lab facilities down there.

CP: Are we supporting the construction of that building?

REB: Yes. That basically will be a University Center for Metro, ourselves, SCSU, and others who will use this facility to offer upper division coursework.

Harris: In the newspaper, there are rumors of an effort to create a new 4-year institution in north metro.

REB: The conversation is more widely spread than that, in terms of a new MnSCU university in the suburbs someplace. It's a political movement in local governments so far. I expect the State will build a couple centers so that other state universities can come in and offer BA/BS programs, as they are needed. Hopefully that's the direction it will go.

Jeppson: We don't have intentions to do anything more.

CP: Are you comfortable with the faculty you are hiring?

Jeppson: There is one course that we don't have faculty for yet. It has not been as smooth as we had hoped. Those we have found are very qualified.

CP: Do you foresee a time of hiring a full-time faculty?

Jeppson: If it works out, yes. One, possibly two.

Crockett: We have two programs, 2 plus 2, operations management program and a construction management program. Both nationally accredited. Two classes in each program will be offered starting in January. We're having excellent response to hire adjuncts for operations management. We have been hiring people with a lot of experience. We'll have to rely on the industry to help us teach construction management. We are getting a lot of response from potential students and employers. We're getting fabulous acceptance by the 2-year schools down there. Regarding specific classrooms, one lab class will be in the new building. We will be able to partner with Hennepin Tech, too. There are two campuses there, the North campus in Brooklyn Center and the south in Eden Prairie. This technical college serves an area with over 500,000 people.

CP: Are we contracting directly with the faculty?

Crockett: Yes.

CP: Good. Some places contract with the business rather than the faculty themselves.

Crockett: I want to commend our faculty. They have been to the Twin Cities four times, interviewing, talking to schools, etc.

**C. Digital Measures Faculty Data System** Enz Finken: The software is purchased. (Enz Finken distributed handout from Dr. Strong.) The system is still under construction. It can be used, for example, uploading data for the Delaware study. Regarding the PDP process, take the data you want and upload to those boxes. Page 1 is a replication of the 5 categories of a PDP. Page 2: Provides space for objectives, methods and feedback. Page 3: The idea is that you would complete your PDP and then could run a report that would take all of the new data that you have entered throughout the year, and place it in the right categories. That would be a narrative report that you could attached to your PDP. For the last 2 pages, the first page is a sample report that Dr. Strong ran of a fictional PDP report. Dr. Strong noted that if you have categories where you have not uploaded any data, we don't want those areas to show. This is an experiment. It can be built entirely to our needs. It will take some time. We don't know who will take this over when Dr. Strong retires.

CP: We have a concern on the middle page. As I understood it when Judy and I talked about this, I had the impression that this was a list that would appear in the data form. That is a concern to us if it suggests the only way of fulfilling the categories. We don't want to dictate PDP content.

Enz Finken: Universities all over the country are using this. You will have maybe 20 categories which represent the vast majority of the kinds of things that would be reported by the faculty and you can upload your data directly to a particular category. And, in every instance the category "other" comes up.

CP: I asked Judy if any other MnSCU schools are using, and none do, so we are the pilot in MN.

Enz Finken: Judy is looking for people to try it out. The intention is it would be optional piece of the PDP process.

CP: When someone is appointed to replace Dr. Strong, we would be happy to provide two faculty to try out the program, as a pilot.

**D. MEMO – REB:** What I interpret this memo to say is, the March 4, 2008 date is mentioned in the Minnesota statutes as a caucus day. The Board of Trustees have waived that this year. We go ahead and have classes on that evening, March 4<sup>th</sup>. That is, March 4<sup>th</sup> will be an evening class date. The issue is the Feb 5<sup>th</sup> date, when caucus events are scheduled. You can see all kinds of qualifiers on that in the Memo. There is no statutory requirement that we not have classes. A number of events are scheduled for the evening of Feb 5<sup>th</sup>. Those things all will go on. There is a difference between events where a person knows he/she has the option to come, and classes that a professor teaches.

CP: Would you see a problem if Faculty Association recommended to faculty that their spring syllabi exclude the February date and include the March date? In the spring we lose a precinct caucus date anyway. We're just changing dates.

REB: What I'm concerned about, is if some students wanted to go to a precinct caucus, there will be a class to miss.

Gracyk: In my experience caucus meetings are over-represented with MSUM faculty, so faculty are personally interested.

CP: Faculty Assoc will send out a memo to faculty. March 4<sup>th</sup>, that's spring break.

REB: We'll look at the calendar and get back to you.

**6. Topics for next Meet and Confer----January 31, 2008**

Meeting concerned 5:15

Respectfully submitted

Gloria Sheldon