

Faculty Senate Special Meeting

December 8, 2018

Attendees: Peter Lucon, Scott Risser, Charie Faught, Glen Southergill, Nick Hawthorne, David Hood, Katherine Zodrow, Miriam Young, Hilary Risser, Kristi Bailey, Steve Gammon, Mary North-Abbott, Dan Authenrieth, Doug Abbott, Laura Young, Stella Cappocia, Courtney Young, Dan Trudnowski, Tim Kober, John Garic, Kishor Shresta, Ulan Holtz, Abhishek, Jeff Braun, Brant Wright, Rita Spear, Elyse Lovell, Chip Todd, Roberta Ray, Martha Apple, Jerry Downey, Chris Roos,

Remarks from the Chair for proceeding:

Not full agenda, not looking at normal items. Quorum has been achieved, so items and resolutions can be made.

All of us are state employees, we are not a business and our boss is the governor. We have the same institutional mission, have the same best interest and must be cognizant and be responsible stewards of financial resources. Should also be respectful of other employees. Need to presume good intentions until we see evidence otherwise.

As state employees, must follow all appropriate regulations, including state and federal, BOR, and faculty and staff handbook. What is going to happen must follow with no shortcuts. Senate will hold everyone to that.

The Chancellor is retiring in July, with question of what he can do. Deputy and Commissioner are fully aware of what is happening on this campus, both in terms of competence and incompetence. Since the chancellor is staying until July, this sends a message. The Commissioner does listen. UM and Dillon are examples, such as not filling anonymous surveys at Dillon. Faculty Senate chair of Dillon contacted commissioner who sided with faculty, which now evaluates administration. OCHE is watching and listening.

On the issue of financial exigency, we are not at this stage. What has not been said is realignment with special focus and the current financial trend must be addressed. This has not been said enough. One thing with financial exigency is a way to terminate tenured faculty members. Administration does have the right for changes in staffing and programs. Faculty Senate has control of curriculum, which is part of shared governance. There is a way for faculty to respond, such as the closure of programs, which must go thru CRC, FS, and BOR. Faculty can say don't eliminate a program. However, administration can decide not to staff faculty lines or have faculty teach those courses. This situation would hurt students. We do have a role and have power, but must use it wisely.

Tenuous employment, even deans and vices, are at the leisure of the institution. The situation is not the same as tenured faculty, so it is the responsibility for tenured faculty to speak up on controversial issues. Tenured faculty should not fear controversial and tough issues, and should be able to speak their minds to say what needs to be said. This includes PPC and Chancellors cabinet discussions.

We will use small group parliamentary procedure. Keep in mind that some procedures will be kept, such as statement less than ten minutes. People must refrain from speaking after so others have a chance to speak. Guests can make motions and speak, but senators can second and vote.

Today we should be talking about the process and version 2 of the PPC plan. Changes to version 2 are based on interactions with departments and academic deans. This discussion should not be about advocacy of particular programs. Everyone that advocates for are arguing against something else. Any cuts in the alignment plan that seem to be based on someone being a trouble maker, union member, disagreeing with administration, women, or minority group will be watched closely. If anyone is saved based on a back door deal, old boy network or hunting buddies, should be based on metrics, rational clear change and cannot be suspect.

Will chair the discussion, but document now has the floor.

Discussion Regarding PPC Version 2 Draft Document

Comment that should have same numbers and metrics for each department, so can compare with each department. Example would include number of majors for each.

Comment on language of each program. Some had valid recommendations to make improvements, but the recommendations are not even across the board. What were the decisions made that lead one program to make changes versus another to be eliminated- what was the process?

Comment from chair to take a stab of framing concern into a motion for the senate specifically ask giving programs more or less time to make changes. Why are some programs given time to make adjustments and others are terminated with no changes? No second, so no further action.

Chair comment that motion without a second will die, but conversation can continue. Clarification that would like to know why this happened.

Comment that if read through v2 some programs immediately close, but others given more time to make teaching adjustments, changes to curriculum. Appears to be discrepancy in how programs are being treated.

Question on can we ask those who are part of the decisions to answer the question. Can also have a motion to request the information, but can also ask individuals present in the room.

Question of would deans be willing to address the questions and comments. Response that effort was made to make the information available in the metrics. Each section is an analysis of the metrics, realistically where each one fall, how many students, service, and the metrics. The basis of recommendations is trying to paint that picture. Sustainable programs also need a critical mass of faculty. The goal was to try to tell a story that is consistent. Language was based on differences that

have been noted. Others may not agree if this is consistent. Tech has to make changes and staff reductions, and looking at programs that are at the bottom, which will bear the brunt. Tried to be very consistent in the metrics driving the decisions. Since new, looked at it with a blind eye in order to make changes.

Question in looking at metrics, how much weight for Science and Engineering. Response that science and engineering designation was a weighting measure, not very qualitative. Stated up front that was a factor. Must fit within the guideposts. How were programs included in STEM and non-STEM also important. The method was to simply use the CIP definitions, which became quite an argument. While some codes do have some grey area, with some programs with an argument, but stuck with IPEDs and CIP codes data. To ensure the integrity of the process, some groups lobbied very hard, but stuck with CIP codes. Deans made efforts to not make back door deals.

Comment that since last Friday, have heard unsubstantiated rumors. Deans did level best on making eliminations based on the data. Metrics may not show to the best advantage to have the same shot. Heard that some departments reached out to and not others. Should not have impropriety, but v 2 doesn't show why with justification. Those that do remain, rumor that only be kept because of relationship. Personality and likability should not be a factor, and the data should be apparent with decisions based on the data. Should be an attempt to be impartial and fair.

Comment that qualitative statements like weak and strong, should have quantitative measure of what is the cutoff for weak strong and moderate. Dean response that in the discussions were along the alignment, perhaps should exist in v3. Some of the language has been a bit descriptive, but can change. Response that hard effort to reach every department after v1, especially those that are directly impacted. Changes that see are due to responses from faculty. Goal was to get dialogue, which did achieve. Conversations helped to make changes, more conversations will occur.

Response that a lot of conversations occurred before v1 came out. Most departments did provide information, but not all (all given the opportunity). Talked about the process, what they wanted to see or not. Information went into the document, such as data science and statistics with notes becoming part of the document. Lots of conversations beforehand.

Question on can you describe your moral in going through the process. The moral on campus is not great. Looking at spreadsheet for 1735 students able to register- recognizing drop in registration, may have 300 plus not eligible based on holds. If students aren't there, but have to go through this. Response in dean's council overview of pre-registration counts. Some are due to graduations, some based on holds like parking tickets. In terms of moral, whole campus is aware of issues before us and we need to take action. PP process in comments to newspaper and media, focused mainly on money and budgets, but another piece to the process of commissioner "what is holding MT Tech back" which led to WIRE, special focus, etc. Special focus designation changed who Montana Tech is. How is our campus going to change due to special focus.

Response that this has been the most difficult week in career. Cannot go through the process and not impact. For one dean it was the third time going through the process and is always difficult, because it

impacts people's lives. This has been hard work. Was warned that this was happening and that this is being taken very seriously.

Comment on one of the questions in list why are all the administrators safe, all the administration on the board (PPC), isn't this a conflict of interest. Is there any way to save money by cutting administration or consolidating? PPC did consider, but PPC decided that cuts to Administration would be the Chancellor's purview.

Question regarding making decisions based on potential cuts. For instance, one student who skipped out on an exam. Typically the faculty member asks students to notify in advance, but was notified after. In other words, these kind of decisions are changing based on potential cuts, as we don't want decision to be about keeping the student. Decisions should be based on learning and ability to matriculate. Want students to do the work as opposed to streamlined class. Registration have at least four students for watching alcohol awareness class four hour video, two for parking tickets. Could we not improve retention by changing the policy- these may not be the best hurdles to overcome? Getting the money to pay for parking ticket, classes being filled up. Could we not make some changes to allow students to register, or are parking tickets more important. Not sure the policy on the alcohol training. Response that alcohol class is a federal requirement to be eligible for financial aid. Response that can take a look at parking ticket policy to be looked at, problem is that students can continue to collect and may not pay. Tickets help pay to repave the parking lot, all plays together, would have to pay other ways. Things that institutions can do for students to help students, such as emergency fund if purely financial that can be set up, such as with alumni fund. A small amount should not hold students from registering next semester, should review what we can do. We do have the funds, but we do have students with holds with some that accrue large amounts, like \$600. Parking tickets can be 1/3 of paying for improvements. What are the administrative hurdles that prevent students from registering? What accommodations can be made?

Question if faculty person whose program may not exist after this, what happens and what is the process? Is there a general vision, or how might that look? Response from the Vice Chancellor that BOR policy and Collective Bargaining on Timeline on when faculty need to be notified, will follow those dates. We are obligated to teach out students in the program, no new students in the programs, also must be report to northwest accreditation body and how this will be completed. May have course substitutions, credits from other schools can be part of how this is done.

Question are there limits or rules in place about transfer course, such as 50% of courses. Response that catalogue requirement are that a student must have at least 50% of upper division credits at Montana Tech plus capstone. The requirement is not necessarily in the department.

Question regarding integrity of the degree if substitution from getting from other departments. Response when a student starts under a catalogue will need to honor those courses.

If only faculty qualified to teach those courses and faculty leave, will not be able to honor those course. Response that will make sure that the courses are offered that students need to take.

Question regarding along the timeline of a student, what happens when it is a distance student- do they have a timeline to complete the degree and courses? Response that will have a plan of study for students- will not last forever and must be reasonable, including distance students.

Comment that this has been horrible, don't want to have this happen again. Missoula went through the process mostly for budgetary reasons. Is this enough so that we do not have to go through again (don't want to repeat the process). Will it be transparent about making enough cuts? Will this be part of the final document? Response that issues are already in the document. We will have an annual review of programs, and will set certain criteria for departments to trigger an action plan to review. Will try to implement to help everyone to avoid and flag issues and address as they arise (red, yellow, etc.) Departments should know where they stand. Response that the most important paragraph in V2 is about the continuous process of effectiveness. Quantitative metrics and strategic planning will be the basis of hiring, etc. As an institution we have had twenty years of flush, but not sustainable, based on petroleum engineering. Need to be fully committed and PP which will never go away. Will continue the process every year, programs will need to know the metrics and work to make improvements. We are not there right now. This does not get us all the way, but sets the table where we need to go. We are facing tough times in higher education, but we are small and highly efficient and we do them well.

Question regarding what is the timeline for the construction and how will it be implemented. Response that this spring metrics and thresholds will be created, including timelines. Everyone in the room needs to be a part of this. Program review has been happening as part of accreditation, but will now be annually process for accreditation. Level of scrutiny may vary, but will be ramped up and should be taken seriously. BOR policy that once every 7 years for each department, with a cycle.

Question regarding why did we not have used this process as an earlier point? Have not used in this way to make program decisions, if not why. Response that one page to BOR have included language regarding program being reviewed, have contained information if issues have been identified. Going forward in the future will have teeth. We went into a pattern of not assessing correctly, but will do so moving forward.

Comment from the chair that quorum no longer exists, but can still discuss

Comment that wind energy program was discontinued because of program review document.

Chair thanked the academic deans in the work for metrics and coming up with proves, thank the vice chancellor for non-academic side. Response that had v1 and now v2, with changes traced back on conversations held in forums, PPC committee mailbox comments. Once you have time to digest v2 will see the process changes. V3 still coming up.

Question regarding in three years' time if followed current path would we have to declare financial exigency. Response that have not done analysis, but at some time will run out of funds. In a couple of years hoping to level out in terms of enrollment decline. We currently have 4 million dollars in excess funds, but not replacing as we use them. Something has to be done now to make it stronger for the future.

Question regarding how much thought on other sources of income, while we do need more students. Research brings in more dollars and research should be fostered. We do okay in research, but we teach more than high research institution. Hard to teach, research. Response that we need to free up resources so that we can refocus our efforts to gain additional funding. Realignment plan helps to refocus and go after the funds. Comment that enjoying conversation regarding endowments.

Question regarding recruitment- are we looking at recruitment a little more intensely, not just targeting high schoolers, but also nontraditional? Are we looking at different ways to recruit and using funds? Response that operational funds are declining in last three year, but increase recruiting budget. PPC PowerPoint included on efforts. High points about recruiting talk. Apparent that recruiters aren't recruiting for departments but for Tech. Once they express interest for Tech, then look to department. Recruiting is based on student interest. Does executive council believe that the amount spent is appropriate, with response that it is underfunded. Question regarding is there a plan to fix that situation? Response that campus committing more resources to recruiting, but still have a way to go. Are some of the cost savings being earmarked for marketing or recruitment. Response that no discussion of where funds should be dispersed, but should be considered. Response that as faculty and everyone at Montana Tech is a recruiter. In a general sense faculty do not understand that as their role.

Comment on recruiting and marketing. Recruiting is great, but if a student does not know what is available, then a problem. As a Montanan, not aware of what available in Butte. If we do not let students know. Recruiters in a hospital for cancer treatment, ad for cancer nurses. We need students know about programs. Response that it is a marketing issue. Marketing and recruiting tied together, but not the same thing.

Chair comment that each department should know how marketing and recruiting workloads. We do need assistance, faculty development, which faculty need to fulfill those roles based on strengths and abilities. Response that used to have faculty call students that have expressed interest in a program at Montana Tech. Don't know why we went away from doing that, but should consider going back to the effort. Some department do, some don't. Comment that students and others do not pick up the phone due to caller id. Not an effective use of time. Comment that can send and ability to send texts. Things have worked in the past, but need to be updated with departments needing support. Comment that could quickly go down list on how we can improve. A lot of motivation on how this happens- periodically recruiting folks may be able to interact with department on a regular basis to keep the information flowing to let us know what the issues are and how we can do better. Response that there is science on the issue is that faculty more effective for activities on campus, with a lot of little things, with departments developing a one hour session and wearing Tech wear.

Comment that recently going into the high schools that students are high tech. Reached out communications department to have a PowerPoint that appeals to the audience. Just looking at ways to reach out to younger age groups using the technology that we have. Looking for help. Response from another faculty that can help.

Comment on process between v1 and v2. Can we revisit the process moving forward? Response that V2 posted last night, with a v3 coming up scheduled a week from today. Question regarding are there particular points of information that administration is looking for in the newest version. Response that another iteration of dialogue should happen. PPC have an opportunity to bring in individual recommendations and thoughts will also occur. Other routes to exist. View it as another round of conversations.

Comment on curious to know how much PPC has been involved in the draft and what do their role in the next round. Response that there are some committee members are not pleased with how the process has panned out. Document written by two subcommittees. Some feel that the committee as a whole should have been the body. Individual committee members are encouraged to send thoughts and recommendations to the chancellor. Deans are all on the committee who became subcommittee for academic side. Every person on the committee has had an opportunity to provide input.

Comment that one week for the process to conclude, with question as to what is being requested for input. Response that forums for communications exist, with individuals and departments allowed to participate in any venue they choose. Constructive input from a variety of sources helped to put together the current V2. People have not been reactionary, but constructive and giving options has been commendable.

Motion to adjourn and seconded.