

# Faculty Senate Agenda

September 8, 2022

- I. Welcome and Minutes (<https://www.mtech.edu/facultystaff/facultysenate/minutes/index.html>)

Approvals for May 6, 2022 Meeting Minutes

## Action Items

- II. Confidence & Professionalism Recovery Plan (CPR Plan) Subcommittee Members- see below

## Informational Items

- III. Budget Report

## Discussion Items

- I. Board of Regents MUSFAR discussion
- II. Faculty and Staff Satisfaction Survey
- III. All Faculty Meeting
- IV. Faculty Senate Meetings
- V. Two Faculty Staff Handbook Resolutions- see below
- VI. Timecards for Faculty Policy- see below
- VII. Workload- see below

I. Whereas Montana Tech is an institution with a long history of academic excellence, with its graduates in high demand in all employment sectors;

Whereas current students (and their parents) and future students are our main priority;

Whereas Montana Tech benefits from a strong reputation with alumni and employees;

Whereas enrollment and retention are essential for both our short term and long-term viability as an institution;

Whereas we are currently experiencing the following issues that impact our institution's short term and long-term viability: accountability and governance, trust, and communication;

It is moved that we as the Faculty Senate form a subcommittee to draft a Confidence & Professionalism Recovery Plan with specific recommended actions and time frames to improve accountability, communication, and foster transparency to increase trust. Further, the goal of the subcommittee will be to provide the draft of the plan to the Faculty Senate by October 1, 2022 and present the plan for Faculty Senate review and approval.

**V. Agenda 1:** On November 6, 2020, the faculty gave final approval for amending the FSH, adding a new section 206.8 (see attached minutes), in accordance with the policies for amending the FSH, excerpted below.

**"304 POLICY FOR CHANGING FACULTY/STAFF HANDBOOK**

*Changes in the Faculty/Staff Handbook can come as new or changed policy from the Board of Regents, or may be proposed by faculty members, the Faculty Senate, staff, or the Administration. Proposed changes will be discussed in open meetings with the affected parties and the Administration before recommendations are forwarded to the Chancellor. Normally, all institutional policies are reviewed by the Chancellor's Cabinet, Dean's Council, and ASMT. Additionally, the Faculty Senate reviews matters pertinent to their responsibilities. All proposed changes directly involving academic issues will be carried in writing, either by a faculty member, the Faculty Senate, or by the Administration, to the Faculty Senate and followed by a discussion in a faculty meeting. A recommendation will require an affirmative vote at a general faculty meeting. The Chancellor must approve all changes to the Faculty/Staff Handbook. It is expected that the Chancellor will discuss with the affected parties the reason for disapproval of a proposed change or insertion of new items to the Faculty/Staff Handbook."*

The FSH has not been amended to reflect this change. The faculty have not been notified of a disapproval nor given a reason for same.

I request that the faculty senate ask the Chancellor "will you approve this item from November 6, 2020, and complete the process of FSH 304?"

**VI. Agenda 2:** I propose to amend FSH 304, new in all-caps, removed as strike through.

**04 POLICY FOR CHANGING FACULTY/STAFF HANDBOOK**

*Changes in the Faculty/Staff Handbook can come as new or changed policy from the Board of Regents, or may be proposed by faculty members, the Faculty Senate, staff, or the Administration. Proposed changes will be discussed in open meetings with the affected parties and the Administration before recommendations are forwarded to the Chancellor. Normally, all institutional policies are reviewed by the Chancellor's Cabinet, Dean's Council, and ASMT. Additionally, the Faculty Senate reviews matters pertinent to their responsibilities. All proposed changes directly involving academic issues will be carried in writing, either by a faculty member, the Faculty Senate, or by the Administration, to the Faculty Senate and followed by a discussion in a faculty meeting. A recommendation will require an affirmative vote at a general faculty meeting.*

AFTER APPROVAL AT A GENERAL FACULTY MEETING, THE PROPOSED CHANGE SHALL BE SUBMITTED TO THE CHANCELLOR WITHIN THREE (3) BUSINESS DAYS. THE CHANCELLOR SHALL HAVE TEN (10) BUSINESS DAYS TO APPROVE OR REJECT THE PROPOSED CHANGE.

IF APPROVED, THE CHANGE WILL TAKE EFFECT IMMEDIATELY, AND WILL BE PUBLISHED IN A REVISED EDITION OF THE FACULTY STAFF HANDBOOK.

IF REJECTED THE CHANCELLOR SHALL PROVIDE A REASON IN WRITING TO THE FACULTY SENATE WITH SUCH NOTIFICATION. AN AFFIRMATIVE VOTE OF THE FACULTY SENATE OR OF THE FACULTY MAY INITIATE AN APPEAL A REJECTION TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA, AND IF THAT IS UNSUCCESSFUL, TO THE COMMISSIONER.

*The Chancellor must approve all changes to the Faculty/Staff Handbook. It is expected that the Chancellor will discuss with the affected parties the reason for disapproval of a proposed change or insertion of new items to the Faculty/Staff Handbook."*

### **END OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT**

Reason: There is no deadline in policy. There is no appeal process.

As a time saving measure for all involved, and for the faculty senate agenda:

Be it resolved, it is the sense of the faculty senate, that since faculty are salaried, timecards for faculty shall be abolished. If sick leave, vacation, or other absence needing to be accounted for by payroll was used during the pay period, a separate form shall be developed, and this submitted to account for such time.

Let's increase efficiency and cut down on excess work for all concerned.

VII. For faculty senate agenda.

Due to a faculty member quitting a week before the semester began, our department has pretty much everyone teaching an overload.

There is no coherent definition of what constitutes a full teaching load in the faculty staff handbook or in the collective bargaining agreement, save for summer school in the CBA. See attached.

Recalling a 2018(?) Montana Standard article on program elimination, a former provost admitted that a faculty member had a total of only eight students between assigned courses, implying a teaching load (assuming 3cr courses) of 24-student credit hours. Most faculty probably have around 100-200 student-credit hours. Quite the imbalance...

My own student-credit hours in one semester was over 500 recently, and is currently in the mid 200s.

\*\*\*\*\*

I propose that the faculty senate codify in the faculty staff handbook that during a fall and spring semester, a "full teaching load" is no more than 12 contact hours per semester and no more than 18 contact hours per school year, defined as:

Lecture course: 1 credit hour (50 min of lecture) = 1 contact hour.

Lab course: 1 credit hour (from 110-170 minutes in lab) = 2 contact hours.

A full load may be considered fewer credit hours if the faculty member is teaching a large number of students. A minimum of 6 credit hours of lecture will be considered full time if student-contact hours exceed 300 (effectively two 3cr classes with 50 students each or similar equivalent).

The average should be effectively 9cr hours per semester, but some may end up doing 10 & 8, 11 & 7, or 12 & 6.

More than 12 contact hours in a semester or 18 in a school year, or teaching all large enrollment classes (formula TBD) and you are paid overload on a per contact hour basis.

Further, a faculty member having a teaching assignment changed within 30 days before a semester begins will be paid the equivalent of 1 contact hour of overload per new course assigned if they have taught the courses before and recently (within 12 months), or 2 contact hours per course assigned if they have not. This is compensation for last minute course prep efforts.

Absent a codified policy, we have had and likely continue to have a great imbalance. It also disadvantages faculty in evaluations as courses will be "rough" due to lack of allowed prep time and or overloading. This should be accounted for in evaluation by not counting any bad evaluations against the faculty member.

If a faculty member quits, dies, etc., the salary savings can pay these bills.

If it's due to poor planning, there are deterring budgetary consequences.

We can start the debate from there.

