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FA President Don Larsson called the meeting to order at 3:08 p.m.

1. Information Items--

   a. **Reorder/Addition:** FA President Larsson: Are there any additional agenda items? Seeing as there are none, we’ll proceed.

   b. **FA President’s Report (Donald Larsson):** Most of the issues will be dealt with later in the agenda.

   c. **MSU President’s Report (Richard Davenport):** We will get a budget report here soon from Rick Straka but I’ll talk about the bonding meeting this week. I testified on behalf of our bonding request and HEAPR money for building, repair, and replacement funds. The hearing went well. Our proposal was well-received. Representative Brynaert challenged the Governor’s position on our behalf. A few weeks ago Governor Pawlenty was in town and used the visit as a platform to blast the University, saying brick and mortar projects should be replaced by online ones. Quickly following this our bonding project got vetoed by him. My testimony went well though and Representative Brynaert stood up on our behalf. Representative Tom Rukavina chaired the committee. Representative Brynaert’s point was that here at Mankato was a perfect example of a building project for programs that can’t be done effectively online. She made a strong case for our Clinical Science Building project. The legislators then asked us questions such as, are these programs that could be delivered online? We do have a big challenge ahead. There is an approved $140 million dollars for bonding projects and we are 25 on the list of 31 bonding projects. To get to our bonding project, including $50 million from HEAPR, the state would need to fund close to $250 million worth of MnSCU bonding projects. As you can see we are $100-150 million away from where the Governor is right now. We have a long way to go in regards to the bonding budget. I will keep you posted about the legislative battles. Legislators wanted a bonding bill to be approved two weeks after the beginning of session. The House is
hopeful, but the Senate hasn’t committed itself yet. The bonding bill will probably go to the end of the legislative session and will be used as a bargaining chip by the Governor.

We are moving ahead with strategic planning. All of the ad hoc groups have met. The group on Excellence and Quality, co-chaired by Assistant Vice President Avra Johnson, has been waiting for a final member to be appointed. There is a lot of work to be done. We are working on stages: Step 1: Strategy groups meet and develop a set of assumptions to support the strategic priority and these are shared with campus. Step 2: Tactical plans are developed to support the objectives. Step 3: Budgets are determined. My goal is to spend the entire year on this and begin implementation next year.

MSU has been selected as a site for a Board Listening Session. It’s from 6:00-8:00 p.m. next Monday, in Ostrander Auditorium. You need to sign up ahead of time if you want to speak and remarks are limited to three minutes. Everyone needs to address one of the three questions for designing strategic priorities for the next three-four years. As one of the four presidents selected to be a part of this, I have traveled around the state to most of the listening sessions. This is the last session. Attendance has gotten better at each listening session. Legislators, community and staff have been willing to share their thoughts at these sessions regarding the questions. If you haven’t signed up in advanced, they have allowed people to sign up at the door. FA President Larsson: FA Vice President Grabowska and I have both registered to speak from our own perspective, not necessarily an official position but informed by our current duties. One technical point is that the latest release says it is in CSU 253. President Davenport: We have updated that. FA President Larsson: Do you have the names of those attending? President Davenport: The Trustees are Duane Benson, who will moderate; the chair of the planning committee; Dan McElroy; Christine Rice; and in addition there is Trustee Chris Frederick - four trustees will be there. They won’t respond to any comments because this is a listening session. They will be taking active notes. My role is to take notes and then we get together later and compare notes. FA President Larsson: Will other administrators be there? President Davenport: Four presidents are selected to attend: President Szymanski, MSU Moorhead; President Kopischke, Alexandria Technical College; and President Cecilia Cervantes, Hennepin Technical College, Vice Chancellor for Finance, Linda Kohl; Vice Chancellor for Academic & Student Affairs, Linda Baer; the Chancellor will be there; and Lori Lamb, Vice Chancellor for Human Resources. Staff will play no active role in this and the presidents play no active role; we are there to listen. FA President Larsson: There was a piece in The Reporter today and apparently they will do an opening presentation of economic challenges in the system, is this right? President Davenport: The Trustees will open with a video that is about four minutes long. Everyone is introduced and there are microphones around the room. People speak based on the order they signed up. If others want to speak they will ask you to sign up. At Moorhead, they deviated from this approach. After 45 minutes, we were done, so Trustee Benson encouraged people to speak out and about 25 people spoke who had not signed up gave testimony. Formality may vary. We are prepared. We have invited many members of the Mankato community. We hope the people at our University will come out and speak their minds. The first session was a bit of a problem because no one spoke to the question. FA: Do we know those questions? President Davenport: 1. What are the most significant changes and challenges affecting higher education in Minnesota? 2. How can MnSCU colleges and universities add value and better
meet your needs now and in the future? 3. Given the fiscal and challenges facing secondary education, what should the System’s goals be in the next five years? FA President Larsson: We may have some ideas.

President Davenport: I’m about to release a concept paper regarding diversity and the College Access Program. This is something I have been working on for weeks. What are the best practices for the “at risk” underserved? It is a concept paper and I am asking everyone for reactions. It gives us a new direction on how we serve students who are more likely to fail than other students. It is based on research - best practices around the country. The plan is to decentralize the College Access Program and locate it in the colleges. Provost Olson has had extensive conversations with the Deans. The budget wouldn’t impinge on the colleges. There will be no hardships as we move forward with the model. The problem with the current program is that it appears to be quite isolated. It isolates current students to the point where they are not integrated quickly enough into the college model. The concept proposes a faster, integrated and specialized advising to help them be successful. This change builds on previous planning where I eliminated the Division of Diversity and created the Dean of Diversity. This was part of the long-range plan to bring academic services, student services and now diversity services together. We want to enhance the success of these students. This new proposal elaborates extensively on the research, but doesn’t get into the logistics and implementation of the new College Access Program. It is a concept proposal. I look forward to your comments. Once I get feedback from the University community, we would move ahead with the revised model based on comments and suggestions. There will be many questions about the transition process. I want all of us to be more successful in working with our underserved students. I use this term broadly, not just students of color, but all at risk students. Often times, people restrict this definition, but we are looking at students who come from extremely deprived backgrounds, they are the students least likely to succeed even if they are admitted into college. This is the purpose of the CAP program. I want to hear your ideas and suggestions.

FA President Larsson: Welcome some new faces, including new HR Director, Becky Barkmeier. It will be fun to get to know each other. You have a lot to learn. President Davenport: She has been here a week; she comes from South Dakota State University with a wealth of experience, and we are pleased to have her here.

FA President Larsson: I have a question for the Provost or Linda Duckett. There is search for Interim Dean of Diversity - what’s the status? Provost Olson: Dr. Duckett has agreed to be Acting Dean of Diversity until we can appoint an interim. We solicited nominations from all on campus. Surprisingly, there is a large number of nominations and among them a large degree of interest. I have interviewed 14 people, so far, and I am not done. I may have one tomorrow. Once I have interviewed everyone, I will have a conversation with President Davenport and hopefully late next week we will appoint an interim. FA President Larsson: Do you anticipate a national search will be launched right away or deferred a while? Provost Olson: I would like to have a conversation about this. We have many Dean searches going on already. The initial goal was to do a search right away. If folks have comments on this they should talk with President Davenport or me.
d. **MSU Provost/VPAA Report (Scott Olson):** We have the last interview for the Dean of Arts and Humanities. We should have a recommendation early next week. In regards to the College of Business search, e-mails recently came out announcing when candidates are coming to campus, about the end of the first or second week of February. These were started last spring. Allied Health and Nursing was started later. Dean of Students’ candidates are coming in soon. We also have searches for Registrar and Director of Admissions. A lot of candidates are coming in the next few weeks. I hope many of you can attend the open sessions for the candidates. FA President Larsson: Thanks for keeping these broad calls and open meetings. This week FA Vice President Grabowska and I got to meet most of the candidates. The College of Business schedule will be more challenging for me. All of these candidates are aware of the situation they are coming into. They may be less aware about the intricacies of the contract. Provost Olson: I’m excited about the Arts and Humanities candidates I met and for now, the College of Business candidates look good as well. We are attracting a high quality of people and as with the Interim Diversity Dean search as well. Along those lines, President Davenport made clear we will be honoring Mike Fagin for his work. I appreciate faculty for helping with this. At the Pan African Conference luncheon we will have a special recognition of Dr. Fagin. If you care about diversity as I do, you might want to come to this.

A lot of the agenda is talking about bad and scary and fear-inducing things. I want to remind us that good things are happening. Fall enrollment was up 75-80 students and spring was up by 30. This is good. We are doing that in face of first year of high school graduation decline. It’s exciting to know that people see this as a great place. Interim Dean of Students, Walt Wolff, told me that the number of denials is also up significantly - 107%. Interim Dean Wolff: We denied 405 people. Provost Olson: Standards are still high. Another thing going on is that our concert choir, my own flesh and blood sings in this group, is now on National Public Radio. One concert is being played across the country. FA President Larsson: They aren’t in the Grammy’s yet? Provost Olson: Not yet.

The work climate survey is taking place - the second being done by our IO Psychology group, a fantastic group that does amazing work. We are up in 34 indicators. If you remember these categorize us in the green area which represents 90% or more are favorable. Forty-one percent of our indicators are in the green. Median group with rates of 80-90%, the yellow area, we have 39% here and only 20% of our indicators are in the red area, that with 70% approval or less. Despite everything there is still good stuff going on.

e. **Human Resources Topics (Becky Barkmeier):** Vacancies have been mailed out to everyone. As the Provost pointed out, there are several Dean positions open. Does anyone have any questions on that? FA President Larsson: I haven’t looked at them yet. Every opening we have will face some intensive scrutiny. I appreciate the efforts of HR in responding to some of the puzzling and unusual features, such as the nine-month faculty contract, and making sure all have access to the contract. I appreciate the office handling this. Director Barkmeier: The staff has done a good job. If you have questions, please contact me or the office staff.
f. Alcohol Policy (Walt Wolff): The Alcohol Policy was a controversial issue with the students. Last spring we tabled it for the summer. We resurrected it this fall and took it back to the original group and gave them issues listed by the students. We now have a good document that the President now has. Last time this was looked at was at the formal and informal review. It looks like we now have an agreement as far as the policy is concerned. President Davenport: We received great input from faculty and students. We now have a policy students approve of and yet the teeth of the policy are still there. Interim Dean Wolff: We thank everyone for their work, especially Roy Kammer.

2. Action Items--

a. Policy Review: (Donald Larsson): The informal review period has passed and we are entering the formal review policy for proposed policies and changes at the next couple of Meets and Confers. We will bring our responses. Anyone want to add to this? President Davenport: I’ve already talked about the bonding issues. This is a bonding year. Budget, we have Rosemary Kinne here but that has been a huge topic around legislative relations.

3. Discussion items--

a. MnSCU/Legislative Relations (Donald Larsson): Briefly, on IFO side, our legislative lobbyist, Russ Stanton, has been giving us updates. One concern is that of the solvency of TRA as a retirement format. This group is facing similar challenges as Medicare and so on. There have been some fixes with K-12 packages rolling over into the other state employees some years ago. Russ is very knowledgeable about this and is trying for legislation to fix this for several decades. People nearing retirement should be aware.

The IFO has put full support behind the bonding request. We also have joint opportunities to meet with some of the gubernatorial candidates, but not all. On that note, regarding Governor Pawlenty flying in and flying out of Mankato, he spoke about our campus but didn’t get our name correct. But that aside and the fact that he seems to be running for President, we have nearly two dozen people running for Governor and many have key positions in the legislature. Not many other opportunities right now, but the bonding bill will be coming out this year.

President Davenport: TRA, all of us who had TIAA-CREF thought TRA looked good. Now maybe TRA has problems. More information to come.

b. Budget and Planning Process (Rosemary Kinne sitting in for Rick Straka): Vice President Straka is at a MnSCU Chief Financial Officers’ meeting. He didn’t have any new information to share. We are still looking a preliminary $6-10 million reduction in 2012. On the MnSCU website there is the economic outline by Laura King. Also they have a section where you can submit comments or suggestions. That’s a good place for people to suggest change or ask questions. FA President Larsson: It seems clear in the last day or two that the budget situation on other campuses is being publically active. There have been new seniority rosters at Southwest. I was asked today about rubrics for retrenchment from Winona, St. Cloud and Vice President Linda Baer. Sometimes we get questions from faculty asking if we are too far ahead of
everyone else. What is the situation for everyone else? Budget Officer Kinne: We are leading. We should be proud the President and Cabinet have taken the initiative to plan early. President Davenport: Earlier this week Provost Olson was quoted on NPR all day long, about the institution moving forward with program cuts. When I was giving testimony at the House the same day the issue came up. There had been a long discussion. The presidents at other universities have been working on this, such as Earl Potter from St. Cloud. They are taking a different approach and haven’t been as public about it. Once we became public it put pressure on the other institutions regarding their planning. The presidents recently asked me to give a presentation at the Leadership Council on how we at MSU, Mankato moved forward. I have had to correct the misinterpretation that decisions have already been made. I reiterated to constituents that this is not the case; we are in a discussion mode. This is the early phase of program metrics. The other institutions have apparently been doing a lot behind the scenes. FA President Larsson: Rod Henry has commended our campus for the open process and said this might be a model for his own campus in Bemidji. President Davenport: He shared that with me as well.

c. Report of Graduate Education Task Force (Anne Blackhurst): Those involved in this past fall’s faculty leadership retreat will remember that you appointed faculty members to a planning group on Graduate Education. Ultimately 21 task force members including 17 faculty members met to address the charge to strengthen and enhance graduate education on campus. As a matter of accountability, I have brought copies of their final report, partly to thank you for the excellent decisions about who you appointed. These are 17 really smart senior faculty who have devoted their careers and lives to graduate education. I was impressed with the results of their work. I wanted to share this with you and we want to make sure the campus community is informed about our recommendations. I encourage you to read all of it - the four pages of Executive Summary is really important. The appendices are also an important part; they summarize the data we collected. These are the basis of our recommendations. We identified institutions that we could use as benchmarks for our campus. We went back 10 years and found institutions that were like us on issues such as sustainability. We then looked at today’s data and those that are in different categories. Some are similar to us: just added doctoral programs, name change, located about one hour from a Research 1 school. All struggled on how to differentiate themselves in higher education programs. After identifying these schools, we spent hours talking with the graduate deans at these schools about how they did this, to make this transition to a higher level of quality. We also used quantitative data seen in bar graphs about graduate enrollment, level of external funding, state stipends, and numbers of online programs. Interesting to see how we rate. We looked at IPEDS data on the amount of funding we have compared to other schools. I encourage you to look at the first two appendices. There is a third appendix that looks at demographic and enrollment trends. I’m sure you know that the trends predict a decline of high school graduates in this state, but there is also a prediction of a 49% increase in graduate enrollment. Nationally, there is a projected 21% growth in jobs that will require graduate degrees. The task force says that graduate enrollment will be a piece of meeting our current financial crisis. We conducted satisfaction surveys of alumni, current students, and graduate faculty. We summarized some of the key findings. All the data are available on the graduate college website. I am proud to say that across the board, former and current students liked faculty, thought their courses were relevant, and appreciated the accessibility of advisors.
Faculty members are not as satisfied about perceived level of support for graduate programs. So I encourage you all to read all this report. We want to widely distribute this. It is also available on line. FA President Larsson: Does it outline an action report? Dean Blackhurst: It does not. Copies of the report were then distributed. Dean Blackhurst: If you quickly turn to page 2 near the top where it says “key recommendations”. The task force decided to focus on big ideas rather than specific tactics or strategies. This document serves as a context or foundation for the new task force, on thinking and action like a doctoral institution. That task force must develop specific outcomes or objectives. We focused on big ideas. The first is at the institutional level. On page 2 it says that recognizing that there are a number of ways to be a strong program. Demand for high enrollment polls, like the MBA, but also high demand, limited programs. Many would like to go IO Psychology but they only accept a few, only a few are permitted to come. The recommendation helps us attract other students. There are examples of what these mixes might entail. The second one has to do with graduate programs; to define a niche that sets them apart some way from other departments. This could vary. It could be on, for examples programs like Technical Communication, or unique programs like the MSW program that trains rural social workers. We encourage each program to develop a niche that is unique. The third has to do with research and bringing in more external funding for research. When we compare to other schools on research, many are bringing in 10-15times more funding than we are. This talks about how we might develop interdisciplinary research centers that would bring in more research dollars that would bring in more students and enhance our programs. They then acknowledge a barrier from achieving this. The fourth recommendation regards work load and other barriers for achieving the first three points. I’m willing to take questions now or one on one, later. We have more copies of this report if you want. The data from the surveys is in much more detail. FA President Larsson: Thank you for the good work. This is a good looking document. Obviously as this goes forward, the next task force has some challenges to live up to these recommendations. There are some important issues to address. I hope this gets in the hands of the Trustees as we go. One of the issues is that they do not know what a university does. There is so little attention to what a university does. This could help explain this. President Davenport: I agree. President Obama reiterated the importance of two-year colleges and we all support this. But we are concerned. Dean Blackhurst just said that the advanced degree is one employers will be looking for. We have gotten lost. I am on the ASCU committee and they are just now getting to Congress on this. The two-year colleges have a strong lobby effort. The powers that be are getting to President Obama. As an immediate fix, we all can support that we need to get people in the workplace to increase our economy. But this is short term solution. We need to be competitive in the global market place. We need good scientists and people with a strong liberal arts education.

d. Program Metric Rating Categorization (Scott Olson): We were talking earlier about the right process. We made our best guess about the right way. We’ll see as the months proceed. It is causing a lot of angst, fear, and anger - we know that. The attempt was to try to create a process for a horrible unthinkable situation, something none of us in living memory have faced. Most of us wouldn’t remember the last time MSU had to do this. We are doing this task with a commitment to shared governance and to not dividing the faculty against each other. We want you as a faculty to be able to stand together. Is it right or not? We won’t know until later. Much depends upon if other money becomes available. Don’t forget the goal is to minimize the
harm to the institution, minimize harm to students, and minimize harm to quality. The goal is to contain and minimize harm. There will be harm but the goal is to reduce this. That’s why we are doing this. We could have done it across the board, but it would not have minimized the damage - it would have distributed it and made the damage greater. This is our approach - right or wrong. I hope that we have been doing it through shared governance. Everything you have been getting is still in discussion. I hope we do not turn the faculty against themselves. This is hard to do in some situations. There are challenges. The tools we have are crude, especially the cost study. For example, all education studies are in CIP 13, all education. The Counseling Education Department is the same as Social Studies. Some have fairly good CIPs. We have a “400 year-old telescope” and we are trying to “land on the moon”. There are obviously qualitative issues we need to address, such as mission centrality. How do you do that? Just like the last Meet and Confer on this, we are trying to listen to and respect what you as a faculty have to say. How do we compare on mission centrality? What counts for quality here and quality there? We decided to let you tell us what counts for quality and we will do the best we can with that. I use this analogy: Sir Isaac Newton figured out a lot about the universe using less than the Hubble telescope. Crude measures still tell us something. See, this is kind of a triangulation, looking at all six columns: The negative on one column may not tell you anything but six negatives all the way across does. We talked about “sexanguination”, but that sounds like a Marvin Gaye song. There are now nine things we are “triangulating” and hopefully through that process you get the ability to see where the moon is and perhaps a landing spot. We cannot control the structure of the data. The presumption of the process is in the next stage. The main problem we have is a financial program, not a quality problem, not a mission problem, not a relevance to Minnesota problem. The problem is a cost problem and, later, an enrollment problem. This became Step 2, this is the solution we need to find. There is a presumption here. As we do step 3, Quality and mission centrality, bear in mind the presumption is you have been graded correctly. With a good case, there will be movement. It won’t happen for everybody. If we move everyone up to 2c, we have accomplished nothing. The presumption is still that the evaluation is correct. This feels like it is all about cuts to the faculty. Last April President Davenport said that 11% of administration was cut, 8% of AFSCME was cut and 5% of faculty. Nobody in permanent faculty positions lost jobs but permanent administrators and AFSCME did. Right now we have to focus on faculty because of IFO contracts. I met with MSUAASF membership on Tuesday. I told them that as soon as we are done with this process on March 1, we are talking about MSUAASF. We will adapt our metric for this process to other positions. MSUAASF, we are talking to you next. It is only faculty now because of the contract. The burden will be shared by all, including the administration. FA President Larsson: A couple of general comments: Other bargaining units and I meet regularly. Once a month we get together, usually two-three of us get together. Local heads of AFSCME and MSUAASF, they see that there is collateral damage. We have AFSCME and MSUAASF who work in other departments. If department merges or disappears, they may be affected as well. The process here has been a complex one; we are all working very fast in an unknown territory. I think we have done well to do as we have. I want to thank the administration for realizing that the tools are crude. Thank you for bringing in additional information. We do have this back and forth, it’s complicated, it drags things out but the process should improve. In regard to the program metric, this is a summary of the types of events and comments we have been receiving. Departments are working on programmatic responses. We need to provide information about sources for data.
You may know of better data. Provost Olson: Every cell I entered myself. There may be errors. We are keeping a list and trying to fix them. This was the best way for us to understand. So there is a lot of room for a mistake. FA: If there are data errors, respond in the 600-word process? Provost Olson: Could also just shoot us an e-mail - some have been pointed out that can be done today, send a piece of paper or e-mail. FA: We had a problem with number of measures - we just called Associate Vice President Sandmann. FA President Larsson: Departments need to scrutinize this. We have pointed out issues of missing data. Has money been coming off of the top of your budgets? This may save other people. Some proposed changes to their own particular curriculums. Some are looking a program cuts themselves. Provost Olson: We are open to having a conversation - open to listening to recommendations. FA President Larsson: Some will play out over time; some can be done more quickly. Qualitative measures: How do we demonstrate programmatic excellence? You have said about importance to region or community: is this overriding? At the same time, as noted on talking points, we recognize that no matter what we do there are going to be winners and losers. Our goal, as the union, is to make sure the playing ground is fair. All steps have been conducted in an appropriate way. We have done this so far. We will continue to do this. Provost Olson: I can give a clue about the next thing you are going to see. It doesn’t exist but I’ve talked about it with the Deans’ Council. Column 1: Original categorization of 2a, 2b, or 2c; new categorization, might be the same, most will be the same. Then a column on type of reduction specifying staffing, non-salary only, or whatever we have in mind. Next in mind: A chips cashing column. This is where the BESI’s come in. Perhaps like in the department of Accounting; 2b to start, 2b revised, need staffing reductions, chips column; they have five people retiring. Final is going to say 2c, once the cash in chips we have to add positions back. They end up being 2c because of BESI’s. You will get this February 15 as a goal. This will account for BESI’s. There are also phased retirements. Any chips would be cashed in for a final placement. They don’t need a reduction. FA: What would happen if we offer more BESI’s? Provost Olson: Vice President Straka has said maybe but it wouldn’t happen by February 15. We could theoretically do another round of BESI in March and April. Again folks could credit this again then another chip would be gained. No way to do more BESI’s now because we won’t know where to target. That won’t happen until March 1. FA: How much flexibility do Deans have to deviate from the document? When Deans say, need to cut like nine positions? Provost Olson: When we get your statements, the Deans, Associate Vice President Sandmann, and I will go through that together. FA: There may be some departments that may be more comfortable appealing to the Deans. Provost Olson: I will get them. FA: There are a lot of documents. Provost Olson: I do the promotion and tenure documents and there are many of those. FA: Deans aren’t your proxy? Provost Olson: Our office is working with the President’s Office and we are working with the budget. We can’t leave the decisions to the Deans. There has to be a conversation. We are going to have to push the Deans to go farther than they want to go. We will keep track and hit the target mark. FA President Larsson: Deans may advocate for college but not necessarily for all programs. Provost Olson: Then we have to get President Davenport and Vice President Straka in the room. The meetings with the Deans are already scheduled. FA President Larsson: There are some specific deadlines. The big unknown is the exact fall out for 2b programs. Many 2a programs are shell departments with no activities in recent years. There are some and they are responding. But the
2b may experience significant cuts. I am assuming that significance can include and lead to retrenchment of some faculty, even some tenured. The question I am posing, when a program is closed outright, I would assume some faculty in the first year and some later to make sure students have courses they need. At the end, “X” positions are cut in 2b categories. Will they all go at once? Provost Olson: The problem is the July 1, 2011 deadline. All must be done by then. If we saw that we got 90% there, could the next 10% come the next year? Could we use reserves? We can have conversations but the reserves are stretched as well. We need permanent base cuts. We could use one time dollars to get there but we need the baseline cuts. We took BESI’s because we could see where cuts would be.

FA: To make sure we are talking about this accurately, what is the definition of chips? Your cost data came at the beginning of this academic year. It does not include people leaving for another university or retiring this year. Will this be a chip? Provost Olson: Some attrition would be a chip, however there are some colleges that are riding on stimulus dollars. Those are not chips but we received money to tie us over. CSET, CoB, COE and SBS have stimulus dollars. A&H and AH&N don’t have any. So chips depend. FA President Larsson: Should the cuts lead to cuts from probationary or tenured faculty, attrition is the first place you look for reductions. That’s built into the process. FA: We had a meeting in St. Paul recently and briefly discussed this. Some schools are treating phased retirements differently. How is this going to be used? Provost Olson: Phased retirements are chips - slower but a lot are already factored in.

FA: Are we still encouraging people to apply for phased retirements? Provost Olson: To be honest, there are on-going discussions about phased retirements; how they should be used, their length, their use and harm. For now we are saying three years. We are looking to see if there are changes. President Davenport: This unfortunately is an academic reality. If you haven’t seen the presentation by Vice President Laura King on line, it is an awakening. We have heard the rhetoric. She presents the data and statistics. It’s K-12, its healthcare. When you see the combination of factors in the budget, it is overpowering. We can’t be optimistic after seeing that. We can hope for a miracle to turn things around. But I think it isn’t going to happen.

Provost Olson: I can send the link to share this.

FA President Larsson: We read about other states taking voluntary furloughs. When I am asked about this my answer is that the IFO does not like this politically and it probably wouldn’t happen. Even then, there is a lot of vagueness on its effectiveness at all. They are short-term solutions for a long-term problem. Saving University money for a year or two is not a response. Cuts and furloughs, we are not just opposed to them as a union; they just don’t work. FA: Are we to suppose the 14% will address this particular issue? Will that take care of the $6-11 million? Provost Olson: The goal of the institution is $6-10 million. Not all will come out of faculty but the lion’s share will because this is our largest cost. The $6-10 million should take care of structural problem pointed out by Laura King. But there is another dip in the roller coaster. We have to keep on this. So far we are growing. That’s why we are at 7700 France. If we can keep our numbers where we are, we will not have this second dip. If we just ride the roller coaster, we are looking at another 10-15% two years later. Understand President Davenport’s strategy. We need to find students besides regular high schools.
FA President Larsson: The current economy has made things worse with its slow recovery. The state demographer sees the transfer of wealth; fewer workers in the work force and more taking more out of the system. That will make things worse.

Davenport: One factor we don’t know that could have an impact on all of this is tuition. At this point, the Board of Trustees has taken a solid stand about increasing tuition. There will be a lot of pressure to charging the students more. Right now we are locked with Board approval for 5% increase and we basing budgets on this. There will be college closures if something isn’t done. The Trustees are being more flexible on tuition. The downside, if they don’t address the tuition issue and allow us to get beyond what we can charge, a number of institutions will go under.

The System will not let them go under; therefore the rest of us will be paying to keep them above water. The Trustees are persuaded by that argument. If they have a flexible tuition plan then that won’t bear on us. They have talked about balancing tuition among universities. We are slightly below so we would see our tuition rising to be comparable with other state universities. The Trustees are going to suggest to the Chancellor this possibility. Laura King understands. If you were here several years ago large tuition raises helped us but that will not happen again. The other hope is to allow the tuition to go above. We can’t do double digit tuition raises each year. If they don’t address that, we are in worse shape than in the past. They will not let others increase there’s. Provost Olson: Some states had 30-40% tuition increases.

e. Seniority Rosters (Scott Olson): These are drafts. We want your feedback on them. There are no done deals here. Read the contract. Understand what rosters are to be. React to them. Think through the consequences. We have listened to everything everyone has said. Some changes have already been made. There are no done deals. There is a lot of thinking that must be done. What happens to cherished programs if we start going up on that roster? You may have a program eliminated if we start at the bottom and go up. I would like to ask that we have an additional meet and confer before February 12. We are trying to comply with all contractual items. We will still have one in late February. You have gotten a draft of the rosters, and we will make changes. FA President Larsson: We will work to do that. The contact allows for the administration to do this. If the FA decides not to participate, administration is still free to act. Provost Olson: We will do this at a time when as many as possible can be there. FA President Larsson: The administration brings new ideas to Meet and Confer, and then we have 10 days to respond. Our Meet and Confers, we have reached a point to bring this to closure or to disagree. Recognizing this we frontload our Meet and Confers. In that spirit we welcome that opportunity and whatever else needs to come in between.

In reference to some of the talking points the FA has already pointed out: The last item on the sheet, because of contractual language, there may be some disagreement. This includes final seniority rosters. If it came to February 12 and you fall short of a few days, we are open to a MOA for a few extra days. We are willing to accept flexibility within a limit. The March 1 deadline needs to remain in place. IFO said they can be reasonable about flexibility. We don’t need an MOA for Meet and Confer. Provost Olson: I need you to know that the administration agrees with many of these but there are devilish details. There are no substantial disagreements. Teaching in the area, an actual teaching assignment, not whether you could teach in that area - that is the key.
FA Larsson: The roster situation is still terribly confusing. The contact doesn’t always work well to clarify this. We must respond to four different articles and only one is labeled Seniority, so it is good to have this online so we can search “seniority”. There are certain things that are unclear. Nobody paid attention to the rosters until retrenchment became a reality. I sent these talking points to the administration leaders. Please feel free to send to other administrators. There are a number of concerns, including specific faculty concerns with individual placement, conversations with the Dean or asking FA to participate in individual placement issues, programs and departments asking what are the splits and what do they mean? Given that silence assumes assent, in most cases departments seem willing to accept rosters as they are being reconfigured. A number of departments have been very vocal that these changes make no sense. They have always taught each others’ courses, always been one department. CIP codes identify one way of looking at programs. Academic degrees identify another. Seniority rosters identify another. They don’t always seem identical. There is a need for more alignment with rosters and what we all are doing. I’ll come back to academic programs in a moment.

In terms of IFO and FA positions, departments are in the best position to give information. I have been happy that Academic Affairs listens to these arguments and said they may agree to some of these. What is a program? CIP codes made sense to measure across MnSCU policy. They work for program units in which a major or minor study is available. That is one thing to look for. Does that program lead to a degree or a minor? A certificate may be as well. Rod Henry has indicated that most seniority rosters should track programs as related to degrees. Or if a department has a good reason, we can do a MOA when they do not track to a degree or minor. In one department alone it was divided into four rosters but one individual was left in one program, one senior and many untenured. Provost Olson: There are a few folks low on seniority rosters that think we are out to get them. But we promoted and tenured them recently. What is driving the roster division is and must be an internal logic. FA President Larsson: We hear what departments are saying. No matter what we do there will be winners and losers. For example, while there are distinct advantages for having one roster there are distinct disadvantages for individual members. The FA can’t advocate for one program or another but we are advocating for the principle of the contract. We cannot be supporting one program over another even if one generates more credit. I had to point that out to one program today. They went from one roster to several. I told them that from your department perspective it seems to fit these rosters. It will have implications for retrenchment. If you are in a single roster, you might not touch the tenured but you would lose fixed-term and other probationary people.

The second major point that became clearer to me is the issue of the second roster home. There are some programs where people are rostered in because they taught there for three or more years. There are three distinct examples: 1. Where people taught in different programs. Two people in Astronomy used to teach in Math. 2. People rostered in programs that no longer exist. Education had the C & I program that disappeared years ago. Some of the faculty are still on the roster. Some were never placed on roster where they are currently placed. There is general agreement that the C&I roster should disappear. 3. Departments that split but then people retain seniority rights in old programs (that may not exist). One program is problematic because program a and b split but each person is listed in a secondary roster of an old department. We
are working on that answer. No one is going to be happy but there will be some resolution. We want to point out that we need to pay close attention to second rostering, based on the contract, if a faculty member has taught three or more years in more than one department, they have a second home. Take my department as an example. Creative Writing is now listed as a separate roster. The three most senior people used to teach Literature. Now they just teach Creative Writing. Under the contract, they should be cross listed with the Literature Program. If Creative Writing ends, they would be able to cross to Literature. There will be more discussion as the nature of the cuts becomes a reality. That summarizes the main points there. We will need further discussion. This is to ensure contractual rights are followed.

**f. Open Forum:** The first open forum is tomorrow, and I encourage faculty to attend.

The meeting adjourned meeting at 5:03 p.m.

__________________________________________  ________________________  
Warren Sandmann  Barbara Carson  
Reviewer for Management  Reviewer for Faculty