Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
March 15, 2018, 3:00 P.M. GBB 123

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

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

**Members Absent:** A. Alger, A. Belcourt, M. Boller, S. Certel, Y. Cho, G. Collins, B. Halfpap, M. Horejsi, G. Larson

**Ex-Officio Present:** B. Fitzgerald, N. Lindsay, P. Kirgis **Guests / public:** R. Best, N. Cooper, J. DeBoer, L. Schelvan

 **Minutes:** The minutes from 2/8/18 were approved.

## Public Comment:

* Nancy cooper, a 25 year adjunct faculty member in Music and a member of [Moms Demand Action for Gun Sense in America](https://momsdemandaction.org/). Yesterday over 100 students and friends gathered on the oval to remember the 17 students killed in Florida a month ago and to protest the government’s inability to pass meaningful, sensible gun legislation. It seems like a good time to move forward on issues of gun violence that impact campuses.

Attention – Educators for Gun Sense, a nation-wide coalition of College, University, and secondary school faculty and staff members who want to keep guns away from our schools. She had information sheets about the group to distribute. She encouraged senators to join by texting the word “educators” to 6433. The organization’s primary purpose is a loud and consistent call for gun free schools.

The US Senate is currently considering a Bill to allow concealed carry reciprocity between states. This would allow individuals from states that allow permitless carry to carry in states with stricter laws. This especially impacts Montana because Idaho has permitless carry. She had cards available to urge senators to vote against carry reciprocity. – cards to hand out (political)

For years the Montana legislators has been attempting to pass legislation allowing guns on Montana campuses, as well as in bars, restaurants, and in Post Offices. The nest legislative session is less than a year. These Bills will likely be proposed again. She urges the Faculty Senate in the advance of the next session to come out on the record as being against any legislation calling for concealed or open carry on college campuses. She recently learned the process of bringing a resolution to the Senate, so will be preparing a resolution for future consideration. She would love to hear from any faculty interested in signing.

She was available after the meeting with various documents for interested senators

* Ross Best, student and public meeting advocate. At the last meeting he shared an email sent to President Bodnar. Even after recent improvements there is widespread disregard on the campus for Montana’s constitutional and statutory guarantees of public participation and open meetings. He called on President Bodnar and ECOS to move decisively to ensure the University fully acknowledges and complies with its duties in this regard. President Bodnar sends out emails to the campus community, but there has not been one about public participation and open meeting policies. And he has not had a response to his February 8th email. So he asks the Faculty Senate for help.

Public participation and open meetings are fundamental constitutional commitments in Montana. Public accountability and popular sovereignty depend upon them. Members of the Faculty Senate have a role in checking the balance of the President’s authority over the University. There is nothing in state law or Montana Supreme Court precedents that support the position that any deliberative bodies on campus are except from the requirements of public notice, minutes, and public comment. If this is not the case, it should be simple matter for the administration to site the legal provisions. So far the administration has not done this.

He requests that President Bodnar have his staff prepare a reasonable thorough explanation in writing why Montana’s participation and open meetings requirements do not apply to the university and its extensive committee structure in ways that ordinary readings of state law suggests. ECOS should consider this matter and it should be on the agenda for the next meeting. The University should be transparent about why it is not being transparent.
* Senator Jen Thomsen, College of Forestry and Conservation. She is concerned about the lack of discussion, support and resources for faculty and staff in terms of how to prepare or respond to gun violence or other threatening behavior in a classroom or on campus. Such as what kind of signs should faculty look for and how it should be addressed. Faculty should be prepared. Having a plan of how to respond and direct students if there is an incident is important. If anyone else is interested or values this, she would be happy to try to initiate the discussion. Others interested should contact her.
* Senator Doug Coffin, College of health and Biomedical Sciences. Vote on the 6 Mill Levy is coming up in September. It is worth 300 million dollars over 10 years. Student groups, Forward Montana and MountPIRG are fanning out across campus to get support. They will also be asking for time for class wraps. Consider signing the petition, register to vote, and vote in November.

## Communication

* ASUM President Braden Fitzgerald
The students have been busy getting support for the 6 Mill Levy, so definitely vote.
ASUM is currently focused internally with the budgeting process.
He recently spoke to student supervisors about departmental Procard usage. Faculty advisors may use their Procard for Student Group business and then request reimbursement from the student group’s account. However, the Student Group must preauthorize these expenditures.
* MCFA President Tom Gallagher. The Missoula College Faculty Association represents about 65-70 faculty.
 The MCFA is concerned about the administrations proposed change to UM Policy 350 [Non-Tenurable Academic Appointments](http://www.umt.edu/policies/browse/academic-affairs/non-tenurable-academic-appointments). The proposed revision adds “accept for programs offering AA degrees” to the maximum percentage (25%) of tenure track to non-tenure track faculty . Academic Policy changes require Faculty Senate Approval. He asks for the Faculty Senate to support Missoula College by asking for more discussion in identifying an appropriate maximum for Missoula College and how it aggregates.

The MCFA meets regularly with the administration to ensure contract maintenance. The ratio of tenure to non-tenure track faculty is a priority concern. The Missoula College has approximately 58% adjunct faculty. The Health Professions Department has 91% tenure-track faculty due to accreditation requirements. In contrast the Applied Arts and Science Department, which teaches most of the General Education Courses, has a 75% adjunct faculty ratio. Some collective bargaining agreements include language that requires permanent faculty lines when a certain percentage of enrollment increase is attained.

It is predicted that the outcome of the Janus Supreme Court Case will significantly change the membership requirements of all unions, but particular unions that represent public employees. The high adjunct ratio may create a situation where the MCFA will not be able to collectively bargain. It will be difficult to ask adjunct instructors for union dues. Missoula College’s salary floor is $28,000 (30,000 for faculty with a Master’s or PhD). In comparison a first-year Missoula county public teacher is hired at $35,000 and the salary floor for Helena …. Is $38,000. We hope that the salary floor may be increased with negotiations.
* The University Planning Committee Discussion was moved to New Business. Senators were encouraged to review the documents posted to the agenda.
* Chairs report
Chair Bowman and Chair-Elect Semanoff attended the Board of Regents meeting last week in Dillon. They met with faculty senate leaders from the other campuses the evening before the faculty breakfast with the regents. The purpose of the meeting is to decide on a theme to discuss with the regents. This is how the Senate advocates for faculty.
The Faculty Senate has a blog. It now has two posts. The second is about advocacy.

Prior to Sheila Stearns stepping in as interim president, she was nominated and approved by the Senate for an honorary degree. This was put on hold while she was acting President. It will be awarded during the May commencement.

Chair Bowman forwarded concerns regarding commencement. There will still be two ceremonies, but the times have been changed. The Professional Schools ceremony is at 9:30 a.m. and the second ceremony is at 2:30 p.m. for the College of Humanities and Sciences and Missoula College. Many schools and departments are having primate celebrations. Some are taking place between the two ceremonies. Marshalls are still needed to help direct people to the ceremonies.

Faculty Senate elections are underway. The faculty have until after spring break to put their name on the ballot.

APASP recently completed its review of programs not funded by the general fund. However, they may still have academic implications, so please take a look at them. The comments should be available by the end of the week.

The Faculty Senate is co-sponsoring a conversation tomorrow at 2 p.m. in the Davidson Honors College on the Diversity of Thought.

The first Provost candidate is speaking today at 5:00 p.m. in the UC Theatre. The time was moved to accommodate the Faculty Senate meeting. So she will try to end the meeting early, so senators will not be late to the presentation.

## Committee Reports

### ASCRC Chair Doug Coffin

The Catalog governing graduation motion was sent back to committee. There was concern that it eliminates options for transfer students and can be accommodated by DegreeWorks.

[Cultural Hardship Absence Motion](http://www.umt.edu/facultysenate/documents/FSDocs17-18/CulturalLeave3-15-18.docx) was amended and approved. It was brought to ASCRC by the Native American Student Council. It includes a general introductory paragraph to be

## New Business  Discussion of University Planning Committee draft documents

* Representatives (Senators Manuel, Semanoff, Schwarz, Ratto-Parks, UFA President Kirkpatrick and Dean Kurgis) provided an update of the UPC process as of today. The documents on the agenda are drafts and change at every meeting. Professor Semanoff and Dean Kurgis met with President Bodnar this morning. He emphasized that it is important to get the details of the process right so that the campus can accept the difficult decisions. The decisions will be painful and impact many of us, so we need to be assured that the process was taken seriously.

The UPC has subgroups working on two primary charges. Senators Semanoff, Schwarz, and Ratto-Parks are on the subgroup charged with refining the mission and identity. This includes identifying 4-6 areas of excellence to guide the University. The current draft posted to the agenda had five areas of excellence. These are not intended to map to individual Colleges or programs, but rather transcend traditional boundaries. The latest areas of excellence are: Environment & Natural Science, Communication & Artistic Expression, Health & Human Development, Law & Public Policy, and Business & Entrepreneurship.

Senator Chatterjee recommends that the Law & Policy area be changed to Law, Politics and Public Policy. This better reflects the broader descriptive statement. His department would like to see the global reach of the areas more explicit.

Senator Fern: The idea of helping students to develop critical thinking and analytical skills is extremely important and should be clearly articulated.

ASUM President Fitzpatrick clarified that the UPC has identified values that cut across every degree, such as the necessity to become global citizens with social mobility. These core concepts may be attained through general education and will be articulated in some way. The UPC is still working on this.

Senator Vonnessen: Provost Candidate, Jon Harbor suggested promoting STEM plus. UM has the science, but also exposes students to the liberal arts. The liberal arts seem to be missing in the areas of excellence. The headings are very broad but the accompanying statements are very specific.

Senator Semanoff: There has been some discussion with whether these should be statements or questions. The areas were developed by thinking of grand challenges students would face in the future. There will be further modifications.

Senator Ware: Physics and Computer Science fits within the broad area of Environment & Natural Science, but not in the qualifying statement. Perhaps additional statements or questions could be added. Some of our strengths (Education, for example) are not reflected in the five areas. Computer Science is another. The major is actually growing.

Senator Ratto-Parks: The subgroup has debated specificity. It’s not clear that the intent is to figure out where programs would fit.

Senator Schwarze: The statement under Environment & Natural Science refers to sustainability. An earlier draft had sustainability in the heading.

Senator Dawson: A current trend in the high schools is that students identify more with place based education rather than the environment. Sense of place is important for students in choosing what college to attend. Something like: Place based education in the natural world of society or the natural and social sciences for a sustainable future, or tomorrow’s leaders for an environmental sustainable future would focus the intent more. Environment and natural science refer to the same thing. Putting economic development in front of ecological limits suggests that the areas focus is more on economics.

Senator Coffin: What does an assessable education mean? He always considers the fact that we are a public university by the mandate of the Montana Constitution. It says that we will develop the full educational potential of each person. Equality of education is guaranteed. Is this inherent in an assessable education? Our mission statement should tie into our constitutional mandate. We exist to provide educational opportunity for the citizens of Montana. He also questions whether using flagship in the singular is a credible statement. This may need to be modified.

Senator Wilkinson: The term STEM and computer science has been used frequently. We should be careful about the technocratic response that technological advancement is an inherent good. She echoes the comments that the specific statements map to degree areas and schools and leaves out general education and academic services. The library is dedicated to promoting information literacy, writing and research.

Senator Beck: In some ways in order to accomplish all of these things we need the humanities. The areas of excellence or the mission does not mention the liberal arts or humanities.

Senator Ratto-Parks: This question comes up often. The subgroup has created several charts, one has values incorporated. One idea has been the power of the liberal arts and the associated behaviors and underlining scholarly abilities and how they are woven across the areas of excellence. Concepts such as innovation, critical thinking, problem solving, community building and creativity are in all of the areas. We are still struggling with how to make this clear.

Senator Hunt: Two of five categories emphasize economic development which seems imbalanced. He agrees that critical analysis should be better articulated in some way.

Senator Marco: Something that resonated with him from the Presidents talk was a university organized around grand challenges that have societal importance rather than a structure based on disciplines. Most collaboration en between departments is focused on problems. So departments in a way constrain the interdisciplinary work. The expected push back to this change is that everyone fears losing their turf and thus defends the traditional structure.

Many of the concepts such as critical thinking are means and tools. These are ways to address the grand challenges. We train students, but this is not the goal in itself. We should focus on solving the challenges. A byproduct of this will be informed and engaged citizens that learn how to critically analyze and solve problems, etc. We should sick to President Bodnar’s original vision and move past our urge to protect our traditional domain. The University will be much more appealing if it adopts this modern view.

Chair Bowman asked how the areas of excellence will be used. Are these areas of our existing excellence or areas we expire to be excellent?

Senator Schwartz: The charge was to identify areas of strength that can be applied to areas of opportunity. The hopeful outcome is to increase students / revenue where strength and opportunity overlap. The big unresolved question is will the areas of excellence feed into data analysis work in the short term.

Senator Ratto-Parks: The Subgroup reviewed consultant reports and various materials since 2012. Often the larger community views UM’s strengths differently than the faculty. The Subgroup is building on the work that has already been done by the Strategic Planning Coordinating Council and others.

Senator Lurie asked whether there was any clarification regarding the budgetary savings that is needed from the process. There is a difference between the long term vision of the university and what is needed in the short term to balance the budget. There should be recognition that these are separate processes.

Senator Semanoff: This triggered the transition to discuss the process question posed by the Data Analysis Subgroup and how the Senate should participate.

Dean Kirgis: The President talked about a 10 million structural deficit in his presentation to the campus community. We need to close this over a period of time. His charge to the UPC was to find $5 million in savings from the Academic Affairs budget over the next several years. The plan must be submitted to the Board of Regents at the May meeting. The expectation is that there will also be a $5 million in increased revenue to close the budget deficit. If we have a credible plan to do this OCHE and the Board will help us get there over a period of years.

The cuts must be from academic affairs because the budget cuts over the last 4-5 years have been disproportionately out of administrative services, auxiliaries, and other parts of the university. The remaining budget is in faculty salaries. So it has been explained to the UPC that this is the only place to find this amount of savings.

President Bodnar is emphatic that this is not just a cost cutting exercise. We are also looking for areas where we can grow, shift resources, realign or curtail.

The Data Analysis Subgroup has drafted a process which is intended to identify the plan. There are key parts that need the Senate’s input and feedback. Given the short timeline there is not time to engage in new analysis, so will use much of the APASP analysis with the recognition that there are many concerns about the inputs and outputs. There were some flaws in terms of how the student faculty ratio was calculated so the Data Office is working to create a ratio according to course rubric rather than department. The goal is to use several metrics so the flaw in any one will not play a significant role. Minors and certificates will not be evaluated because the savings. The focus will be on two- year, undergraduate, and graduate programs as separate categories. The APASP productivity data will be considered and a new metric for cost savings has been added. Administration and Finance and the Provost Office will provide the net cost/revenue data so that we can see the budget impact of the program. Research dollars will also be considered. This first stage analysis will identify programs that are struggling with productivity. The qualitative analysis will take place in stage two.

APASP had a lot of qualitative analysis. Given the time constraints UPC will look at APASP scores on quality, demand, alignment, and opportunity. This will then provide a score to guide the decision making which is where APASP broke down. President Bodnar is very committed to a shared governance process. He does not want this to be his decision in isolation. He is looking for guidance from the campus to clarify what shared governance means in practice. The UPC needs to know whether it makes recommendations, does the Faculty Senate, ECOS, or the President with feedback.

Professor Stark’s view as the UFA representative is that it is not the job of shared governance groups including the UPC to make specific programmatic recommendations. The Collective Bargaining agreement specifically states that this is the President’s job. The UPC does not feel it can design a process where it can make decisions at the programmatic level. Its preference is to present President Bodnar with as much good information as possible with rankings and quintiles to help guide his decisions. The President recommendations would then come back to the Faculty Senate to review and recommend as stated in the CBA, section . …. This leads to the question of timing.

Comments / Questions:

Senator Vonessen: Criterion 3 misses the total number of student credit hours generate by programs. Some programs teach a lot of students outside their majors. This is an important part of the productivity of a program. The total student credit hour is available in APAPS criterion 2. This should be part of the stage one analysis.

Senator Coffin: This process does not look at how to build review or how to make public education more affordable. Half of the country’s population does not like public education because we are associated with student debt. At some point we have to stop cutting budgets and start fighting for public education.

Senator Chatterjee: This process cannot be apolitical. There is no way to get around the politics. People with certain kinds of power will win in this process. . There is no neutral body to make the decisions that will make us happy. We need to be honest about the process and the desired outcome. We need to discuss how we are going to grow revenue as well. This will make the discussion more productive. People will defend their turf.

Senator Lurie: The five million in savings can be calculated in tenure track faculty. It equals 66 faculty if you divide $5 million by the average faculty salary (estimated 75,000). How is this process going to intersect with the CBA? At some point the faculty need to take a stand on what we need to be a university. How many programs do we need? How many faculty?

Dean Kirgis: There are benefits to that are added to the savings, so the number will be lower. When OCHE is asked this question the response is: Your enrollment is down by 25%, you need to cut the same percentage of faculty.

Professor Manuel: Remember this is better than another round of non-strategic across the board cuts.

Senator Ware: We need a recruit UM campaign that is running parallel to the UPC process. The faculty need to know about these initiatives, so something positive is brought into the discussion. It’s unclear whether this will happen with a new Provost, or if President Bodnar is working on a plan. It needs to happen soon.

APASP did look at cost, but it wasn’t ranked. It is not clear whether the research funds considered will be dollars or quintiles. Budget impact in terms of net cost is very difficult to calculate. It would be more genuine to determine what is spent now of the program. He cautions that the Senate as a full body would not be able to review each program to determine whether to invest, align, or de-invest.

Dean Kirgis: The draft Faculty Senate review section was taken from MSU Northern’s process (over a time period of 18 months). The Senate needs to decide the output of its review. It was put in the draft to start the discussion.

Senator Angle: The first portion of the discussion of areas of expertise speaks to areas where we have opportunity for growth. If the President fails to present a plan to the Board of Regents in May does the decision get taken out of shared governance?

Dean Kirgis did not have an answer.

Senator Beck: We have to recognize that a $5 million cut equates to approximately 50 faculty. Are programs identified for further consideration going to enter the retrenchment process?

Dean Kirgis: His understanding is retrenchment means terminating tenured faculty. There is no way to save $5 million without eliminated tenured faculty positions. The path forward will likely include retrenchment.

Senator Manuel: The term retrenchment is not used in the draft, because there could be programs that are primarily adjunct faculty. When the programs identified the CBA retrenchment process will be triggered.

Senator Bunch: There has been a lot of pain with faculty leaving in some departments. This is probably disproportionate across campus. Will the data take this into account? Is it a snap shot in time or taken over a number of years?

Dean Kirgis: The data evaluated is over a period of time. This metric is used because it is the only number (20% decline in enrollment over a period of six years) used in the CBA to justify the curtailment of a program.

Chair Bowman: Is the UPC proposing to provide the data to our brand new President who doesn’t have a Provost or an academic background to make the recommendations, or the UPC makes the recommendations, they go through the Faculty Senate and then go to the President.

Dean Kirgis: At the end of the day the President has to make the decision in accordance with the CBA. So how does he get there? What is the appropriate role of UPC and shared governance? At what level of detailed analysis do we provide him with guidance? Is it a list of programs? Is it data and information? The UPC is open to feedback.

Senator Ratto-Parks: The UPC would appreciate having your questions / concerns made formal through the website interface.

Senator Semanoff clarified that the preliminary drafts on the Senate agenda have not yet been discussed by the full UPC. The subgroups have been working independently. The UPC will meet tomorrow.

Senator Vonessen: It is not possible for the Faculty Senate to come up with recommendations. The Senate will need a draft recommendation to consider. The time line is too short for the body to review all the materials. The Senate will have to determine the form of its review.

Dean Kirgis: Do the members of UPC vote on which programs to eliminate? In his mid this is the responsibility of the President. He would like to see the Senate’s review and recommendation to the President’s recommendations. This is what President Bodnar wants to hear from you.

Chair Bowman: How should we as a body plan for this? What kind of feedback do we give? If any? Areas of Excellence have to considered in light of what will be eliminated

Senator Mayer: The areas of excellence feed right into this and have direct consequences for programs that will not be sustained. These things need to be considered in this way. The omissions identified need to be considered and incorporated.

Senator Manuel: We would be doing a disservice if we don’t consider our recommendations in light of the strategic strengths and weaknesses of the university. We need to move forward to grow the university in a sustainable way. He is not sure how close we are going to get because the subgroups are working at different levels.

Senator Coffin: The Board of Regents are responsible for our current situation. We need to push back.

Chair Bowman: ECOS will consider whether the Senate needs to have a special meeting and will be expecting an updated draft of the process plan after the UPC meeting.

###  Executive Session

* The Senate Consider Posthumous Degree Candidate
The candidate presented by Anne Delaney (seconded motion from ECOS) was unanimously approved.

## Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5 p.m.