

FACULTY SENATE
April 23, 2014
346 LEON JOHNSON
4:10 PM – 5:00 PM
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY – BOZEMAN, MONTANA
Minutes

Members Present: Arnold for Igo (Ag Ed), Babbitt (Physics), Bolte (Music), Bonnand (Library), Brester (Ag Econ), Burrows (Ext), DeWeese for Newhouse (Art), Durham (JJCBE), Gannon (Bio & Chem Eng), Greenwood (Math), Herbeck (Ed), Hostetler (GC), Kohler (Chem & Biochem), Larson (M&IE), Lynch (Psych), Martin (Mod Lang), McMahon (Ecology), Miller (CE), Reidy (Hist, Phil & Religious Stds), Rossmann (Library), Schachman (Nursing), Swinford (Soc), Walker for Waller (Hist, Phil & Religious Stds), Wathen for Christopher (HHD), Zabinski (LRES)

Others Present: Larry Carucci, Ron Larsen, Edward Dratz, David Singel, Matt Caires, Nancy Cornwell, Kregg Aytes, Kenning Arlitsch

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

Senate Business and Announcements – Chair-elect Reidy

- The minutes from April 16, 2014 were unanimously approved.
- The annual all-faculty closed meeting will take place on Wednesday, April 30, 2014, in the President's Conference Room, 4:10 – 5:00 pm. Graduate and undergraduate degrees, as well as two posthumous degrees will be approved.
- The new policy for reporting suspected legal, regulatory or policy violations is on the legal counsel website for a thirty-day comment period, and University Council will vote to approve on May 7. Comments made be made to Leslie Taylor: lesliet@montana.edu or Bob Mokwa: rmokwa@ce.montana.edu
- New Course and Program Approval Process
 - Currently, the courses listed on the FS web site have been approved by C&PC, and they will be voted on during the closed, April 30th annual all-faculty meeting. If senators have concerns with those listed on senate's website, please email Chair-elect Reidy: mreidy@montana.edu
 - Senators are asked to review the new program, *Asian Studies Major and Minor for MSU*.
 - A letter from the Academic Programs Working Group will be posted for senator perusal early next week.
 - Chair-elect Reidy informed senate that the C&PC will be the approving body for courses and programs going forward, and voting will no longer take place during senate meetings.

Elections for Faculty Senate Chair-elect and Faculty Affairs Chair Positions

- Chair-elect Reidy asked for a motion to re-elect Larry Carucci as Chair of Faculty Affairs→seconded→all in favor→unanimously voted to reinstate Larry Carucci as Chair of Faculty Affairs.
- Randy Babbitt of Physics volunteered to be the next Chair-elect of Faculty Senate. Chair-elect Reidy asked if there were any other nominations amongst senators, of which there were none. Reidy made a motion to conduct a hand vote, in lieu of a paper ballot, for the Chair-elect position→seconded→unanimously approved. Reidy made a motion to approve Randy Babbitt as the new Chair-elect of Faculty Senate→seconded→all in favor→unanimously approved.

Academic Freedom Policy (AFP) Second Reading – Chair Carucci

- Based on discussions and recommendations from Faculty Affairs and senators, the word “teacher” has been changed to “Faculty member” in the document. Final approval for the change will come from the BoR.
- Reidy asked for a motion to approve the document→seconded→all in favor→unanimously approved.

Ethical and Professional Standards Second Reading– Chair Carucci

- Leslie Taylor has modified the document to include more formal language. The essence of the policy remains the same, however.
- Letter A was changed back to the original form and an accurate imbedded web link is pending.
- Letter E has a link to the policy with more information.
- Letter F remains exactly as was discussed in the April 16, 2014 senate meeting.
- Letter G will include a new link to the Research Misconduct Policy.
- Letter H has added words, “biosafety,” “human,” “animal,” and “radioactive.”
- Letter I will have a new link to the referenced “Enterprise Information Technology Policies.”
- Letter J will have new handbook sections.
- Letter K is Provost Potvin’s contribution to the document.
- The remaining document verbiage is the same as in the previous version.
- Discussions ensued:
 - Larson questions the use of web links in the document, as web structure might not remain the same; links can change and faculty would have to continually monitor and scrutinize the links to ensure they work and point to the correct reference. He wonders if faculty might lose control of their own policies if they rely on someone else’s terminology that may have the ability to change the links. He believes it is better to write out policies in the document rather than link them. Carucci stated that in this particular document, links are used due to the numerous protected categories; faculty do not have control over non-discriminatory classes. Carucci stated that links will point to official documents where the policies are.
- Reidy moved to accept the document→seconded→all in favor→unanimously approved.

Guidelines for Level of Review for Curriculum Changes Second Reading – Ron Larsen

- Based on the April 9, 2014 FS input, Larsen added verbiage to the document: “The following are not considered minor changes:
 - Change in number of credits
 - Change in pre-requisites
 - Removal of a course from the catalogue”
- The statement at the top of the document was also added to reference C&PC as the logical entity to have control over the bulleted lists that are referenced as “minor.”
- Babbitt asked where a “change of semester” scenario might be placed in the guidelines document. Larsen does not consider a change in semester to be minor and thus, it would not be listed in the document – it would be an interpretation. Reason - A course is only offered once a year; and, it is being taken by other departments.
- Larson notes that service courses changing in time can drastically alter students’ classes and would be more than a minor change. Larsen suggested a parenthesis that says “will notify impacted departments” under MINOR COURSE CHANGES, second bullet. One would discover those who are impacted by examining what students have taken the specified course in the past and what department they are from. Data warehouse info is readily available to help answer those queries, but pre-reqs will have to be mined from DegreeWorks; MSU will be ready to do that next year.

- Kohler commented on the need for approval from the Provost's office for change of instructor under the minor changes categories and how that process might be streamlined. Larsen is amenable to having that category be removed, eventually, from the document. Carucci stated that there could be a significant difference when instructors are changed – e.g., if an instructor in history is changed, there might be an 80% change in course content and could impact another categories further down in the guidelines document. Swinford noted that in his department, resumes and vitas from instructors are required when approving courses; Larsen stated that those same documents are still required for faculty who are not part of the tenure track faculty.
- Larson moved that an addendum in the guidelines document be added to show that a change in meeting time or location should be accompanied by a notification of the affected enrollment based on historical enrollment data → seconded → all in favor → unanimously approved.
- Reidy moved for acceptance of the guidelines with Larson's addendum → seconded → all in favor → unanimously approved.

Open Request for Input – Planning and Strategy Session for Next Year

- Chair-elect Reidy would like a more creative process in senate where disciplines are collaborating with one another. Additionally, he would like to set aside an “open-microphone” portion of every senate meeting, 10-15 minutes, for faculty to express concerns and disseminate information. He believes senate needs specific goals and engaged senate in an open discussion about the content of and mechanism for conducting future Faculty Senate meetings. He asked members what they wanted to accomplish this coming AY.
 - Discussions ensued:
 - Walker stated that senate does not seem to participate in the originating of ideas; rather, they are involved at the later stage of approving ideas. He would like to see senate become involved in setting priorities; e.g., finding out the cost for bringing outside contractors to campus. Departments are stretched and there are challenges with remedial education for incoming students, yet MSU is spending money on outside contractors.
 - Brester suggested that senate discuss how to accomplish the stated goals in the Strategic Plan (SP) since there are no plans on how to achieve them.
 - Reidy noted that the SP is broad, vague document and senate should come up with “a strategy within a strategy” to accomplish the stated goals. Further, senate should spearhead some of the strategic goals and examine how they might be prioritized.
 - Lynch envisions priorities being listed and ranked from the most important to the least. He has not observed, from administration, a distinct methodology for making critical decisions. He would like senate to discover how admin sets priorities from the SP.
 - Kohler noted that the SP is deficient in strategy. Faculty participants in the strategic planning process were told that strategies would be articulated after goals were set. He believes it is incumbent upon senate to now weigh in on what these strategies should be.
 - Babbitt reported that at the recent joint council meeting, the very same discussions about how the list in the SP was intentionally set, first, and prioritizing the list was to follow. Administration may already be working on ranking the priorities.
 - In the context of the SP's listed priorities, Brester would like to know where and how the money is being spent and what the priorities are - Are they service excellence, the merger of Leadership Institute and the Leadership Fellowship Programs? Creating these programs without senate input negates the philosophy of shared governance. Senate is not asked to vote on things that cost money in a time when

enrollment is increasing and faculty want to keep the educational experience at a high level.

- Reidy suggested that senate agree on and create the prioritization and work with admin in expediting them within the context of the SP.
- Lynch asked if the planning and budget councils collaborate. If so, could senate ask the Planning Council to present their prioritized plan for the coming year before the first senate meeting in fall 14?
- Reidy, a member on the Planning Council, noted that the council does not have priorities, per se. Rather, they have matrices of MSU needs that are measured to ensure the SP is being met; there is no hierarchy within research, discovery and learning and outreach.
- Budget Council (BC) member Rossmann reported that the council recently met with leaders who fund units - Facilities, ITC, Athletics – to better understand their budgets. BC will be examining investment ideas for PBF dollars, which will be approved at the May BoR meeting. The ideas should tie into the SP or meet PBF metrics. PBF revenue are one-time only dollars, and one role BC might assume is determining how the funds are directed according to the SP. The BC is also inventing a model for “all-funds budgeting,” which would encourage the campus community to examine how budgets are allocated in response to the SP. The model would be a combination of concepts such as forming a responsibility center, budgeting, and amalgams of other forms of budgeting. Rossmann will share the next Budget Council agenda in senate.
- Reidy is not certain that working through the university councils is the way to have faculty voices heard.
- Rossmann suggested that groups of faculty attend council meetings.
- McMahon queried the mechanism for expressing an idea in senate. Reidy stated that after minute approval, the agenda would reflect a time for open discussion.
- Brester added that smaller subgroups of senate might be more productive in accomplishing goals than engaging the entire senate.
- Reidy envisions more senate motions being made to bring forward in leadership meetings. He emphasized the importance of complete departmental/unit representation on senate, as well as consistent attendance at the meetings.
- Caires suggested that Terry Leist attend the first fall 2014 FS meeting to explain the budget.
- Rossmann noted that the BC has spent most of the year learning how the budget works and has not addressed money allocation. She suggested senate convey “concepts” about where money should be directed in a positive way.
- Babbitt suggested that instead of Chair and Chair-elect of FS attending all meetings as the sole senate representatives, other groups of senators might participate.

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

Signature,
Robert Mokwa, Chair

Signature
Michael Reidy, Chair-elect