ASF Meet & Confer Minutes
February 9, 2012

Present: Judith Ramaley, Connie Gores, Ken Janz, Scott Ellinghuysen, Jim Schmidt, Nancy Jannik, Jill Quandt, Brett Ayers, Jenny Lamberson

1. Space Utilization Concerns
ASF views the Facilities and Finance Committee as an opportunity for meaningful discussion on space utilization issues. People care deeply about their space. There is a perception that information about decisions that have already been made are being shared with the committee rather than seeking feedback on these decisions before they are made. Dr. Ramaley said there had been no strategy or policy issues discussed last fall because we haven’t been dealing with those issues. The classroom survey has been completed. The committee will look at this and help guide decisions along with input from Deans and others. The charge of the committee is policy and resource allocation, not necessarily how projects are executed. Principles and approaches to criteria are how All University committees should be used. But, there have not been policy and strategy issues to explore recently. We are in a period of calm, but we are about to have some changes coming with the one-time money from tuition. How should we use carry forward to better something rather than repair something? ASF should keep track through our members their reactions. Priorities or strategies for the Facilities and Finance Committee haven’t been identified. There will be work to do. Ken Janz noted that three years ago the committee looked at splitting into two committees to look at different aspects. The committee was involved in the budget process. ASF brought up the example of the Wabasha/Somsen reshuffling and Dr. Ramaley said that should not be handled by the Facilities and Finance Committee. Instead, there should be consulting done with those that are affected by the moves. Those people should know what is going on and be able to contribute. The nature of how we do work is changing. It is appropriate for the Facilities and Finance Committee to work out a set of protocol for how those that will be affected will be informed. People doing work need to know how they will need to change. Significant space moves involve more than one department. Concerns about particular parts of a project should not be handled by the All University Committee. It will degenerate to what we had before and we will be locked constantly in battles. The previous process was dysfunctional. Administration is happy to develop a new model. ASF commented that the advantage of having things go through the committee is that all of our members can have their voice heard through our representatives. The degree to which department heads represent employee concerns is variable and challenging. We want everyone to have the opportunity to have their concerns heard. Dr. Ramaley does not want agendas driven by an individual’s concerns, so how do we balance this and how deep do we go? There are three kinds of problems: 1) how we are doing things….we need to fix things and there may be unintended consequences, 2) we simply made a mistake, 3) some people will never be happy no matter what we do. We are not good at saying we are sorry. And we don’t want to fret over the person that will never be happy. We can start with coming up with an agreed upon way we work with the people that will be affected by the choices that are being made. Administration will bring this through the Meet & Confer process though it may take some time to develop.

2. Academic Integrity Policy – ASF asked about the function of the database for tracking academic integrity issues and asked if Knowledge Lake may be a better location than the SLD database. Connie Gores wants limited access to this type of information. The SLD database is a repository for conduct and behavior related infractions. It holds both on campus and off campus information and is very private.
General information may be shared from here but not specific information. They will not give out specific details. The SLD database is protected, private and there is limited access. Knowledge Lake would not provide this security so it would not be the best place to store this information. We need to know if students have repeating patterns because our responses to situations may be different with this knowledge. When a problem is serious it will get the attention of a Dean. In some programs, character and integrity are considered before a student is admitted into a program or allowed to graduate. We continue to struggle with what is fair and appropriate. What kind of people are we preparing and what will their conduct be in a professional environment? A database for this needs to be closely guarded. Dr. Ramaley does not want to see this widely available. There is some concern that the way the draft policy is written is too linear. This is a just a perception. There are choices and it was not intended to be a step by step sequential process. It is not intended to address every concern. The revised format could include different pathways as examples. There should be classroom and non-classroom examples. We need to consider how it can be constructed so it looks like there are alternatives. Nancy Jannik reported that she is pleased with the faculty who have looked at the draft. It has become quite concerning to many faculty because they feel like they can’t keep up with the ease that technology brings. It is good for them to be talking about this differently. They are talking to each other. It may take longer, but there are good conversations going on. We may want to draft a second guidance document/handbook/coaching tool. Set penalties are too restrictive. We need to strike a balance between clarity, structure and flexibility. The institution is sometimes seen as a mysterious entity. There is murkiness. The punishment is often a failing grade. Students may go to appeal their grade. This is complicated. But, we don’t want to make it so complicated that no one can use it.

3. Theme House Update
The Theme House is rolling along. It is scheduled to open this fall. We have had to scale back and clarify what this project will include and hold to the budget. Students have been actively involved in the process. There have been seven applications received for the ten spaces. Sophomores, Juniors and Seniors are eligible to apply. The next step is to meet with faculty to help work on the academic connection. There are always bumps. The geothermal heating will not work here. Cabinet has talked about putting resources behind hiring a Sustainability Coordinator again. We may start by bringing someone in on a contractual basis. Stay tuned.

4. Students First
The Students First project has been sunsetting. MnSCU is now in the process of identifying which IT projects will be moving forward. They will revisit framework on how IT projects get prioritized. Previously, all IT projects went through Students First. Now that Students First isn’t going, they will need to develop a new process. They are sorting out what is a central resource vs. a regional resource vs. a campus specific resource. Ken Janz is regarded as an important contributor to this process. It is a rapidly changing environment. It is a work in progress.

5. Room Reservation System
System wide scheduling software will be purchased. R25 will be sunsetted. Until the new system is up, R25 will be supported. WSU may be a pilot program for the new software. Ken Janz thinks WSU should be in the pilot program. The new software is web based. We are thinking about how we will do business differently with this tool. The Facilities and Finance Committee should have a demo on this. We may need to revisit our approach to public spaces. It has not been fully tested. The Registrar’s Office will hopefully be able to do some basic integration with ISRS.
6. Budget Update
The next economic forecast will come out on February 29th. It will be interesting to see what happens. Unemployment is dropping a little. Minnesota is usually a little ahead of the curve. How are we going to reshape the economy?

7. Chancellor’s Faculty Forum
As a result of the Chancellor’s framework, there are things going on to address each of the three areas. How do we approach student success, advanced credentialing and degree completion? There will be a summit on student success tomorrow. Dr. Ramaley has been encouraged by everything she has seen. She thanks the members of ASF for their interaction and exchanges. Within a couple of weeks we will define our next steps. What does an extraordinary education look like? We will approach this like the Next Chapter process. What has emerged is that each institution is at a different point in interpreting their mission. Stay tuned. We will be asking for your help on what we should do and to help with the design.

Respectfully submitted,

Jenny Lamberson
ASF Secretary
February 9, 2012