

**Minutes - Faculty Senate
December 08, 2000
3:30 PM – Mountain Con Room - SUB**

Attendees: Henry Gonshak, CHAIR, Kate Miller, Curtis Link, Bob DeDominic, Danette Melvin, David Hobbs
Visitor: Chancellor Gilmore
Recorder: Curtis Link

Agenda

Agenda for December 08 meeting:

1. approval of minutes from previous meeting
2. consideration of anonymous request for faculty senate consideration of 'no confidence' vote in administration
3. administrative budget cuts (Gilmore)
4. does the senate wish to respond to Mingle's report on MUS restructuring?
5. senate agenda for next semester
6. senate or administrative sponsored potluck
7. other business
8. adjourn

Old Business

Approval of minutes from last meeting -

The minutes of the last meeting on December 1, 2000 as recorded by Butch Gerbrandt were approved.

New Business

Item 2 on agenda

Although no formal action on the anonymous motion was taken, the general consensus was that the Senate had no interest at this time in sponsoring a vote of 'no confidence' in the administration.

Discussion was discontinued when Chancellor Gilmore arrived to discuss the current budget cuts.

Item 3 on agenda

Gilmore began by discussing his recent attendance at a meeting looking at a forming a planning committee or task force to discuss the role of chancellors in relation to the presidents of the main campus.

Next, regarding the recent announcement of Dan Bradley's departure, Gilmore said that he will use the opportunity to study the current administration structure to determine if it can be made more efficient. Several of the specifics mentioned were to look at the number of departments currently at Tech, the number of colleges, and the number of vice chancellors.

Gilmore plans to cover Bradley's responsibilities for two or three months this spring until a plan is put in place for how to fill the position. Gilmore said he has done both jobs before.

Bob DeDominic asked Gilmore if our administrative structure was typical for an institution of our size. Gilmore responded by saying that our structure was certainly not atypical, but that there were many variations in administrative structure.

Regarding the budget, Gilmore said that one of his main concerns and goals was to build up a reserve of about \$500k or approximately a 2% enrollment reserve to handle the enrollment fluctuations from year to year. Gilmore noted that the average of enrollment numbers of a period of years shows that Tech's enrollment has remained essentially flat even though fluctuations occur yearly.

The next item of discussion was the consultant Jim Mingle's report to the BOR (Board of Regents) regarding restructuring of the MUS (Montana University System). Gilmore said that a motion had been made by Regent Simms for the Commissioner and the BOR to endorse the first eleven points in Mingle's report. Gilmore thinks this would solve a number of issues that we're currently faced with.

Regarding the suggestion from Mingle that the administrative structure of the MUS was not optimal, Gilmore commented that Mingle felt that the Commissioner and his deputy would not be interested in a system where the head of the Missoula campus was not also the president (presumably that applies to the Bozeman campus as well).

Mingle did comment favorably in his report on some of the sharing of service that has occurred for example, the library system. Gilmore pointed out the Tech's food service has contracted a service from the Missoula campus. This contract could be changed to another service at Tech's discretion.

Henry Gonshak brought up the concern about not being allowed to contact legislative representatives at our discretion. Bob DeDominic asked about the resistance to combining administrative services across campuses. Gilmore replied that it was mostly an autonomy issue brought about by the conflict of interest due to Dennison's dual role. Bob also brought up Mingle's finding that the Dillon campus appears to work well with the Missoula campus – more so than Tech.

Kate Miller voiced concern about the threat to accreditation noted by Mingle in his report, specifically point 5.

In continuing discussion, Gilmore commented that it was Regent Thompson (from Butte) who was instrumental in having the restructuring study done.

Kate Miller asked about the \$50k cuts to IDCs (Indirect Costs obtained by research grants) and what that would mean to researchers on campus. Henry asked about how the departmental recommendations for cuts were used to make the final decisions for cuts. Gilmore said that all of the recommendations from the deans were followed. Whether the deans modified any of the suggestions from the departmental level, he didn't know.

Discussion began on the proposed cost savings by eliminating the position in Central Duplicating. Even though David Hobbs noted the services required by Chemistry as an example, Gilmore responded by saying that overall, the use of Central Duplicating had decreased significantly and that it was a reasonable option for cutting.

Gilmore noted that, more generally, Tech is funded at a 21:1 student to faculty ratio and that in actuality, Tech operates at a 16:1 ratio – contributing to the continual budgeting dilemmas. Gilmore suggested that, for example, departments really need to look more closely at the number of low-enrollment classes and how many of them could be taught on a biennial basis.

Bob DeDominic wondered if budgeting could be moved down to the departmental level so that the difficult decisions about classes and numbers could be made there.

David Hobbs voiced concern that Tech has a marketing persona of engineering school solely devoted to the extractive minerals industry, and that contributes to the growing enrollment problems.

The discussion and meeting concluded with comments from Gilmore about looking at new areas such as nanotechnology and by Bob DeDominic and Curtis Link about resources for recruiting work by the faculty.

Henry concluded the meeting by asking Gilmore if he foresaw any more budget cuts in the near future to which Gilmore replied that he didn't think so but he couldn't say for sure.

Meeting adjourned: 5:00 PM.