**Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting**

February 14, 2013

Bump 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. David Boyles (late arrival), Al Boysen (late arrival), Robert Corey, William Cross, Marius Ellingsen, Thomas Fontaine, Adam French, Patrick Gilcrease, Jason Henry, Stanley Howard (late arrival), Charles Kliche, Travis Kowalski, Frank Matejcik, Larry Stetler, Charles Tolle (late arrival), and Frank Van Nuys.

Also present: Acting President Duane Hrncir, Associate Provost Michael Gunn, and Graduate Dean Doug Wells (late arrival).

**III. Approval of agenda**

The agenda was approved.

**IV. Approval of minutes**

The minutes of the January 17 meeting of the Faculty Senate were approved. (Motion by Dr. Stetler; seconded by Dr. Van Nuys.)

**V. Report from the chair**

1. *Missed faculty meeting.* Dr. Corwin noted that he forgot to call a general faculty meeting in January as per the bylaws. However, the bylaws also call for a second general faculty meeting in March, so rather than reschedule the January meeting to February (and thus have two back-to-back general faculty meetings), he will only call the one meeting in March. At this meeting in particular, the faculty will have the opportunity to vote on the modified bylaws put forth by the Bylaws Committee in the January senate meeting.
2. *Report from President Hrncir.* President Hrncir took the floor to discuss a number of issues of concern to the faculty.
	* *NCAA Division II move*. The university’s move to D-II will be completed by July. It was started 5 years ago under President Wharton, who felt it would enhance the visibility of the school and further improve the caliber of its scholar-athletes. The costs of the move are handled by Hardrock Club fundraising and private donations. When asked if the increased importance of athletics indicated decreased concern for quality of the education, President Hrncir stated “We’re not compromising our standards,” and emphasized that the university policy is to recruit *scholars*, not *athletes*. When asked how to handle a potential coach request for an athlete’s grade change, President Hrncir recommended reporting it to both himself and Athletic Director Kaiser; both the university and the NCAA take such breaches of academic policy seriously. When asked about the perceived increase in athlete travel or coaching hours, President Hrncir noted that he doubted the travel impact would be noticeable until we get into a conference, whereas the athletic department has been informed of the “allowable” hours and is to abide by them. However, in the event of issues or problems that a faculty member cannot resolve with the coach in question, contact Dr. Hrncir and Athletic Director Kaiser, a point the President emphasized repeatedly.
	* *Financial issues*. Though currently in the middle of a legislative session, there is reason to believe there is money to go to the school. The top priority is a salary policy, and President Hrncir explained to the legislators just how vital it is. The second priority is $2 million to fund a PhD program in Physics, which would include four faculty FTEs, support work at the Sanford Mine and the school’s own Bio-physics research, and also possibly fund an accelerator for the campus. Another funding issue is a new Rec Center attached to the King Center, to be ready by Fall 2014. Students have taxed themselves $10 per credit hour to help fund it; currently the university needs only raise $2 million to complete it.
	* *Space issues*. As the university grows, so do space requirements… but more space means more funds, and federal funding is currently a mess. On the faculty side, one suggestion is to go to the businesses that have a stake in our MI programs to seek funds for either the revamping of the old MI building or, ideally, the building of a new one near the Paleo Lab. On the student side, as freshmen numbers grow, it is increasingly difficult to house the sophomores. One possibility is student space in the Hardrocker Square, but there are several logistical issues that must first be resolved.
3. *Report from Michael Gunn*. Dr. Gunn took the floor to discuss further issues of interest to the faculty.
	* *Student demographics*. SDSMT enrollment continues to grow. The number of applications this year increased by 20% from last year; which were up 20% from the previous year; which were themselves up 15% from the previous year. Moreover, incoming students are of increasing quality, at least on paper: the average ACT score is 27.2, with a Math score of 27.8; the average GPA is between 3.48 and 3.52. Retention numbers show similar improvement: the overall retention rate is 78%, an increase of 4% over the year, and markedly better than the 55-60% rate one decade ago. Moreover, our graduation rate last year (the number of a given cohort that graduates within 6 years) was 54%, a 4% higher than the national average. Even better, our 4-year graduation rate this year was 18%, up from 12% last year, although some of this is due to the lowering of the number of credit hours.
	* *Emeritus professor policy.* The BOR has a vaguely defined policy for it: a candidate for emeritus rank is put forward by the Department Head to the President, who forwards it to the Board of Regents, who approves of it. A subcommittee of Department Heads, chaired by Dr. Kyle Riley, has proposed guidelines for earning emeritus rank, which include a minimum time requirement, evidence of distinctive service, and a departmental recommendation. Moreover, while it is still an honorary title, it is expected that the emeritus professor will continue to support the university. Emeritus faculty can still engage in research, but must be funded through grants; they can publish subsequent work with the University affiliation. Emeritus faculty may also teach, though their classification as “adjunct” or “temporary” faculty will be determined case-by-case. Emeritus rank can also be awarded to Associate (or even Assistant) Professors; the title is Associate Professor Emeritus (and SDSMT does, in fact, have some). The next steps will be to address emeritus rank for lecturers and staff.
	* *Advancement in rank*. The analog of “promotion” for the lecturers, as defined by COHE. It has the same impact as promotion on careers, but it has a different set of expectations: no research expectations, no service expectations, and advising is viewed as *service* rather than *academic* activity. A proposed policy has been drafted based on similar policies used at USD and SDSU, and includes guidelines for starting rank, timelines for advancement, and a process for advancement (initial letter from the lecturer, then put forward by Department Head, then put forward by President, and finally approved by BOR; there is no Promotion and Tenure committee involvement). One notable exception: the President may grant exceptions on a case-by-case basis to “accelerate” lecturers who have already served the University for a long time. This policy has reviewed by (1) Human Resources, (2) four lecture-heavy departments, and (3) all Department Heads, and as of February 10, all parties appeared to support it.

**VI. Committee reports**

* The standing committees had nothing to report.

In the interests of time, it was decided to address only New Business.

**VIII. New business**

1. *CGE policy on faculty graduate service*. Doug Wells, Dean of Graduate Education, discussed a proposed policy from the Council on Graduate Education clarifying what faculty members could serve in graduate-education roles, such as being a major professor, teaching 700-level courses, or serving on a closed-door thesis defense. When it was noted that some 700-level courses are delivered online, Dr. Wells noted that the instructor should nevertheless have some SDSMT appointment. The motion to accept the CGE policy carried unanimously.
2. *Curriculum requests.* Acting on behalf of the Curriculum Committee, Dr. Cross moved to approve all February curricular requests except for three that the committee felt warranted discussion; this motion passed unanimously. Of the three tabled requests, two more – a credit hour change in the Civil Engineering MS program and a globalization modification of BIOL 311 – were also passed unanimously after a brief discussion.

The remaining request – to change EE 637 to EE 737 – generated more heated discussion. Some Senators noted that as a proposed 700-level course it had no prerequisites (in particular, necessary organic chemistry knowledge). The concern was that an instructor would be required to spend significant time in a 700-level course reviewing essentially *remedial undergraduate concepts*. Other Senators noted that while the course is ostensibly for the MES program (as indicated in the curriculum request), it uses an EE prefix *in spite* of the fact that the EE department was neither informed of it nor is pleased with it. As one Senator explained, “This course has been offered here [at SDSMT], but it was taught by EE faculty from SDSU.” Moreover, it was noted that the curriculum request failed to note the EE 637-MES 637 cross-listing. As a consequence, the motion to approve the EE 637 request was defeated unanimously.

1. *General faculty meeting*. As per the bylaws, an all-faculty meeting will be scheduled for Tuesday, March 26 at 4:00 PM. Among the issues will be a faculty vote on the proposed Bylaws changes approved of at the January senate meeting.

**IX. Adjournment**

Senate meeting adjourned at 12:35 PM.