Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes  
April 12, 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. Alger, B. Allred, J. Angle, D. Beck, M. Boller, M. Bowman, J. Bunch, A. Chatterjee, S. Clouse, D. Coffin, A. Delaney, D. Erickson, E. Gagliardi, S. Gordon, K. Griggs, B. Halfpap, M. Hamon, B. Harrison, M. Horejsi, J. Hunt, G. Larson, D. Lurie, T. Manuel, H. Martens, M. Mayer, M. Monsos, M. Musick, A. Nack, H. Naughton, D. Patterson, S. Phillips, G. Quintero, S. Ross, A. Ratto-Parks, Y. Reimer, S. Schwarze, J. Sears, M. Semanoff, A. Sondag, S. Strohl, E. Uchimoto, N. Vonessen, A. Ware  
 **Members Excused:** A. Ametsbichler, E. Baucom, A. Belcourt, J. Carter, S. Certel, G. Collins, Z. Cooper, N. Dawson, A. Elliott, L. Fern, D. Macdonald, L. Nichols, M. Pershouse, J. Thomsen

**Members Absent:** J. Banville, S. Bitar, S. Caro, Y. Cho, G. Collins, T. Crawford, N. Greymorning, A. Kline, M. Maneta, J. Millspaugh

**Ex-Officio Present:** Interim Provost Kirgis,Associate Provost Lindsay

**Minutes:** The minutes from March 15th were approved

## Communications

* Interim Provost Kirgis’ UPC update was moved to the second half of the meeting to accommodate his schedule.
* Chair-elect Matt Semanoff provided an update on the UPC’s Mission and Identity Subgroup’s work. The draft document linked to the agenda included Montana Ways and revised Communities (formerly Areas) of Excellence.

The Montana Ways (Ways of Communicating, Ways of Creating, Ways of Knowing, Ways of Living) would parallel the General Education Program.  It is meant to honor our liberal arts tradition.  The focus is moving from content areas to competencies.  The Subgroup tried to give some ideas of items that would fall under the categories.   The Subgroup is hoping to get more guidance from the President.

  Feedback

Montana Ways suggests that we have a different way and it seems that our way has gotten us in the current situation.  Could “way” be replaced by “foci”?  Suggesting that these are things we are committed to or focused on.

The Subgroup has considered that we are too focused on the local rather than the global or international and has tried to open up the narrow focus.  There is a lot of room for interpretation in the ways these will eventually be developed.

How we go about re-aligning general education will be a challenge that we discover moving forward.  This could be a replacement for the current program with 11 groups. There has been some discussion of creating a course for each of the Ways.    
  
The President asked the UPC Subgroup to generate some guideposts for curriculum required of all undergraduates.  The question of how to implement and what the model will look like is for the Senate, the general education committee and the entire faculty to determine.  Senator Schwartz thinks of these as the key principles that might guide a new model.  If there is a shift in our core curriculum, it will need to draw on what we already do, but perhaps in a more innovative way.  Rather than discussing the details of courses, the Senate should consider whether all the principles are included.

               The existing general education structure has a lot of overlap in the descriptions and learning outcomes.   
  
The ways came about because of questions about how we assert liberal arts values such as critical thinking. The Subgroup has tried to sort out how to relate these to the areas of excellence (communities).  We do have major and discipline specific learning, but also general expectations of what all UM graduates should develop. The ways is trying to give identity to what we value in a core curriculum.

One of the presumptions UM is fighting is that students interested in STEM fields should go to MSU. This document increases this belief.  There are no sciences in the Ways or the Communities.  This has to be changed. The scientific method, basic science and discovery is missing.   We have strong science programs, but they are not represented in these ideas.

President Bodnar is very much on board with making sure the sciences are well articulated.

Technology needs to be included as well given the current environment.

The sixth area of excellence could be some STEM field. We can’t just succeed STEM to MSU.  We hear that many students go to MSU for Engineering, but end up studying something else.  We have to advertise and strive for excellence in STEM fields.

It is encouraging to see just four focuses for the core.  Students are turned away from UM because of the number of requirements.  UM’s general education requirements are an impediment to students graduating.  We should chose a word that is more future thinking for our new model, not “way.”

For those not reflected in the areas of excellence.  It looks like humanities are going to be assigned to general education rather than scholarly inquiry.  Did the Subgroup consider the MUS Common Core.  Will these ideas have any impact on transferability of students between institutions?

The Subgroup has not considered the transferability details of the system. That would be an aspect for consideration during implementation. We are struggling to distinguish ourselves and establish our identity, but we are part of a system and this should be acknowledged.

Montana Ways can be replaced with something like categories or values and include something to cover science such as basic scientific research.  Basic science distinguishes from technical engineering.

The Subgroup started with lists under each title.  Something like this was included in the drafts.

Knowing as one of the four categories is vague and over general. The other three ways are also ways of knowing.  The proportionality is concerning.  Ways of Knowing is the fundamental goal of liberal arts education not one of four goals of a liberal arts education. Putting it together with the other specific goals is misleading. Ways of Living is part of college, but a lot of it is non-curricular.  It’s more life experience of being in college. How to live life is not something you take a class on.  This is an odd way to describe a curricular goal.

The Subgroup may want to meet with the General Education Committee.  They have some interesting ideas.   
The Chair of the General Education Committee attended a Subgroup meeting when this discussion was initiated.

It is apparent that many disciplines can fit within the categories. However, ecological is mentioned specifically, but other natural sciences are not.  The scientific method is a way of knowing. It is broad and encompasses many different areas of science.   If this helps define general education in the future, it looks as if students could fulfill the core without taking a science course.   The existing Ways of Knowing course is heavily focused on philosophy.

The Subgroup can certainly focus on adding an emphasis on science.  It will be up to the General Education Committee, ASCRC, and Faculty Senate as this moves forward in defining how they are implemented.  These broad stroke images can be modified.  The Subgroup will move ahead and try to accommodate all the feedback.

#### Communities (Areas) of Excellence

The most noticeable changes from last month is that the questions were replaced by clarifying statements.  Technology has been incorporated with Business rather than Entrepreneurship. The is still discussion of retaining all three terms.  There is now focus under Environment and Sustainability. The title did include Natural Science, so the point is taken about losing some of the emphasis on science.  The category encompassing law was expanded according to feedback.

The Subgroup should be clear about the intended audience of the document.    
The Areas may be used to determine which areas to cut.  It seems that all of the Professional Schools and Colleges fit into the scheme except the College of Education and Human Sciences and there is a lack of coverage for the College of Humanities and Sciences, specifically in the area of science.  We have had a few narrow focuses for excellence such as the creative writing program. When the areas become broad to cover most programs, it then seems to exclude the rest.   It makes a strong statement of what is not included and suggests we don’t inspire to excellence in STEM fields.

Each one of the areas seems to apply to one of the Professional Schools and leaves the others behind.

The Subgroup was specifically trying to avoid having the areas map directly to Colleges.

Entrepreneurship should be put back into the title because it includes a lot of development.    
The audience maters in terms of the language used. Is the goal to define the strategic overlay of the UPC Data Group? It seems that the document is trying to serve two purposes.

The Communities of Excellences have been de-conceptualized.  The Subgroup has been working on a several page document with a preamble that explains the purpose.  The “we” in that document is often the Subgroup, but also the University of Montana.  It has been a struggle to determine the voice.  The Subgroup has primarily been focused for the internal audience, the people of the University of Montana. Something like these things will be presented differently to the public, our external audience.  The audience is an important point.

There are too many “and’s” in the document which questions whether the focus is really concise as it could be.

 The group will continue to work on the documents.

* UFA Vice President Megan Stark   
  She amplified Chair-Elect Semanoff’s invitation to faculty to serve on committees next year. We have very important work ahead of us and faculty involvement is critical.   
    
  She wanted to make sure faculty are clear about where we are in terms of shared governance in the process as outlined in contract (section 7.100, displayed). The contract exists to establish working conditions and terms for the unionized members on campus, but it also exists to outline the rights of the individual parties involved. Section 3 defines the rights of the Union, Section 4 outlines management rights, Section 4 defines individual faculty rights, Section 7.100 defines the Faculty Senate’s rights. The process over the last few months. Shared governance does not mean that everyone agrees on the outcome, but that the various parties have engaged in their respective roles according to the contract.   
    
  The University Planning Committee was established as a consulting body. The President will make the recommendations to the Faculty Senate as required by the CBA. The UPC is intended to be a representative body to provide and evaluate the information. The Faculty Senate has the right to weigh in (review and recommend) on matters of academic concern. We are currently at 4) Development, curtailment, discontinuance, or reorganization of academic programs. So the Faculty Senate has scheduled listening sessions so it can create a response to provide to the President. Should retrenchment be triggered by the recommendations the UFA will step in to ensure the CBA is followed. A process for prioritization exists in the CBA. The UPC process followed the contract more closely than APASP or AAIP.  
    
  Questions:

The Faculty Senate does not have the authority to overturn a recommendation from the President. There are other sections in the contract where the administration and the union must be in agreement, but this is not one of them.   
  
Professor Stark was not sure whether Section 7.100 or Section 18 was open during bargaining. She will refer the question regarding changes to the contract to the UFA President Paul Haber.

### Chairs report

The UPC is guiding a process that will reshape the University of Montana. We need to be clear that despite the positive spin the outcome will be the loss of faculty members. Therefore the faculty must pay attention. There are two members of ECOS on the UPC to keep ECOS and the Senate informed. All faculty will need to consider the President’s recommendations. On Tuesday there is a Special Faculty Senate meeting in SS 352 [moved to the Music Recital Hall]. At this meeting President Bodnar will present his recommendations. The recommendations and the data are to be available online prior to the meeting. This meeting is intended for all faculty, so please attend and bring your colleagues.   
  
ECOS is charged with providing a response to the recommendations by Friday May 4th. This cannot be done in a meaningful way without faculty input. Therefore two listening sessions have been scheduled from 3:00 – 5:00 p.m. on April 24th and 26th in SS 352. These are open meetings and all campus members are invited to attend. The President is also having a listening session on Friday, April 20th with members of the UPC. There will not be separate listening sessions for faculty hosted by the administration. The UFA advocated for the Senate when other sessions were proposed.

The President’s decision to restructure eliminated the Enrollment Expert position previously held by Vice President Tom Crady. Although the decision was made in January, the search for the VP of Enrollment and Strategic Communications has only just started. This will likely mean that this important hiring process will completed in the summer when faculty are not on contract an students are not on campus. The Search Committee Chair CIO Matt Riley will attempt to find ways for meaningful involvement when the candidates are on campus most likely in May or June. This is a critical position with broad implications. This is a concern because if we had not had enrollment issues we would not be discussing colleagues losing their jobs. Enrollment indicators for fall are not looking positive. Please stay engaged with this important search.

ASCRC has worked hard on student success initiatives. ECOS is highlighting and amplifying the importance of including faculty in conversations taking place in committees around student success.

ECOS is also considering other ways to collect faculty feedback. There will be an online form for faculty to provide input. ECOS will be having additional meetings to draft the Senate’s response to the recommendations. These will be available for discussion prior to the May 3rd Faculty Senate meeting.

## Committee Reports

### ASCRC Chair Doug Coffin

* The [Curriculum Consent Agenda](http://www.umt.edu/facultysenate/curriculum/approved/ASCRC/ASCRCCurrConsentApril-2018.docx) was approved.
* The [Credit Rounding Motion](http://www.umt.edu/facultysenate/documents/FSDocs17-18/ASCRC-credit-rounding-4-18.docx) was approved
* The [Intermediate and Advanced Writing Course description changes](http://www.umt.edu/facultysenate/documents/FSDocs17-18/WritingCourseDescrPrereq_4_18.docx) were approved. The language will remind students to take the writing courses in sequence. The prerequisites will not be enforced.

### Graduate Council

* The [revised Graduate Increment Requirements and Guidelines (301.30)](http://www.umt.edu/facultysenate/procedures/GradCouncil_300/301.30_GraduateIncrement-4-12-18.docx) were discussed and sent back to committee. The Mathematics Department teaches UG service courses and was not in favor of requiring graduate students to complete a graduate component that accounts for 20% of their grade that requires a separate grading methodology. Graduate Council Chair Ross asked that Senator Patterson send a follow-up written explanation of his concerns that could be shared with the Council.

## Communication Continued

### Interim Provost Paul Kirgis

Interim Provost Paul Kirgis summarized the UPC Data Subgroup process and the current status of the review. The methodology was to act in two stages. In the first stage the UPC looked at the objective data on efficiency and cost as well as other factors such as research and productivity. This resulted in an initial pool of programs for further consideration in stage two at which point the work of the mission and identity group would be considered as well as a deeper analysis of the data and connections among programs to see where there was the possibility of achieving budget savings.

In Stage two the UPC handed off its work to President Bodnar to work in conjunction with the Deans, himself and incoming Provost Jon Harber. This process is ongoing.

The Data Subgroup worked with the Data Office and Chuck Harris’ research team to ensure the data was accurate, understandable, and appropriate data to move toward a balanced budget. The UPC is close to being able to release the data publically. The delay is due to converting the information to an assessable format. There is an [explanatory video](https://youtu.be/UzpIEFb6CaI) and a [Tableau](https://public.tableau.com/views/UPCDemandModel4-12-2018Enhanced/Demand?:embed=y&:display_count=yes&publish=yes&:toolbar=no.). Tableau presents data in an interactive way. He hoped it would be ready for the meeting and apologized.

The first stage analysis de-Identified programs and focused on cost per student credit hour in conjunction with enrollment. Then information was added on faculty FTE and faculty instructional cost. Cost per student credit hour is on the vertical axis and enrollment on the horizontal axis (which can be modified according to different ways of measuring enrollment, such as majors, degrees awarded). Then other information such as research grant awards, student population (resident, non-resident, WUE), and comparisons to Delaware data norms of instructional costs was overlaid. Some programs are simply more expensive to deliver. The end product was basically a de-identified scatter plot for undergrad and graduate programs. The UPC simply chose those that had an exceptionally high cost and were off the Delaware norms. Some of the anomalies, such as programs with high research activity were removed, but the intent was to be inclusive. The Subgroup estimated the budget impact by taking the average salary across campus ($50,000) plus added benefits ($62,000) multiplied by the faculty FTE. This provided a relatively conservative estimate of potential savings. The group of programs in this category resulted in a potential savings of 16-17 million dollars. The President’s objective is to make 5 million in cuts and build the rest through growth.   
  
This group of programs was provided to President Bodnar and formed the basis for the Dean’s Saturday retreat. Incoming Provost Harber also attended. The retreat focused on how to guide decisions for UM’s future in terms of programs to curtail, discontinue, reorganize, or expand. He and President Bodnar continue to meet with deans and talk with Incoming Provost Harber to add the qualitative component to the process. They are discussing how programs might fit together in order to develop a plan. The plan will recommend a variety of changes (curtailment, discontinuance, and reorganization) to programs. These are defined terms in the collective bargaining agreement. Curtailment is a reduction in tenured faculty. The CBA specifies this process according to probationary and non- tenured faculty. It is possible to retain a program and reduce the number of faculty. Discontinue is the elimination of a degree program. This can occur with our without faculty curtailment. Reorganization is moving programs and people around. This can occur within or across colleges. It can merge programs, discontinue programs with faculty moving to another program, and can occur with or without curtailment. The hope is that the plan will be released on Monday [Tuesday morning] to give faculty a chance to review prior to President Bodnar’s presentation at the Special Faculty Senate meeting Tuesday afternoon.

Questions / Comments

The Deans were provided with the data last week and asked to vet within their college. The assumption is that they did so. The data is based on fiscal year 2017 and is mostly from APASP. The enrollment calculation was based on course rubric rather than paying department. The responses to APASP that documented flaws in the data were considered. The UPC made corrections based on the feedback. It really tried to get the data right. Unfortunately it will never be perfect. A goal that the campus is working toward is one truth with respect to data. We now have a better understanding of the numbers and have improved the way we keep track of research dollars. The faculty will want to be able to understand the data so the decision making is transparent. It is hoped that the President’s presentation on Tuesday will include a rationale for the decisions. The graph has a lot of useful information.   
  
It was never intended for the UPC to choose the program, but rather to provide critical information to the President. The whole structure needs to be taken into account. There could be programs not identified by the Data Subgroup that are folded into the process. What matters is the President’s recommendations.   
  
Interim Provost Kirgis could not speak to the timeline to realize savings. President Bodnar’s understanding is that UM has 3 to 4 years to balance the budget. This is a negotiation between him, OCHE and the BOR. If we get to the point of Retrenchment the CBA procedure / timeline will be enacted. A lot can happen in these years.

Considering the role of retirement and attrition is tricky because of the Age Discrimination Act. We cannot ask faculty if they are planning to retire. We need to get to a budget figure through strategic actions which will likely include curtailment at some level. We hope that attrition solves some of the problem.   
  
On average 15- 20 faculty retire every year. The use of vacancy savings has gutted departments, so we should be trying to realign positions within colleges and departments, so there is not an imbalance. People cannot be productive under these conditions. Everyone’s morale is suffering and some (the best) will leave. This will be part of the process, but it is totally unpredictable. We need to be strategic so there are operating funds. The goal is to lay out a plan that makes sense given our enrollment. The administration understands the critical nature of the situation and is sensitive to releasing names of programs for curtailment when trying to recruit. The UPC cannot do the work of a retrenchment committee.   
  
The messaging is critical and the administration is having discussions about the best way to tell the story. It has to be a message of innovation, growth and regeneration and a renewed commitment to the liberal arts. This will be a challenge given how the national rhetoric. We have to counter this narrative as well as the one of a university in decline. The story in Wisconsin is a lesson we need to learn from.

The administration is looking at other structures and funds, but that is not a part of the UPC process  
Departments may be moved from one college to another without curtailment. Some examples were given.

There is enormous concern about enrollment and the administration is moving as quickly as it can to address these. We are trying to impact the 20% loss of students over the summer. We used to have a big summer program. This is where Academic Affairs is currently focused, while the recruitment for an admissions person is underway.

Often a lower student to faculty ratio correlates with a better student experience, so the method of cutting all the programs with this more personal student experience won’t improve the university’s reputation. Some programs with higher ratios could be under staffed. The data was normalized according to the Delaware study. For example we know music is expensive everywhere because of the one-on-one instruction. There was an issue of comparing Forestry to the Delaware data that had to be addressed.

Our total overall enrollment is down by 30%. Total instruction is down 10% and tenure/ tenure- track faculty is down less than 5%. Five years ago we were doing a good job of educating our students with higher ratios. We have to look at the discrepancies.   
  
The UPC Mission and Identity Subgroup is focused on the bigger picture of how we succeed going forward. We must free up the resources to be able to reinvest. Hopefully we will be able to use the information collected to identify where we can grow.   
  
This is going to be a long process. The President’s recommendations will be preliminary. The point in giving them to the Faculty Senate is so faculty can provide feedback on what will not work and needs to be done differently. The end goal is to have an actionable plan. Interim Provost Jon Harber has been included because he will be responsible for the implementation.   
  
Missoula College could not be treated the same way as the main campus. It is in a period of transition without a leader. There were areas identified in APASP where action could be taken. The administration is looking at options to help Missoula College find a new identity built more aggressively on online education and outreach beyond Missoula on alternative ways of delivering education in order to make it a growth area.   
  
Interim Provost Beverly Edmond processed all the FEC’s before she left. The Administration would not deny promotion to resolve the budget situation.

Some of the things at the core of the university have been harmed the most over the past 4-5 years. Some of those things should not be cut but restored. The deans are considering the communities of excellence in conjunction with possible reorganizations as well as potential cuts. We are not in the growth stage yet.

Good and Welfare

* Senator Mayer commented that the proposed reorganization of the College of Humanities and Science shows now prospect of significant savings and would be an act of academic vandalism.
* The Kyiyo Pow Wow is next week, there will be Indian Law lectures at the Law School, and other associated events.
* The [Immersion Learning Research Network (iLRN) Conference](https://immersivelrn.org/ilrn2018/) will be in Missoula this June. The conference will bring together “a global network of developers, educators, and research professionals collaborating to develop the scientific, technical, and applied potential of immersive learning. Workforce trainer, higher education, and K12 professionals are so invited to participate”.

## Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.