Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
September 21, 2017, 3:00 P.M. GBB 123

Call to Order
Chair Bowman called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.
Camie called roll after President Stearns and President Elect-Bodnar’s communication.

**Members Present:** A. Alger, B. Allred, J. Angle, J. Banville, M. Boller, M. Bowman, J. Bunch, S. Caro, S. Certel, Y. Cho, S. Clouse, D. Coffin, N. Dawson, A. Delaney, D. Erickson, L. Fern, E. Gagliardi, K. Griggs, B. Halfpap, M. Hamon,B. Harrison, J. Hunt, G. Larson, D. Lurie, T. Manuel, M. Maneta, H. Martens, M. Monsos, M. Musick, H. Naughton, J. Pavilack, S. Phillips G. Quintero, A. Ratto-Parks, Y. Reimer, A. Sondag, A. Szalda-Petree, E. Uchimoto, N. Vonessen, A. Ware
 **Members Excused:** A. Ametsbichler , D. Beck J. Carter, Z. Cooper, A. Elliott, S. Gordon, N. Greymorning, U. Kamp, A. Nack, L. Nichols, D. Patterson, S. Ross, S. Schwarze, S. Strohl

**Members Absent:** A. Belcourt S. Bitar, A. Chatterjee, T. Crawford, G. Collins, M. Horejsi, P. Dietrich, J. Laskin, J. Millspaugh, J. Sears J. Thomsen

**Ex-Officio Present:** President Stearns,Associate Provost Lindsay

**Guest:** Incoming President Seth Bodnar and his wife, Dr. Chelsea Bodnar

**Minutes:** The minutes from September 21st were approved.

Chair Bowman announced a change in the schedule to accommodate incoming President Bodnar’s schedule.

## Communications

### President Sheila Stearns

President Stearns shared that there were many things happening for homecoming, including the Foundation Board meeting, and so it is a good opportunity to introduce incoming President Bodnar. She clarified at a press availability event that she is President for what remains of fall semester, and she will do her best with the important ongoing tasks such as prioritization. This effort had a condensed timeline compared to the recommended 8-9 months; initial work began this summer. President Stearns thanked those engaged with the effort.

President Stearns notes that with difficulty we did manage to balance the budget for 2017 and 2018. We finished 2017 with approximately a million to the positive. So we were able to take that forward to 2018 where there were deficits. Fiscal year 2018 has some base problems and we need guidance from prioritization to make decisions, particularly in personnel where UM is over the benchmarks. Any reallocation decisions will be based on APASP recommendations, and all employee groups could be affected.

President Stearns stated that we are still waiting to hear whether there will be additional cuts to the state allocations resulting from the expense of fighting fires this summer. There is a chance of a special legislative session if there is agreement between the Governor and the Legislature to work to cover the cost of fighting forest fires.

#### Questions

Senator Coffin: Our enrollment in graduate and professional programs is about the same or more than MSU’s. Many of those programs have a faculty: staff ratio required by accreditation. The ratio is used in the media as a justification for reducing personnel. Does this take into account these requirements?

Stearns: She shared that she is not a proponent of using the ratio as a goal. The situation is much more nuanced than that. The recommendations from APASP guided by data and reports will be more sophisticated than that. We do know that if personnel costs are 90% of the budget, a university is not properly funding many operations such as the library, technology, and etc. We know that we are heavily staffed for our current student population. We have had layoffs, but not enough to match the decline in revenue.

The administration greatly appreciates everyone’s involvement in the recruiting process for UM’s next President. All comments were considered, and the Board of Regents made the decision based on your input.

President Stearns introduced Dr. Chelsea Bodnar, a Missoula native and Seth Bodnar, UM’s President-elect.

Chelsea shared that is honored to be back in Missoula and grateful for the opportunity to be part of the university and the community.

Seth Bodnar reported that he is excited and deeply honored to be chosen as UM’s next president. He takes the confidence and trust shown to him by the Selection Committee, Board of Regents, and University community seriously. He identified that UM matters for the city, state, and country. He views his role as helping to continue its growth and success as one of the most important thing he will do in his life. He is incredibly honored to become UM’s President. There are challenges but he is impressed with the campus community’s effort to move forward.

Seth Bodnar shared that we could not have found someone who is going to work harder for the institution and the faculty. He views the faculty as the core assets of the institution, and understands investment in the faculty produce the quality generated by the university. His job will be to ensure faculty have the resources to be successful. He wants to be a true partner. He thanked President Stearns for her leadership and commitment to set the university up for future growth. He wants to continue to put the data and matrices on the table, and work through them collaboratively. As an outsider, he sees incredible opportunity here.

Chair Bowman welcomed President-elect Bodnar and let him know that he is no longer an outsider.

## Public Comment

* Ross Best, a student at UM, spoke about the Montana Public Participation Law. Since 2002, the Law has required meetings to have a public comment item on the agenda. He believes that this is the first time the Senate has done this. He stated that UM is in crises because of decades of secrecy and illegal decision-making. Even now, there seems to be a lingering conviction that higher education is somehow exempt from constitutional guarantee of public participation, open meetings, and open documents.

Ross believes that rather than being shielded from openness and accountability, higher education more than any other part of our government should be willing and able to teach by example. He stated that the University has no higher mission than to help Montanans learn to be Montanans.

Ross asked that Faculty Senate and the administration guarantee adequate public notice of meetings that include advanced availability of comprehensible agendas. Further, he asked that every open meeting allow for general public comment on matters not otherwise on the agenda, and that minutes must be taken and made easily available. Finally, Ross asked that documents to be discussed at open meetings be easily available to everyone, and that citizens be allowed to record meetings without resistance from committee members.

Ross believes that citizens who wish to participate in our government should not be forced to hunt to find things online when they are not even sure they will be able to find them, and he called on administration to do a better job; he also asked Faculty Senate to support his efforts.

### Associate Provost Nathan Lindsay

The Collective Bargaining Agreement requires the delivery of the extra compensation report to the Faculty Senate in accordance to procedure. The report was posted to the agenda for senators to review. In 2014 the total was similar. Extra compensation is any compensation that is outside the normal contract, such as teaching in summer or winter session.

Interim Provost Edmonds is traveling and sends her regrets. She wanted Associate Provost Nathan to convey the message that she hears the concerns about the library collection. She will work with the library to find other funds within the library to address the budget reduction so there will be minimal impact on the collection. She received a lot of feedback related to the proposed e-journal cancelation list.

Questions
Senator Caro: The library faculty met with the dean yesterday, but she did not mention this.

Ross Best, member from the public: Does this guarantee there will not be major cuts elsewhere to the Library?

Lindsay: Interim Provost Edmond is working out the details.

### UFA President Paul Haber

Paul shared that there has been concern about the communication on sabbaticals from the Provost’s Office to Deans and Chairs. The UFA and the Faculty Senate was not consulted. It would be expected that any major changes to sabbaticals would involve conversations with shared governance. We are under budget constraints but it would help if we had a comprehensive view of the administration’s approach to reductions; APASP is not currently informing the budget decisions. Paul further stated that he presumes that the reason the Provost proposed to slash sabbaticals from over 30 to 6 is driven by fiscal constraints. Collectively, we could reason that the university cannot afford semester sabbaticals because they are too expensive. However, full -year sabbaticals pay faculty .75 of their salary so the .25 can be used for backfill. We should be looking for ways to retain lecturers and non-tenure track faculty. If we are moving toward eliminating lecturers and non-tenured faculty without reducing course offerings then there will be increase to teaching loads. This would create many problems, including CBA workload violation.

He proposes that we collaborate to maintain sabbaticals. His hope is that we will be able to work something out in a better way. He noted that this should have been a deliberative process.

Questions.
Senator Coffin: This relates to section 11.100 in the CBA- “Because of its duty to provide excellence in its education the administration recognizes the need for and is committed to supporting as many sabbatical assignments as possible.“ Six sabbaticals doesn’t meet this standard. This isn’t about money. This is about values. It is an affront to the faculty. This is in effect is telling us we don’t matter. We no longer have money for travel or supplies. This is the last thing faculty have in terms of development. He isn’t sure whether it would stand up to a grievance, but he is glad the Union is on it. We need to defend sabbaticals in whichever way possible. The Senate needs to respond as well.

Chair Bowman noted that ECOS is discussing this next week. Interim Provost will be invited to the meeting.

Senator Ratto-Parks: Do we have a way to be in touch with President-elect Bodnar? There seems to be gaps in communication.

UFA President Haber: Yes, we are in touch with President-elect Bodnar.

Senator Harrison: At the last meeting, President Stearns indicated lecturers would retain their normal contracts for spring semester. Has there been any further conversation regarding visiting faculty or expectations after this spring? Long- term colleagues are being treated cavalierly.

Senator Ware: Currently Department Chairs are in conversation with their Deans and Deans are in a conversation with the Provost’s Office. There are still some negotiations taking place. The last he heard the Provost was hoping to make a decision in the next week or so.

Senator Fern: Has there been any discussion regarding whether lecturers will receive another notice about future contracts?

Haber: He is worried.

Senator Ratto-Parks: And if we do, how much weight will it hold? How much of what occurs during President Stearns leadership can be changed during the transition? Programs have to plan for course schedules.

Haber: We need to know how we will address different levels of cuts. If we have a structural deficit then we must reduce costs in a responsible way. We need to look at various budget scenarios, a 4-5 million, or double that. The budget is a moving target. He assumes the administration is doing this, but we don’t know what the scenarios look like. All sectors will be impacted. If not, the rationale should be scrutinized. The issue is complicated. The contract protects seniority. Therefore, the administration cannot expect any savings from tenure-track faculty for FY 18-19. Tenure and other items in the CBA may be challenged at some point, but not in this environment. He doesn’t know how the administration could come up with 10-12 million if that is required.

Senator Caro: When will faculty merits or promotions be processed on their paychecks?

Haber: He believes the processing usually is complete sometime in November and is retroactive. If a faculty member is laid off before the contract is ratified, they should still receive the retroactive pay.

## MCFA President Tom Gallagher

The Missoula College has a separate Faculty Association. His role is similar to Paul’s. The Missoula College Faculty Association (MCFA) represents approximately 70 faculty. The College has approximately 1500 students and has two campuses, the new River Campus, and West Campus, past Big Sky High School on South Ave. The mission at the two-year college is transfer education, career-technical education, workforce development, developmental education, and community outreach. Dual enrollment is one example of community outreach. The mission is different that the main campus, and this could be the reason for two faculty associations.

The union is focused on a number of issues. Faculty engagement is important. Missoula College is on its 3rd Dean in five years and will have a third President and third Provost in the near future. The ground rules keep changing, AND so the union has learned to ask for them in writing so there is less misunderstanding. Missoula College faculty are required to do service and creative scholarship, but their primary responsibility is teaching. Tenured faculty teach 15 credits a semester/30 per year. Adjunct faculty in 2014 could teach up to 40 credits a year. Twenty credits a semester was full-time. This practice helped balance the budget. The MCFA worked hard since then for equity for adjunct faculty on the main campus. Prior to Dean O’Brien, the workload for Program Directors and discipline leads was increased. In addition to their teaching load, they are expected to supervise adjunct faculty, provide curriculum leadership, and function as community liaisons in addition to their teaching load. This situation required a grievance to resolve, AND Things are getting better.

The ratio of adjunct faculty to tenure-track ratio has varied between 53 - 57%. Their CBA references Academic policy 350, which sets the maximum ratio at 25% for a College or department. The Health Professions Department is pretty close to the recommended ratio due to its accreditation requirements. Adjunct instructors, especially those that are professionals in the field, add value to the student experience. Missoula College has a Department Chair, Program Directors, and Discipline Leads who are adjunct faculty members. The quality of programs suffer when people don’t know whether they will be retained from year to year. There are adjunct faculty who have been teaching at Missoula College for 10 to 15 years. This really is an unfair labor practice. This is not a good workplace and is not good for excellence in academics. Missoula College does not have a critical mass of tenure-track faculty to operate successfully.

The MCFA is engaging the administration to fix the problem. It is asking for an action plan to increase the percentage of tenure-track faculty. Missoula College is at the same percentage of adjunct faculty now as it did when enrollment was up significantly from 2008 to 2012.

####  Questions

Chair Bowman: How does the high percentage of non-tenurable faculty impact academic freedom?

Gallagher: There are too many of us wearing several hats and not enough of us to carry the load, so there is an issue of diversity and their ability to serve students.

He will work to communicate more with the Faculty Senate

## Professor Andrew Ware – APASP update

Reports were due a week ago Monday. There were only 10-12 [units of analysis](http://www.umt.edu/apasp/process/uoa.php) that did not submit reports. Most of these were in the process of elimination or did not have any general fund dollars. Additional reviewers were recruited, including several from the Faculty Senate, and so that there are now just under 50 reviewers total. The reports have been divided into groups of 100 for processing each week. The first round of reviews was due yesterday and the second is due Monday. Phase Two of the review includes units of analysis without general fund dollars.

As soon as the review is complete the units will be placed in [categories](http://www.umt.edu/apasp/process/categories.php). If the unit is new (less than four years of data) it goes into the “too new to evaluate category;” these will still be reviewed with comments. The top category is highest quality with probability for growth. The middle offers possibility for growth. The lowest category need modifications now. There will be the opportunity for public comment once the units of analysis have been placed in categories. APASP is not meeting this week to allow time for the review.

####  Questions

Senator Caro: Thank you for doing this important work. She heard that reviewers were giving higher ratings for units that were meeting their unit standards, but this was not included as a metric.

Ware: To his knowledge, reviewers have not been advised of this. One of the questions was: “Does your unit have a research mission and how do you evaluate that?” The report should have included results of this evaluation that showed evidence of productivity. Units are being evaluated on the data and the responses. The reviewers are not looking at information outside of the reports. Some units have information about research expectation in their unit standards, but the reports should have referenced what the units are actually doing.

Senator Banville: Please explain what a reviewer does.

Ware: For academic units, the [six criteria](http://www.umt.edu/apasp/docs/FinAPCM_1_9.18.docx) are given a score of 1-9. The reviewer starts with a score in the middle. Then reviews the report and the centralized data and looks for strengths (move up on scale) and weaknesses (move down on the scale). Each unit has three independent reviewers. The scores are [weighted](http://www.umt.edu/apasp/process/rubricsweights.php) so productivity and quality count more than efficiency, etc.

If the three reviewers’ scores are similar, the average score will be put on a consent agenda for APASP to consider. If there are discrepancies, the Taskforce as a whole will discuss the scoring. The reviewers also provide a narrative of the strengths and weaknesses.

The results will be given to everyone. Input from the Vice Presidents (Administrative units of analysis) and Deans (Academic Units of Analysis) is requested once the results are available; this input will impact the final APASP recommendations. Units can respond with a separate rebuttal directly to the President and Provost as well. The [framework document](http://www.umt.edu/apasp/process/framework.php) has the approximate timeline. Reviewers were assigned so there were no conflicts of interest. The scores and comments will be made public.

Professor Weix: How many new programs will be exempt?
Ware: The new programs are still being evaluated. They are just not being placed in a category.

The report authors were given opportunity to explain discrepancies in the centralized data. Interdisciplinary units, in particular, had difficulties with the data. The reviewers understand that some of the data is at the department level. It was up to the unit to provide evidence of their work.

The reviewers are scoring the units the best they can as a complete picture; the centralized data is not weighted more than the narrative.

Recommendations will be made in two phases in terms of units without state funding. The President and Provost will still need to follow the process outlined in the CBA for eliminating or restructuring programs. Changes to curriculum will require the normal review process as well.

The initial categorization of the units should be available November 8th.

## Chairs Report

* The Intercollegiate Athletic Report was posted to the agenda for Senators to review. Representatives from Athletics will be at the November meeting to answer questions.

## Committee Reports

## ASCRC Chair Doug Coffin

ASCRC responded to the request from the Senate to investigate the impact the proposed cuts to the library collection would have on courses. Professor Barry Brown met with ASCRC and Graduate Council. The GPSA conducted a survey and presented results to ASCRC. After discussion, ASCRC drafted a resolution based on ASUM’s resolution. It will be on the Senate agenda next month. The situation is still fluid giving the Provost will be working with the Dean to cut $600,000 from the budget. The resolution makes three points. First, the library should be recognized as essential to the mission of university. We have to have access to library materials, just like we have to have power for the buildings. Second, we need a specific process to address this essential infrastructure in budget planning. Third, we need to identify means to reduce the cost of journals by working with larger buying consortiums. We would like to collaborate with the University Library Committee to come up with some strategies.

ASCRC also passed an internal resolution on student success. ASCRC has a workgroup working out issues related to advanced options such as AP, IB, PLA and dual enrollment. Another workgroup will be looking at various paths to completion.

Senator Caro: The library does not have a money source that it has not considered. The library budget has four areas: a small gift account, collections, operations, and personnel. The library has cut operations and personnel, in addition to collections. She is not aware of a source that would minimize the cuts to the collection. The library will be reducing its late night hours due to personnel cuts. It will close at midnight, rather than 2:00 a.m. Currently, those hours are staffed by a student employee, which is a safety concern.

Coffin: At some point there will be follow-up from the University Library Committee on the budgeting process and efforts to reduce cost.

It was clarified that the Law Library had to cut $300,000 from its collection to fulfill its share of budget cuts.

##  New Business – Executive Session

* The Posthumous degree candidate was presented by Senator Monsos. The Senate unanimously approved.

## Good and Welfare

* Senator Ratto-Parks informed the Senate that the Fall Writing Symposium is on November 1st from 12:30- 2:30p.m. The symposium is theme developed from the University-Wide Program-level Assessment. This year the topic is how to create assignments that elicit the kind of writing expected of college students. A student panel will address questions about what they find confusing about assignments and what helps them to understand. The goal of the symposium is a practical opportunity to discuss with colleagues what works and does not’ in terms of writing assignments.

##  Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:43 p.m.