

Faculty Senate Minutes

9/29/2023

1-2 p.m.

SUB 113 AB

Senators in attendance: S. Risser, D. Autenrieth, S. Juskiewicz, R. LaDouceur, G. Wallace, A. Mitra, C. Young, D. Galarus, L. Buckley, M. Egloff, C. Faught, A. Traut, L. Granger, D. Reichhardt, B Hill, and M. Haynes

- I. Welcome and review of 9/5/23 minutes – Chair called the meeting to order and a motion to approve the minutes was made and seconded. The motion passed without discussion.

Action Items

- II. Request for Emerita status for M. Young – Charie Faught presented Miriam Young for Emerita status in the Nursing Department. A motion to recommend this status was made and seconded. The motion passed without discussion.

Informational Items

- III. Announcement of the awarding of Tenure and Promotion - Chancellor Cook congratulated faculty who received promotion and/or tenure this AY, including Dr. Capoccia, Ms. Corbitt, Dr. Galarus, Dr. Graff, Dr. Kirtley, Dr. Nagisetty, Dr. Pal, Dr. St. Clair, Dr. Southergill, Dr. Gilkey, Mr. Haynes, Dr. Stapley, Dr. Atkinson, Dr. Jiang, and Dr. Lucon
- IV. Introduction and message from VP for Student Success & Dean of Students – VP and Dean Joe Cooper introduced himself and some of the initiatives being sponsored by his office. Faculty were thanked for submitting concern reports and were encouraged to continue. Dean Cooper seeks to collaborate as a partner in instances when student complaints are brought to his office.

Discussion Items

- V. The parking fee increase and campus consultation – was discussed to determine if the BoR policy was followed correctly and if there was an opportunity to improve communication between budget committee and faculty. VC Ron Muffick presented the process the budget committee followed. The committee includes faculty and staff representatives, and thus they were consulted. These members are supposed to go back to their constituents to discuss the proposed parking increase. A comment was made regarding difficulties parking on campus despite the foundation having plenty of empty parking spots. Foundation does not pay parking. Foundation requested more reserved parking last May which was denied. However, the foundation owns the parking lot and so the request was later granted. A comment was made that adjuncts and administrative assistants should not be charged for parking. A comment was made that departments can pay for parking permits, and instead reserved parking for adjuncts would be helpful. A comment was made that more parking is needed. A comment was made that there are plans for more parking spaces west of the HPER. A question was raised as to whether MBMG is represented on the budget committee. They are not. Montana Tech's parking fee is middle of the pack in terms of Montana universities, and this parking increase helps cover the rising costs of maintenance and snow removal.

- VI. The proposal to increase adjunct pay to \$1500 per credit hour – was discussed. It was asked if this could happen next year or does BoR need to approve? No, but the cost is not feasible when you consider adjuncts and overload budgets. A question was raised as to whether salary savings more than cover adjunct/overload costs. They do, but those savings would be reduced by an increase in adjunct pay. A question was raised as to whether adjuncts could be separated out from overload because they need the increase more. This can be done but the amount is not known at this time. A question was raised as to whether full-time faculty would accept an adjunct increase without an overload increase. A comment was raised that adjuncts are paid too little. A comment was raised that \$2,000 per credit would be better. A comment was made that Montana Tech is middle of the pack in terms of other Montana and national institutions. A question was asked as to whether departments can increase adjunct pay amounts as market demands, and that couldn't \$1,000 be the floor. 51% of institutions pay more depending on discipline, 49% pay flat rates. A question was asked as to if there is another amount was feasible, the answer was not that the \$1,500 is not feasible but that modeling would need to be done. A question was asked about how many students in class are needed before an adjunct becomes profitable at the current and new rate. In the future, adjuncts who teach a certain number of credits may need to be enrolled in the retirement plan. A smaller group may convene to discuss this issue further.
- VII. Review of course evaluations (subcommittee) – was discussed and Senators Young and Egloff agreed to join the subcommittee.
- VIII. The proposal to change the F/S Handbook 205.4.3 – was discussed. It is currently inconsistent that faculty applying for tenure, mid-tenure, and promotion use departmental/unit performance standards, however their annual evaluations use general standards in the F&S handbook. A question was raised if the previous item's subcommittee could take on this issue as well. Senator Young declined.
- IX. For the Good of the Order – no new items were raised.
- X. A motion was made and seconded to adjourn at 1:58 pm.