

FACULTY SENATE
February 3, 2016
346 LEON JOHNSON
4:10 PM – 5:00 PM
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY-BOZEMAN, MONTANA
Minutes

Members Present: Adams (Art), Arnold (Ag Ed), Austin for Wilmer (Pol Sci), Berry (CE), Babbitt (Chair), Babcock (Chair-elect), Bolte (Music), Brown (JJCBE), Burrows (Ext), Cantalupo (Ext), Downs (English), Gannon (ChBE), Greenwood (Math), Hendrikx (Earth Sci), Herbeck (Ed), Hostetler (GC), Larson (MIE), Lawrence (Bio Chem), Martin (Mod Lang), Meyer (Hist & Phil), Repasky (ECE), O'Neill (Arts & Arch), Ricciardelli (Film & Photo), Rossmann (Library), Scott (Psych), Smith (HHD), Swinford (Soc/Anthro), Wiedenheft (MBI), Zabinski (LRES)

Others Present: Bob Hietala, Chris Fastnow, Chris Kearns, Dana Klopp, Terry Leist, Karlene Hoo, Martha Potvin, David Singel, Ron Larsen, Kellie Peterson, Kenning Arlitsch, Gail Schontzler, Holly Capp, Levi Birky, Deborah Haynes, Ilse-Mari Lee, Helen Melland, Alison Harmon, Keith Kothman, Anna Diffenderfer

Chair Babbitt called the meeting to order at 4:10 pm, and a quorum was present.

The January 27, 2016 Faculty Senate minutes were approved.

Courses and Programs – Chair-elect Babcock

- The following undergraduate course and graduate program (name change, only) were approved in the Faculty Senate Steering Committee after receiving no comments:
 - HSTA 315: The Age of Jefferson and Jackson: The Early American Republic
 - LS 350: Literature Reviews: Theory and Practice
 - CRWR 240: Introduction to Creative Writing

Announcements – Chair Babbitt

- A moment of silence was observed in memory of MSU students who we lost recently. Chair Babbitt commended the university efforts in curtailing substance abuse and in suicide prevention.
- Deans are to submit hiring plans to the provost by the end of February; faculty and dept heads should be working together to craft hiring plans by mid-February to send to your deans, in time to submit to the provost by the end of February.
- Senator last week requested that items to be voted on be so notated on the agenda. Babbitt stated that senate leadership does not know what items will be voted on as voting only occurs after motions are made by senators.
- Babbitt is working with the Deans to come up with Deans' Reviews, and the intent is to have Deans/Dept Head reviews take place in mid-March

Hospitality Management Program (HMP) – Chair-elect Babcock

- Last senate meeting ended with the status of the Hospitality Program as follows:
 - Motion to approve → seconded → discussion →
 - Motion to adjourn → seconded → all in favor → unanimously approved
 - ROR states that motion on floor at time of adjournment is first item on next agenda.
- Discussions ensued:
 - Senator stated that there would be an opportunity cost lost with this program:

- The HMP has a three-year track where the summer would consume 40 credits/13 classes. Those resources could be provided to some other depts to teach 1-2 summer classes to help students with their curriculum and provide out of sequence, to allow other depts. to improve retention/graduation and buttresses some of the priorities we've heard from our peers. We could support our grad program, offering more TA support, allowing depts to start help centers to provide help for undergrad students, which in turn helps retention while bringing in more grad students. Enabling students to get through their classes before securing research permits researchers to be more efficient with research grants and get follow-up funding. These are the lost-opportunities by funding this new program.
 - With our limited resources, our priorities are governed by the Strategic Plan, which decides where our funds go and what MSU desires to become. When we see this new program that will require significant resources, is that the best use of our resources, or should we maintain and improve the quality of existing programs and use the resources for other parts of the strategic plan that we've talked about in FS?
 - How does this program fit into our strategic plan; what are the lost opportunities costs, and how does that effect how we achieve our Strategic Plan? The resources that would be diverted into the HMP might be used for:
 - Maintaining a quality education in programs already in existence;
 - Investing in further increasing our retention and graduation rates;
 - Investing in recapturing our Carnegie I status.
 - The proposal is required to address how it fits into our Strategic Plan.
 - Potvin does not believe the HMP will take resources from the university:
 - New students coming to the program will pay tuition to the institution, and after a couple of years, will generate more revenue than the cost of the program and start-up costs; by generating new revenue it will supply more resources to support other priorities on campus.
 - Last summer MSU started a new summer school model where a dept who offers courses, the dean gets a return of \$141/Student Credit Hour for those taking the courses; some depts. are managing those enrollments and generating revenue for their depts. This program would not take resources that otherwise might have gone to some other program.
 - Other depts. have been entrepreneurial in creating and requesting GTA-ships for their own programs that are supported by the SCH they have generated.
 - Is CPC confident that all costs in this program aren't taking away from other programs?
 - CPC looked at the curriculum and assessed that it is high quality and the CORE is well-defined. They are not charged with determining whether the cost associated with the program is real or accurate. There is confusion that CPC, APWG, and perhaps FS are supposed to make decisions about budgetary things. What CPC look at in the proposal are resources. The provost provided a letter that the resources are available for the program. We do not want to approve a program that will fail.
 - Do other senators share concern about potential costs to overall programs at the university?
 - Who vets the spending priorities and if that is not senate's job, at what point do we weigh in on the priorities and where the money goes? I believe this is our forum to do that. We do not have a clear answer on these priorities. When did the discussion take place that this is the best use of our funds? What were the outcomes of those discussions in the terms of "this is an

important thing for MSU to do because of _____?" I don't know if we know what ____ is yet.

- A couple of reasons the HMP was brought back to senate was because;
 - CPC, APWG and senate leadership met and spoke extensively with Harmon suggesting improvements to make HMP a good, viable program.
 - There were many changes to curriculum that enhanced the program;
- Should we couple every program we pass with a priority document, or should we evaluate every program separate from prioritization and with a resolution emphasizing prioritization, or should have prioritization later?
- Proposal keeps improving. We are now entering into a fundamental and philosophical decision. HHD is telling us how they want to utilize their resources and there is no reason that senators should be telling them that this is not the best way to utilize their resources that the university is willing to provide; I would not want HHD telling other departments how to decide to use their resources.
- There should be transparency about how these decisions are made and our communication needs to improve. That is a separate discussion.
- One of the reasons we struggle with part of this discussion – not a clear equation that we are working towards that describes incomes/outgoings/faculty lines/GTA's, etc. If we had a clear algorithm that demonstrates senate concerns, it would be beneficial.
- As a grant proposal, the justification was poor. For example, the program itself does not train for any value added industries; outgrowth does not address turnover and there is no data in the Independent Economic Analysis. After three iterations, can't link the justification to the program to the outcomes.
- Motion for a paper vote → second → discussion → majority approved voting by paper ballot (14); opposed (8).
- Leist noted that after the initial year, or two, the HMP is a self-funding program; and resources coming in for the program are for the program itself.
- Paper ballot vote: 18 in favor; 8 opposed. Motion to approve HMP passes.

Prior Learning Assessment Policy – Chair Babbitt

- Many suggestions were made by MSU to the PLA task Force that the BoR put together and the taskforce implemented them. The MUS PLA policy was passed by the BoR in the fall. Each campus is tasked with composing their own PLA policy.
- Larsen developed the policy → went through JAGS with minor changes and is now before senate.
- Motion to approve the current PLA document → seconded → discussion:
 - Larsen is satisfied with the document in that it covers all that we can handle. The vast majority of what is in the policy, MSU already does. Only one new piece is the portfolio portion; expectation is that MSU will not see many of them.
 - Nationally, this policy is incredibly good compared with some things that are being allowed at other institutions in other states.
 - Some of the concerns that we currently see by which PLA policy can't really address:
 - If University X has Econ 107; MSU accepts it as Econ 108. Suddenly University X does a PLA for Econ 107 but doesn't inform MSU (not labelled on transcript). Now, University Y has Econ 107 that transfers into MSU as Econ 108, but they label it is as PLA. What does MSU do with University X who doesn't inform label PLA? Do we penalize University Y for following good policy?
 - Currently, we are probably accepting PLA's we do not know about and there is nothing we can do about it, except that if we see a problem, we can cut the link for the acceptance of both the non-PLA and PLA version of a course.

I.e. go not accept either the non-PLA or PLA version of Econ 107 from university X or Y.

- National Association for Registrar is pushing for all institutions to label PLA.
- How do we insure international credits are transferable, since faculty do not know how well some of the international programs are?
 - Larsen does not believe students transferring from international programs will change from what is already in place. There are some organizations you can pay to assess a transcript; other than that, you are relying on the expertise of the faculty. English speaking countries are easier to assess, however.
- All in favor→unanimously approved.

Annual Review Policy – Chair Babbitt

- Annual Review Language as Posted on the FS web site:
 1. Introduction, second paragraph currently reads:

“Thus, a record of having **met performance expectations as indicated by** annual reviews does not guarantee the candidate has assembled and demonstrated a cumulative record that meets the standards for retention, tenure or promotion.”
- JAGS changed this in last meeting to:

“Thus, a record of having **favorable annual reviews** does not guarantee . . .”
- After FS met last week and discussed the policy, it went back to JAGS because of questions about “expectations” and “extraordinary circumstances.” No language to this effect was adopted by JAGS.
- Babbitt clarified:
 - Senate is discussing and voting on the policy only; forms online are the current planned implementation of the policy. Any suggested changes should be directed to the policy at this point.
 - Numbers on the form, final and overall score, is discussed in the policy as something that is weighted (how it is to be weighted is still to be determined) and will be an indicator of merit. Dept heads, however, are allowed to re-rank merit scores and that can happen outside of faculty overall annual review score.
- Potvin described how the annual reviews are used in merit determinations. Faculty have their annual review and a ranking→ dept head makes a rank list provided to the dean→dean reviews all units within their college and sends a rank lists to provost→provost reviews colleges and reviews deans’ lists, moving down the lists, and make determinations until the money is gone. Potvin then conducts comparisons between the colleges and follows guidelines of what percent should go to each college.
- Discussions ensued:
 - Re: implementation of the form:
 - Would it be electronically populated, and would there be manual discretion to override by the dept head for the evaluating committee in case of an error in teaching evaluations? For example, out of a class of 400 maybe three disgruntled student submit evaluations: Would that be something the dept head might want to weigh in on? An electronically populated form would not permit change, however. Language not adopted by JAGS would have given discretion to the dept head to modify the form; is there something else in place to make a correction?
 - Numbers on the form will never be electronically populated. Percentage of effort might be electronically populated AY; and your annual review is CY. There should be instructions that, should things change from year-to-year, average those changes.

- Music Dept Director believes that a percentage of effort-based review system compares faculty to classified, non-exempt staff.
 - Recognition of faculty effort goes beyond a 40-hour work week, and includes summer for which they do not have load. This is something we have to take into account.
 - Would much rather, as a unit head; see a value-based weighted system. What do we value? What would we like our faculty to be accomplishing? Although this is not a cumulative review for tenure, but it shouldn't be a system in which the annual review is in opposition to the cumulative review. Faculty have to include their annual reviews in their dossiers, so it plays a role.
 - We value teaching and research in roughly equal proportions; it changes, perhaps, by dept or perhaps by faculty in a dept but really the value based system is more appropriate than a percentage based effort system.
 - This is something that should go into Dept R&S documents as part of shared governance; units should determine the value weight they wish to see and that then goes up through the university structure (colleges, deans, university committees not a unilateral decision.

The meeting adjourned at 5:03 pm.

Randy Babbitt, Chair

Michael Babcock, Chair-elect