**Minutes of the Fall All Faculty Meeting**

January 26, 2016

Classroom Building 203

Chair Rod Rice called the meeting to order shortly after 4 pm. Twenty-eight members of the faculty attended, including Provost Kouris and Vice President of Human Resources Shuman.

**General Discussion of Issues**

Dr. Rice brought the meeting to order and identified the two main issues that would be discussed during the meeting: recent Senate action items and the Workload Model draft.

***Recent Senate Action Items***: Recent items worked on by the Senate include Course Overload Request Policy, Export Control Policy, the Distinguished Professor Program, and upcoming Senate elections.

*Course Overload Request Policy*. The Faculty Senate Academic Affairs committee has made several recommendations with respect to course overloads. The primary issues relate to compliance with BoR policy and ensuring that there is good faculty and departmental oversight of the course overload process. A reworking of the current Course Overload Form and of the Course Overload section of the Academic Catalog have been proposed. Items included in the reworking include making the minimum GPA requirement (2.7) more obvious, moving course overload request fulfillment from Webadvisor (once initially granted) to all course overload requests being input by the Registrar’s office, limiting course loads to a maximum of 21 credit hours in a semester, and having the course overload approved by both the student’s advisor and the student’s department head before submission to the Registrar.

*Discussion:* Discussion focused primarily on class scheduling issues and how this might affect Opportunity Scholarship winners needing to achieve the requisite number of hours needed to maintain their scholarship.

*Export Control Policy*: Dr. Rice outlined the new BoR Export Control Policy (4:48) and stated that the Senate Academic Affairs and Research and Scholarly Affairs Committees are planning meetings to discuss how the faculty can help assure compliance with current export control law.

*Distinguished Professor Policy:* Dr. Kouris discussed the Distinguished Professor Program (SDSMT Policy IV-16). Because Dr. Kouris believes there are few opportunities for local recognition, he would like to reactivate this policy.

*Discussion:* Discussion had several aspects including a request to find out what other South Dakota institutions do. Concerning questions about what recipients of such an award might receive other than a title, Dr. Kouris mentioned that his previous institution (TCU) had a similar program that gave $20,000 to each recognized professor. Although this may not be possible at SDSMT, Dr. Kouris expressed a willingness to consider additional benefits and perhaps combining this award with other honors.

**Workload Model**: Dr. Anderson led the discussion of the draft workload model. The committee responsible for developing the policy tried to balance the competing goals of treating all faculty consistently with the varying missions of each department.

The process for moving forward includes collecting comments on the draft workload model, incorporating these comments as necessary, then forwarding the draft workload document to the Institutional Workload Committee (IWC). The IWC will be composed of three members chosen by our SDSMT COHE representatives and 3 chosen by the President. This committee will send recommendations concerning the draft policy to the President for comment and possible amendment or approval. If no consensus is reached with regard to the final workload model, the issue will be sent to the Board of Regents for resolution.

*Discussion Q&A:*

*Question:* How were the maximum values for Research (45%) and Service (20%) derived?

*Answer:* The approximate average division of time for research active faculty in each department was obtained from the department heads, and the percentages were derived from the values obtained.

*Question:* Who defines what counts toward service?

*Answer:* Each department will produce its own more specific workload model that addresses this issue. Such departmental models are to be approved by the Provost.

*Question:* As the models will be different for each department, how will consistency between departments be maintained?

*Answer:* The goal was to balance individual departmental concerns and fair treatment of all faculty, so that consistency between departments was not pursued.

*Question:* As there would not be consistency between departments, how will the Promotion and Tenure Committee (P&T) be able to accurately adjudicate their responsibilities?

*Answer:* There will still be departmental expectations documents and the P&T Committee has had to deal with the balance of distribution of effort issues for several years.

*Question:* Did the committee discuss how the workload model document may help tenure track faculty better understand the steps needed to obtain tenure?

*Answer:* Yes. The definitions will help this issue, but the faculty member and their department head will need to discuss these and perhaps have a 3-year review to make sure both have the same view of progress toward the goal of tenure.

*Question:* Will possible unequal workload distributions between departments alter allocation?

*Answer:* (Dr. Kouris) There will be some connection between the workload model and movable resources. This will happen at some point in the future but not until we have some non-fixed resources.

*Question:* What do our peer institutions do?

*Answer:* With the exception of South Dakota State, most do not use a detailed model.

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