

Faculty Senate Agenda  
9/7/2018  
9:00–10:00 a.m.  
SUB 113AB

Attendance: Scott Risser, Matt Egloff, Charie Faught, Chad Okrusch, George Williams, Stella Capoccia, Atish Mitra, Katherine Zodrow, Courtney Young, Kishor Shrestha, Laura Young, Diane Wolfgram, Doug Abbott, Dan Autenrieth, Tony Patrick, Peter Lucon, Ron White,

- I. Welcome and Minutes
  - a. Introduction of members and brief mention of meeting times
  - b. Motion to approve 5/3/2018 minutes and seconded. Minutes approved.

**Action Items**

II. Proposed amendment to the bylaws.

- a. Tech formal name

Bylaws need to be changed by full faculty. Proposal to change to Montana Technological University in all areas in the bylaws motion to approve and seconded. Motion passes. Will be sent to full faculty for official change.

- b. Faculty Senate Membership Requirements

See agenda. Would replace membership section of current bylaws. May be against union contract at Highlands College. Current has appointment by department. As written makes it hard to have new members come in, fresh ideas may be stifled or have huge turnover and would cause stagnation. As written would pick based on seniority and so on. Question about what problem to solve, would help senators voice opinions. Faculty survey does suggest that some do not feel that they can speak up. Also a question of departments being able to choose the faculty senate representative. Has been put forth, so need to take action. Should be going back to department with feedback and input. Will have worry if not tenured (comment that should be tenured). Some departments do not have tenured members. Question regarding survey and being able to speak up by tenure and not tenure (breakdown is that tenured may have more concern). May greatly limit choices. Motion to table in order to get feedback from departments and to determine if a contract issue may exist and seconded. Motion passes.

**Informational Items**

III. Committee updates:

- a. Teaching Communities

Be prepared for next meeting to give a report for next meeting.

- b. Research Mentors

Be prepared for next meeting to give a report for next meeting.

- c. Program Prioritization Committee

Overview of activities since May meeting, with reminder that meeting minutes available to everyone. Summer switched to non-academic units, which provided an overview of areas and opportunities to work in greater collaboration. Last week's meeting returned to academic units. Chancellor Blacketter described the budgetary need and the requirement to make recommendations by the end of the semester. Members requested further guidance, such as if the WIRE recommendations be the foundation for decisions. This week's meeting included the feedback to use WIRE recommendations as guidance, with the deans of the colleges taking the lead on making decisions. Faculty will need to work with departments, and departments with deans in order to provide feedback in the process.

- d. WIRE

All campus presentation today at 3 in the Copper Lounge. Spent summer discussing how a two year college fits into a special focus institution.

#### IV. The state of Tech committees –

- a. Has there been a(n over) proliferation of committees?
- b. Is there an interest in reviewing and recommending committee mergers, dissolutions, or expansions?
- c. Interest in discussion of diversity.

Overview: Overlap in committees, do we have too many, are some not active, are they doing what they need, are we discussing diversity (also for students) as a whole?

There is a diversity committee. Interest goes beyond committee, including need to support increased student diversity. As diversity increases, would like to see discussions on current issues, language, and changes. For student body, would like to see resources available. More support leads to more diversity (positive cycle). In areas of great diversity, may be more organic. Committee did meet five or six times last year. Was no chair at the time.

Is an opportunity to review and audit to see if overlap and determine if committees are meeting. Also consider meeting minutes requirement, including ways to report, and ways to communicate. Consider place to have all committee meeting minutes. Would be great if all minutes were posted as e-mails (deans notes as an example). Question regarding a subcommittee to review and make recommendations. Alternative recommendation is to review as a whole senate. Worthwhile endeavor, but does take resources. A third option is to ask someone else to do the work. Recommendation is to ask Colleen Fink resend for updated list of description and charge, and ask to contact chairs to ask to decide how to provide minutes.

Question regarding how each committee reports (deans, other committees, etc.). If so, reporting body can help to determine if overlap, etc. Process should begin by identifying who each committee reports to, then having the reporting body determine structure, etc. May find that some committees may not report to anyone, so would help to determine a reporting path. Some committees are recommending bodies to the Faculty Senate, but some are to the Academic Officer, etc. Recommend to send to person who requested review to see if he is interested in leading the charge. Should close loop and have report back to the senate.

Faculty advisory Committee for College Relations and Marketing Office has not met for approximately 15 years. Potential exists for this particular committee to do some positive work, if it would meet.

Question was asked regarding having meetings even if no items on agenda (chair charge and report). Recommendation rose to request chairs to give a report at full faculty meeting. Could also be in a clearing house on the website, would be a long meeting may not be a good use of time. Not all committees have a charge, some may have completed their tasks. Comment to report back at a future meeting. Courtney Young is willing to contact Matt Donnelly to determine process (and review of minutes).

#### V. Last minute scheduling changes (changes to teaching assignments) – Is this a campus-wide problem?

Example given that a week before classes, mass cancellation of classes and redistribution occurred. Not good for the students due the schedule change, including some courses required for graduation. Department does not open new section until at least 10 students. Poor planning, need to know well enough in advance. Comment made that we should have a deterrent for last minute changes. Also have an imbalance of teaching amongst faculty.

Comment made that a similar situation has happened in another department, which was brought to the dean, with the responsibility falls back to department heads. Question regarding what we can do as faculty to help with this situation. Two direct steps taken (in part with new dean): two year planning, combining spring and summer scheduling in October.

Low enrollment requires discussion and validation with the appropriate dean. 10 students often the number, but some have less do to other requirements. Comment with good leadership qualitative assessment needs to occur. Cognizant of students who need to graduate. Can alternate classes as part of planning. Belief that administration will be more active in course management. Belief that will be happening more in the future. Recommendation of reviewing the work of independent studies that are being developed and implemented. Lack of planning can be damaging to our reputation as an institution. Motion to table the discussion to continue next meeting and seconded. Motion passes.

VI. Faculty Senate Relation to PPC and WIRE recommendations  
Moved to next meeting

VII. Faculty membership on the Deans'/Provost's Council  
Moved to next meeting

VIII. Other Items