**Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting**

February 11, 2016

Bump Conference Room

**I. Call to order**

Chair Rod Rice called the meeting to order at 11:03 AM.

**II. Roll call**

Senators present: Drs. Andrea Brickey (MEM), Robert Corey (PHYS), Grant Crawford (METE, for William Cross), Thomas Fontaine (CEE), Patrick Gilcrease (CBE), Jason Henry (PE), Frank Matejcik (IE), Charles Tolle (ECE), Al Boysen (HUM), Mengyu Qiao (MCS), Marius Ellingsen (ME), and Timothy Masterlark (GEOL/GEOE).

Absent: Drs. Bill Cross (METE), Frank Van Nuys (SS), and Zhengtao Zhu (CABS).

**III. Approval of agenda**

The agenda was approved by voice vote.

**IV. Approval of minutes**

The minutes of the January 2016 meeting of the Faculty Senate were approved by voice vote.

The minutes of the January 2016 All-Faculty meeting were approved by voice vote.

**V. Report from the Chair**

Dr. Rice reported that Dr. Howard had asked him to check on the status of SB 102, which would allow periodic retail sale of beer or wine for special events--performing arts, receptions, fund raising events, or athletic activities--on South Dakota campuses. Dr. Rice stated that if the bill is passed, each South Dakota campus has the ability to define their own practice and can reject such sales if desired. In an email to Dr. Rice, President Wilson noted that this is not a BoR sanctioned bill and added that under existing policy, SDSMT can serve alcohol on campus for some special events, but cannot sell it. She also stated that if this bill is passed, she does not anticipate any change in current SDSMT policy.

Dr. Rice also reported that Dr. Kouris is forming a group to discuss the feasibility of providing a certificate in entrepreneurship and innovation. Faculty can expect to hear more about this in the future.

**VI. Committee reports**

Relevant committee reports are covered in new business.

**VII.   Old Business**

1. Workload Policy

According to Dr. Rice, 33 faculty filled out the survey questions on the proposed Faculty Workload Policy drafted by the Ad Hoc Workload Committee. Here are some of the results:

*Question 1*. My administrative unit is likely to develop faculty workload guidelines that would be helpful in managing faculty workload: **74% agree or strongly agree**; 19% neutral; 7% strongly disagree.

*Question 2*. The proposed Faculty Workload Policy will be sufficient for my administrative unit to establish program-level workload metrics: 53% agree or strongly agree; 31% neutral; 16% disagree or strongly disagree.

*Question 3*. Sections I and II effectively outline faculty roles and describe the purpose and goals of the document: **70% agree or strongly agree**; 18% neutral; 12% disagree or strongly disagree.

*Question 4*. Section III adequately defines teaching and advising workload responsibilities as well as general guidelines for assigning percentage of effort: 59% agree or strongly agree; 18% neutral; 23% disagree or strongly disagree.

*Question 5*. Section IV adequately defines scholarship expectations and general guidelines for establishing scholarship workload: **70% agree or strongly agree**; 7% neutral; 23% disagree or strongly disagree.

*Question 6.* Section V adequately defines service expectations and general guidelines for assigning service workload: **86% agree or strongly agree**; 3% neutral; 11% disagree or strongly disagree.

*Question 7.* Section VI provides effective guidance for assigning increased workload assignments in exceptional circumstances: 58% agree or strongly agree; 16% neutral; 28% disagree or strongly disagree.

*Question 8*. The optional Faculty Workload Description Worksheet is adequate for documenting activities in order to calculate workload: 52% agree or strongly agree; 26% neutral; 22% disagree or strongly disagree.

*Question 9*. The proposed Faculty Workload Policy effectively balances flexibility in assigning workload for faculty within programs while providing broad guidelines for the campus to work within: **71% agree or strongly agree**; 19% neutral; 10% disagree or strongly disagree.

The Committee turned the survey data and comments over to the Provost for further action. Although the survey results do not constitute a vote on the acceptability of the workload draft, respondents agreed generally that the document effectively outlines faculty roles, adequately defines teaching and advising, scholarship, and service responsibilities and expectations, provides appropriate flexibility, and establishes workable broad guidelines for administrative units in assigning faculty workload.

Most respondent disagreement focused on definitions of teaching, advising, and scholarship responsibilities and expectations, guidance for assigning increased workload, and the adequacy of the Workload Description Worksheet.

1. Course Overloads (Academic Affairs Committee)

The Academic Affairs Committee continued working on the proposed Course Overload Form and gathering additional feedback from the Registrar.

1. Export Control Issues (Academic Affairs and Research and Scholarly Affairs)

The committee met and is setting up the schedule for additional meetings.

1. Senate Elections

Dr. Rice reminded Senators to notify their department heads if their terms expire at the end of spring semester 2016. If so, Senate Bylaws require that departmental elections must be held and results reported to Dr. Rice before 1 March.

1. February Curriculum Requests (http://www.hpcnet.org/feb4\_2016 ).

After brief discussion of a proposed 1-credit elective, Mindfulness and Well-Being (GES 250), the faculty curriculum requests were passed.

1. Professor Emeritus Requests (Drs. Antonen and Fontaine)

Both Emeritus requests were approved unanimously: Dr. Antonen (motion to approve, Dr. Boysen; Dr. Brickey, second); Dr. Fontaine (motion to approve, Dr. Ellingsen; Dr. Corey, second).

1. Harvard Business School Credential of Readiness Program (CORe)

Two SDSMT students—Kelsey Hibl (IE) and Harrison Costello (GEOE)--piloted this program last year. The CORe Program requires 120-150 hours of business analytics, economics for managers, and financial accounting in order to earn a certificate. President Wilson wants to go forward with the program and asked Dr. Rice to share the Memo of Understanding (MOU) with the Senate and Faculty before she signs it. The MOU does not obligate the university nor change our curriculum and does not require any university commitment of funds.

Discussion: Most senators appreciated the fact the program does not obligate SDSMT financially. However, one member expressed some hesitance about recommending the program publicly as it requires no prerequisites for business analysis, no credit hours, and isn’t accepted across Harvard’s own campus.

**VIII. New Business**

None.

**IX. Other**

Dr. Tolle reported that representatives from various SDSMT departments gave demonstrations recently and talked about SDSMT to students at Corral Drive Elementary. The kindergarten students sent a number of thank you cards to the university and Dr. Tolle read some of them aloud. The program was a success and another Rapid City elementary school has asked for a similar demonstration.

**X. Adjournment**

The Senate adjourned at 11:46AM.