

Faculty Senate Minutes  
 October 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2018  
 Gaines 043  
 3:10 - 4:30 pm

Name	Represents	Attended
Richards, Abigail	Chair	X
Walker, Brett	Chair-elect	X
Amende, Kevin	EN/Mech & Ind Engr	X
Anderson, Ryan	EN/Chem Engr	X
Austin, Eric	LS/Political Sci	X
Belasco, Eric	AG/Ag Econ	X
Brody, Michael	ED/Education	X
Carr, Patrick	AG/Research Centers	X
Dana, Susan	Business	X
Gao, Hongwei	EN/Electrical & Comp. Engineering	X
Haynes, George	Extension/On Campus	X
Herman, Matthew	LS/Native American Studies	X
Izurieta, Clemente	EN/Computer Science	X
Kosta, Alison	Extension/Off-campus	X
Little, Jeannie	AR/Music	X
McDermott, Tim	AG/Land Res	X
Meyer, James	LS/History & Phil	X
Ruff, Julie	Nursing, Off Campus	X
Slye, Teresa	Gallatin College	X
Stowers, Steven	LS/Cell Biology & Neuroscience	X
Thomas, Amy	LS/English	X
Yamaguchi, Tomomi	LS/Sociology & Anthro	X
Yeoman, Carl	AG/Animal & Range	X

ALTERNATES	Dept	Attended
Geyer, Lukas	LS/Math	X
Rotella, Jay	LS/Ecology	X
Young, Scott	Library	X

**Others Present:** Kim Obbink, Jodie Delay, Mike Wittie, Ian Godwin, Chris Fastnow, Michael Babcock, Provost Mokwa, Brendan Mumey, Keith Hutchison

- I. Call to Order
  - a. Chair Richards called the meeting to order at 3:10pm
- II. Approval of the September 19<sup>th</sup>, 2018 meeting minutes  
 Teresa Sly motions to approve. Clemente Izurieta seconds. None opposed. No abstentions. Approved.

### III. Informational Items

#### a. University Council Updates

1. Strategic Plan presented
2. Unmanned aircraft policy approved
3. SAFE Statement-postponed
4. Non-Employee Policy-Postponed
5. Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery Planning
  - A. Bozeman Fire Department shared some information on Risk Assessment for our buildings on campus
  - B. The Bozeman Daily Chronicle was in attendance

#### b. Strategic Plan Feedback

1. Draft copy provided at meeting
2. Different from the iteration that was out a week ago
3. Comment period is still open
  - A. Thursday 10/18: 12-1pm in SUB 168
  - B. Monday 10/29: 9-10am in SUB 233
  - C. Other ways to comment
    - i. To email in your feedback-[strategicplan@montana.edu](mailto:strategicplan@montana.edu)
    - ii. To enter your feedback into the system-  
<http://www.montana.edu/strategicplan/process/your-input.html>
  - D. Strategic Planning Committee Members
    - i. Michael Babcock, Carina Beck, Tami Eitle, Alison Harmon, Yves Idzerda, Megan Lasso, Micah McFeely Dan Miller, Chris Fastnow, Ian Godwin
  - E. Michael Brody: Will Senate have any responsibilities in approving the plan? Not beyond giving your feedback, if you wish.

#### c. Carnegie Classification on Community Engagement-Kim Obbink, Chris Fastnow, Jodie Delay, Mandy St Aubyn

1. We are looking at 2020
2. Brown University manages the logistics of this classification
3. 2010 we received this for engagement
4. Report in a 10-year window
5. Committee info is on the handout sheet
6. Mutual collaboration between faculty/campus and “community”
  - A. Working together to solve problems
  - B. We need a better way to collect the information or the “stories” we are looking for. If you have ideas on how to do that better, please let someone on committee know.
7. Not an award. Described as a self-study, similar to the accreditation process.
8. 360 institutions have this classification.
9. If we don't get it, we wait another 5 years to try.
10. [www.montana.edu/outreachengagementcouncil/carnegie2020.html](http://www.montana.edu/outreachengagementcouncil/carnegie2020.html)

11. Michael Brody: How do we handle “massive” engagement in departments? Pull out your best stories, or a summary of the data would be helpful.
12. Application: This year submit a list of names of community members and the Carnegie people will reach out to them and do their homework on the back end.
13. If you know a community member that has been engaged with MSU, we would love to hear about it.
14. Timothy McDermott: Extension folks have engagement entered into Activity Insight that could be pulled out.
15. Michael Brody: Are there types of engagement that are seen as more “worthy” to Carnegie? No. It is about the “two-way street” type of engagement. For example, modifying curriculum to fit our partners and our institution. A diversity of engagement in a project is important.
16. Clemente Izurieta: Do we have a current ranking? Yes. How many levels are there. This one does not have levels. You either have it or you don’t. How many schools are “in”. 360 nationally. Not sure about our peer institutions. U of M is “in”.
17. Due April 15, 2019
18. Michael Brody: Is MSSE a highlighted project? It certainly could be, and we may have used it last time. The new MAT might be a good one too.

#### IV. Old Business

- a. Courses approved in Faculty Steering
  1. ARTZ 207: Shop Pass
  2. BIOE 527: Teaching Evolution
  3. GEO 305: Igneous & Metamorphic Petrology
  4. IMID 521: Laboratory Rotation I
  5. IMID 522: Laboratory Rotation II
  6. IMID 523: Laboratory Rotation III
- b. Grad program changes in Microbiology & Immunology
  1. MBI MS Master of Science in Microbiology & Immunology (Plan A)
  2. MBI MS Master of Science in Microbiology & Immunology (Plan B)
  3. MBI PhD Doctor of Science in Microbiology & Immunology
    - A. Pretty straight forward name change
    - B. Same curriculum
    - C. Operating as a single degree for a while
    - D. Discussion:
      - i. Michael Brody: Reviewed curriculum. Everything looks good. Don’t like the A and B options. A Thesis/Non-thesis option would help with clarification.
      - ii. Timothy McDermott: Plan A and B options are very common designations in certain disciplines. If you look at it, the difference is clear.
      - iii. Designations of Plan A and B is common in Engineering and some other areas
    - E. Has been in the works for about 4 years

- F. Ryan Anderson: Can we vote on all three at once?  
James Meyer proposes that we approve all three program changes at once. Carl Yeoman seconds. None opposed. No abstentions.  
Approved.

V. New Business

- a. New Courses-Will vote on these in Steering Committee next week. Comment period is open for roughly seven days.
  - 1. Undergrad courses
    - A. CULA 165: Baking and Pastry-Part of the culinary arts associate degree
    - B. HSTA 220IH: Shaping of America: History of American Religion-Retitling of course
  - 2. Graduate courses
    - A. BCH 553: Proteins II
    - B. EDCI 550: Ethics and Advocacy for School Librarians
    - C. EELE 509: The Art of Biochips: Solving Healthcare Problems with BioMEMS
    - D. EGEN 511: Engineering Methods for Teachers
    - E. EARTH 562: Advanced Geomorphology
    - F. NASX 542: Research Praxis in Native American Studies
  - 3. Course Deactivations-FYI notifications
    - A. NRSNG 518: Pharm for Infant Child Adult
    - B. NRSNG 519: Pharm for Middle Aged Adults
    - C. NRSNG 520: Pharm for Older Adults
    - D. NRSNG 528: Family Mental Hlth Nrsng IV
    - E. NRSNG 561: Primary Care I
    - F. NRSNG 562: Primary Care II
    - G. NRSNG 563: Primary Care III
    - H. NRSNG 571: Clinical Preceptorship
    - I. NRSNG 590: Master's Thesis
      - i. Nursing is getting rid of their master's courses that were specific to a certain program (Master of Nursing Practice) that is no longer offered. Will be replaced with other courses with the same content that fit better in the new programs (Doctor of Nursing Practice).
- b. CS-MS: Seamless BS/MS in Computer Science
  - 1. Proposal:
    - A. Allows BS students to reserve 12 undergraduate credits toward MS program after admission
    - B. Waives GRE requirement
  - 2. Rationale:
    - A. Reduce barriers into CS MS program
    - B. Enhance size and quality of the CS MS program
  - 3. Attempt to try to identify gifted students and get them into the MS as simply as possible
  - 4. Mike Wittie, MS Coordinator

- A. Making it easier for them to go into the master's program and hopefully they will want to go on and get their PhD.
- B. Graduate council had a small hand full of concerns.
  - i. Setting precedent with making exception for 12 credit transfer (as opposed to 9 credits)
  - ii. Waiving of the GRE requirement for seamless program participants because it may reflect poorly on MSU's admissions processes and the students in our CS programs.
  - iii. Labeling the program as "seamless" might be misleading as students *do* have to apply to Graduate School.
- C. Graduate Council conclusion: "UGC believes that an exception should be granted for this program proposal but does not endorse a general change of policy across graduate programs."
- D. Undergrad student can enroll in 400 and 500 level classes paying undergrad tuition and reserving those credits towards a graduate degree.
- E. Small departments tend to have fewer graduate levels to take
- F. Waiving GRE requirement could reflect badly on graduates who go out into the work world.
- G. Grad Council conclusion: Endorse the proposal
- H. Letter from grad council in attached to the proposal in CIM
- I. GRE waiver is not specific to this program. It has never been a requirement for Computer Science master's programs.
- J. Timothy McDermott: LRES, tried to do something similar and ran into issues. Double counting credits. Undergrads would carry over 12 credits towards their masters. Not double counting. Are students recommended by faculty, or do they apply? 3.25 GPA is the requirement for graduate credits. Fall of their junior year they apply to reserve credits. Is there a separate research project? It would depend on which plan they are going for. It would happen in their 5th year. Some students will work those grad courses in earlier, some will do them their junior and senior year.
- K. What is the criteria for getting Grad Council to okay something like this? Are they going to stop this?
- L. Eric Austin: Former students could do this up to the 9 credits. Is the only difference here that it is 12 credits instead of 9? Is this understanding correct? Yes.
  - i. Abigail Richards: That would be valuable to clarify.
  - ii. Brett Walker: Those credits that they bring in don't necessarily go toward their degree. Steve Stowers: It would be difficult for undergrads to take more than 9 credits while doing their other undergrad work.
- M. Timothy McDermott: Is there an issue with Banner and coding?
- N. Timothy McDermott: Would like to see Montana Hall lower the credit requirement.

- O. Julie Ruff: Are we talking about “discipline specific” credits? Yes. Is that in writing? Brett Walker: That would be a matter for the department to deal with.
  - P. Abigail Richards: Will get some clarity for the senate on the credit issue
  - Q. Susan Dana: Why is grad council endorsing this “exception”, and not the whole package? The “exception” is in reference to the 9 vs 12 credits.
- c. PYAP-BS: Bachelor of Science in Psychology
- 1. Proposal: Elimination of Applied Psychology & Psychological Sciences options in favor of unified program.
  - 2. Rationale: “The program leading to a BS degree offers students experience with the basic and applied science of psychology. Students select the appropriate psychology and career electives in consultation with their advisors and based on their career goals and interests.”
  - 3. Opting to unify their two degree options into one program
  - 4. Keith Hutchison: Students now choose one of two concentrations. Only differ in one class, which is open to both. Want all students to understand the topics of both concentrations.
  - 5. Will put STATs back in program requirements.
  - 6. Eric Belasco: How would students know which direction to go in, field practicum, or undergrad research? Students would be urged to go down the path where they’re strengths are.

Clemente Izurieta motions to suspend the rules. Seconded by Julie Ruff. None opposed. No abstentions. Motion to suspend the rules is approved.

Timothy McDermott moves to approve. Clemente Izurieta seconds. None opposed. No abstentions. Approved.

- d. Workload Policy review
- 1. Draft Documents
    - A. Units develop Workload Plans
    - B. Specify types of assignments and distribution of % of Effort in each area of responsibility
    - C. Contains 8 *shall* items
    - D. Approved by College Dean’s and Provost
    - E. Describes what teaching, scholarship and service may look like for a particular POE
    - F. Reference to changing POE
    - G. Information about Joint Appointments when developing unit plans
    - H. New Flow Chart
  - 2. Workload Task Force, JAGS have worked on this
  - 3. Looking at guidelines-Flowchart
    - A. Faculty Senate has reviewed it but has not endorsed it.
    - B. We are on our second trip around at this point
    - C. Looking for feedback if you don’t think things look right
    - D. 1. Introduction and purpose: “Any consideration of faculty workload must recognize the various roles of faculty in fulfilling

the mission of the university. At Montana State University, tenurable and tenured faculty have responsibilities in the areas of teaching, scholarship and service. These responsibilities are distributed among the faculty in a unit. Under this policy, each academic unit will develop a Workload Plan consistent with the principles stated in this policy.”

- i. There was no purpose in the Purpose. A purpose has now been added. “The purpose of this workload policy is to guide academic units in the development of workload plans that will establish fair and reasonable assignments for faculty across the unit and the university.”
  - ii. Both policy and the plan would guide the faculty
  - iii. Michael Brody: Purpose does not mention faculty, but “units”. Some may see that and think it doesn’t refer to them because they are “faculty”. Faculty should be included if it is indeed referring to them also.
  - iv. Julie Ruff: Definitions of Fair and Reasonable? Brett Walker: Agree. It is ambiguous. Language should be more precise. Michael Brody: Fair and Reasonable in reference to this document. Brett Walker: “Fair and Reasonable assignment” should be based on the percentages of teaching, research, service listed in their contract.
- E. 2. Faculty Responsibilities “Expectations associated with the faculty member’s responsibilities are guided broadly by the mission of the university, with appropriate adjustments as necessary to fulfill college or unit responsibilities. Individual assignments in teaching, scholarship (~~suggestion to add “administration” here~~) and service may vary within a college or unit, and across the university.
- i. New language has been added. “Some faculty who have been approved to serve in positions that include administrative responsibilities, such as Dept Heads or Center Directors, may have a portion of their workload dedicated to the administrative responsibilities while maintaining responsibilities in the other area of responsibility.” JAGS members wanted the WLP to focus on typical faculty assignments within a unit. Administrative assignments, particularly for pre-tenure faculty are rare.
  - ii. Kevin Amende and Michael Brody: They have Program Coordinators in their units that should be included in this. They get paid. It is not part of their service.
  - iii. Michael Brody: Mission and specific responsibilities don’t seem to fit together. Walker: Reading #2. Seems vague. Michael Brody: If we asked President Cruzado, she would say that it is our responsibilities as a Land Grant Institution that should drive our mission.

- iv. Eric Austin: Follow the difficulty from going from the Mission to “do this”. Like about the language: It gives us a hook between the mission and strategic plan which should offer some clarity. Mission stated here is valuable, but with additional clarity.
  - v. Michael Brody: His college has “goals” that are broader. Then the “unit” has more concrete things.
- F. Faculty Responsibility (cont.) “Tenurable and tenured faculty members’ teaching, scholarship and service responsibilities are allocated as a percentage of the faculty member’s total effort in all areas of responsibility. For the purpose of this policy, this distribution of effort will be referred to as the faculty member’s “percentages of effort” or “POE”. The total apportionment across all areas will be 100%. All faculty must have a defined POE in each of the areas of ~~teaching, scholarship, and service~~ responsibility, distributed such that faculty members have comparable total effort.”
- “The faculty member’s POE ~~in teaching, scholarship and service~~ are initially stated in their letter of hire and reviewed as part of the annual review process. The process for adjusting POE is described in the Annual Review Policy. A faculty member’s workload assignment will be consistent with tenure and/or promotion and annual review guidelines.”
- i. Michael Brody: The last part is the most important
- G. #2 again enter slide info-link to the annual review policy
- ii. Michael Brody: Reasonable
  - iii. Eric Austin: This is a critical question. The language is ambiguous. Need more specific info for guidelines.
  - iv. Workload Guidelines should give us more specific information.
  - v. “A faculty member’s workload assignment will be consistent with tenure and/or promotion and annual review guidelines.”: Kevin Amende; Percentages can be changed along the tenure process. Does this document clarify that information? It does elude to it, because it refers to your contract and your annual a review. Timothy McDermott: What if your hire letter says something different about your percentages? It would be your annual contract and the change would have to be a joint decision between you and your supervisor. Perhaps that should be clearer in this document. Brett Walker: Needs to be ambiguous enough to fit all disciplines. Inequality is workload that is happening at the unit level. Can’t be so ambiguous that we don’t solve the problem we are trying to solve in the first place. It would then be defensible across the entire campus. Contracts and letters of hire will be important.



#### H. Workload Plan:

- i. “Each unit will develop a Workload Plan for teaching, scholarship and service assignments that is consistent with the guidelines accompanying this policy. The plan must specify the types of assignments and the distribution of POE in each area of responsibility.

The unit plan shall also include **the circumstances that would justify variation** from the typical workload for faculty. The College’s Dean and the Provost will review and approve each unit’s Workload Plan.”

- a) Concern: What is means by circumstances  
Response: discussed at JAGs – circumstance definition a part of the Workload Plan Guidelines (e.g. faculty using course buy-out as part of a sponsored project)
- b) Suggestion: Include a link to Faculty Modified Duties Response: shall have link in Workload Plan Guidelines

- ii. “The Workload Plan may be reviewed and/or updated at any time. Any change to the unit’s Workload Plan shall be submitted in writing to the College’s Dean and the Provost. Plans will also be reviewed and updated, if appropriate, at the time of the unit’s program review/accreditation.”

- a) Concern: the alignment of unit workload plan review and accreditation may not be the same.  
Response: that is OK – plans can be reviewed/updated at any time. At minimum they must be reviewed at the time of accreditation. If the mission of a unit changes, the plan can be modified

#### e. Committee assignments

1. Kevin Amende will be on Space Management
2. Michael Brody: Has someone who needs to get off the parking committee
3. Teresa Sly volunteers for Space Management
4. Rec Sports Advisory board
  - A. Still vacant
  - B. Meets monthly 5-6pm
5. Core 2.0 Committee
  - A. Meets Mondays 9-10am
  - B. Twice monthly
  - C. Anticipate 3-4 additional hours of work outside of the regular meetings
  - D. Michael Brody volunteers to do Core.
6. Senator Smith (Psychology): Motion to add an item to a future faculty senate meeting agenda: formation of a committee to create guidelines for the evaluation of research center proposals. Jessi is no longer with MSU. How would the senate like to deal with this going forward?

- A. Next steps – form senate sub-committee (7 members?)
  - B. Short presentations from 3-4 existing centers
- VI. Announcements
- a. Oct 8: Indigenous Peoples Day: Celebration at noon on the Mall
  - b. Oct 8: “Democracy by Degrees” Lecture and book signing by Dr. Robert Rydell 4:30-7pm in Hager Auditorium (MOR)
  - c. Oct 8: Shannon Weatherly Memorial Lecture by Sarah Deer, 7pm in SUB Ballroom A
  - d. Oct 9: Erik Funk, Provost’s Distinguished Lecture. 7pm in Reynold’s Recital Hall
- VII. Public Comment
- a. Provost Mokwa: Appreciates the committee’s conversations. Please revisit the Seamless BS/MS proposal. It is not about double counting. All the other rules still apply. Many are coming in with many AP courses. Would like to keep them challenged and engaged.
    - 1. Last spring this committee approved some programs. After they go to BOR, they have to our accrediting bodies, NWCCU. NWCCU has been going through restructuring and in asking for feedback. They have heard that they are taking too long to approved programs. They heard us and have approved all the programs we had before them for review.
  - b. Two important searches coming up.
    - 1. Senior Diversity and Inclusion Officer-Came out of last year’s initiatives. Four candidates coming to campus. Dean Shannon of Nursing is chair of the search committee
    - 2. VP of Agriculture, Dean of AG, Director of Extension Research Centers? Five candidates coming to campus soon.
- VIII. Adjournment
- a. Meeting was adjourned at 4:44pm

**Note: The next Faculty Senate Meeting will be held on October 17<sup>th</sup> in PBB room 108**