**Minutes of the Fall All Faculty Meeting**

September 22, 2015

Classroom Building 203

Chair Rod Rice called the meeting to order shortly after 4 pm. The Provost/VP for Academic Affairs and 42 faculty members attended.

**Origin and Purpose of Workload Committee**

The process for developing a workload model was initiated by the President last spring because the current document, the 2006 Statement of Institutional Priorities for Faculty Performance, does not contain one.

Dr. Laurie Anderson, Chairman of the Workload Committee, and Dr. Kouris described the purpose of the committee and outlined the following parameters for the workload model:

* Support the Mines Strategic Plan
* Provide the department heads with the flexibility they need in their leadership role
* Optimize the talents of the faculty
* Be consistent with the BoR-COHE agreement
* Promote excellence in every aspect of our mission
* Promote equity, recognizing the variety of purpose within our disciplines
* Withstand the test of time

The Workload Committee’s role is to act as an advisory panel for the Institutional Workload Committee (IWC) specified in the BoR/COHE Agreement (section 10.3, Workload). The IWC, consisting of three members appointed by COHE and three by President Wilson, is free to accept or reject all suggestions made by the Workload Committee. If the IWC rejects the plan or their recommendations are not approved by the President, the issues may be submitted by either party to the BoR for its decision.

**Discussion**

*Question:* Will there be a minimum set of standards?

*Response:* In section 10.3 of the COHE agreement, 30 credit hours per academic year are specified. Primary research and teaching responsibilities are mentioned but not defined. Some flexibility is given in counting hours for research faculty. However, a clear workload model is needed before feedback can be of value.

*Question:* What about contact hours versus credit hours?

*Response:* At least one other school investigated by the Workload Committee does attempt to measure this, but SDSMT would need to make sure this practice doesn’t countermand accreditation processes.

*Question:* How do we count numbers for the various duties faculty perform?

*Response:* Trying to make one size fit all is a bad idea. The Provost is not very interested in counting and would prefer a template or general framework for departments to apply that is consistent with Annual Evaluations, Tenure and Promotion Guidelines, and the Strategic Plan. Dr. Anderson will distribute workload statements from other institutions to the faculty. These statements represent two varied approaches: one that is specific and attempts to quantify workload in a detailed manner; and a second more economical approach in which the quantitative decisions are delegated to the department heads. The final model SDSMT develops is likely to be somewhere between these extremes.

*Question:* What is a reasonable work load model?

*Response:* Perhaps one expressed as hours with add-ons for less easily reified work. While we may not want a model that is solely time-based, collecting the proportions and total times currently being expended may be useful. Perhaps this collection could be a starting point for the model, which should not change the current work distribution significantly.

*Question:* Are other university workload models useful?

*Response:* Somewhat. The Workload Committee Chair will message the faculty and provide links to peer institutions such as Montana Tech, Michigan Tech, Missouri University of Science and Technology, and the like. Also, peer institutions such as Colorado Mines and New Mexico Tech will be investigated.

*Question:* What about time spent working off-the-clock in the summer?

*Response:* Probably can’t be accounted for, and equity between 50 and 80 hours a week needs to be considered, too.

*Question:* Can the workload model keep up with the changing status of the school?

*Response:* Some schools use a more dynamic approach and this may be considered.

*Question:* Is this the basis for performance evaluations?

*Response:* Although workload policy is linked, it is not the basis for evaluations.

**Follow-Up Actions**

Over the next few weeks, the Committee will visit all departments and gather additional inputs based on the Workload Model Questionnaire. Faculty are invited to talk directly to the committee or directly to their department head to learn more or share ideas or suggestions.

Dr. Rice adjourned the meeting at 5:00 pm.