FACULTY SENATE
OCTOBER 16, 2013
346 LEON JOHNSON
4:10 PM – 5:00 PM
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY-BOZEMAN, MONTANA
Minutes

Members Present: Babbitt (Physics), Bolte (Music), Bennett (English), Brester (Ag Econ/Econ), Burrows (Ext), Christopher (HHD), Dougher (PSPP), Durham (COB), Eiger (Cell Bio & Neuro), Gannon (Chem & Bio Eng), Greenwood (Math), Hostetler (GC), Igo (Ag Ed), Kaiser (ECE), Kohler for Lawrence (Chem & Biochem), Lynch (Psych), Martin (Mod Lang), Miller (CE), Newhouse (Art), O'Neill (Arch), Reidy (Hist & Phil), Ricciardelli (Film & Photo), Rossmann (Library), Schachman (Nursing), Swinford (Soc/Anthro), Waller (Hist & Phil), Wilmer (Political Science), Wiedenheft (IID), Zabinski (LRES)

Others Present: Robert Mokwa, Chris Fastnow, Larry Carucci, David Singel, Bob Swenson, Leila Sterman, Nicol Rae, Martha Potvin

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

Senate Business

- The minutes from October 9, 2013 were unanimously approved.
- The C&PC and APWG approved a number of courses and programs, all of which are posted on the FS website. Senators will vote on them at next week's senate meeting.

Update from Council Representatives

- Budget Council – Doralyn Rossmann
    - Information about the Budget Council may be accessed via their website: http://www.montana.edu/budgetcouncil/
    - Referring to the council's areas of responsibility and charge as articulated on the website, Rossmann stated that both need revision.
    - The council acts as an advisory body to the president. Additionally, if the council allocates funds to vice presidents for specific projects, the council may make recommendations on how that money might be spent.
    - More recently, the council has been focusing on university level/extra funds, specifically strategic investments proposals. Some of the on-going strategic investments that were funded last year have an assessment component. The council is preparing to gather data from individuals who proposed them.
    - The council is examining the research office shortfall and offered guidance to the Rapid Action Task Force.
    - More in-depth budgetary information is needed for the council to be more effective.
    - Rossmann encouraged senators and their constituents to communicate issues they would like brought to the council, to her.
    - Kohler asked if there was a pie-chart depiction of the budget that could be used as a simple communicative tool for the campus. Rossmann stated that a narrative needs to accompany budget information and the council is working on a way to do that.
    - Wilmer asked Rossmann if she believes her involvement has had a positive impact, if her advice has been well-taken and if her time has been well-spent on the council. Rossmann believes input regarding specific issues has been heeded. She believes more budget information should be made available to the council. Additionally, the fact that the council is an advisory rather than a decision-making body restricts activity.
- Research Council – Randy Babbitt
    - The council usually meets twice a month but has only met once, so far, jointly with the Rapid Action Task Force.
    - The council not only reviews research dollars coming in, but creative activities, how to use F&A money, technology transfer, and student engagement, to name a few.
- Rapid Action Task Force – Robert Mokwa, Michael Reidy
    - Chair Mokwa and Chair-elect Reidy, members of the task force, have been engaged in finding solutions to the $1.5M shortfall in the research office. Other venues of return have been explored, but conversations have repeatedly converged on F&A's and how they may be used to meet the shortfall. Faculty interest on the council is focused on preserving the campus research component, as well as finding an investment solution.

Results from the All-Faculty Meeting held May 6, 2013 – Chair Mokwa

- On May 6, 2013, an open meeting at MSU transpired with 80 attendees including faculty, administration, Clay Christian, Kevin McRae. It was a brainstorming session, facilitated by Eric Austin, bringing important issues to the forefront. A list of 27 items were articulated and listed. The top five were:
    - Carnegie Tier 1 Status; sustain and enhance
    - Salaries
    - Strategies to address enrollment
    - Performance Based Funding
    - Transitioning from the CBA to the Faculty Handbook
- Chair Mokwa has been working with administrators, in a shared governance environment, to help meet goals on how to address these five concerns.
- An outline of Faculty Senate activities was presented and Chair Mokwa explained how they dovetailed with the five areas of concern.
    - At the May meeting, faculty were not aware of the research shortfall or the change in status of the VP of Research. Since that time, however, faculty have been involved in trying to find answers to the financial challenges in our research enterprise. In the short-term, department budgets and IDC returns are being examined as possible solutions.
    - Strategic planning and the growth issue have partially been improved by hiring more faculty. Growth, however, is an ongoing phenomenon and continues to morph.
    - One of the most important functions of Faculty Senate is the approval of academic curriculum and programs.
    - Performance Based Funding is being implemented and Chair Mokwa believes faculty may use this opportunity and mechanism to improve the quality of education. Faculty are being asked for ideas on how PBF may be implemented and the metrics to be used.
    - Regarding salaries and raises, Chair Mokwa stated that a 2.25%, $250/year raise is coming from the legislature this year. The state office does not award MSU the complete 2.25% /$250, but something less; MSU comes up with the rest. Provost Potvin will be sending a letter articulating what the raises will be, based on merit, market, equity, changes to promotion and retention amounts.
    - Discussions ensued:
        - With regard to PBF as the answer, Wilmer would like to know why students take longer to graduate. She believes it manifests in different settings. If we don't know why students aren't graduating in four years, we can't have a program that affectively addresses the goals of those who subscribe to PBF.
        - Chair Mokwa concurred by stating that PBF should be more data driven. Graduation rates should not be the sole metric for determining PBF, as many more things affect how the student gets through college.
        - Lynch asked if anyone has gathered the data on performance problems or graduation rates.
        - Eiger stated that we don't have a baseline on how to do data gathering and it is a very complex system. In research, there is a baseline and a control and performance problems/graduation rates are very complicated. Additionally, PBF creates a competitive environment whereby funding is allocated to those institutions who get more students out the door.
        - Wilmer believes faculty should decide what metrics are important and figure out what is causing the graduation rate problem.
        - Singel stated that copious amounts of literature and studies are written about this topic and MSU is working with the Institution of Research to examine what might be applicable to our campus. The national data have working hypotheses and by examining cohorts and implementing them, MSU could have an impact. Some of the problems examined in the data were:
            - Curriculum is structured so that students cannot get key courses required for progress towards a degree; that is actionable.
            - There are issues associated with changing majors. When and what is the degree of congruence, at the root, before there is this branching into different majors resulting in extra credit accumulation? McKinsey studies shows there are probably a semester to a year's work that students take that is not applicable to their degree program. Is that deliberate idea of the student to get an additional certificate for an enriched program, or is that related to a lack of clear sample academic path? As faculty, we tend to think about what we do in our classroom. Is the purpose of this to get students through our classroom based on our normal teaching activities? If you identify cohort groups by examining the data, many student categories could be identified beforehand that include those who struggle to get through our program.

- Mokwa - Many things are outside of faculty control that involves remedial courses, counseling, advising. A significant effort will be expended in addressing these different cohorts of students that are already dropping off. The athletic department is an excellent example of this effort with a graduation rate of 77% with some student-athletes maintaining a 4.0 average. Adopting some aspects of that model might help some students who are less likely of making it through, and should involve the Office of Student Success
- Eiger - The PBF model encourages competition between educational institutions and rewards those with higher graduation rates.
- Mokwa – Because faculty have input on this program, it does not have to be competitive.
- Potvin – Having students graduate on time, earning a degree and keeping their costs down is our goal, competitive or not. For 1 ½ years, the Grad Success Team, along with five subcommittees, examined MSU data and reported on how we can consider DWF rates in classes. Our TEAL classrooms have shown student success where DFW pass rates went from 56% to 86%, and the Budget Council has allocated more money to continue to build on that success. Other options for assisting students to move through their program include offering summer classes for repeat courses, moving students seamlessly into masters, etc.
- Data for the graduation rates may be obtained from Chris Fastnow, Office of Planning and Analysis. Additionally, all faculty are members of Educational Advisory Board, which have data and a number of best practice studies. Access to this information may be obtained by asking the VP of Admin and Finance for login credentials.
- Lynch – Hears two things: 1. How to increase graduation rates 2. Is there relatively more money going to those schools that do relatively better with grad rates than those who don't? We are competing, aren't we? I thought that "Performance" Based Funding meant that those who "perform" better get more money.
- Potvin – Short term, MSU is not looking at rates, but at an increases in graduation numbers. The goal is to finish more students that we have, and we will improve because we have a growing population. We do not know what metrics will be chosen.
- Mokwa – Another way to look at it is, in the short term, it is new money that we would have not received had it not been for PBF and it is spread out over all campuses ($7.5M). The past PBF funding model and reward of 5% was based on how well we recruited students. Five percent of the money is now being moved to output.
- Brester - The last time the United States made major increases in the number of graduates at four-year universities was after WWII because we put more money into making that happen. To the extent we tweak things, like scheduling, which could improve, if we're just going reduce the DWF, and some faculty teach 300 student classes, the best way to do that is not to give any D's and F's. That's the concern – metrics matter. If we focus on numbers and grad rates without either adjusting who we allow in, which we do not want to do, but we have to also realize we will continue to lose people because they don't belong here. But for those that need to be here, we should keep them. For the class sizes we have, TEAL classroom don't work. I don't want this to be a quality-basis response.
- Eiger – We should take PBF and place it into high schools to bring math skills up, as well as improving student advising.
- Reidy – The $7.5M is not really new money. It is already in place and is used to do what we already do, but now OCHE wants us to do it differently.
- Mokwa – There is a debate about whether it is new money, or not. OCHE considers it new money, as it wouldn't have been there had they not made the PBF agreement. Our opportunity is our percentage and if we meet our goals, we receive the entire amount. If not, we receive only a portion and the rest goes back into a pool for educational enhancement grants to help us understand why we didn't meet our goals and to assist students who are not doing well.

- Lynch – We should find ways to improve graduation, in collaboration with all other MUS schools.
- Singel – Spoke with Regent Buchanan, who stated we either get the money, or not, and we are only competing with ourselves.

As there was no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:12 pm.

Signature,
Robert Mokwa, Chair

Signature
Michael Reidy, Chair-elect

Minutes were transcribed by Gale R. Gough, Administrative Associate, Faculty Senate.