Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
January 13, 2017
Amended 5/15/2017
Room 120, Donaldson Campus, 11:00 a.m.


I. Call to order by Rick Henry: 9:40am
II. Approval of minutes: Rick asked to suspend approval until next meeting where minutes from last two meetings will be approved.
III. Communications: Suspend until next meeting
IV. Reports of Committees: Suspend until next meeting
V. New Business: Chad Hickox Report
   a. Re: PAC
      2 Tenure applying
      4 promotion applying
      Emmett asked – Were PAC members meeting with you Chad? Chad replied, he would be happy to schedule with PAC to “check in”.
   b. Budget - $200,000-300,000 shy
      Attrition is one way to cut the school’s expenses, do not rehire
      Do not expect layoffs, however, just keep open positions open
      1. Physics
      2. Business
      3. Computer Technology
      4. E-learning position
      5. Sociology

Enrollment and Retirement factors in

   c. Chad asked the faculty which course should we drop first?
      Steve Lewis—we never had a physics faculty
      Chad—physics top of the list to eliminate
      Barbara—whatever positions we interview for, start the search now
      Chad—waiting game to see what budget cuts effect
      John—act now-use pending budget approval in the search for faculty positions
      Chad—will follow up, however, no one expects to come to this with the cuts
      Chad—also tuition increase could help with cuts in budget
      Tod—can individual programs have higher tuition, is this possible. Other aviation schools have higher tuition
      Chad—could be with OCHE approval
      Barbara—helps build smaller programs

   d. Ben asked about the one ID day proposed over Spring Break, Chad said no that is not happening

VI. Barbara made a motion regarding holding the minutes approval. Emmett seconded.
VII. Rick asked about how faculty felt about the shooter training? What should we do as a senate?
    Steve mentioned that the officers did not like the flip mechanism currently on the doors
    Could ask the police for a list of recommendations for Helena College
Emmett forwarded a list to Matt
John said the officers mentioned window coverings, eye hooks, wedge at the door
John added need the shooter drill annually
Barbara mentioned the need for mirrors outside of the classroom doors mounted on the wall to see who could be in hallways
Rick asked if emails to faculty if there is a shooter, or a note on computers? And on classroom computers
Tod said cannot hear “warnings” in noisy labs at the AP campus
Nathan suggested a motion to send recommendations to the administration
Ben-these are cheap recommendations to administration/leadership that they could act on this
John made a motion to send recommendations per the police officers to leadership. These recommendations also should include training every year.
Emmett seconded
There was an amend to the motion by Nathan to not include the wedges.
Bryan seconded
Karen RC mentioned the need to remove the screens installed on some of the existing doors in the upstairs hallway
All in favor of the motion

VIII. Evaluations
Rick had very low responses
Glen reminds his students at the beginning of the class to complete the evaluations
Karen H mentioned how the evaluations play into the tenure, etc.
Rick-need more participation from students
Nathan asked the question-validity?
Glen- students not too sincere
Victor stressed important to teach, not to please
Rick-majority of faculty not pleased with participation
Steve-look at data. How many participated? 35% or 60%, or? Present to leadership.
Bryan mentioned this was discussed in the union meeting where they tried to form a committee to talk about this tool.
Glen-he gets more out of comments than rubric
Steve and Rick agree
John –tool needs to be modified. It should benefit the faculty. Omit questions that do not. Propose new questions. Keep comments.
Barbara- this is a course evaluation not a faculty evaluation.
Emmett-do we receive all the comments that are typed? This should be a course evaluation, but it is a faculty evaluation. A course evaluation is not considered for tenure.
John-need proper data to evaluate for tenure and promotion

IX. New Advising Council for tenure candidates
Joyce reports only met once to consider objectives and mission
Nathan-new tenure track hires should meet with tenure advisors
Karen RC-for my tenure, met with my tenure committee 3 times a year. Very supportive throughout the tenure process.

Nathan motioned to adjourned. John seconded.

Meeting adjourned at 10:30