

Faculty Senate meeting 10/20/00 Minutes by Kate Miller

Agenda Items:

1. Last minutes approved unanimously

2. Mary McLaughlin contacted Henry Gonshak regarding whether the Faculty Senate would sponsor a campus forum to discuss the issues surrounding changes in faculty evaluation. Based on a report from Bob De Dominic, there seem to be many on the Faculty Evaluation Steering Committee who didn't even think the committee should exist in the first place because they questioned Dan Bradley's charge to the committee to propose a new system of faculty evaluation.

The first step would be to have a faculty-wide forum (this is in the instruction book for evaluation).

Gonshak: 2 issues,

1. Should Senate have the forum ?,

2. Should there be revisions in evaluation procedures?

Forum to discuss issues, what are benefits, will this be used to reduce staff? Is there even consensus in Steering Committee that they want the new evaluation process to go forward? If steering Committee is not committed, then FacSen should not have the forum.

\*Motion by MacGregor to poll the Steering Committee to determine whether it accepts its charge from the Vice Chancellor to implement the evaluation plan. If so, then we will agree to co-sponsor a faculty wide forum to address the issues.

Henry will inform Mary McLaughlin about the Senate motion.

3. Faculty meeting with Mingle on re-structuring.

Faculty views in meeting were mostly a negation of any benefits we have received from re-structuring. Faculty would rather have autonomy than money, though we don't get any additional money from UM.

Should the Fac Sen spearhead document to Mingle re: faculty views of re-structuring

Fac Sen consensus to use opportunity with Mingle to put together a document.

\*Motion by Gerbrandt: Draft a campus faculty response to Mingle's inquiry about the state of re-structuring at Montana Tech. Motion passed unanimously.

Basic components of document to Mingle:

1. The final decision on tenure and promotion are being made at Missoula by Dennison. Holding us to UM stds. Not Tech stds. Changes character of our own priorities. We don't see ourselves as a teaching institution any more.
2. Threats to accreditation
  - Loss of power over our own curriculum threatens Northwest Accreditation
3. Costs savings: Banner is an example of how the administrative consolidation has cost us money: \$180,000 for Banner plus training our people, and system is of dubious benefit (especially to researchers). Banner gives no history of enrollment. Increased costs but not clear benefit to Tech. Payroll problems: pay on same cycle as UM . We can't afford to go back to biweekly payroll because Gilmore would have to hire another person to administer.
4. Failed promises in terms of reciprocity. The move has not benefited us e.g. MacGregor's MS program. Students don't have the access to programs, disciplines, etc. as promised; no outreach between UM and Tech.
5. Name issue. Curtis Link will try to find the wording in the re-structuring document. Rather than having a levelling of the units, we are now an invisible sub-unit.
6. Affiliate vs. branch language. Examples of how we are becoming a branch rather than an affiliate.
  - Implementation of Banner being forced on us...?

7. Is COT is happy with the merger, as were most of the other units...? (there were no COT representatives present to verify this..)
8. There used to be 3 major campuses in Montana. Tech, MSU and UM.
9. Last year when Tech put together our congressional research proposal requests, UM put their requests ahead of ours. We were told explicitly that we couldn't talk to our congressional delegation.
10. Survival and viability key on our ability to directly communicate with our congressional delegation, BOR , etc.

Deadlines:

meet on 27<sup>th</sup> to review rough draft by Henry

Early in week of 30<sup>th</sup> send document to faculty and ask to vote to approve or disapprove.

By Nov. 3<sup>rd</sup>, send to Mingle.

Meeting adjourned.

KJM