

## Faculty Senate Minutes

1/18/2019

10:00-11:00 am

Kelley – Steward SUB 113 AB

Attendance: Scott Risser, Charie Faught, Atish Mitra, Chad Okrusch, Karen Weisenburg-Ward, Jackie Timmer, Kishor Sinesthra, Ron White, Vickie Petritz, Ulana Holtz, Dan Autenreith, Miriam Young, Larry Smith, Matt Egglof, Brant Wright, Peter Lucon, Phil Curtiss, Jeanne Larson, reporter from Montana Standard, Courtney Young, Laura Young, Mary North Abbott,

I. Welcome and Minutes (<https://mtech.edu/facultystaff/facultysenate/minutes/2018/Faculty-Senate-Special-Meeting-12182018-acc.pdf>)

Will have to return to the next meeting since not correct links (now has been updated). Next meeting will have CRC recommendations with signatures required plus two Emeritus Faculty recommendations.

### Action Items

II. CRC Recommendations

- a. Modify courses in Mining Engineering, Petroleum Engineering, Geophysical Engineering, Health Programs (CNA), Geological Engineering, Data Sciences,
- b. Create new course in Geophysical Engineering/Geoscience

Documentation sent out approximately one month ago.

Question does re-alignment have any bearing on submissions? Response that for the geophysical engineering department it is still to be determined, along with health programs. The geophysical engineering course should not be impacted by any changes.

Motion to approve and seconded. Motion Passes.

### Informational Items

IV. Committee updates:

- a. Teaching Community

No representative available, but chair states that past were well attended.

- b. Research Mentors

No report at this time.

- c. Budget

Budget meeting on Monday revolved around fees. Primarily all meetings are in diagnostic phase and trying to figure out what we have in order to move forward. Also philosophical discussion on how to move forward on fees, both mandatory and non-mandatory. For instance, Nursing fee is \$650 per semester once a student enters clinicals, since it requires 1-10 faculty. Right now the ratio is 1-7 faculty to student ratio for clinicals. Currently there are a wide array of fees for departments that are used in different ways. Some fees are going into a general fund account which are used for other purposes. Nursing fees help pay for faculty. Right now trying to understand fee structure at Tech and other places.

Some discussion about overall price point compared to MSU and UM. Comparison of engineering and MSU, our tuition is slightly higher with significant jump with fees, at around \$500-\$600 dollars per semester greater at Tech. Looking at price points for such fees.

Have we considered the tax implications for students? Some items are tax deductible, while potentially fees may not be. May be the same amount of money, but may have tax benefits.

Asked the question about where it (fees) came from, it is a path to get around tuition limits. Process of creating fees may be inconsistent and may not be accessed by individuals or departments who may need it.

Online learning budget is \$680,000, may not be part of the general fund. \$400 for engineering fee, with some students paying for the fee even if taking just one credit for thesis credit for a semester.

Comment that other states have policies and regulation on fees, but Montana does not seem to at this time. Has not been highly scrutinized at the state.

Response from Vice Chancellor of Finance that fees in the past have been convoluted, but trying to put a light on it and to be used for the purpose they were created for. If we need operation budget, should show up as such. Nursing only receives a small percentage of the fees, with some of the rest going to pay for faculty. Goes back to a philosophical approach on how to create a budget moving forward.

Would like to put forward concerns of graduate students who are taking a minimal amount of classes and still getting a fee. Response that may impact only certain students at the graduate level, but will be looking at the process. Right now it may be tied to the department, not the degree.

Question about what role does ASMT play in the approval process? Response that fees are discussed at ASMT meetings, starting last semester. ASMT would like to see some fees being increased. Talks are continuing. An example is the pool being updated, the whole student body voted on raising the HPER fee.

#### d. Campus committee Assessment

Turned report over to the Chair, with no further report at this time. Chair will review moving forward.

#### e. Chancellor Search Advisory Committee

Meeting today for the committee. Will be getting the applications soon to review, but need to go through training, which is today. The search firm will go through training, then link to a website with applications, then full meeting on February 14 to narrow the nominees down. The search committee members are listed on the Tech website. Not aware of how many applicants at this point (may not be able to discuss yet).

## Discussion Items

### V. Advising Models

Has been on the faculty senate to do list, with request to create an advising center, with request to endorse. Fiduciary or financial implications may be beyond our purview, but request was about being beneficial or not. Would like to give some sort of response to the leadership team.

Comment that freshman engineering model currently not working, so opposed to the model. Another comment that if someone else advises that it "becomes a mess". Another department agrees that they do a better job. Another

comment also opposed, but wondering about students who get lost and need to be addressed. Freshmen engineering does a reasonable job, but not if someone gets lost, then more difficult. In nursing do a plan of study for pre-nursing.

Category may include at risk students and those who are on probation.

Another department supports the proposal. When students are lost, need to help.

Is it possible to have an advising program for some departments and not others? Proposal for first year students and probationary. Not necessarily replacing existing advising, would have an additional point of contact. Another department happy to have additional resources for first year students, but not in support of having additional years.

Problem with either have or will be accountable in different ways. There may be other opportunities or ways to improve. Concern that may not be what was communicated (may not be the case). Serves the campus, but mostly serves CLSPS since Highlands offsite and engineering has freshman advising.

Comment that financial issue still a concern, especially if Nursing is excluded.

Do we support the idea when it only supports a third of the campus?

Would prefer that freshman engineering would keep the student until they pass chemistry and pre-calc ready. Support someone staying in that role until they are ready for engineering.

A bit of a disconnect in the fine print about freshman engineering- it is part of the document.

Can ask for clarification on the request, but still looking to have a response.

With current advising load, after freshman engineering and who is at high risk and failing a class. Do we have statistics on what our rate was once we have changed or lowered our standards to get into Montana Tech, especially for engineering? Has that issue been addressed? May be a cause since we are allowing more students in? For instance, writing requirements for mechanical engineering have changed. May impact international students, may impact others. Looking to have similar standards. Not everyone is meant to be an engineer, and may need additional advising. If we want to grow we also should be concerned about quality as well.

Not aware of not lowering standards in department, but BOR has a model of what is accepted, such as GRE and class standing. Recommend that we increase our standards, which increases retention. SD School of Mines benefited from higher standards. Convinced that quality of students has gone down, but not sure if that is wrong. May be reason why retention is low.

Maybe increasing fees to pay may be a way to go. Longevity of advisors may be an issue, and have to retrain. Don't see a plan to put people in but not to make advising better.

Would like to scrutinize the plan. If it is not performing, should not hire a director. The plan has to be more thoughtful.

An option maybe to have advising be embedded in the department and not central.

Would like to have help with advising under the department.

Financial situation, having this would be a luxury. Would rather keep faculty and retaining faculty.

Looking for a motion on how to respond. A budget was sent. Motion to reject the advising model presented and seconded. Question is in regards to endorsement (could still hire). If we agree on the motion, would this be this particular model. Response that the motion is just this particular model. Applies to some percentage within CLSPS without nursing, with three people one director (response that that is the current proposal, with hope to serve everyone). Better to reject and let them come up with something else. May be some good things to do, but need to be revised. Is body of opinion that one issue of freshman engineering not working, would senate consider something more global that can fix? Motion is just to reject current proposal. Those making the motion can make changes, otherwise vote. Meeting minutes are public. Implicit in the discussion that we would like to see something else. Motion just to disagree with the proposal.

Motion passes. Not endorsing this model and will pass forward meeting minutes.

Idea that \$100 fee would generate enough to have three positions (or three faculty). Another comment that MSU cost less and doing better. Students know who is doing better. Comment that cost of living in Bozeman is much higher.

## VI. Other Items

Process for program closures. Comment that we can wait until the next meeting. Paperwork to dissolve one department has been given. The draft with recommendations, with no communications since that time. Comment that need clarification to move forward. Potentially should start at the department, which also has consequences if not done. The document is considered final with no need to have further action to recognize. Question presented that these are the procedures to eliminate a department, should follow the BOR policy (only for those for tenured faculty). However, document for Academic Affairs for a level II items for what forms are required and who fills them out. Consider holding administration to requirements. Have e-mailed Commissioner Thiel to provide clarification on some steps. Indirectly asked others in administration and timeline for steps. No response yet.

Is it common to have elimination before BOR? Response that BOR is the last step.

Can place it in the minutes and can discuss in the future. BOR does have a process, even though we at Tech may be new. Faculty Senate does play a role.

Curious to revision of course evaluations. Has that been part of the process. Chair of the committee has exited. Still in stasis. Not piloted or tested at this time. Comment that committee may have dissolved (minutes would indicate status). Comment that we can pick new senators to pick up again. Response that may not be useful at this time, and should revisit the final comments.

Move to adjourn.