# ECOS Minutes, 3/1/18,

*Members Present:* M. Bowman, A. Delaney, S. Gordon T. Manuel, G. Quintero, M. Semanoff, N. Vonessen  
Guests: P. Haber, M. Stark (3:30), D. Coffin (4:30)   
Student Ross Best (Public)

## Communication

### Chairs Report

* Chair Bowman reported on her meeting with the Advocacy Workgroup (Professors Borrie, Beck, and Ratto-Parks . The Senate already does advocacy, so no changes to current practice are needed. ECOS attends BOR meetings and advocates for faculty through its various meetings with the administration and shared governance groups. The curriculum review process is also a form of advocacy. A formal lobbying group associate with the Senate could be a liability. The Senate and Union should complement one-another. Review process also a part of advocacy. One suggestion to become politically active is to get involved with statewide group working on the mill Levey. This is something that everyone can agree on.   
    
  Another issue that came up at the meeting is the possibility of have a two year term for the Chair. This is the practice and MSU. Mary-Ann and Matt will talk to the MSU Chair and Chair-elect at the BOR meeting about this. One of the goals of having the administration communicate at senate meetings is to have them stand for questions, not lecture. It was suggested that half their time be used to provide an update and the other to address questions.
* Chair Bowman provided an update from the Budget meeting. The University saved $1.8 million from the voluntary retirement offer to Faculty and $2 million from the Voluntary severance offer to staff and administrators. Six million was put into this fiscal year’s budget from one-time only money. When VP Crady arrived on campus. He had a budget of $1 million, but it was reduced. This will need to be restored. UM’s total budget is $148 million, $117 million of this is personnel. However, if tuition waivers are eliminated the total budget drops to 131 million, this changes the personnel percentage. The goal is for personnel to be 75% of the budget. Missoula College did not hit its developmental targets to receive performance funding. MSU received $4.9 million for performance funding and UM received $3.9 million.
* Three Provost Candidates will be visiting campus.
* The Honorary Degree candidate postponed last year will be on the Board of Regents agenda. There was a question regarding whether the Faculty Senate needed to approve the individual again.

## Paul Haber and Megan Stark (UFA)

Professor Schwartz sent some questions that needed to be addressed by the UPC (below). These were discussed. ECOS needs to know to what extend the Faculty Senate should be involved in reviewing the UPC recommendations. What should its response look like? It needs to consider the timeline

1. When will UPC see the Dean’s implementation plans that grew out of the APASP process?
2. What will be the scope and specificity of the UPC’s “recommendations for programmatic alignment, investment, and disinvestment?” Will there be a recommendation for every academic program, and what justification will be provided for those recommendations
3. How/when will UPC develop and get campus feedback on criteria that we will use for making recommendations?
4. How/when will UPC solicit and review program-level input on alignment with the mission, areas of excellence, and core curriculum recommendations?
5. If UPC is presenting recommendations for FS review between April 12-26, what process will FS use to respond to recommendations?
6. Can the President’s plan to be presented at May 2018 BOR include retrenchment, since according to the CBA any retrenchment plans must be presented to a Review Committee?

## ASCRC Chair Doug Coffin

* The spring curriculum deadline is Friday. The Provost is not putting forward the 7 moratorium forms submitted. What needs to be approved by the Curriculum committees is how the programs will teach out. Professor Coffin sent a follow-up email summarizing his discussion points (appended).

## Business Items

* The Draft appeal policy was approved with the suggested edits. It will be sent to the curriculum committees for consideration.
* Stacey agreed to be the primary reviewer for the Structural and Functional Neuroscience Center. Mary-Ann will be the secondary reviewer.
* The Faculty Senate Agenda below was approved.
* A special ECOS meeting was scheduled for next Tuesday at 3 to discuss how the Senate should review the recommendations from the UPC. Chair-elect Semanoff was going to draft a survey to send to Senators with options of how the Senate should conduct its review. A subsequent email discussion presented some options to be discussed by ECOS.

### Public Comment

### Communications

* President Seth Bodnar
* *Interim Provost Beverly Edmond (tentative)*
* ASUM President Braden Fitzgerald
* UPC Presentation (Matt & Tim)
* UFA President Paul Haber
* MCFA President Tom Gallagher
* Chair's Report
  + BOR meeting
  + Commencement update

### Committee Reports

* ASCRC Chair Doug Coffin (5 min)
  + Catalog Governing Graduation
  + Cultural Hardship Absence

### New Business

* Discuss mechanism for Faculty Senate review of UPC recommendations

### Executive Session

* Consideration of Posthumous Degree Candidate

## Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

## Email correspondence from Professor Coffin, 3/2/18

Thank you for your time and a vigorous discussion.

I would like to reiterate so that I can provide a summary for ASCRC.

We came to a consensus that all and any program and curriculum changes should be reviewed by Faculty Senate. That is to prevent extended and unforeseen consequences that changes my have on other programs and related curriculum, potentially harming students. ASCRC and Grad Council reviewers have this expertise. We must protect the integrity of our curriculum.

Some ECOS members argued for an ad hoc review committee, in lieu of ASCRC and Grad Council. That might be OK but we need to ensure the quality and protect the integrity of the reviews, by using experienced reviewers. That decision should be made by faculty senate.

The administration/UPC is looking for a two-week window for reviews. That might be workable. Faculty senate has to flexible and make a good effort to work with the administration (but must also protect the integrity of the reviews). However, the converse is also true, the administration cannot put forth an agenda that deprives Faculty Senate of their right and responsibility to conduct proper program and curriculum reviews.

Attempts to by pass the review process should be resisted and could be subject to grievance by the UFA.

All this will be brought to a discussion in the next faculty senate meeting. March 15? (Or 8th?)

Correct?

Thank you,

Doug

Douglas Coffin, Ph.D.