Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

December 13, 2017

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, D. Beck, M. Bowman, J. Bunch, A. Chatterjee, S. Certel,S. Clouse, D. Coffin, G. Collins, Z. Cooper, T. Crawford, A. Delaney, D. Erickson, L. Fern, S. Gordon, N. Greymorning, K. Griggs, B. Halfpap, B. Harrison, J. Hunt, G. Larson, D. Lurie, T. Manuel, M. Musick, H. Naughton, L. Nichols, D. Patterson, J. Pavilack, M. Pershouse, S. Phillips, A. Ratto-Parks, S. Schwarze, M. Semanoff, R. Severson, S. Shen, E. Uchimoto, N. Vonessen, A. Ware
 **Members Excused:** B. Allred, J. Carter, U. Kamp, M. Maneta, A. Szalda-Petree

**Members Absent**: A. Alger, J. Banville, A. Belcourt, S. Bitar, M. Boller, S. Caro, Y. Cho, G. Collins, N. Dawson, A. Elliott, E. Gagliardi, M. Hamon, M. Horejsi, J. Laskin, H. Martens, J. Millspaugh, M. Monsos, A. Nack, G. Quintero, Y. Reimer, S. Ross, J. Sears, A. Sondag, S. Strohl, J. Thomsen

**Ex-Officio Present:** Rebecca Power- Assistant to the President

**Guest:** approximately 18 guests including: Barbara Koostra- Director of Montana Museum of Art and Culture, Chase Greenfield-Student Regent and member of APASP, Liz Putnam- member of APASP, Paul Haber- UFA President and member of APASP, John DeBoer- member of APASP

## Public comment

* Meradeth Snow, Chair of University Library Committee: The University Library Committee is dismayed that the Mansfield Library is omitted in President Stearns recommendations given it is mentioned in the first recommendation from Interim Provost Edmond for additional investment related to student success. There have been significant cuts to the library (collections and personnel) over the past five years. The library is vital to the teaching and research mission of the university. The Committee hopes that additional investment in the library is included in President Stearns final recommendations.

## Communication:

### Chair’s Report

Chair Bowman read a statement from Athletic Director Kent Haslam: “Please inform Faculty Senators that representatives from Athletics, University Police, and the Title 9 Office met with Lisa Davey and her partner Monday. We are working together, using all university and community resources to develop a plan to address the harassment. We are taking it seriously and working collaboratively with Lisa on this issue. “

Discussion of President’s APASP recommendations and reflections:
The purpose of today’s special Senate meeting is to help clarify what input Faculty Senate should provide to the President in response to her recommendations regarding the APASP process.

The meeting was planned at the start of the semester in anticipation of a contentious debate regarding reactions to decisions. However, the recommendations seem vague and it is difficult to react. What may seem vague creates some space for input from others whose knowledge and experience can offer clarification and clear pathways to implementation. We can appreciate that the President took a high altitude view of programs and services at the University that invites the expertise of others, including the Faculty Senate. Collaboration can be messy. In considering how to structure this meeting to best meet the purpose, ECOS debated how to focus the listening session to generate meaningful input for our response to President.

As elected representatives your thoughts and recommendations matter. There are representatives from the APASP Taskforce in attendance to answer questions and inform. Senators were asked to be recognized before speaking, identify themselves, limit remarks to 1-2 minutes, be civil and share the opportunity for comment. Senators have priority to speak.

Some of us prefer to get to point, while others believe that processing is the point. While she recognizes the limits of time and tolerance she asks that all of us to understand that how and what we communicate reflects important aspects of diversity and that listening is a way to convey respect and appreciation to those differences. ECOS has generated a motion, and if it seems congruent with the tone of the meeting will introduce from the floor for consideration. There are also some specific areas we can explore together, but first we open the floor for your thoughts and reactions.

Senator Doug Coffin: There is question in process because anything that will be implemented next fall will need to be reviewed this spring in order to make the catalog. So we need to figure out what changes the administration wants to implement for the next academic year. So we should be separating the recommendations into immediate changes and those that are not on a condensed timeline. We also have to consider whether any of the requested changes would trigger section 18 of contract.

Chair Bowman: Implementation plans will be communicated sometime in January. Those plans will identify the specific actions.

Senator Andrew Ware, APASP member: If curriculum changes are included in the implementation plans, they will be subject to the normal review process. The implementation plans should define the timelines for any changes.

Senator Jody Pavilack, History: She is confused about the link between the general recommendations and the negotiations already happening behind the scenes. There are faculty in some units being proposed to move into other units and there are taskforces to develop other units. So by the time these recommendations turn into implementation plans, actions will already have taken place. There seems to be other negotiations that are parallel to this process. The History department has been approached regarding accepting faculty from other departments.

Senator Chatterjee, Political Science: He has reviewed the Dean’s, Provost’s, and President’s recommendations and in some instances they are recommending different things. So it’s unclear what is going to happen given the vagueness of the recommendations. How will the inconsistences be reconciled? Is this going to get less vague?

Chair Bowman: The implementation plans will be available January 12th. The hope is these will provide some clarity.

Chatterjee: How will the implementation plans be derived? There are many interpretations of the recommendations. So essentially anything can happen. The recommendations do not narrow the probability space.

Senator Greg Larson, Communication Studies: He echoes the concerns regarding the vagueness and the delay of tough decisions. Allowing the Deans and chairs to make some of the choices is not necessarily a bad thing, but he hopes there is some guidance to the deans about the expected outcomes. The financial goals need to come from the administration.

Pavilack: At least with the departments she is familiar with (History and Latin American Studies) there are decisions being made, but there has not been the opportunity for faculty to respond. There is a contradiction between the vagueness in the recommendations and the actual actions.

Ware: The Deans and Sector Heads are exploring options. Some of the deans are working on more specific actions than others. They are in the process of developing action plans that require negotiations within their units.

Senator Diana Lurie, BMED: The number of programs at Missoula College slated for …… is surprising. Now the dean has announced her resignation. Is there another plan for Missoula College that we may not know about, especially given the new building?

Ann Delaney, Missoula College, Health Professions: The Dean’s resignation was a bit of shock. Missoula College has a strong faculty that work well with the Associate, so we will be fine. There are some discrepancies in the report that are being communicated to the President. The new building has not yet been advertised.

Barbara Kustra, a contract administrator for the Museum of Art and Culture. Employees in her status are not represented by shared governance, so this morning she attended the Staff Senate meeting to make a comment about the recommendations and is doing the same now so her voice is heard. Recommendations 5 recommends the Museum be re-embedded within the College of Visual and Performing Arts. The Museum was under this structure prior to the 21st Century. There was no notification or consultation with her about this recommendation. Recommendation 6 is very vague in comparison to the specificity in recommendation 5.

Coffin: We are under the impression that the reorganization that results from prioritization will allow for personnel cuts to reduce costs. At the last meeting President Stearns indicated 90 employees had expressed an interest in VSO. We need to know the impact VSO will have on the unrestricted budget. Currently personnel is 79% of the unrestricted budget. What is the percentage after the personnel reduction from VSO? And how many additional personnel reductions are needed from implementation plans?

Chair Bowman: At the Cabinet meeting this morning it was clarified that information about the positions being vacated through VSO would be released.

Ware: The VSO was only offered to employees on 100% state funding. Some of the positions will need to be backfilled. The VSO offer did may not have had enough planning. We don’t know which positions will need to be filled.

Chair Bowman: There is a team monitoring the employees interested in VSO. It is considering where backfill is needed. They have not shared what units are losing personnel. Employees have until 5 today to process the final VSO agreement.

Senator Amy Ratto-Parks, English: The Senate should consider the programs that were in the Taskforce report that are not mentioned in the President’s recommendations, such as the programs of national distinction, such as Creative Writing. It has suffered from budget cuts. It has a national presence in terms of alumni, but is also a source of TA’s for the Composition program. This will have a tremendous ripple effect for campus. If the number of TA’s drop, English will be unable to support teaching composition courses for the incoming cohort of students. It does appear that there is a general undercutting of liberal arts programs, such as Language, Literature, and many of the humanities programs. Programs are not isolated, they interconnected and are playing a larger function in undergraduate education. This needs to be considered in the recommendations.

Chair Bowman asked APAPS members whether there was a mechanism for them to give feedback.

Chase Greenfield, student member on the APASP Taskforce: He provided comments to the President and in-coming President, and copied the Cabinet and APASP Taskforce. He is concerned that some things were left out or were bundled together when they should not have been.

Ware: Individual members of the Taskforce are providing input. There is not a process for Taskforce to provide collective feedback.

Senator Stephen Schwartz, Communication Studies and member of APASP clarified that the recommendations being discussed today did not come from the APASP Taskforce.

Senator John Hunt- English: Not all the Programs in the bottom category of the APASP report are in the President’s recommendations. Specifically what is the rationale for recommending moratorium or discontinuation for programs that do not have associated costs, such as the Film Studies minor? It does bring additional student FTE into the program without additional costs, and increases course offerings. This may be true for some of the other programs in the third category.

John DeBoer: The numbers of students completing no cost interdisciplinary options, minors and certificates is low. APASP identified this trend, so now we need to find out why students are not completing and make changes to ensure that they have access in order to complete.

Senator Brady Harrison, English: The sentence, “The number of faculty in Humanities can fluctuate without diminishing UM’s commitment to the Humanities at the heart of our historic curriculum.” in Recommendation 22 Undergraduate-Graduate Restructuring Opportunities, E. Humanities is concerning. In English there are 6 or 7 lecturers that receive termination notices periodically and the department has lost lines to retirements. Our curriculum is not as robust as we would like. We cannot diminish much more and still offer a quality program. Is this a philosophical statement?

Chatterjee: This is a prime example of vagueness. This could mean anything and nothing. What is the meaning of listing history, literature, philosophy, and political science together? This statement in the same section, “We must reduce costs through more strategic deployment of faculty in all disciplines” could be applied to all the criteria. This could mean research and teaching collaboration among faculty, which the Humanities Institute is already doing some of this. But other interpretations could mean something different.

Senator Nikolaus Vonessen, Mathematics: So there are repeated comments about vagueness. This was also discussed in ECOS. Because the recommendations are not specific, ECOS thought the Faculty Senate should have another chance to review recommendations before they turn into decisions. This is the rationale behind the draft motion on the agenda. It was finalized earlier today. The notion was introduced for consideration. Presumably the high-level implementation plans will have the specifics that are currently missing.

Faculty Senate requests the following:

That deans prepare their “high-level implementation plan” in consultation with the chairs and faculty of affected departments and programs;

That Faculty Senate have a two-week period to review the “high-level implementation plans” and to provide meaningful feedback to the President before the final adoption of the plans;

That the President thoughtfully consider Faculty Senate input before adopting the final version of the “high-level implementation plans.”

Ware: This is fine, but timing is an issue. President Stearns last day is January 12th and President Bodnar’s first day is January 16th- confirmed by Rebecca Powers, Assistant to the President. And there are no Senate meetings before the transition, so how would this work?

Vonessen: These are recommendations of the current administration to the new President. In any case the deadline for implementation plans is given as January 11th or possibly later. So it seems reasonable to have a period of input in January. We tentatively discussed how to handle this in ECOS given many faculty will not be on campus in January. There should be a one week period for faculty to submit comments via electronic means. This will provide faculty not on campus a way to engage with the process.

Coffin: He believes the deadline for Level I and II curriculum changes to make the next catalog is the March 8th Board of Regents meeting. We may need to request the Board of Regents to waive the intent to plan requirement for changes that are a result of prioritization. There is a question of whether restructuring requires a preliminary intent to plan review.

Vonesson: It is his understanding that a moratorium would not require Faculty Senate approval. The faculty are mostly concerned with programs the administration recommends to discontinue. [Follow-up review: the CBA gives Faculty Senate explicitly the right to review and recommend regarding “development, curtailment, discontinuance, or reorganization of academic programs” (7.100, Item 4).  Article II, Section 5, Item 7 of the Articles of Faculty Senate gives us this right.  This is also indicated on our curriculum forms.  Note the Faculty Senate does not need to approve; it has only the right to review and recommend.]

Coffin: If the administration dissolves a department, the tenured faculty in the department can be subject to termination in accordance to the collective bargaining agreement.

UFA President and APASP member, Paul Haber: If the implementation plans are available over the break and make significant changes that concern the faculty, please don’t have the only means for input via online communications. He doesn’t see the urgency to respond before we are all back on campus. We need to respond to the changes collectively as a campus.

Ratto-Parks: She is curious what the incoming president think about any of this. At what point do we get to hear what Incoming President Bodnar thinks about the recommendations. There is a gap between the Taskforce recommendations and President Stearns recommendations. Ultimately the process is slow and we need to know whether the recommendations are in alignment with his vision for the university. How does his view relate to what we are trying to do?

Chair Bowman: So there will be high- level implementation plans submitted to the new President mid-January. So ECOS just wanted to make it clear that these plans should be made in consultation with Chairs and faculty. Is there value in giving him feedback while he is considering the plans?

Several friendly amendments were made to the motion:

In the spirit of shared governance, the Faculty Senate requests the following:

That deans prepare their “high-level implementation plan” in consultation with the chairs and faculty of affected departments and programs;

That Faculty Senate hold a special meeting at the beginning of spring semester to review the “high-level implementation plans” and to provide meaningful feedback to the President before final decisions are made in response to the plans;

That the President thoughtfully consider Faculty Senate input before final decisions are made in response to the final version of the “high-level implementation plans.”

Senator Helen Naughton, Economics: The APASP timeline indicates the President will have final decisions made by Friday.

Vonesson: President Stearns overturned the timeline to allow for final recommendations to the incoming president next Tuesday rather than final decisions. So the timeline is under revision.

Ratto-Parks: We asked the Presidential candidates about their commitment to shared governance. This motion is really about a commitment to shared governance. Does the motion embrace the request for commitment?

Senator Greymorning, NAS: Remember there are things happening already, which have not been discussed by shared governance.

Chair Bowman: The Senate Leadership will ask for clarification about restructuring discussions.

Pavilack, History: What are we actually going to achieve as a body in terms of providing meaningful feedback in a two hour meeting spring semester?

Greymorning: Universities in other states and countries are going through similar processes. In some of these universities departments have come together collectively to merge or make other changes rather than the administration. At one university the entire faculty objected to top down decisions.

Beck: A lot of the decisions have not been made strategically and the APAPS Taskforce is not at fault. There is not a strong connection between our strategic plan and the recommendations from President Stearns. He hopes that if we do meet again that we try to figure out how the implementation plans align with the strategic plan. He requests that ECOS ask the President to consider this for the final version of recommendations. Clarification is needed in terms of how the recommendations fit in with the long term strategic planning.

Chair Bowman: Perhaps the special meeting at the start of spring semester will be the time for reactions to specific recommendations.

Chair-elect Semanoff, MCLL: Does the Senate want to include a comment about the strategic plan in the motion?

Vonesson: The Strategic Vision is still a work in progress. At least ECOS is scheduled to meet with the SPCC to make additional revisions. For the APASP process there were comments on the old Strategic Plan and the new strategic opportunities. The new one is still undergoing revisions, so is not sure how helpful this will be in the motion.

Chair Bowman: The Senate Leadership could ask President Stearns to give some consideration to the strategic vision in her recommendations and find congruence.

The motion was approved unanimously. The Registrar confirmed that there was quorum.

ECOS will decide on date of special meeting.

Chair Bowman asked whether there was a consensus on any particular recommendations. ECOS can amplify any recommendations that the faculty agree are important.

Senator Tim Manuel, Accounting: Hopefully we can all agree that we need more investment in data (Recommendation 23 and 24).

Senator Patterson, Mathematics: There is a cost to getting more data.

Senator Steve Schwartz, Communication Studies and APASP Taskforce: Are we all in support of a Faculty Dashboard?

Professor Liz Putnam, APASP Taskforce: Senators should look into what is involved in a faculty dashboard and how they have been used before they decide one way or another. There are several universities involved with controversies over their use.

Ware: The Author’s response will be made public. The Cabinet, including Chair Bowman, currently has access to them.

Professor Leora Bar-el, Linguistics: This document is very vague and the Provost made the comment to the Cabinet that the difficult decisions will be made by the deans. It is not clear what the Faculty Senate is responding to. If you do not respond to all of them, does that mean the others are accepted? How will implementation plans feed into this report? This document is problematic.

Chatterjee: We just passed a motion that indicates we will discuss specifics when we get specifics. We should “pass this over in silence”- Wittgenstein.

Haber: The Provost’s recommendation identified several areas (Biological Sciences, School of Business- Big Data, and Health and Medicine) of excellence designated for further investment after the structural deficit issue is addressed and there we have money. She is envisioning the university’s future. This should be a decision that is made with broad consultation with shared governance groups. It is unclear how these three areas make a coherent place of distinction. There should be a robust participatory process that looks toward the future. We have not done this.

Chair Bowman: The sense of the Senate is not to amplify any of the recommendations. We will wait for the implementation plans to react to the specificity. The motion is enough at this point.

Ratto-Parks: The Senate needs to identify what shared governance will look like with the new President. What will signal appropriate consultation and consideration of our feedback? This is a turbulent time and it is only fair to communicate this expectation rather than assuming it is obvious.

Chair Bowman: Matt and I have a meeting with new President next week and will bring up this topic. In looking at it from the administration’s viewpoint, it doesn’t always mean that we are agreed with, but rather that we are heard and our input is considered.

Ratto-Parks: We should not have to wonder whether we are being ignored. Clear expectations would be helpful.

Coffin: Please communicate to the new President that information should be forthcoming upon request. There have been times in the past when we had difficulty getting information in time to make decisions. It would be a great thing if he would discuss transparency with his cabinet.

Chair Bowman: She is on the cabinet. The Faculty Senate voice is heard. It is difficult to translate this if you are not in the room listening to the discussion. ECOS met with the Cabinet this morning, ASUM and Staff Senate also meet with the cabinet once a month and have leaders on the cabin. She feel that our input is considered and hopes that this continues with the new administration.

Manuel: Part of the problem is systematic. It doesn’t appear that the administration knows the budget, at least not in a timely fashion. The deans have expressed Heard frustration that they can’t plan because they don’t have the information. We need to change the budget modeling so we have a better idea of projected revenues.

Lurie: One of issues we are talking around and the issue of whether voices being heard is that there is a lack of rationale and explanation in the divergence of the reports. This is lacking in terms of transparency.

Chair Bowman: We hope the implementation plans that are developed with consultation with the faculty will have the specificity and transparency.

Haber: From the UFA perspective appropriate shared governance means prior meaningful, consultation about important issues that impact members. He provided the examples of the termination letter to lecturers and the sabbatical letter of when the administration did not appropriately engage shared governance. He knows there have been issues and so far has responded positively. Decisions must be rationally articulated in a transparent way to the effected group.

Chair Bowman: The senate leadership will amplify the message. Faculty are encouraged to email comments regarding the recommendations to Chair Bowman at FacSenChair@mso.umt.edu or Rebecca. President Stearns is very open to suggestions.

Beck: Native American Studies and Missoula College does not have graduate programs (Recommendation 22. C).

## Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:26 p.m.