**Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting**

March 21, 2013

Hardrock Conference Room

**I. Call to order**

Chair Ed Corwin called the meeting to order shortly after 11:00 AM.

**II. Roll call**

Senators present: Drs. Scott Amos (proxy for Thomas Fontaine), David Boyles, Al Boysen, Robert Corey, William Cross, Adam French, Patrick Gilcrease, Jason Henry, Travis Kowalski, Frank Matejcik, Purushotham Tukkaraja (proxy for Charles Kliche), Larry Stetler, Charles Tolle, and Frank Van Nuys.

Also present: Dr. Molly Gribb.

**III. Approval of agenda**

The agenda was approved.

**IV. Approval of minutes**

Approval of the minutes of the February 14 meeting of the Faculty Senate was delayed, as many Senators had not received their copy of the minutes the previous week.

**V. Report from the chair**

Dr. Corwin yielded the floor to Dr. Gribb to discuss two matters of interest to the faculty.

1. *New PhD program.* Dr. Gribb discussed the intent to plan process for a new PhD program in Civil and Environmental Engineering. The PhD will be a cooperative venture with SDSU: both campuses will share the program, resources and expertise, and each school will have its own degree-granting approval. Currently there is no PhD program in either civil or environmental engineering in South Dakota, and so each year a number of students with CE and EE baccalaureates from SDSMT, SDSU, and the USGS must leave the state to pursue doctoral degrees in these fields. The new PhD program is designed to address this, and as such has support from both President Hrncir and SDSU President Chicoine. However, as this is still in the *Intent to Plan* stage, no major details are as yet available. The motion to approve to PhD program’s Intent to Plan was passed unanimously.
2. *Presidential search update.* Dr. Gribb reported that the search continues to progress, with a good pool of candidates under consideration. The next major step of the process will be a “neutral site interview” (planned for April 5-7) for the semi-finalists (anywhere from 2-50) to select the short list of 2-5 finalists. These finalists will then meet on campus for interviews with several constituent groups on April 18-19, after which the Board of Regents will meet.

**VI. Committee reports**

The standing committees had nothing to report.

**VII. Old business**

There was no old business on the agenda to discuss.

**VIII. New business**

1. *Curriculum requests.* Acting on behalf of the Curriculum Committee, Dr. Cross moved to approve all March curricular requests except for the EE/MES 637 request that had failed at the February Senate meeting. Of the remaining requests, the only requests to generate discussion were those of the Math Department and, in particular, the decision to delete Dynamical Systems (Math 431) in favor of Advanced Studies in Mathematics (Math 452), as the former class is often recommended to Electrical Engineering students and is a good complement to Control Systems. Dr. Kowalski explained that Mathematical Modeling (Math 451), by design, also has a significant dynamical systems component, and interviews with previous Industrial Advisory Councils suggested that graduates of the Applied and Computational Mathematics program found the presentation given in the modeling class more applicable. Moreover, the open nature of Math 452 would allow for a semester to be devoted to Dynamical Systems if there was a great need or desire to do so. After further discussion, the motion to approve the curriculum proposals passed unanimously.

The remaining request, to change MES 637 to MES 737, produced further discussion. A key change from the previous version of the request was to drop EE 637 from the SDSMT location entirely, which effectively addressed one of the concerns from February. The other issue, namely, that as a 700-level course it had no prerequisites and might, therefore, effectively be a remedial course, continued to generate some debate. In the end, the motion to approve the request passed with 1 abstention.

1. *General faculty meeting*. As per the bylaws, an all-faculty meeting will be scheduled for Tuesday, March 26 at 4:00 PM. Though the primary issue at the meeting will be the faculty vote on the proposed Bylaws changes approved of at the January senate meeting, Dr. Corwin then opened the floor to for suggestions as to what other topics should be brought to the faculty for discussion. Among them:
	* *Emeritus concerns*. Some Senators expressed displeasure with the emeritus professor guidelines discussed by Dr. Gunn at the February meeting. Two issues of particular concern were the expectations of “required recruiting” and the vagueness regarding the possibility of teaching, including pay and rank.
	* *Parking issues*. While Pat Beau sent an email to students informing them of a change to “24/7 enforcement” of parking, no such notice was sent to the faculty. Senators wanted to know what precipitated the sudden change in parking policy, and what effects it would have on the faculty (such as late night parking for grading or labs, or overnight parking during conferences). Many Senators felt that the “ticket now, ask questions later” policy was less an attempt at effective parking management than a quick cash cow. Other Senators noted that if SDSMT wants to be viewed as a “mainstream” university, it should look into mainstream university rules for parking.
	* *Lecturer oversight.* Some Senators, noting the vested interests faculty have in hiring effective lecturers, expressed concern over the lack of professorial oversight in the lecture track; for example, the lack of involvement in the faculty in the advancement process of lecturers, or the ability of the lecture track to independently select the elementary textbooks (and therefore the learning outcomes) of a program without faculty input. Is there any aspect of lecturer oversight afforded the professoriate, and if so, what?
	* *Starfish.* Senators voiced a number of concerns over Starfish, the newly implemented “student retention software solution.” Many Senators were unclear on what, exactly, faculty were required to do with it. Dr. Corwin expressed his understanding that it was essentially going to replace the current “midterm DEF,” system, although many Senators expressed their disbelief that that would be the end of it. (As one Senator quipped, “At first it’s a pilot; then it’s the autopilot.”) Senators overwhelmingly expressed their doubts about the effectiveness of the program, arguing that (1) automated email alerts were unlikely to motivate a student that could not already be bothered to email a professor, (2) it trivialized the responsibilities of both the student and professor, and (3) likely had further undesirable hidden costs, being an “administrative solution to an academic program.”

**IX. Adjournment**

Senate meeting adjourned at 12:30 PM.