President Davenport called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

1. **Information Items**
   a. **Reorder/Additions**: None.
   b. **FA President’s Report (Don Larsson)**: Not a lot today. We are happy to have played a part in the decision making regarding budget - want to stay in the discussions over break. State level: There are continued concerns about students first - work groups forming - would like more involvement. IFO President Rod Henry will not be running.
   c. **MSU President’s Report (Richard Davenport)**: We are on hold regarding the budget forecast until February 2010. I have been selected to be one of four presidents to work with the Trustees on a new MnSCU Board strategic plan. Throughout the year I will continue my “walk around visits” to various offices and staff for the purpose of learning about important issues for each operation and to get to know the faculty and staff. This is also a busy time of the year when I increase my time with donors and friends of the University to enhance our gift giving. In addition, I am working on developing a new model for the College Access Program that is more modern and that focuses on maximum success of our students. I hope to share more with the University community sometime in January. In addition, everyone should expect to hear more about a couple of additional administrative reorganizational changes that will result in cost reductions as well as improved quality and excellence in our services.
   d. **MSU VPA&SA/Provost Report (Scott Olson)**: Thanks for patience on the weather - we tried to get the message out early and get information out and plan for alternatives. Some finals were substantially inconvenienced but we do the best we can. Please give advice on how we could do this better. Can’t remember the last time we had to close classes during final exams. May want to have pre-emptive conversations for next year. FA President Larsson: It opens lots of questions about other issues with communication - we have STARS alert, but could work on better communication. Provost Olson: STARS alert worked for those who signed up, but not everyone did. This is a banner year for grants - AB record year before was $8 million - currently we are running at $14 million and the year is not half over. We could double the record year, which is something to be proud of for all of you. President Davenport: We have a $6 million grant from Bush foundation - we received the largest amount. Provost Olson: We were given about $2 million more than the next highest grantee.
e. Human Resources Topics (DeeAnn Snaza): i. Vacancies: Sent out vacancies earlier. Contact Human Resources with other questions. ii. BESI Update: As of November 16, there were 35 inquiries - 31 have been approved and will receive notification by December 15 or sooner. Of the 35 requests, there are 2 AFSCME, 4 MSUAASF, 1 MAPE (pending), 2 MMA, 1 Managerial (pending) 25 IFO. The two pending are asking for options that may not be approved - 4 A, 3 B, 18 C, 10 in FY10, other 15 in FY11 - 31 approved at $1.905 million. Some positions were estimated for replacement, but we believe we are close on cost. FA President Larsson: Thanks for the increasing flexibility, up to and including the expanding deadline.

2. Action Items—
   a. Informal Policy Review: Review Period Ends December 10 (Malcolm O’Sullivan): A reminder that December 10 is the deadline for policy review; send in the comments. Vice President Straka: Comments on the Minors policy were added - drafting changes will take place and then revisions will go back for another review.
   b. Feedback on Proposed FY 11 Calendars—i. FIG ii. FRG iii. Sabbaticals iv. PDP: 1. 1st year Probationary 2. Continuing Probationary 3. Fixed-Term: 4. Tenured/NTT Assistant/Associate 5. Tenured/NTT Full Professor 6. Coaches v. Non-Renewal: 1. Probationary Faculty vi. Tenure and Promotion: 1. Tenure 2. Promotion: FA President Larsson: No big changes, but down the line there are some things to look at. For Article 22 it would be nice to have all plans read and reviewed before reports. No comments for this cycle.
   c. Veteran’s Day Feedback (FA): Two items: 1. From faculty, got informal feedback on problems in technology without or lack of support - otherwise okay for one day. 2. Students - Veteran’s Club on campus - wondered about if not a holiday then some sort of recognition for student veterans or dispensation for students to attend ceremonies on Veteran’s Day. President Davenport: good feedback from other bargaining groups.
   d. Core Values Statement Feedback (FA): Provost Olson: The feedback is needed soon - Thursday there will be a survey for everyone to have feedback on the final draft statement - love it/hate it. FA President Larsson: Nothing formal - happy to see this process whittle down top something manageable. How will these values affect our discussion about budget? FA: Survey is coming out when and when will it be due? Provost Olson: They will have until January 15 - not ideal timing, but had to go to all Meet and Confers. FA: Electronic? Provost Olson: Yes – E-mail to link to survey to one screen survey. FA: Students? Provost Olson: Yes.

3. Discussion Items—
   a. MnSCU/Legislative Relations (Standing): President Davenport: Major project is bonding -Clinical Sciences is # 25 on the list - #1 on new - asking for planning money. We are hoping that the Governor will not veto and we are successful in security the planning money for our capital project. MnSCU is also asking for $110 million for the HEAP Project - more than we will get, but we will be happy with 50%; and Minnesota State Mankato should receive 10% of that amount. There are also City bonding projects and we do not want to be in conflict with these projects; in fact we do support each other’s projects. The City projects include an upgrade of the hockey arena downtown and a Performing Arts Center. There is not enough money to go ahead with a stand-alone women’s hockey facility. The Governor likes to use his veto pen, so
we need to lobby hard for our projects. FA President Larsson: There is a lot of worry about what will come from this session – with the Governor and legislators at odds; and the Governor running for President, and legislators running for Governor. Senator Sheran is not optimistic about what will come out of the bonding session; she is worried about bonding. The IFO has officially endorsed the MnSCU bonding request and looking at other legislative requests and language.

b. **Budget and Planning Process (Rick Straka) (Standing):** Most people have heard about the budget forecast – short-term is worse; long-term maybe not as bad. The Governor wants to wait for the legislators to deal with $1.2 billion shortfall – we do not have to act on it until FY 11. There is an appetite to wait for the February forecast to see if there is improvement. We are hopeful that the budget for this year will stand - for FY 11, we think FY 11 will be fine with $2 million surplus so we could handle a $ 25 million un-allotment from MnSCU without touching department budgets. The real issue is FY 12 and we will try to stay on task with that. FA President Larsson: BESI projections - 60-100 positions of full-time faculty - Do you have a sense of where we are now? Vice President Straka: We have taken care of about 20 with the $1.9 million - still difficult to say - 60-80 overall, 5.4 would be closer to 60 than 80, but no inflation figured - nothing that changes our overall picture. FA: Odds of de-allocation? Vice President Straka: We are not thinking of much for FY 10 - for FY 11, perhaps a pretty good chance we will probably have to use the surplus $2 million in FY 11 with un-allotment or change in allocation. Provost Olson: There is an excellent article in SATRIB about structural problems in the Minnesota budget and demographics - very serious long-term problem.

c. **Academic Program Redesign Process (FA):** Defer to metrics - noting again that we will run into interesting questions about program definitions and seniority rosters. There are several roster issues that invite profound confusion and we will try to get state IFO input on this issue.

d. **Strategic Priorities (Richard Davenport):** We are getting a later start than planned with our new Strategic Priority Task Force, and I will issue a revised deadline in January. Every task force is co-chaired by union members. FA President Larsson: Sorry to say we just have not had a chance to move on this as fast as possible - by January 7 we will have more information, along with other task forces such as advising. Provost Olson: Dr. Jerry Robicheau on Doctoral Programs, Dr. Donald Friend on Global, and Rolland Rowe on Extended Learning. FA President Larsson: There is a need for library reps as well as on other groups. President Davenport: We are open to getting some good input from the Library as well. FA President Larsson: Other faculty are serving as well from roles such as CESR.

e. **MavCard Update (Rick Straka):** The Student Union picture is good; but the bell tower picture is not good – there is a need to get the change by Friday before security access expires. Other services should still work, but security will not. Original plans were to charge $15 fee - do not want to do that - so very friendly reminder to renew MavCards so we can get down to one database - need to do that. FA President Larsson: One potential problem was fixed right away. Vice President Straka: There was a problem with the other system in assigning new bar codes - thanks to faculty who notified us of this issue so we could fix it. President Davenport: Plus update on new photo. Vice President Straka: The option to tie in to Wells Fargo as well - it is an OPTION. Does not have to tie to a Wells Fargo account - but does help the University if you tie to Wells Fargo.
f. **Program Metrics (Scott Olson):** Shared with lots of groups - the two handouts are the result of the joint shared governance meeting - not always sure where we are going with these, so glad we have time for a rich discussion for your initial reactions, and to go over some other ideas to get your feedback in real time about these issues. We want to come away from this with some more firm ideas to move on this so Deans can advise Cabinet. We want to look real closely at all of the issues so we can see how it will all work. FA President Larsson: How do you think about this? FA President Larsson: Ask that FA members jump in. Preliminary ideas: General spread of criteria is not unreasonable; weighting does not seem unreasonable at the moment. When you get to the finer areas, other questions do arise - mission centrality - need for flexibility and attention to individual programs - across the five criteria, and for all programs, it will be hard to apply a single standard to all programs - for example, H&W central to the College of Allied Health and Nursing, but not to Math - maybe more prominence to graduate and undergraduate education - how do these separate from quality? As for quality, a little confusion about unqualified - but understand this is a good thing. There may be some levels of differentiation there, as there may be real problems in qualifications, or very small qualifications. Cost—SCH/FTE makes sense, that is one of the more basic, but on the other hand, difficulty in getting data from outside of MnSCU - but for programs that have no comparable program in MnSCU, how does that stack up to other key competitors outside MnSCU - may be high in MnSCU, but low against others. Enrollment, SC/FTEF and growth rates - okay, but do not use as sole measure - nothing to validate current excellence as compared to growth. Employability – it is hard to find meaningful measure, especially for Arts and Humanities measures. Provost Olson: To repeat back - weight are probably reasonable; mission—need for flexibility, graduate and undergraduate, and look at all other SP; quality - other measures – cost - need outside measure; enrollment - other metrics not just growth; employability—look at non-professional programs. FA Vice President Grabowska: Why look at this if you are held harmless? Why not move this 10% to another area? Provost Olson: OK point? FA: grads for some liberal arts programs are very well employed. Provost Olson: Some programs live and die by employment – Nursing and Accounting for example. FA Vice President Grabowska: Employment later than right away is not tracked. FA: Same with students who go to employment in public agencies. Provost Olson: The original idea was to use CUPPS database to look at state needs, not actual employment. Shared governance moved to this approach. FA President: There are two other factors - grad school placement, other is employment as a “loss leader” in that students start one program and move to another. FA: May go to the issue of flexibility - more explicitly take into account support programs - they are very important , but not necessarily to their own departments - for example, Economics is a support program for all of the College of Business, yet may not be seen as central to the college it is housed in. FA: Want to compliment colleagues on the work on metrics - but one thing lacking is the University mission statement. We seem to be missing major elements of the stated University mission statement. Our college has stated that department goals tie to College goals and University goals - yet they do not show up here. Vice President Straka: There is a need to look at overall mission, not just strategic priorities - centrality to the University mission. Provost Olson: One of the surprises was that strategic priorities came up so strongly. Strategic priorities are things you focus on for a period of time, check them off, and then move on. And the ones on the list are the old ones. Mission changes very slowly if at all - and that is more what we should be focusing on. A list of MACRO and MICRO ideas - need to look at all of these together. Approaches: 1) Leave the structure but
tweak the weights, 2) Leave as is; 3) do this as a two-step process - Step 1: Cost and enrollment first - three piles - great, trouble, maybe. and Step 2: Mission, quality and employability - maybe only the “trouble” pile to then use mission and quality as get out of the trouble pile. 4) Another idea - two steps – Step 1: Do all five in some form of weighting with prescriptive measures - Step 2: A departmental response with a limited time and space to say “you got us wrong” in terms of cost, mission, any criteria, MICRO Mission-centrality: 1) Status quo; 2) Replace strategic priorities with something else - such as mission statement; 3) Bulls eye approach – central - cannot exist without it; ring 2 - University jeopardized; ring 3 – state - ring 4 - community- ring 5 - nice ring 6 - why? 3) An “immunity idol” from the Governor and state - for example: we have a center of excellence engineering - so we need to do it; another example - we have STEM goals - we have to do STEM; 4) Supplement - add to what is there Quality - 1) add external validation - what accrediting/program review say is not the only say - other external validation markers; 2) Article 22 - scholars, teachers, how will you demonstrate this? It may be tough to measure this. Enrollment 1) Stability over time- not enough just to grow - need to validate current excellence; 2) role of majors versus GE and the role of attractor programs such as Nursing - students say they want to come here for that, but they end up in other programs - how does this get measured? No answers - just want to talk about this - what are your opinions? FA: Mission as the primary consideration - that is first, then cost. Need to look at what is important to us - current metrics does not look at “immune” programs - need to be honest - placing mission at the top is most important. Provost Olson: So first pass - immunity programs that can be shrunk but not eliminated. FA: Yes. FA: Immediate reaction is two-step process is completely wrong - we are not a business, we are an educational program. There are some things we have to have such as a Gen Ed program - so immune, or partially immune. Provost Olson: FA will not be able to make that determination - so administration will have to - what kind of rioting in the streets will there be? FA: Immunity does not mean they are not touched, they can still be touched. FA: Other piece - cost and enrollment, particularly enrollment - a number of programs that are market-driven in that the students all finds good jobs - growing a program may not always be the best idea. FA: First thing - cost and enrollment seem to be such a little chunk since this is a budgetary problem. That said, one long-term problem will be demographics and we will need to attract students in the long-term. The other considerations may not appear costly, but they will be. FA: what you are hearing is more of leaving it as it is, go with the two-step process. Mission and quality first - but the key is the two-step process. FA President Larsson: Agree that mission and quality is first, and two-step, but time is of the essence. Provost Olson: But the timeline can get people off the list. FA President Larsson: There will be a formal period and also lots of informal consultations. Provost Olson: There will be a timeline. President Davenport: We need an appeal process. FA: Bringing it back to departments is good as they look at other issues. Would like another opportunity to see and respond. Provost Olson: We hope to come up with a pretty good sketch of this to share with Deans, then over break start filling it in, then share with FA. FA: Mission and quality before expense - that has to drive our decisions - need to make decisions about long-term not just short-term. Please to see follow-up - want to keep seeing this - we need to keep this as a two-way street. Provost Olson: What about micro stuff? FA: Agree with all FA - need to look at strategy, not tactics - have to look at mission, not strategic priorities. Need to have an even better handle on this. And there is an inherent process to identifying the immune programs. President Davenport: We have seen this
at other institutions. My experience has been that almost all programs will be able to make strong arguments on mission and quality - some better than others perhaps, but all strong - we are a comprehensive institution and need to maintain that. But we do have to make cuts - may not be many program cuts, but there will be a sizing down of some programs. Clearly, everything relates to enrollment. Budget - we need to be predictable about the number of students coming in - just a sizing down. FA President Larsson: we are already seeing programs trying to be innovative in increasing class size - may not all be ideal, but are ways of trying to address these issues. Provost Olson: We will be addressing these issues as CoD over the break as well. President Davenport: The two-step approach seems to make sense. FA: Under mission centrality - how are these things to be scored? Provost Olson: Started with numeric scores, but the more I think about this, the less likely that seems - maybe piles, not numbers. FA: We have had this discussion at Arts and Humanities Council - grouping may have less bloodletting because it is grouping not minutely detailed. FA: In terms of thinking globally. Do not forget the University goals - such as diversity. FA President Larsson: One set of standards that is out there already is the enrollment management reports. President Davenport: If I was a targeted program, I would be looking at ways to get more students and to eliminate costs. If we could increase retention, shorten time to graduation that would help as well. Want to wish all a Happy Holiday!

Next Meeting: Thursday, January 28, 2010, 3:00-5:00 p.m., CSU 204 (FA Chair/AD Agenda)

The meeting ended at 5:00 p.m.
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