

Faculty Senate Agenda

September 29, 2022

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

Approvals for September 8, 2022 Meeting Minutes

Action Items

- II. Faculty for non-union grievance committee-
 - a. Eligibility-needs to be full time faculty (instructor and above), can be a union member

Informational Items

- III. Budget Report
- IV. Chair Report
 - a. Board of Regents MUSFAR discussion
 - b. Faculty and Staff Satisfaction Survey
 - c. All Faculty Meeting
 - d. Faculty Senate Meetings

Discussion Items

- V. Old Business (from 9/08 meeting)
 - a. Two Faculty Staff Handbook Resolutions- see below
 - b. Timecards for Faculty Policy- see below
 - c. Workload- see below
- VI. New Business
 - a. Faculty Staff Handbook- Workload Appeals- see below
 - b. Sabbatical Assignments- see below
 - c. Adjunct Faculty Pay- see below
 - d. Four Faculty Senate Bylaw Resolutions- see below
 - e. Enterprise Risk Management Committee

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?"

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.

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.

VI a. Faculty Staff Handbook- Workload Appeals

New Section For FSH: Workload appeals

As a first step, the appellant shall attempt an informal resolution with the Dean prior to filing a formal appeal to the P/VCAA for submission to a workload appeals committee.

Following the informal process, workload assignments may be appealed to a workload appeals committee composed of two members appointed by the faculty senate and two members appointed by the Montana Tech Administration. The four members shall unanimously select a fifth member. Workload appeals shall be submitted to the P/VCAA who shall convene the committee within fifteen (15) days.

The Dean or Dean's designee and the appellant shall make formal proposals concerning the assignment of workload to the committee, which shall conduct a hearing within fifteen (15) days of being formed. The committee will be charged with resolving the differences within fifteen (15) days of the hearing. Such a resolution may include selecting one of the formal proposals or a compromise assignment.

The committee shall submit its recommendations to the P/VCAA. The P/VCAA shall make a decision within fifteen (15) days.

During a workload appeal, the appellant will continue to perform all duties as previously assigned in that semester. If the workload appeal finds in favor of the appellant, the successful appellant will be compensated with overload compensation or a reduction of teaching workload the following semester.

VI b. Sabbatical Assignments

This item requests a change to **ARTICLE 13 – FACULTY DEVELOPMENT** of CBA and **213 SABBATICAL ASSIGNMENT** of FSH which are governed by **BOARD OF REGENTS' POLICY 801.1**.

Using the CBA language, Section **13.300 LIMITATIONS AND CONDITIONS** currently states the following in subsection 3:

3. Compensation for a full contract sabbatical assignment from campus funds may be granted for up to two-thirds (2/3) of an individual's regular contract for the academic or fiscal year. A single semester sabbatical assignment may be granted at full pay. Special compensation arrangements...

The following highlights are requested for adding to subsection 3 with the understanding that it will need BofR approval:

3. Compensation for a full contract sabbatical assignment from campus funds may be granted for up to two-thirds (2/3) of an individual's regular contract for the academic or fiscal year. A single semester sabbatical assignment may be

granted at full pay. An individual doing research with at least 1 graduate student may also be compensated with full pay if the sabbatical assignment includes advising the graduate student(s) during all of the sabbatical assignment. Special compensation arrangements...

Reasoning: Some faculty choose not to take sabbatical leave because they do research which requires advising graduate students while away. For the research to progress in a timely manner, proper advising must continue but may not be best by temporarily assigning the advising to another individual during the sabbatical assignment.

VI c. Adjunct Pay

I was able to communicate with Vanessa, and the rate of pay for union faculty on overload is \$1100 per credit hour. The adjunct rate for all others is \$1000 per credit hour, as this rate has been in effect since the late 1990s/early 2000s, I would like to add it as a discussion item to piggy back on our discussions of overload.

VI d. Four Faculty Senate Bylaw Resolutions

Resolution ONE:

The current bylaws of the Montana Tech Faculty Senate state about meetings:

Article VI. Meetings

(Revised according to the faculty action 11/6/72)

SECTION 1: Regular Meetings (Open)

Regular meetings of the Faculty Senate shall be held monthly or as needed during the regular academic year) with additional meetings or cancellations of the scheduled meeting at the option of the chairperson. It shall be understood that at all open meetings an invitation to attend is extended to all of the administrative staff, all faculty members, and to a student representative. It shall be further understood that this invitation includes both the right to engage in the discussions of the committee and the right to introduce motions.

It does not include, however, the right to second nor amend motions, nor the right to vote upon them when they are placed before the Faculty Senate for final action.

Resolution One:

That the Faculty Senate of Montana Tech meet no more than once a month, during regular working hours and will meet if and only if there are action items to consider. Any informational reports are to be sent via email.

Resolution Two:

That the Faculty Senate of Montana Tech will no longer need to or vote to approve decisions of the Curriculum Review Committee. Decisions of the Curriculum Review Committee shall be sufficient and the final step in faculty approval of curriculum changes.

Resolution Three:

That the Faculty Senate of Montana Tech shall monitor and participate in appropriate actions, including legal actions, that defend academic freedom and the free speech rights of faculty, staff and students at Montana Tech.

Resolution Four:

That meetings of the Faculty Senate of Montana Tech are not dependent on the presence of the Chairperson of the Senate and shall not be cancelled or rescheduled due to the absence of the Chairperson. The Vice-Chairperson shall conduct the meetings in the absence of the Senate chairperson.

VI.e. Enterprise Risk Management

- There is an Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) Committee on campus and part of the charter notes membership of a “Shared Governance” member. It was pointed out to the committee that there is the Faculty Senate and the Staff Senate. The ERM Committee will reach out to the Staff Senate to offer participation. I told the committee that as a Faculty Senate member that I would bring it back to the Faculty Senate. I am on the ERM Committee, and happy to represent Faculty Senate but am happy to participate with another Senator should one be interested. I would retain my role on the ERM Committee and not do “double” duty.