

Full Faculty Meeting Minutes

4/17/2019

4-5 p.m.

Library Auditorium

- I. Welcome by Chair and introduction of new senate officers. Thanks to outgoing Chair (Scott Risser) for outstanding service. Motion to accept agenda and Seconded. **Motion passed.**

Action Items

- II. Graduation List (Registrar)
Registrar confirmed that the list of graduating students have been sent out to faculty electronically. Errors and omissions should be sent to registrar. Motion to approve the list (provisionally, with potential changes) and seconded. **Motion Passed.**

- III. Change to Faculty Senate By-Laws

- a. *Resolution to amend the Faculty Senate Bylaws to include: "The rules contained in the current edition of **Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised** shall govern the Faculty Senate of Montana Technological University in all cases to which they are applicable and in which they are not inconsistent with these bylaws and any special rules of order the Faculty Senate of Montana Technological University may adopt."*

Comment from faculty: Why is this necessary? (response: following Robert's rule helps maintain order in proceedings, and helps in accountability. More gets done in the same time). Comment from faculty: Some places (such as some non-profits) choose not to follow Robert's rule. Question from faculty: Do we not already have this in the handbook (response: no). Motion to add this to bylaws and seconded. **Motion Passed.**

- b. *Senate will conduct a Faculty Satisfaction Survey every Spring semester.*

Comment from faculty: How are these surveys used (response: as a communication channel with administration). Comment from faculty: Would support such a survey as policy, but not putting in by-laws. Motion to add this to bylaws and seconded. **Motion Passed.**

Informational Items

- IV. Provost Announcements:

Thanked outgoing senate chair (Scott Risser) for his service. Had two points to make:

- a. Rumor Control

Provost read out parts of minutes from the 17th March senate meeting – which he had not attended, where points were discussed about budget (The minutes mention, among other things, a possible budget shortfall of 1.2-2 million dollars, along with a possibility of fee increases, and questions about

why the CFO was removed suddenly). Provost mentioned that a lot of rumor of the types mentioned above is circulating in campus (and hence in the community), which is unfortunate. No accurate number is available at this time about actual shortfall projection, as this depends directly on enrollment. He advised faculty to ask the existing students who have not registered yet to do so soon. He also mentioned questions asked by faculty to chancellor candidates about the “2 million shortfall”. He confirmed that any fee increase proposal is always done following proper procedure. CFOs of various campuses have been let go (coincidentally) during the same week. There is also rumor about all the vice chancellors receiving notice, which is also not true.

b. Budget Development

See attached notes (provided by provost)

V. Faculty Satisfaction Survey

Vice-Chair talked about the upcoming faculty satisfaction survey. A couple of new questions have been added to the survey, which will be sent out by Monday the 22nd of April. Assured that the survey is 100% anonymous and each person can submit only once, and the link is not transferable. Still, if someone is uncomfortable submitting it online, can sent to any of the three senate officers.

VI. Program Prioritization Committee

Chair: recommendations were finalized in November and the process is moving forward implementing the recommendations. Provost: See Dean’s committee meeting for relevant comments.

VII. Wire: no discussions

VIII. College Updates

Dean Gammon: CLSPS has to decide who we are in terms of STEM education as we move forward. Expects more collaboration between colleges and more efficient sharing of resources.

Dean Hartline: About 90 graduate students finishing this year (up from 70 last year), 3 of them PhDs. Two new PhD programs proposed. Several grant proposals submitted and 9 million dollars brought in - in form of grants. We are discussing how to streamline policy so as not to get into same situation as UM (UM audited by NSF for handling research salaries contrary to NSF norms).

Dean Gurchiek: Highlands is a much different school than 10 years back. Trying to provide non-credit courses to community, and also working with other campuses to provide courses for their majors.

Executive Session

IX. Executive Session: no minutes

Adjourns: 5:25pm

4/17/19 FACULTY MEETING OUTLINE

1. RUMOR CONTROL

- Faculty Senate minutes.

2. BUDGET DEVELOPMENT

- Historically, "tight budgets" at Tech have been the norm. We were fortunate to have the "good years" that came with \$120/bbl oil and one time only funds. For some of you this is all you know, for some of the more seasoned faculty, they will remember the days of tight budgets.
- Believe it or not, this is the most transparent the budget process has been in my 31 years at Montana Tech.

It is an iterative process. Budget is basically 50% from the state and 50% from tuition. It makes it a difficult process on the tuition side because we don't know what the actual tuition is until the middle of October.

Maggie Era: Maggie did a great job developing the campus budget. What I am about to say is not criticism of Maggie. I love Maggie. The following is a description of the process right, wrong, or indifferent.

We would have budget presentations and then the executive council would set the budget. Many in the room would agree that the budget presentations did not effect a change in budgets. Operating budgets have seen little/no change, travel budgets were not increased, etc.

Maggie would come to the Executive committee meeting and say "We are going to be \$1 MM short." Then she would come to the next meeting and say "We are going to be \$400K short" and eventually we would have a balanced budget.

Brant Era: I will not discuss the reasons for Brant no longer being an employee at Montana Tech. It is a personnel matter, not open for discussion.

Simply put, Brant neither asked for nor received a lot of input for this year's budget. This year's budget was loaded into the system two days before it was due. This was the least transparent the process had ever been.

In November, I took the initiative to create a committee to work on next year's budget. The committee meets every Monday. The first thing we did was to look at this year's budget and we identified \$571,373 that we could reallocate to the campus. This money came from late retirements before the semester started (Hobbs), retirements during the semester, late start dates (Dean Gammon did not start on July 1, etc). This money was reallocated to the campus (part-time budgets in all three colleges, student clubs, start-up funds for new faculty, restore URP funding that had been cut, and additional monies to recruiting, among others).

We developed a timeline and processes in line OCHE and other MUS campuses. This is the earliest we have ever had a draft budget.

We then started looking at data (lots of data).

We looked at how our tuition and fees compared with other campuses (we are most expensive, second is Bozeman, then Missoula). Western is the lowest, \$1,500 below us).

We looked at auxiliaries.

We then looked at FY 18 actual expenditures with FY 19 budgeted numbers.

We spent a lot of time looking at the Information Technology budget.

We considered residence life/dining projections.

The enrollment projection subcommittee met numerous to discuss where we expect enrollments to be in FY 20. We are using conservative estimates in the budgeting process. As each registration event occurs, we get a better handle on projected enrollment. We have one more event this week or next.

We then looked at accounts that could possibly be used in the budgeting process (kick the can \$): Conference & Workshops, Sales and Service, General Designated, and IDC's.

Next we looked at Fees and compared our fees with other campuses in Montana. Every two years each campus is allowed to propose student fee increases. Student fees are either mandatory (Athletic fee, building fee, IT fee, Health Service fee, etc.) or non-mandatory (program fees, course fees, lab fees, etc.). The maximum that we can increase our mandatory fees is 3% in aggregate, based on a mandate from OCHE. After consulting with ASMT, we proposed increasing three mandatory fees: Health fee, North Campus Activity fee, and South campus activity fee in February. The net effect to students of the increase in mandatory fees was 1.16%.

We then submitted increased non-mandatory fees on April 1. Students affected by the fee change were consulted in addition to ASMT. For example, OSH-IH and South Campus students approved the increase.

Academic subcommittee met on April 1.

Non-academic subcommittee met on April 8.

Two subcommittees met on April 15. As it currently sits, we have a balanced draft budget. Before the end of FY 19 contracts, we will have a campus forum.

Thank you for the time today. More work to be done, more iterations to occur. Your deans are on the committee and they meet regularly with their department heads.