

Meeting Minutes

Name of body: Faculty Senate

Date: February 8, 2024

Time: 3 pm

Location: Gilkey – Room 105

Call to Order (3:00 – 3:05): Meeting called to order at 3:02

- Roll call : **Members present:** J. Barile, A. Belcourt, J. Bell, O. Berryman, M. Boller, K. Bosak, J. Carter, M. Cassens, A. Chatterjee, C. Cleveland, K. Cotton, B. Draper, T. Duce, A. Duwell, J. Eglin, B. Emidy, R. Fanning, L. Fern, S. Fielding, L. Fishman, T. Floyd, J. Freer, J. Goodburn, M. Harrington, M. Hendrix, K. Jakob, D. Kellenberg, P. Kirgis, K. Loree, A. Luis, D. Macaluso, C. Martin-Wagar, M. McGrath, L. Meloy, J. Olomi, Charles Palmer, Chris Palmer, M. Roscoe, M. Schertz, M. Shogren, J. Tuttle, N. Vonessen, C. Walker, A. Ware, C. Yoshimura. **Members absent:** K. Geiger, S. Lollar
- Approval of minutes from [12/7/2023](#) meeting: Approved

Public Comment (3:05 – 3:15pm): No public comment

Reports (3:15 – 3:30pm)

- Chair's report
 - Welcome - Chair Fern welcomes back all Senators for the semester, and particularly thanks the new Senators this semester who are newly taking on positions.
 - If any new or returning Senators need a new nametag for any reason, please email Chair Fern and she will provide them.
 - Program Manager – we have posted a position for a new Program Manager of Faculty Senate, with a goal of getting someone onboarded by the end of the semester. Chair Fern extended her thanks to the Registrar's office and the Provost's office for helping Faculty Senate while they have been without a Program Manager.
 - Big Sky Culinary Institute – The Blackfoot Café at Missoula College is featuring a second-year student in the culinary program in the café each week this semester.
 - Spring Curriculum Deadline - please contact Troy Morgan and Megan Burns with questions instead of Cindy Marbut.
 - Accreditation -This is our seventh year in our cycle, many people have been working to assemble materials.
 - There will be a faculty form on April 24th from 3-4 where it is essential that a significant portion of faculty attend. The date and time will be announced and participation in this forum is encouraged.
 - Faculty Service Award - Chair Fern encourages nominations.

- Canvas rollout updates – there will be trainings and resources being made available this semester, and using Canvas this summer will be an option for faculty. The entire campus will move over to Canvas in the Fall 24 semester.
 - A third party will help move all online content over from blended, online and some in-person classes that use online assessment.
- Flagship Fund – applications are due March 1. Chair Fern encourages individuals to apply with ideas related to AI.
- Listening Session – there will be a joint session on 2/9 between the Faculty Senate and the UFA to have discussions amongst faculty. We will bring forward concerns and ideas from that meeting to the Provost's office.
 - We have set our goals for a generative conversation.
- OSPI – there will be a University Leadership Council meeting on 2/20 with a focus on higher education and the state of the sector. This learning session will be facilitated, and all are encouraged to attend.
- Updates ([Spring Curriculum Deadline](#), Accreditation Update, [Faculty Service Award nominations](#), [Canvas rollout updates](#), [Flagship Fund reminder](#), ECOS led listening session for AA playbook, [higher-ed state of the sector learning session](#).)
- ECOS Report (Seconded Motion)
 - [Policy 201 edits](#): the motion passes
- ASCRC Chair Mike Monsos
 - [Curriculum Consent Agenda](#) (Seconded Motion): the motion passes

New Business

- Guests (3:30 – 4:55pm)
 - Director of Co-Lab for Civic Imagination Michael Rohd
 - [Democracy Summit](#) – This has emerged as part of a PFA, and Rohd has been tasked with communicating across campus to identify how democracy education is occurring. The Democracy Summit (3/27) will be an additional way to gather information on what is already happening and what could happen in the future.
 - Rohd invited all faculty to let him know if they want to participate/add anything to the Summit. Several Senators offered suggestions for inclusion, and direct communication with Rohd is encouraged to move forward.
 - Executive Director of OSS Brian French and Director of Student Success Technology Solutions Laurie Toomey [EAB early alerts](#)
 - Brief overview of Navigate early alert reporting. <https://www.umt.edu/navigate/early-alert/navigate-alerts-referrals.pdf>. Alerts as well as referrals are available, including adding positive feedback for students and student self-alerts.

- There are correlations between early alert reporting/follow-up and improved student outcomes. Some of these correlations include retention and graduation rates.
- Changes for spring semester based on faculty feedback and new Navigate functionality include starting Census (instead of week 2 early alerts), limiting early-alert requests to lower-level courses, and fewer campaigns that are open for longer amounts of time than previously.
- Faculty are encouraged to start by reporting with even a few students, or clicking "submit" even if you don't have any students who are struggling, so that it is clear no one is struggling in the class. The easiest way to log in is through the link right under French's signature in emails faculty are sent.
 - Ad hoc reporting is permitted outside of campaigns and is open throughout the semester.
- Provost Lawrence and Vice Provost DeBoer
 - Chair Fern articulated that the Faculty Senate role in shared governance is to review, debate, discuss, and make recommendations on matters pertaining to academic affairs of the University. The Provost's office has solicited our response and feedback to the Academic Affairs [Playbook](#) and [Portfolio](#) as they consider decisions for the future of academic programming at UM.
 - The playbook is still in draft because input is still being solicited for information that is not yet evident to the Provost's office. The Qualtrics survey faculty have been emailed and the UFA/Faculty Senate listening sessions are pathways to giving feedback.
 - Medium and long term stability of the institution are main foci of the planning being done now. This planning is being done in response to demographic predictions regarding declines in enrollment nationwide; maintaining enrollment and increasing retention rates and graduation rates in the face of current views on higher education are essential.
 - Consultation with Deans, ECOS, Staff Senate, ASUM, H&S department chairs has taken place, drafts have been refined, FAQ section has been created. A [RASCI matrix](#) has been created based on Faculty Senate suggestion, and Academic Portfolio Review process has been edited.
 - Changes to the FAFSA and when universities get information on funding has changed; new timelines reflect the need to wait on finalizing budgeting until new deadlines have passed.
 - A balance is sought between funding programs that bring students to campus and making sure there are resources available for

programs students may learn about only after they are more familiar with campus.

- Faculty Senator Responses:
 - SCH is not included in the Playbook; does this mean service departments or courses that don't enroll as many majors are not valuable?
 - DeBoer – SCH will remain an important metric, but not one that is included in this process to consider which programs are drawing students to campus and are being completed by students. Next year the focus will include curricular complexity as another metric to look at programs.
 - Ph.D. programs are not included under evaluation so that we can maintain our R1 status. We have not discussed collectively why we want to be R1, yet the playbook emphasizes default resources to Ph.D. programs to uphold this status. How does this reflect a good ROI?
 - DeBoer - Year three of the Portfolio review has emerged as a logical time for reviewing graduate programs. It would be useful to have a separate discussion about R1, currently it is set as a priority of the state and the President.
 - Newer programs could benefit from review, but they are not included in the Program review timeline or Playbook.
 - DeBoer – OCHE process is to give new programs 5 years, the process here mirrors that. These programs *will* be included in the data, decisions will just not be made based upon this data yet.
 - How does qualitative data (social justice, inclusivity) get tied to funding? Is any of the funding coming back to invest in scholarship? How will this be weighted in the rubric?
 - DeBoer – the Portfolio review process is not intended for funding or budgetary purposes; it is instead meant to consider what we are offering and at what scale. The qualitative process will be helpful in illuminating what is missed through the quantitative metrics.
 - How will the data collection process happen (instruction, timing) so that data is something that faculty/chairs know how to collect and provide within the timeline.
 - DeBoer – the data should all be coming from the Provost's office, new information will not be solicited from programs as in previous processes.

- Considering restructuring, Would it be more helpful to gather data prior to new groupings being created, rather than basing decisions on the size of the school.
 - DeBoer – fewer prescriptions regarding structure are present in this draft, in order to facilitate
- Increasing enrollment and retention are laudable goals, but it is unclear how these are tied to restructuring. Instead, restructuring seems to involve a lot of faculty work with few payoffs to faculty or students. What problem are we trying to solve by demanding restructuring?
 - Lawrence – Interdisciplinarity is a main reason to restructure. Part of restructuring could be fiscal, but much of it is adaptation to a changing world. This review is meant to help us inventory and understand what we are doing and consider it in light of our mid-range and future goals.
- If departments aren't stable and we haven't filled positions in departments that are lacking, why are we reviewing now?
 - Lawrence – multiple units have experienced non-strategic losses and we haven't had a consistent or strategic response to where to put resources in response to these losses. Maintaining faculty is an important goal, but we cannot maintain the level of programming that we have now.
- How can programs represent themselves accurately when transparency about resources means they may be taken away or the ways programs have managed with what they have is not their ideal functioning?
 - DeBoer – the review does not only include quantitative data, the idea of having qualitative sessions is to better understand the context programs are in. Transparency feeling dangerous is not the intention of this process. One important goal is getting programs (and our organization) to scale, which could be painful, but could also be important for future success.
- Banner is a barrier to some things like interdisciplinary programs. We should not let the tool drive the process – do we need to restructure or could we just account for these things (like dual degrees) in Banner or another tool.
 - DeBoer – there is more possibility for accounting than has been shown in the past, and some new data on things like double-majors have been accounted for now. Lawrence – some of the accounting (like

indexes for how faculty spend time) are standing in our way and we will need a phased approach for how we might improve our tools and abilities to account for what we are doing.

- Where are we now with the data?
 - DeBoer – the last pieces of feedback will inform how the process moves forward, and then the data will be distributed next week.
- Are the survey results going to be public?
 - DeBoer – yes, though there is the option for individuals not to make their comments public, (requested from some people giving feedback) so those will not be released.
- Can we weight departments who have had a lot of attrition in the qualitative data?
 - DeBoer – this can be considered as part of context.
- Restructuring is being considered to create “super departments” – but there are many ways of doing some of the things that take a big lift (like getting grants or encouraging interdisciplinarity) – this can happen in other ways.
 - Lawrence – what benefits do you derive from being in a department?
 - Response: People understand what you do – important for unit standards, productivity, coherence. Departmental unity is forged over a long period of time and is not the same thing as forcing together people who have vaguely similar concerns.
 - Counterpoint: Departmental structures could be an impediment to sustainability of interdisciplinary programs. Departments could decide not to re-hire or support if someone in the program leaves.
- Does it make sense to resolve issues regarding cross-listing, which would enhance interdisciplinarity?
 - OCHE does not support this practice, so it is difficult to make moves at our organizational level on this.

Good of the Order (4:55pm)

Senator Carter - Election judges are being sought for Missoula County. It takes a 3 hour training, and people are needed in polling and accounting. Representatives from

different parties are needed so that tasks are completed by people from multiple parties. Please consider engaging the training this Spring.

Adjournment: Meeting adjourned at 4:54 p.m.
