



Minnesota State College Faculty

The GREEN SHEET

The Official Publication of the Minnesota State College Faculty

Volume V, Issue 5

May 2005

What we learned in Phoenix about the ‘Roadmap to Redesign’

On March 18, 2005, three MSCF faculty members (Phyllis Ballata, Century College; Josephine Books, Inver Hills Community College; and Louise Pugh, Minnesota State Community and Technical College-Fergus Falls) attended a conference in Phoenix, Arizona, “Increasing Success for Underserved Students: Redesigning Introductory Courses.” The purpose was to study the Twigg Initiative firsthand. The following is Phyllis Ballata’s report from this experience.

After winnowing out the situations discussed in the Roadmap to Redesign that do not or can not apply to two-year institutions, I was struck by how many of the helpful or practical suggestions the two-year college faculty has already implemented based on work we have been doing for the last decade or two. I was also struck by some suggestions that seemed to be actually counterproductive, that appeared to be based on failed models from earlier educational experiments, or that would eliminate the most valuable and proven current strengths of Minnesota’s two-year institutions. Many serious questions of educational philosophy and purpose need to be confronted in this discussion.

The purpose of the Roadmap to Redesign sounded very good: to reduce student drop/withdraw/fail/incomplete rates and therefore increase successful completion of courses; to make the student work harder and



The Phoenix delegation pictured, from left, Louise Pugh, Josephine Books, and Phyllis Ballata.

more actively; to create consistent outcomes in all sections of multi-section courses; and to reduce costs — basically human costs — since many suggestions increase costs for technology and facilities.

Most of the Redesign experiments took place in four-year institutions with graduate schools that had similar situations — a pattern of introductory courses with large class sizes or mass lecture formats; inexpensive graduate teaching assistants or upper-division students for tutoring; faculty who

wanted to avoid teaching introductory courses in order to save their time and resources for upper division; high percentages of part-time or adjunct faculty; high drop/withdraw/failure rates; decision-making processes controlled by administrators and department heads or a rela-

“Many serious questions of educational philosophy and purpose need to be confronted in this discussion.”

Continued on page 2

What we learned in Phoenix

Continued from page 1

tively small number of tenured faculty; and apparently little historic attention to “underserved populations,” which seem to have just been discovered. The few two-year institutions in the project were normal for the rest of the nation (but not for Minnesota) because they had extremely high percentages of part-time temporary or adjunct faculty and a proportionately very small number of permanent full-time faculty.

Minnesota is often ahead

Many of the problems and situations were not applicable to Minnesota’s community and technical colleges, as we can clearly see from the facts above, but, of those situations that were applicable to two-year institutions, most have already been or are being addressed by teaching and learning initiatives of various types within Minnesota’s two-year colleges. Of course, individual programs or disciplines in each of our two-year colleges have used these initiatives and innovations in different ways in the past—some very effectively, some with little success; some avoided change, some embraced specific experiments; some programs or departments have spent significant time and energy defining the expectations and methods all faculty use, and some ignore each other as much as possible. All of these are normal human responses to experimentation.

Even so, because the community and technical college faculty has consciously worked for many years on improving methods of teaching and learning, we should recognize that often Minnesota’s two-year system is far ahead of the rest of the nation in developing innovative ways to deal with under-prepared, under-served, and first-generation student populations.

Five Roadmap to Redesign models were proposed:

- The Supplemental Model is essentially our current Web-supplemented method. The difference is that we have not embraced the large lecture hall setting that is recommended as a way to save human costs

by replacing faculty. Examples included lecture sections of hundreds of students, but facility redesigns to accommodate lecture halls for several hundred students would be very expensive. Even though some presenters were proud that no students actually came to these lectures, presumably there has to be a way to hold the lecture in case anyone did come; otherwise, the method would become an online class with recorded lectures. Two-year institutions in Minnesota have been justly proud of the constant personal contact between faculty and students that we believe is so important, especially for under-prepared and first-generation college students. Replacing these fruitful personal contacts, whether face-to-face or online, with canned teaching or rote learning appears to be a step backward.

“Two-year institutions in Minnesota have been justly proud of the constant personal contact between faculty and students that we believe is so important...”

- The Replacement Model is basically our current Web-enhanced method. Roadmap to Redesign suggests changes in classroom work to encourage active learning. However, since active learning designs and teaching methods created for various learning styles are currently used by many of us, this does not appear to be anything new to Minnesota two-year colleges.

We have been discussing and experimenting with these methods for years now. Perhaps, we should do a better job of sharing our results with each other and with the larger community.

- The Emporium Model eliminates course sections, creates one huge class, and uses a centralized learning resource center with online materials and tutoring. Mass student attendance in the learning resource center would require extensive investments in money and space. To save money, the computerized learning lab is staffed primarily with teaching assistants and student tutors. This method is essentially a computerized version of the programmed learning model that we have rejected in the past for

Continued on page 3

Roadmap to Redesign models

Continued from page 2

most college applications. It might work for heavily factual or rote learning situations if the institution does not value faculty interaction with students and assuming that the institution could afford the required resources for facilities.

- The Fully Online Model in the Roadmap to Redesign method involves either all teaching materials being presented and monitored by off-the-shelf computer software with little faculty involvement or else a few faculty creating the materials and exams for a course of several hundred students. Once the course is created, presumably these faculty members could be eliminated. Graduate teaching assistants would grade anything that cannot be processed by computer. Faculty and students are not encouraged to actively engage in any continuous way because this would increase the number of faculty needed. The Redesign assumes that regular person to person online faculty-student contact is not worth the cost.
- The Buffet Model assesses student-learning styles by computer, provides a learning contract, and modularizes student work into small sections of information or skills. All students are in a single “class” working individually on discrete pieces of content. The practical or overall connection of these discrete pieces and the interactions between a student and other students or faculty are not considered a significant part of the learning process.

Considering these recommendations brings me to several conclusions. First, the Minnesota two-year college system faculty has much experience in dealing with first-generation and under-prepared students, and sharing our own best practices and innovations would be more effective than hiring consultants. Second, many of the more practical suggestions of the Roadmap to Redesign have been part of our ongoing work on teaching and learning for some years now. Third, the cheap labor of graduate assistants and upper-division student tutors for grading papers and running small groups or laboratories is not available to us, even if we did believe that was it was appropriate. Fourth, the two-year institutions have excelled with personal teacher-student contact; eliminating that source of excellence is not wise. Fifth, under-prepared and first-generation col-

“The Minnesota two-year college system faculty has much experience in dealing with first-generation and under-prepared students, and sharing our own best practices...would be more effective than hiring consultants.”

lege students do not successfully develop as life-long learners in isolated situations. Sixth, a college experience is more than the rote learning of facts from tele-screens; wrestling with critical thinking complexities, learning to communicate with and adapt to others, and creating larger human and mental connections are essential to the meaning of college.

Motions passed MSCF Board of Directors April 16, 2005

- The MSCF Board of Directors approves the 2005–2006 budget and the MSCF portion of dues.
- The MSCF Board of Directors amends the MSCF Bylaws, Article III, Section 4 - Statewide Contract Enforcement as follows (new language in bold): “Each chapter shall have an MSCF member appointed as a Grievance Representative to officially represent the organization as authorized in the master contract. **For chapters with more than one campus, a grievance representative shall be appointed at the other site(s) as requested by the chapter if approved by the Board of Directors.** Said appointment ...”
- The MSCF Board of Directors approves appointment of a grievance representative at the Hutchinson site of the Ridgewater chapter.

Lack of knowledge about the contract is a growing concern

Contract training is an ongoing need for the union membership. MSCF annually appoints a grievance representative for each chapter who has a major responsibility on behalf of the union to provide some of this training. The MSCF also publishes *The Green Sheet* with contractual information pieces and conducts training for grievance representatives, chapter presidents, and members of the Board of Directors.

The MSCF Negotiations Team, upon reaching a tentative agreement, conducts meetings at each chapter to inform the entire membership of all agreed upon changes to the 2005–2007 Labor Agreement. The language items and the economic pieces are thoroughly discussed prior to conducting a vote to accept or reject the tentative agreement. The success of the membership understanding the tentative agreement rests entirely upon each member to make every attempt possible to attend the meeting.

The MSCF will, upon ratification of the 2005–2007 Labor Agreement, bring all chapter presidents and grievance representatives together to go through the entire contract. This session is usually well attended, but our experience shows that even at such an important training opportunity some do not attend. We understand

Contractually Speaking

By William L. Newton



that certain personal needs do arise and must be accepted, but too often the reason for not attending has been lack of willingness to give up the time to travel and attend the meeting.

The chapter leadership will work diligently to educate the membership at its local chapter meetings. This is difficult to do when faculty do not attend the chapter meetings. Again it is the responsibility of each member to attend the meetings, to ask questions, and to assist in the maintenance of the rights contained within the contract. It is so easy not to attend, to accept little favors suggested by the administration for the good of the students, and to question what the union is doing for “me.” It is also true, however, that the contract will only be as good as the membership makes it by know-

“...the contract will only be as good as the membership makes it by knowing what the rights are and helping to ensure that the rights are provided.”

ing what the rights are and helping to ensure that the rights are provided.

From my point of view, lack of knowledge of the contract is a growing concern throughout the membership of MSCF. Far too often faculty members do not even read the contract, they get involved in cutting deals with the administration that circumvent the contract, and then they become upset with the union for not delivering more for “me.”

Ask yourself the question, “What have I done for the ‘we’ lately?” For many years when the former MCCFA and former UTCE organizations were formed, faculty members volunteered and worked diligently to gain and maintain the best contracts possible for the times. Those efforts are visible in contract language that surpasses any other higher education contract in the country. The MSCF seeks faculty members to volunteer for many open positions each year. The leadership spends countless hours contacting faculty to fill vacancies on many committees. The reply too often is, “I just don’t have the time right now,” or “How much release time is available?” or “How much does it pay?”

The future success of your union is totally dependent upon you. What do you want your union to be? What are you willing to do to make sure that it is what you want? The “me” has to become “we.” Will you show up?

Frequently asked questions about the proposed college faculty credentialing

From the Joint Committee on Credential Fields

In late November 2004, a draft of the proposed policy and procedure on faculty credentialing was disseminated system wide for initial review and early discussion. To date, 36 responses were received – 32 from faculty and four from administrators. The following are questions and answers related to the proposed college faculty credentialing.

General Questions

Question: *When would the proposed new policy go to the Board for Trustees for action? When would the proposed new policy be implemented?*

Answer: We have decided to delay the proposed action of the Board of Trustees on the proposed College Credentialing Policy until fall 2005 (September and October). The implementation of the proposed new policy and procedure is planned for July 1, 2006, based, of course, on Board approval.

Question: *Will I still need to renew my license?*

Answer: No. You maintain currency through your faculty professional development plan.

Question: *There have been comments that minimum qualifications would no longer exist. Would faculty still need to meet minimum qualifications for existing assigned fields, license fields, and the proposed new credential fields?*

Answer: Absolutely. System-established minimum qualifications for existing assigned fields and license fields and proposed new credential fields would continue to exist, and faculty would still be required to meet them.

Question: *Would current faculty in unlimited positions be required to meet changes in the minimum qualifications for their credential fields?*

Answer: No, current faculty in unlimited positions would maintain their present assigned fields or license fields until these fields are reviewed and converted to

“If existing faculty were required to comply with new minimum qualifications, the employer would be responsible for the cost associated with compliance as stipulated in the MSCF contract...”

credential fields; they would not be required to meet any changes in minimum qualifications that might be made to their currently held assigned field or license field when it is converted to a credential field unless the new minimum qualification requirements stated that all existing faculty must comply with the new requirements. If existing faculty were required to comply with new minimum qualifications, the employer would be responsible for the cost associated with compliance as stipulated in the MSCF contract, Article 17, Section 6. Changes in Credential Field(s). If the Office of the Chancellor modifies the faculty member’s assigned credential field(s) in such a way that the faculty member must retrain, then the employer will bear all costs, including release time, for the retraining.

Question: *Would current faculty in an unlimited status lose their jobs if they did not meet the new minimum qualifications?*

Answer: No, current faculty in an unlimited status (i.e., they have already completed the probationary period) would not lose their jobs if they did not meet the new minimum qualifications. However, all faculty would be encouraged to meet the new minimum qualifications.

Question: *Would high school teachers teaching PSEO (Postsecondary Enrollment Option) concurrent*

Continued on page 6

FAQs about the proposed college

Continued from page 5

enrollment courses have to meet the minimum qualifications for credential fields?

Answer: Yes. High school teachers teaching PSEO concurrent enrollment courses would be expected to meet the same system-established minimum qualifications as faculty in unlimited positions in the same discipline or program. The procedure would address the limited circumstances under which high school teachers may teach concurrent enrollment courses without meeting the system-established minimum qualifications.

Under the proposed credentialing policy and procedure, the college would be responsible for assuring and documenting that each high school teacher meets the same system-established minimum qualifications as faculty in unlimited positions in the same discipline or program.

Question: *Why can't we continue to have the two processes that currently exist – the assigned fields process and license fields process?*

Answer: While the definitions of assigned fields and license fields are the same (they are defined areas of knowledge and skill specifically related to a program, service, or academic discipline, each having system-established minimum faculty qualifications), the processes for establishing and implementing them at the Office of the Chancellor and at the colleges are significantly different. These differences result in inconsistencies and confusion throughout the system regarding the way faculty who teach the same programs or courses at different colleges are treated; it is essential that we address this confusing, complicated, duplicative, and inconsistent set of policies, procedures, and operating guidelines.

Question: *What contractual right does MSCF have in the policy development process?*

Answer: MSCF has no contractual right in the poli-

cy development process. All Board of Trustees' policies are developed with multiple opportunities for system constituents to review, discuss, and provide input to the development of these policies. These constituents include faculty, administrators, faculty and staff unions, and student associations.

Question: *Without license renewal would I still get my anticipated column movement?*

Answer: The Minnesota State Colleges and Universities Office of the Chancellor has discussed this issue with the Minnesota State College Faculty. These authorized parties have reached an agreement, in concept, that will continue to preserve a similar column movement process for faculty members hired prior to or

hired during the time the license renewal based column movement language was negotiated into the MSCF Employment Agreement. The topic will be handled at the bargaining table.

Teaching and Learning Competency Requirement

Question: *How would the teaching and learning coursework be determined, and would it be worthwhile?*

Answer: The intent of the required coursework is to provide appropriate teaching and learning concepts to assist the faculty member in being successful in his/her teaching role. Currently it is proposed that coursework would be required in the following four teaching and learning content areas:

1. philosophy of community and technical college education: most likely a non-credit course;
2. course construction: most likely a two semester credits course;
3. teaching/instructional methods: most likely a two semester credits course; and

“High school teachers teaching PSEO concurrent enrollment courses would be expected to meet the same system-established minimum qualifications as faculty in unlimited positions in the same discipline...”

e faculty credentialing

4. student outcomes assessment/evaluation: most likely a two semester credits course.

Each of these courses would have objectives and course outlines recommended by the Joint Committee on Credential fields. Once the course objectives and outlines would be developed, they would be sent out for system-wide review and comment. Subsequently, they would be submitted to the senior vice chancellor for approval, and, finally, would become part of the credentialing procedure and/or guidelines. We are considering making courses available from a number of sources, including our universities as on-line courses delivered through the MnSCU Center for Teaching and Learning ITeach Online Center.

Question: *What individuals would be exempt from the teaching and learning competency requirement?*

Answer: The teaching and learning competency requirement would be required for newly hired unlimited full-time and unlimited part-time faculty only. There are three types of exemptions currently in the proposed procedure:

1. A faculty member would be exempt from taking the coursework in all of the following three teaching and learning content areas (course construction, teaching/instructional methods, and student outcomes assessment/evaluation) if s/he has successfully completed either:
 - a. a baccalaureate degree or higher in secondary or higher education documented by an official transcript, or
 - b. three years of full-time (or equivalent) secondary, postsecondary, industry, or trade apprenticeship teaching experience, appropriately documented, in the field for which s/he is being hired. Graduate teaching assistant positions would qualify for this teaching requirement if the experience is appropriately documented as covering the full spectrum of the instructional design, delivery, and student assessment process.
2. A faculty member would be exempt from taking the coursework in either one, two, or all three of the following three teaching and learning content areas

(course construction, teaching/instructional methods, and student outcomes assessment/evaluation) if s/he has successfully completed equivalent coursework in one, two, or all three of those teaching and learning content areas.

3. A faculty member would be exempt from taking the coursework in the fourth content area (philosophy of community and technical college education) if s/he has successfully completed equivalent coursework in that content area.

“It is important that our system’s minimum educational requirements be based on both established business and labor standards and accepted higher education standards...”

Educational Requirement for Career, Technical and Professional Credential Fields

It is important that our system’s minimum educational requirements be based on both established business and labor standards and accepted higher education standards identified within our system and in other colleges nationwide.

Question: *Should career, technical, and professional credential fields aligned with AAS programs require a minimum of a diploma or a certificate rather than a baccalaureate degree?*

Answer: Some faculty have expressed concerns regarding the proposed baccalaureate degree faculty preparation standard for AAS programs. We recognize that there is not a single set of faculty preparation standards which would apply to all fields aligned with AAS programs, and that minimum qualifications must be decided individually for each credential field. With this in mind, it is intended to modify the procedure as it was originally proposed to state that the minimum prepara-

Continued on page 11



Don't know much about...



The bargaining team was assigned to read all of the negotiations surveys. While reading faculty comments, it became apparent that many faculty do not understand a number of issues the team deals with in the bargaining process. Three common areas of misunderstanding are insurance bargaining, the post retirement health care savings account, and the economic settlements in the last two rounds of bargaining.

The articles on pages 8–10, hopefully, will clarify common misperceptions about insurance bargaining and the distribution of the economic portions of the previous contracts. Look for more information about health care accounts in an upcoming issue of *The Green Sheet*. Or find answers to frequently asked questions about these accounts on the Internet at www.msrs.state.mn.us.

Insurance bargaining a delicate balancing act

Quick Quiz:

- Article 19 of the MSCF Master Agreement pertains to _____.
- MSCF negotiates the Master Agreement with _____, but Article 19 with _____.
- True or False: MSCF is one union out of 15 with representatives on the Joint Labor Management Coalition.

Negotiations for the 2003–2005 Employment Contract with MnSCU are beginning for MSCF members. In addition to the Master Agreement, the Joint Labor Management (JLM) Coalition has begun to negotiate our insurance coverage with the Department of Employee Relations (DOER). Article 19 is the only article in our contract that is not totally and solely negotiated with MnSCU.

MSCF and our two representatives to the JLM join 25 other negotiators from 15 different labor organizations on this coalition. Each of the representatives has loyalties to his/her own members and responsibilities to all state employ-



ees as the group negotiates our health insurance coverage. Locals represented at the JLM include Law Enforcement, AFSCME (which represents craft, maintenance, labor, service, health care non-professionals, clerical and technical workers, and correctional counselors), the Minnesota Nurses Association, Faculty (MSCF, IFO, MSUAASF, and SRSEA), Engineers, MMA, MAPE, and judicial employees. MSCF is 4,000 of the 50,000 state employees who receive insurance negotiated by this group.

Prior to 1981, each unit of state government provided its own version of health insurance coverage to its employees. This proved to be inefficient, costly, and duplicative.

In 1985, the Joint Labor Management Coalition was formed and a low plan contribution formula was instituted. The advantages of the Coalition bargaining concept are that the basic benefit design is the same for all state employees regardless of where they work or what type of work they do. It would not be possible for each unit of government to provide the same coverage for the same costs to small units of 70 (the nurses) and large units like AFSCME (30,000) if not for the Coalition. The Coalition makes it possible for each of us to bargain all issues of insurance coverage – from the amount of the co-pay for an office visit or prescription to the inclusion of a clinic in a sparsely populated county in level 1.

During a negotiating year, the 27 members of the coalition come together a number of times to discuss benefits provided, benefits desired, and acceptable rates along with emerging health care and health insurance issues. A strategy for negotiating is devised, and a proposal is written incorporating

Continued on page 12

Where did the money go?

We have struck a theme in this edition of *The Green Sheet* of educating members about some commonly misunderstood issues. In this piece, we will examine the distribution of the economic portions of the previous two contracts.

The 2001–2003 contract settlement was extraordinarily convoluted and complex due to the need to combine two independent contracts, including two very different salary schedules.

We tracked the distribution of monies to former MCCFA and former UTCE members very closely in that round, to this result:

- In year one, we spent \$4,108,253 on lump sum payments for former UTCE and \$8,426,709 for former MCCFA, both non-base salary building.
- In year one, we spent \$3,065,550 on unit buy outs for former UTCE, \$0 for former MCCFA, both non-base salary building.
- In year one, we spent \$0 on column movement for former UTCE and \$260,997 for column movement for former MCCFA, both base salary building.

In year one the grand total spent for former UTCE was \$7,173,803. The grand total spent for former MCCFA was \$8,687,706. On an individual basis in year one, we spent an average of \$3,528.68 per former UTCE member and an average of \$4,999.25 per former MCCFA member. None of these figures include monies to fund increases in the insurance package, which in year one required new money to the tune of \$982,002.

**By Larry
Oveson**

**MSCF
President**



- In year two, we spent \$0 on column change for former UTCE members and \$260,997 on column change for former MCCFA members, both base salary building.
- In year two, we spent \$783,927 on transition to the new salary schedule for former UTCE members and \$1,067,612 on transition to the new salary schedule for former MCCFA members, both base salary building.
- In year two, we spent \$1,791,000 for step movement for former UTCE using backlogged units that were not bought out, and \$0 for step movement using backlogged units for former MCCFA. (Former UTCE folks were moved 1 or 2 steps on the old UTCE schedule before transformation to the new combined schedule.) Both figures are base salary building.
- In year two, we spent \$3,081,190 on mid-year step movement for former UTCE members and \$3,163,398 on mid-year step movement for former MCCFA members, both base salary building.

- In year two, we spent \$993,860 on the new lay-off package for former UTCE members and \$0 on enhanced lay-off benefits for former MCCFA members; both are non-base salary building.
- In year two, we spent \$152,499 on increasing the professional development funds for former UTCE members and \$0 increasing the professional development funds for former MCCFA members; both are non-base salary building.
- In year two, we spent \$556,892 on increasing the Supplemental Retirement contribution for former UTCE members and \$211,564 increasing the Supplemental Retirement contribution for former MCCFA members; both are non-base salary building.
- In year two, we spent \$114,547 on reducing days (175 to 171) for former UTCE members and \$0 reducing days for former MCCFA members; both are non-base salary building.

In year two, the grand total spent for former UTCE members was \$7,473,915. The grand total spent for former MCCFA members was \$4,703,571. On an individual basis in year two, we spent an average of \$3,676.30 per former UTCE member and an average of \$2,707.87 per former MCCFA member. None of these figures include monies to fund increases in the insurance package, which in year two required new money in the amount of \$2,366,962. When all of the pieces like fringes, etc. are

Continued on page 10

Where did the money go? Continued from page 9

included and all monies from year one that need to be replicated in year two, this contract was settled for a total of \$32,839,813 net new dollars.

These totals must be analyzed in the context of very significant language gains for former UTCE members, a couple of which were not costed (e.g., increased sabbaticals and enhanced payout for unused sick leave), as opposed to little or no language gains for former MCCFA (see October 2004 *Green Sheet*).

The 2003–2005 contract (under which we work at this time) was fundamentally different in large part because we did not have to transition to a new salary schedule but more importantly because it was settled for a total of just \$9,431,959 net new dollars. \$1,577,246 of that was eaten up by the insurance settlement before we even got to economics at the table.

In that context, the team had no real flexibility. We concentrated on step movement for those on the schedule, to this result:

- In year one, we spent \$511,000 on column movement for former UTCE members, many of which were generated by license renewal, and \$304,500 on column movement for former MCCFA members.
- In year one, no one received step movement, no one received a base increase other than column movement, and no one received increased Supplemental Retirement dollars.

Because of savings in the insurance package (greatly reduced dental coverage) and retirement turnover savings, the year one net result was minus \$310,272 in the contract cost compared to the base, or previous, year. You may remember that this was the year the MnSCU budget was slashed and there was a mid-year give-back in addition, due to the emergent state budget crisis. All of our colleges operated with fewer dollars in this year than in the previous year.

- In year two, we spent \$707,000 on column movement for former UTCE members and \$304,500 on column movement for former MCCFA members.
- In year two, we spent \$765,604 on small lump sum payments which went only to those on the steps. No one at the top received the lump sum.
- In year two, we spent \$6,024,530 on step movement/step buy out. These dollars, of course, went

only to those on the steps. No one at the top received any of these dollars. The buy-out of a step (removing it from the schedule) near the top of the schedule cost only \$1,400, but caused everyone on the steps to be one closer to the top step. In addition, we bought a standard step movement. The end result was that at the end of the contract, all are two steps closer to the top than they were at the beginning of the contract.

- In year two, we spent \$304,885 increasing the Supplemental Retirement contribution for former UTCE members and \$138,101 increasing the Supplemental Retirement contribution for former MCCFA members.

The insurance package in year two ate up \$1,905,612 in new dollars.

Many myths and misconceptions grew out of the two contract settlements – innuendo and accusations

“...innuendo and accusations have been easy to assert in the absence of the details in this article...”

have been easy to assert in the absence of the detail in this article and in the absence of reaction from those who have been accused. It is time for that to change.

I believe the bargaining teams have held to two foundational principles very well through the bargaining of these contracts. One is that money and language gains are linked, at least informally, and that link must be considered in treating all members fairly. The second principle is belief in a sort of progressivism. That is, when the money is really stressed, do what we can for those who have less.

This second principle has resulted in real disadvantage to those at the top of the schedule, including significant damage to projected retirement earnings. In light of that, this organization needs to undertake discussions about whether or not we want to continue to bargain through projected difficult times ahead with that as a guide.

College faculty credentialing

Continued from page 7

tion standard for faculty who teach the technical content in AAS programs would be a minimum of an associate's degree (e.g., AA, AS, or AAS), with the preferred standard being a baccalaureate degree where appropriate and available.

This means that the preferred faculty preparation standard would be an appropriately related baccalaureate degree in addition to appropriate technical preparation. This is the standard which the Joint Committee will expect to see in the recommended faculty minimum qualifications unless there is appropriate and compelling justification for a different type of facul-

ty preparation. In cases where the faculty preparation standard of a baccalaureate degree may not be appropriate for a specific career, technical, or professional program, the Joint Committee on Credential Fields would consider appropriate alternative educational and training preparation.

Question: *Would every career, technical, and professional credential field require both occupational experience and some type of formal training/education (which could include something other than an academic degree)?*

Answer: Yes. Faculty in career, technical, and professional programs would have formal training/education in their field in addition to related occupational experience. Not all career, technical, and professional credential fields would require an academic degree; however, all would require formal training/education (e.g., an apprenticeship program might be required for selected trades fields).

Occupational Experience Requirement for Career, Technical, and Professional Credential Fields

Question: *Who would determine the minimum number of years of occupational experience for each credential field?*

Answer: After receiving input from college faculty and administrators as well as from business and labor representatives who have experience with the industry and the related program(s), the Joint

Committee on Credential Fields would make recommendations on the minimum number of years of related occupational experience for each credential field.

Question: *Would the proposed educational requirement for career, technical, and professional credential fields result in substituting the academic credential/degree for occupational experience?*

Answer: No. The proposed educational requirement is in addition to, not in place of, the occupational experience requirement.

Professional Development Plans

Question: *What is the purpose of the professional development plan?*

Answer: The purpose of the plan is to identify strategies the faculty member will implement to maintain currency in his/her discipline or program area.

Question: *Who would develop the components of the faculty professional development plan and would they be clearly specified?*

Answer: The core components required in the plans would be recommended by the Joint Committee on Credential Fields and shared system wide with all college faculty and administrators for review and comment. Because the faculty professional development plans will be a term and condition of employment, other aspects of the plan will be bargained in the negotiations process.

MSCF

An affiliate of Education Minnesota

The GREEN SHEET

The Green Sheet is published five or six times a year by the Minnesota State College Faculty (MSCF). Chief editor is MSCF Liberal Arts Vice President JoAnn Roche, with MSCF officers, staff, and faculty contributing.

Letters to the Editor and requests for information should be addressed to the MSCF office, 55 Sherburne Ave., St. Paul, Minnesota 55103. Telephone toll free: 1-800-377-7783; or 651-767-1262 in the Minneapolis-St. Paul local calling area.



An affiliate of the National Education Association
and American Federation of Teachers

MSCF opening remarks to MnSCU bargaining team

Greg Mulcahy, chief spokesperson for the MSCF Negotiations Team, delivered these opening remarks on Monday, April 18, 2005, when MSCF presented its opening proposal to the MnSCU bargaining team.



Thank you for coming this afternoon. As a team, we intend to approach these negotiations in a spirit of congeniality, collaboration, and informality. We will be courteous and respectful in our conversations and seek solutions in the belief that the problems brought to this table are common problems for the parties.

We bring today a limited opener on language that seeks to clarify our unit's boundaries, end some bifurcation, and clarify faculty rights and responsibilities.

The economic opener will come later, but I want to address economics briefly in the context of this bargaining. The wage increases in the last settlement were wholly

inadequate for 60 percent of our membership and non-existent for the remaining 40 percent. This cannot continue.

Faculty perform the core mission of MnSCU. Faculty have become more productive while being denied adequate resources. Faculty have gone in and done their jobs. They will continue to do so. But the lack of even minimal salary improvements is having and will have an ever-increasing corrosive effect on faculty morale.

I'm not suggesting faculty won't do their jobs; I am suggesting this corrosion will change how faculty and others perceive their

jobs. There is great frustration with a system that seems always able to fund consultants and initiatives but is unable to sufficiently compensate or consult its own faculty.

Faculty are continually challenged to think differently about what their duties are and how those duties are performed. You may see proposals from us that ask MnSCU to think differently about how it is structured and how its resources are allocated.

Having said that, it is our intention to settle this contract fairly and expeditiously, even if we need to work on larger substantive issues away from the actual negotiations.

Thank you.

Negotiations Hotline

- 651-767-1276 (metro)
- 866-208-8210 (toll free)

Insurance bargaining

Continued from page 8

what we hope to gain in bargaining and what we won't give up. We then present this proposal to DOER and its representatives. Typically, DOER brings 12–25 individuals representing the various state agencies to the table. DOER presents us with its opener along with rates and benefit levels. The negotiation process begins at that point and concludes some time

later with each side winning and losing some things it either hoped to gain or hoped to keep.

One important point to remember as we negotiate your insurance benefits is that the State of Minnesota is self-insured. This means that we choose our benefit set. It also means that we negotiate our costs within a specific level of funds available from appropriate

and premiums collected from employees. Therefore, everything we want has a price tag attached to it, and this has to be balanced by trade offs – things we are willing to give up. This is a delicate balancing act and each of us negotiating our insurance benefits must keep in mind how to get the greatest benefit for the most members at the lowest cost.