**Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting**

December 11, 2014

Bump Conference Room

**I. Call to order**

Chair Rod Rice called the meeting to order at 11:05 AM.

**II. Roll call**

Senators present: Drs. Al Boysen (HUM), Robert Corey (Physics), William Cross (METE), Marius Ellingsen (ME), Thomas Fontaine (CEE), Patrick Gilcrease (CBE), Jason Henry (Athletics and PE), Timothy Masterlark (GEOL/GEOE), Frank Matejcik (IE), Mengyu Qiao (MCS), Charles Tolle (ECE), Frank Van Nuys (SS), and Zhengtao Zhu (CABS)

Others present: Dr. Ed Corwin (Immediate Past President), Dr. Chris Wyatt for Dr. Purushotham Tukkaraja (MEM), Dr. F. Steve Malott (VP, Finance and Administration), Kelly Corwin (MCS), Dr. James Feiszli (HUM), and Dr. Doug Wells (GRAD ED)

**III. Approval of agenda**

The agenda was approved.

**IV. Approval of minutes**

The minutes of the October, 2014 meeting of the Faculty Senate were approved following an electronic vote on 12-19-2014.

**V. Report from the Chair**

Dr. Rice indicated that at the cabinet meeting Dr. Sinden recommended total individual student course withdrawals would be limited to six (6) over the course of the students enrollment at SDSM&T. He also reported that Music 117 had received Regental approval as a general education offering at SDSM&T. Music 117 is a one-credit class that can be taken in a three-credit sequence over multiple semesters in partial fulfillment of the Goal 4 (HUM) general education requirements.

The Board of Regents, through the input of an appointed General Education Steering Committee (SDSM&T faculty representatives: Dr. Linda DeVeaux and Dr. James Fieszli), will be evaluating the current General Education Core Requirements. One important issue with respect to this review is the CAAP exam and its reliability in predicting student success in upper division coursework. According to Dr. Feiszli, the review is intended to be a bottom-up process and not to be completed in isolation, will take two years, and will include updates that will be brought to the Senate when appropriate. Dr. Feiszli added that one of the committee members should be available to speak at the January All-Faculty meeting.

On other matters, ESF monies are at 15-20% of last year’s figure and total approximately $200,000. The BoR approved a 2% raise and $6 million for refurbishing the Chemistry building.

**VI. Committee reports**

Committee reports are covered in new business.

**VII.   Old Business**

1. Emeritus request (Dr. Davis)

The Senate recommended approval of the request for emeritus status for Dr. Arden Davis at its November meeting. This has been forwarded to President Wilson.

1. Admissions advertising

At the previous Senate meeting, an invitation was requested to be given to Dr. Gunn to attend the January Senate meeting. Dr. Rice agreed to extend the invitation.

**VIII.  New Business**

1. Budget review (Steve Malott)

Vice President Malott presented the current financial state of the school. The agreed payback for the Board of Regent’s loan for this year is $1,520,563 and at the present time SDSMT is running a little bit ahead of expectations. Much depends on student enrollments for spring semester. Projections from previous years indicate a 94% return rate.

Some long-term accounts were negative, and VP Malott has been exercising careful scrutiny with positive accounts in order to prevent simultaneous “run on the bank” department spending that can produce negative cash flows. Malott cautioned that the school must be careful to maintain a positive balance but work out ways to pay bills for needed equipment and materials. Until now, departments have not spent all their resources, but with the cuts being implemented, this may not be true going forward.

VP Malott suggested that current budget problems stemmed from several factors: ambitious spending that exceeded resources; a drop in overhead; unrealistic short-term expectations and projections of research funding, particularly among new faculty; and lack of adequate financial control.

*Question:* There are rumors about the amount SDSM&T was in the hole. Some rumors of up to $11 million have been bandied about. What is the real amount?

*Answer:* Not $11 million – closer to $5-7 million. Some of the confusion extended from the VP of Research budget allocated to overhead, which caused considerable red ink. If we can get past the next 2-3 years, the remaining amounts become manageable.

*Question:* What is the perceived fallout to the school’s reputation from the recent articles in the *Rapid City Journal*?

*Answer:* Although the “blame game” can be an issue, most people in the know were not affected – certainly the legislature and Board of Regents have known about these problems since Dr. Wilson was hired.

Concerning the immediate future,VP Malott stated that Dr. Wilson, Dr. Puszynski, Dr. Sinden, along with Heather Forney and Kelli Shuman, are meeting with the department heads to get the departmental needs for next year. The question they’ll face is how to best meet all these needs. Revenue is important but probably not all needs are going to be met. Fees can be adjusted (up to perhaps 5% of the budget) but not enough to fix the problem. Course fees are also being examined as SDSM&T is on the same state funding protocol as other schools despite the higher cost basis for our programs. Scholarships are hard-funded so they won’t be effected, but VP Malott emphasized that the other key is growth balance. Growth adds greater funds, but if sufficient, may require more resources and could therefore actually hurt the school’s financial position.

*Question:* Will there be a need for departmental budget cuts beyond this year’s cuts?

*Answer:* VP Malott hopes that will not be the case, but can’t say definitively until spring registration is complete.

*Question:* Department budgets are miniscule, with some departments reporting inability to print exams at the end of the semester. How long will the department budgets be as they are this year? Two to three years?

*Answer:* Perhaps that will not be the case, but the answer depends on additional revenue. For spring 2015, additional added money won’t be likely and ESF dependence is a problem.

*Comment:* Dr. Rice indicated that some Departments fund instructors through ESF funding.

*Response:* Although VP Malott was not sure of the amount of ESF funding, he indicated some was allocated twice previously and said that instructor funding was given priority for ESF funding

1. Additional graduation requests and CGE interface (Dr. Wells)

*Additional graduation requests:* Dr. Wells requested that Mr. Josh Millard be approved for an M.S. degree in Mechanical Engineering and Mr. Neisourge Kaley be approved for an M.S. degree in Materials Engineering and Science (the request via email was for the degree to be in Electrical Engineering, but this was found to be a typographical error in the original email from Graduate Education).

*Action:* Approval was moved by Dr. Tolle and seconded by Dr. Rice and passed by voice vote.

*CGE Interface:* Previously, the Council on Graduate Education (CGE) was used to advise the Dean of Graduate Education, but has changed and now recommends policy in graduate education. Dr. Wells asked the Senate concerning what policies of CGE should be approved by the Senate. After some discussion, a model similar to the Academic Affairs/Curriculum Committee model was suggested and adopted.

*Action:* Dr. Wells or his designee will report on CGE matters at each Senate meeting.

C.  Emeritus request (Dr. Sangchul Bang)

The emeritus request for Dr. Sangchul Bang was approved following a motion by Dr. Boysen and a second from Dr. Ellingsen.

D. Senate Committee appointments (new list)

No action was taken with respect to committee appointments.

E. Faculty enrollment in undergraduate courses (Dr. Howard)

*Academic Affairs Motion:* The Senate asks that the President and Acting Provost request that the Board of Regent’s approve a program whereby BoR-employed faculty may enroll in a course to achieve a certification or training that would enhance their faculty role, as approved by the Provost, on a space-available basis with a waiver of all fees, except for any special fees needed for direct use in a course and a tuition reduction to the amount paid by high school students taking classes on the dual credit model.

*Discussion:* Discussion primarily concerned the time commitment, which could be fairly heavy. However, because taking undergraduate courses would require the approval of the requestor’s supervisor, this was felt to be a moot point. In addition, correspondence with Dr. Turman indicated a state law (SDCL 3-20-1) exists that allows state employees who qualify and meet specified conditions to take classes at a reduced (50%) tuition rate. Dr. Tolle suggested that in light of recent Senate discussions about this with Dr. Warner and Regent Krogman during the November BoR visit, it might be prudent to consider requesting the same rate that high school students pay for taking classes on a dual-credit model on a space-available basis when taking the class does not increase the state resources needed for the course (currently $40/credit hour).

*Action:* Motion passes.

F.  Student travel eligibility policy (Student Affairs)

Dr. Gilcrease described the current policy for athletics, which is that there is no formal written policy outside the NCAA policy. In general, the SDSMT teams do not allow students on academic probation to travel, but this is not formal policy.

*Discussion:* Discussion focused on how best to identify deficient students—DEF grades versus Starfish alerts. Many on the Senate believed deficiency grades were the better route. Other discussion centered on the effect travel eligibility has on students – allowing students with deficient grades to continue activities that take too much time away from studying may not be a positive.

The Senate will address this issue by proposing a policy or rule based on recommendations from the Senate Student Affairs Committee. The Student Affairs Committee will then bring the draft policy before the Senate at the 8 January 2015 meeting for review. After that, the policy will be presented at the January All-Faculty Meeting and also discussed with the Student Senate. Once all inputs are gathered and the final draft is completed, the Senate-approved policy will be presented to the University Cabinet for final approval.

*Action:*  The Student Affairs Committee will present a proposal at the January 8, 2015 Senate Meeting.

G. West River Foundation donations (in memory of Regent Randy Morris)

A voluntary $10 contribution per member to the West River Foundation was recommended.

1. Common Exam Times (Dr. Feiszli)

Dr. Feiszli discussed the issue of common exam times. Currently, some common exam times overlap with scheduled class times. Originally, common exam times were scheduled to reduce conflicts with practice times used by the athletic teams, especially football.

According to Dr. Feiszli, scheduling has become an issue for the music faculty because a number of students were unable to attend band and orchestra rehearsals due to the fact that common exams were scheduled at the same time. And with the approval of Music 117 as a General Education Core course, scheduling may become an even greater problem in the future. An additional compounding factor is that evening times are optimum for music classes because of availability of adjunct music faculty and community musicians who augment the band and choir.

*Discussion:* Initial discussion focused on band (MW 7-9 PM) and orchestra (TTh 7-9 PM) rehearsal times, the overlap of students between these groups, and possible new common exam times such as 7 AM, 4 PM, or Saturday mornings. Saturdays would be difficult for the athletic teams because of travel schedules. Further discussion considered whether a course instructor should be required to reschedule a common exam for a student with a class conflict. This led to a motion from Dr. Cross, seconded by Dr. Matejcik.

*Motion:* A faculty member who has a common exam is obligated to find a different time for this exam for a student having a class conflict with the common exam time.

*Action:* This motion passed, although there was a question about the ability to enforce it as the motion represents a resolution rather than a policy. Senate action on this will be discussed at the General Faculty meeting in January

*Discussion:* The additional question of whether we need common exams was brought up. As SDSMT continues to grow, common exams may become complicated as finding a common time will become more difficult.

*Action:* The Academic Affairs Committee was charged with investigating this issue to determine if further action is needed.

**IX. Other**

**X. Adjournment**

The Senate adjourned at 12:35 PM.