5/3/18Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
May 3, 2018, 3:00 P.M. GBB 123

Call to Order
Chair Bowman called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.
Registrar Hickman called roll.

**Members Present:** A. Ametsbichler, J. Angle, J. Banville, E. Baucom, D. Beck, A. Belcourt M. Bowman, J. Bunch, S. Certel, A. Chatterjee, S. Clouse, D. Coffin, G. Collins, Z. Cooper T. Crawford, A. Delaney, A. Elliott, D. Erickson, L. Fern, E. Gagliardi, N. Greymorning, K. Griggs, B. Halfpap, B. Harrison, J. Hunt, A. Kline, G. Larson, D. Lurie, T. Manuel, D. Macdonald, H. Martens, M. Mayer, J. Millspaugh, M. Musick, M. Pershouse, S. Phillips, G. Quintero, S. Ross, A. Ratto-Parks, Y. Reimer, J. Sears, M. Semanoff, A. Sondag, S. Strohl, E. Uchimoto, N. Vonessen, A. Ware
 **Members Excused:**, J. Carter, N. Dawson, S. Gordon, M. Monsos, A. Nack, H. Naughton, L. Nichols, D. Patterson, G. Peters, S. Schwarze, J. Thomsen

**Members Absent:** B. Allred, M. Boller, Y. Cho, M. Hamon, M. Horejsi, M. Maneta, J. Wilkinson

**Ex-Officio Present:** President Bodnar,Interim Provost Kurgis

**Guests:** M. Mangold (staff Senate), several additional faculty

**Minutes:** The minutes from April 12 and April 17th were approved

Public Comment

* Maria Mangold, Staff Senate Chair read the following statement.
Thank you for the opportunity to address the Faculty Senate during this crucial meeting. To be succinct, I will read my prepared notes.

The *sky is falling* narrative that we’ve been living with and speaking of the last few years has tested our limits as individuals and as a community. Staying optimistic is challenging. Staff and I have listened and patiently observed your discussions regarding the *UM Strategy for Distinction*. Thank you for being inclusive in this process.

Although I’m not a faculty member, I am capable of empathy. Four of my close family members are academics and I know intimately of their struggles. I can understand the difficulties of being so specialized within a discipline or field of study that scoring a job is akin to winning the lottery and that most people outside of academia don’t know the demands and stress of the “publish or perish” existence.

You were offered a job and you accepted the position HERE at UM. I think we all agree that this is a special place and that we would like to keep it afloat.

To that end, please be reminded of a few benefits you enjoy as UM faculty members, benefits not extended to your classified staff colleagues:

1. Clearly defined merit-based raise expectations and built-in career ladders
2. For those of you who are tenure-track, a clear path to tenure
3. A faculty development professional who focuses on helping you attain career advancement
4. Salary pay (versus hourly)
5. Little need for a second job on the side to pay the most basic household expenses, or, in many cases where staff members are the sole income-earners in their households, reliance on social services to make ends meet
6. Schedule flexibility offering work-life balance and childcare cost-savings
7. Guaranteed paid maternity leave
8. A Collective Bargaining Agreement that specifies Faculty Senate’s critical role in shared governance and a localized faculty union which works closely with its members
9. A web of support staff who assist you in pursuing teaching excellence, research and grant opportunities, and who wear multiple hats in the pursuit of student success.

Staff have suffered losses among our ranks. 27 were laid off in summer 2016; 84 staff members left campus with VSO as of January 1, 2018, for a total of 111. I don’t have the data on how many positions we’ve lost in attrition and unfilled vacancies.

Losing colleagues and programs is no walk in the park – this is tough. And we, your staff colleagues, we empathize.

But it’s time to act before we dig a deeper hole. The *doomsday* narrative is becoming part of our everyday speech and, frankly, it’s demoralizing.

As you fight to save your faculty colleagues, please be aware that your delay in making decisions will likely result in more staff cuts. I was speechless yesterday when I saw recommendation #1 in your response to the *UM Strategy for Distinction*. How can we move forward “immediately” with staff restructuring when faculty and deans are still clarifying these transitions? How will we deliver staff training? What happens with redundancies? Is there even a plan for soliciting staff feedback and input? Staff feel caught between a rock and a hard place – not empowered to speak up or to enter the conversation; faculty considerations are always the loudest and most valued.

Staff have ideas for implementing shared services, but we’ve been calmly deferring to faculty with the expectation that they are making their own difficult decisions. Don’t fool yourselves that staff are safe from MORE layoffs as you take your time to argue every data point and wait for the new provost to move to Missoula.

In the name of shared governance, please consult with staff before including us at the top of your recommendations to the administration. We have patiently and respectfully waited through years of committees, data crunching, and pleas for justification while staff positions are transformed or eliminated with little explanation or recognition. We’re tired. Most of us are doing the work of 2 or 3 staff… we’ve reached our limit.

Please design a plan of action immediately before we lose more staff and more students. How will we meet budget projections if we continue down a path of inaction and *bait and switch* tactics? Your CBA offers a generous timeline for retrenchment. Do you realize that most staff are offered a layoff notice of just 30 days?

Please help us to restore a community of mutual respect and responsibility.

I’ll leave you with a timely quote from Brene Brown: “If leaders really want people to show up, speak up, take chances, and innovate, we have to create cultures where people feel safe – where their belonging is not threatened by speaking out and they are supported when they make the decision to brave the wilderness, stand alone, and speak truth to bullshit.”

Thank you for listening to our truth.

* Student Abigale Becher, sophomore and Marketing Major
Since she has been at UM, she has heard about looming cuts, but they have not been made. This is a stressful learning environment. ASUM discussed the timeline last night and understands that there will not be final draft until next fall with a 1-3 year implementation plan. She interprets this as another class of students able to enroll in a major that will eventually be cut. She understands that students will have the opportunity to graduate, but she has heard of way to many students who are told that their major may not exist after they leave. This is not good for the community or retention.

## Communication

* President Bodnar
He acknowledged the challenge that the university faces. He understands that the draft recommendations caused anxiety for some faculty and potential excitement for others. He knows that the first draft included mistakes. This was expected. There is always value in discussion and collaboration. The preliminary recommendations were designed to start the discussion. He wants input and new ideas. He hopes for partnership to move the university forward. The recommendations are intended to position the university for a sustainable future and to enhance our distinction. There will be reductions in some areas. But there are also important discussions to reimagine our general education. How we think about UM’s core education. How we prepare students for an uncertain future regardless of their major. He urges the Senate to focus on areas where we can enhance the education we provide for our students. We have a great university that must make some adjustments to move forward together. We have an opportunity to enhance the distinction of UM.

He is grateful for the feedback. Over the course of the summer the administration will be incorporating the feedback and revising the recommendations. Moving forward the various shared leadership groups will have an important role. He met with Mary-Ann and Matt this morning to discuss the Senate’s preliminary response. He would like more substantive feedback on the specific preliminary recommendations to improve the next draft. We must start from an assumption of positive intentions and work collaboratively. He understands that staff and faculty chose to work at UM, not for the money, but because they care about the students and the university’s core mission. We may have different perspectives of how to move forward, but we have the same objective. He values the input from the campus community. He is thankful for the Faculty Senate’s continued engagement.

Questions:

The estimated savings includes some assumptions since the plan is not looking at individuals. The average salary varies by department. Large numbers of FTE changes are not expected. If the target savings is not met through attrition, curtailment will be considered. The estimated FTE reductions in specific departments are being refined based on feedback. This is why your feedback is needed. The acting and incoming Provost will assess the required FTE reductions in specific academic units.

If the loss of faculty by attrition does not equate to the estimated savings will the department need further cuts?

The President clarified the basic timeline. At the May Board of Regents’ meeting he will be presenting the revised mission statement. Over the summer and through the beginning of the semester he will work with both incoming and acting Provosts, Deans, Chairs, and faculty on revising the recommendations for submission in the fall. Faculty Senate will be provided with another opportunity to review and feedback before they are finalized. Curriculum items will be submitted for review. The administration will assess expected attrition and determine whether curtailment is needed towards the end of fall semester. If it is, then Section 18 of the CBA will be followed in the spring.

### Interim Provost Paul Kurgis

The degree candidates were approved.

The Registrar’s Office prepared academic calendars for the next five years. They are intended to align with MSU and the public schools so faculty can now make plans into the future. In was noted that the Academic Calendar for 2019 -2020 is a change to our normal timing. Winter session is shorter and commencement is schedule for Saturday May2nd. The change will allow UM students to find summer employment.

There have been lots of questions about releasing data. Next week a version of Tableau will be available that shows what happened at stage one of the analyses. He will prepare a video that explains what happened at stage two of the analysis and additional information will be posted. This should provide clarity regarding some of the recommendations.

### ASUM Leadership

The outgoing ASUM Executive Team (President Braden Fritzgerald, Vice President Brenna Love, Vice President and Business Manager Ben Kuiper) presented the new Executive Team. President Alex Butler is a non-traditional student, who was formally in the Army. He is majoring in Philosophy with a minor in Economics. He plays Rugby with the Jesters and volunteers for Big Brothers, Big Sisters. Vice President Mariah Welch has a double major in Women and Gender Studies and Political Science with an emphasis in Public Law. The Business Manager Andrea Schaffer is a junior studying Sociology and Women and Gender Studies with a minor in Political Science.

Chair Bowman thanked the outgoing ASUM Executive Team. She was honored to work with such dedicated students.

Outgoing Chair Fitzpatrick thanked his executive team as well. He is a first generation college student and thanked the Senate for letting him graduate. He is grateful for the experiences he has had at UM. For four years the university has been talking about looing faculty and potentially cutting programs. He will never know what it is like to be at a university that is talking about growth or strategic initiatives to support students in positive ways. He is disappointed that the proposed timeline is another year of discussions. Please make a decision. The student body is demoralized and cannot continue with the uncertainty. He is finding it difficult to advocate for high school graduates to attend UM, because of this.

* UFA Paul Haber
He will respond to any questions regarding CBA implications during today’s discussion and during the summer and through the fall. A lot has happened this semester. There is a proposal being considered by the Faculty Senate so the wheels of decision making are going forward. The Senate is in the position to review and recommend. Feedback has been coming in. He suggests faculty and departments be specific. He and Megan Stark have been meeting with departments with suggested FTE reductions to see whether they can creatively respond to the proposal in ways that would benefit students and faculty in the future. Consider developing alternative proposals that will show how the department can function to meet the needs of students. This type of detailed response will be appreciated. Some of the recommendations have already been adjusted such as regional studies. If the renaming of a degree is inappropriate for documented reasons make sure you submit this feedback. If you are planning to put forward a change in your unit and would like support from the union contact him. He is willing to work with units.
* Chair’s report

The curriculum review deadline is September 28th. The deadline memo was posted to the agenda. Several items were postponed until the September Faculty Senate meeting to allow time to discuss the Senate’s response to President Bodnar’s Strategy for Distinction.

From the earlier comments there is a sense that we are not on the same team. She couldn’t feel more differently, but this reflects the frustration of everyone. It is heart breaking to see how this process can pit departments against one another. She has been attending meetings with all the College of Humanities and Sciences Departments with Interim Provost Paul Kurgis. The meetings have been inspiring and devastating. A take away from the last meeting is that if you don’t understand something you cannot manage effectively. This applies to the preliminary recommendations. The recommendations are being changed. ECOS will provide more substantial feedback and has more time to do so. Your comments are important. They are being analyzed and included. We will address individual recommendations even though the recommendations will change. Interim Provost Kurgis is listening with empathy and compassion at these meetings. These meetings have been very valuable and will be considered in the Senate’s final response.

Faculty cannot be shamed into silence. There is no shame in disagreeing in respectful ways. Tenured faculty have the rare privilege to be able to speak truth to power. Today we will talk about the draft response. It is not as detailed as the President had hoped because ECOS was under the impression it had already been modified. The response requests ongoing dialogue through the fall. ECOS is not asking that the decision be delayed forever and are empathetic to the entire campus community (students, faculty, staff, contract professionals). We will absolutely go into detailed responses on individual recommendations.

It is hard to reconcile the need to cut faculty and staff to fix an enrollment problem. The search committee for the Vice President of Enrollment and Strategic Communication is active. Interviews are expected in May and June. It is hoped that the position will be filled by June 15th. So an enrollment specialist will be coming. This is a funding issue. The state needs to fund higher education at a higher rate.

Senator Chatterjee: There seems to be problems with the methodology in terms of how they came to the FTE reductions by departments. Interim Provost Kurgis told Political Science what criteria were used, but we don’t know what rubric was used to convert this to FTE reductions. A lot of the preliminary recommendations were subjective. Many of the departments are pointing out errors in the data at the meetings with the Interim Provost. Departments should also put the information in writing and make sure it gets to the President’s Office. You can also provide the information for ECOS to consider. The administration knows they did not get it right the first time. Faculty have the opportunity to provide this kind of input.

Professor Taylor, Economics: ECOS should consider a macro response to the data issue. Many departments are crunching the numbers and coming up with overlapping issues. There were concerns regarding the statement below from the FAQ document circulated earlier this week.

*“The Faculty Senate is reviewing the proposed reductions and discontinuances this spring, as required by the CBA. With the benefit of this Faculty Senate review having been completed by the end of spring semester, this summer and next fall the president, provost, and deans will work together to refine the workforce reduction plan.“*

Chair Bowman: The statement is problematic. Chair Bowman and Chair-elect Semanoff discussed this with the President this morning. The language has been changed. Our faculty senate review is not completed. More detailed response about the data will be made. Senator Manuel, who serves on the UPC Data Subgroup has forwarded concerns about data from the Senate’s feedback link to Interim Provost Kurgis. He has not yet had a response, but the administration is aware of the issues.

Professor Taylor: If the University is trying to balance the budget, it needs to be publically convinced that it can count. The administration needs to identify the evidence and how it fits the recommendations. The faculty are also interested in the success of the university. The cuts will make things worse for students.

## Committee Reports

* ASCRC Chair Doug Coffin
The Curriculum Consent Agenda was approved.

The Double major Dual Degree motion was also approved with a request that the language be adjusted so it doesn’t appear that the residency requirement only apply to dual degrees.

ASCRC Chair Coffin was thanked for his service.

* Graduate Council Chair Sandy Ross
The Curriculum Consent Agenda was amended and approved. The corrected new title of the Communicative Sciences and Disorders to Speech, Language and Hearing Sciences.

Graduate Council Chair was thanked for his service.

## New Business

* Discussion of the posted [Senate Response to the draft Strategy for Distinction](http://www.umt.edu/facultysenate/documents/FSDocs17-18/SenateResponse5-3-18.docx)

Senator Chatterjee suggested that the recommendations under 5. a be amended to read: The administration should clearly delineate the criteria and rules used to translate the data into FTE reductions.

Andrew Ware: There is a letter coming from the College of Humanities and Science Chairs that askes for this information, but it should also be in the Senate’s response.

Andrew Ware / Doug Coffin: The first recommendation should acknowledge that we already have overworked staff. The shared services model needs to be done in a way that does not just load more work onto staff, it may include hiring additional staff. It should be clear that the Senate supports staff and they should be included in discussions to change the structure of their work. Staffing levels must meet the vital needs of the university. Some of our offices, the Registrar, Financial Aide and others are under the national average recommendations and our accreditation could be in jeopardy as a result. Changing the service model needs to occur strategically. The language needs to be stronger. The VSO was harmful to campus. Perhaps… The Faculty Senate supports strategic staff restructuring that meets the vital needs of the university.

Anna Kline, Geography: At the listening sessions it was suggested that the restructuring of departments be separated from the restructuring needed to ensure CHS departments had coverage to answer phones. It is evident that the College is suffering from the loss of staff and this directly effects the student experience.

Chair-elect Semanoff proposed the following language:
*The Faculty Senate supports exploring the implementation of staff restructuring in order to promote improvement of student support and services, particularly those impacted by the VSO.  To this end, the Faculty Senate encourages the development of a shared-services model for student/administrative services based on collocated programs.  Furthermore, the Faculty Senate urges the administration to consult with staff involved and be attentive to training, career ladders, and development that would lead to enhanced delivery of services and professional growth.*

Senator Justin Angle: He can’t vote for the response in general, and does not support wordsmithing by the Senate. In general, the Senate is always saying NO. We heard from the students and staff it is time for action. Things are tough, but it will continue to be terrible if we don’t take action. The response doesn’t seem to be in the spirit of collaboration, it makes statements of incompetence and bad faith. We are making faculty look like obstructionists. The insistence on slowing the process down is damaging to the faculty brand in general.

Professor Brad Clough suggested that International and interdisciplinary be included in the recommended revision to the mission statement:  *The University of Montana’s mission is to provide high-quality and accessible education and generate world-class research and creative scholarship. By integrating the liberal arts, graduate study, and professional training*with international and interdisciplinary emphases,*we shape global citizens who are creative and agile learners prepared to build and sustain communities. As Montana’s flagship university, we lead conversations that question and expand the frontiers of knowledge to tackle the world’s most complex challenges.*

Chair Bowman discussed the options before the Senate. The response under consideration is broad and based on the feedback and discussions at the listening sessions. A full scale edit by the Faculty Senate would not be productive. The administration will make the final decisions, the Senate can make recommendations. ECOS can include the comments from today’s discussion as an addendum to the document provided to the administration.

Senator Gagliardi, Law: Sometimes a financial crisis provides the opportunity to make changes for the better. The response does not convey that this should be the outcome. She interpret the response that we were leaving it to the administration to make across the board cuts. It does not say that we agree with strategic planning. That is not clear in the response. We need to put students first and make sure that we attract them. Many feel our general education requirements are the biggest impediment to students graduating and the document indicates General Education needs to be supported rather than revised. The law school restructured its requirements (eliminating many) when applications were down. The students are still taking the same classes because they understand the importance of a broad education, but it is their choice. Students these days want choice. The document reads like everyone is trying to protect their turf and that is not the right tone to move forward. While many of the ideas in the response are important, she does not support it. This is not the way she believes the faculty should come to the process. We need to move forward in a better way.

Chair Bowman responded that the intention of ECOS did not come across in the document. ECOS understands that strategic change needs to happen.

Senator Diana Lurie, BMED: Faculty would likely agree that strategic reorganization and looking at our curriculum differently is important. The overlaying issue reducing faculty to balance the budget. This prevents us from moving forward with a strategic plan because you don’t know the implications of the faculty reductions. We need to be clear about this. It is unfortunate that the two processes are intermingled.

Gagliardi: We need to acknowledge the fact that FTE reductions need to be made in number 5. We want to support making them in a strategic way with good data. This wasn’t clear in the response.

Senator Ametzbichler, MCLL: The draft FTE reductions by department are not necessarily strategic.

Senator Greymorning, NAS: Even if the budget is balanced, the unknown factor is still enrollment. What is being done will harm enrollment.

Senator MacDonald, Anthropology: It is nice to hear discussion about general education restructure. He fully supports this. The fear is that President Bodnar’s motivation or restructuring general education is to further impair the College of Humanities and Sciences. Faculty are reluctant to give up their disciplines place in general education (enrollment in courses). Departments are competing for student FTE.

Senator Chatterjee: This is a very political process. The faculty that speak out in favor of the President’s recommendations are in departments not identified for cuts. We are seeing real politics playing out. The arguments are supposed to adhere to some be principles, but there are distributional conflicts. The units that don’t face cuts would like to get rid of others so they can have more resources. The units that face cuts would like to save their faculty.

Senator Ratto-Parks, English, member of UPC, and adjunct faculty member fired and unfired by the previous administration: Faculty have the ability to respect the value of other disciplines. The tenner of the Senate’s response should not assume the faculty are against all the recommendations, some faculty are excited and ready to move forward. They may be reluctant to express this publically because of the costs to campus peers and colleagues. Any senate document should have all the feedback attached. Many faculty have expressed concern that their comments are not being considered. So the lack of trust on campus, isn’t just with the administration. We do not trust across discipline, we don’t trust in shared governance. Radical transparency is needed to move forward. We forget that the campus community may not be aware of the discussions takin place. It is difficult to quantify and represent the meaning of the listening sessions, department meetings, and feedback. The response doesn’t give the whole picture. The direct feedback should be provided to show a spirit of collaboration not just complaints. Groups are working to show the value in the different programs and figure a way to balance the budget. We wanted this process, so we need to show that it is constructive.

Chair Bowman: Sometimes we are arguing with each other’s assumptions. We can agree with the need to make changes that will result in the loss of FTE, but we want to make sure this happens in the right way. This does not mean that we are opposing the process moving forward. There are different opinions in the room. It may be more productive not to try to speak with one voice in one document, but to present a summary of the feedback.

Senator Vonessen suggested appending the minutes of the meeting to the response. The minutes will show the different perspectives.

UFA President, Paul Haber: The faculty can continue to give feedback through the end of spring semester. The deadlines have changed. There will be the opportunity to provide additional feedback when the final recommendations are available in early fall.

Interim Provost Kurgis: There has been much discussion about the timeline. We had hoped we could move quickly with a concrete plan this semester. But it became clear that we could not have the meaningful feedback from campus that we wanted and needed in order to get the plan right. Once this became clear, the timeline changed. The timeline is built into the CBA. We couldn’t launch a curtailment process if needed until the end of next year. The priority is to get this right and be strategic. So it was decided to only submit the mission statement to the Board of Regents in May. The administration will continue to revise the plan over the summer with the goal of submitting to the Faculty Senate early next fall. There will be another window (relatively compressed) for feedback, because there are also timeline requirements to giving faculty notice. We are trying to budget for the next three years to get to $5 million in savings from the instructional budget. So we are planning for a certain number of reductions in each fiscal year 2020, 2021, and 2022. The focused is on faculty because everything else has been cut. He has been meeting with departments in the College of Humanity and Science and has repeatedly heard about the lack of operating funds, staff support including advisors and recruiters.

It is the budget that matters. So the estimates are trying to predict an uncertain future. We know that there will be attrition. Some will be from higher paid faculty. The plan is not firm for each FTE reduction. In total over the 3 years it needs to total $5 million. Over summer the plan will be revised including changes to the FTE reductions. We now know that there was counting disconnect. We can now incorporate the data through fiscal year 2018. The reductions may go up or down for different units. At the beginning of the fall the revised plan will be released. We heard a lot about the divisions and know we got things wrong. The Anthropology and Sociology master’s degrees will not be merged. A lot of things will change in the revised plan. Curriculum Proposals will be reviewed in the fall through the normal process. We hope to have a window of time where we can learn of future plans that can be built into the projections. If curtailment is needed the timeline will start in the spring in accordance with the CBA.

Chair Bowman wanted senators to be clear that the timeline change was made by the administration in response to feedback. They are listening. The process is collaborative. We may not get to the outcome we want but the process is being done with integrity.

UFA President Paul Haber: The timeline shift came out of a series of conversations between the UFA, the Faculty Senate and the administration. This is the middle path in terms of timing. Faculty need to get their ideas for restructuring or efficiency into the administration to consider over the summer. Faculty in units identified for FTE reductions should make alternative proposals with good logic.

Dean Comer: The discussion seems to imply the administration has not been doing anything over the past 4 years. Nothing has been further from the truth. The College of Humanities and Science has been absorbing cuts every year for the past three years. In response to the current need for cuts, departments are developing proactive plans to take care of the needs of our students under the new reality. Not all departments have done this, but most of them are. We are all in this together. We are changing dynamically as a College. We have risen to the challenge.

Interim Provost Kurgis confirmed that faculty are being constructive. He does not think the Senate is obstructing the process.

Senator Coffin: We haven’t talked about what we agree on in the proposal. The faculty and administrators that responded to the ASCRC survey agreed with half of the proposed changes. Those proposals should be submitted in the fall. The Board of Regents timeline is also constraining in terms of implementing changes. If there is a consensus we won’t need curtailment or retrenchment.

Interim Provost Kurgis: We are expecting Level I and II proposals to be processed in the fall. Some may be from the preliminary proposal and others may be alternative proposals from the units.

There is not a specific template for reorganization. The feedback from the meetings, UPC, and Faculty Senate will be considered by the administration over the summer to come up with an alternative restructuring plan. This will come back to the Senate for an additional round of feedback next fall since the faculty are not on contract in the fall. The deans will be engaged over the summer to assist with the revision. He knows about conversations taking place on campus. Please submit your ideas as soon as possible to be included in the information reviewed over the summer. Next fall will be the deadline for final feedback.

Senator Diana Lurie: When we get a new Vice President for Enrollment the plan for recruitment and retention should be shared with the Faculty Senate. So the faculty can get a sense of how the needs are being addressed. We need to know that that progress is being made on that side of the equation.

Senator Andrew Ware: We should keep in mind how the changes we are making going to impact recruitment and enrollment. We need to know the target number of faculty for each department should have at the end of the three year period. The justification for the number should be provided. We need to understand how things were counted.

Chair Bowman thanked Interim Dean Kurgis for his willingness to engage in the discussions.

The UFA attempted to initiate an effort to try to understand the budget well enough to explain it to faculty. Unfortunately the project failed.

The Response with the various edits discussed and comments appended from the meeting minutes was approved with four senators apposed.

* [Outgoing Senators](http://www.umt.edu/facultysenate/documents/FSDocs17-18/ThankYouLetter2018.doc) were thanked for their service and [incoming Senators](http://www.umt.edu/facultysenate/documents/FSDocs17-18/Faculty-Senate-Election-Results.docx) were welcomed.
* Senator Mark Pershouse was nominated and was affirmed by a vote as Chair-Elect.
* The College of Humanities and Science and the Professional Schools caucused to nominate members to ECOS. The College had two members interested from the Sciences, Senator Nancy Hinman, Geosciences and Laurie Minns, Division of Biological Sciences. Faculty from the College voted by secret ballot. Senator Hinman and Senator Gil Quintero were nominated. The Professional Schools nominated Senator Anthony Johnstone.

The new ECOS members were affirmed by the Senate.

Matt Semanoff, MCLL (Chair)
Mark Persehouse, BMED (Chair-elect)

Gilbert Quintero, Anthropogy
Nancy Hinman, Geoscience

Anthony Johnstone, Law
Tim Manuel, Accounting & Finance (2019)
Anne Delaney, MC - Health Professions (2019)

## Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.