

Faculty Senate Minutes
 November 13th, 2019
 ABB 138
 3:10-4:30pm

Name	Represents	Attended
Austin, Eric	Chair	x
Brody, Michael	Chair-elect	x
Amende, Kevin	EN/Mechanical/Industrial Engr	x
Anderson, Ryan	EN/Chem Engr	x
Borys, Nick	LS/Physics	x
Brookshire, Jack	AG/Land Resources	x
Carson, Robert	EHHD/Education	x
Creel, Scott	LS/Ecology	x
Dana, Susan	Business	x
Dratz, Ed	LS/Chemistry & Biochemistry	x
Ellis, Colter	LS/Sociology & Anthropology	x
Fick, Damon	EN/Civil Engineering	x
Haggerty, Julia	LS/Earth Sciences	x
Haynes, George	Extension/On Campus	x
Herman, Matthew	LS/Native American Studies	x
Izurieta, Clemente	EN/Computer Science	x
Jelinski, Jack	Emeritus Faculty	x
Kosto, Allison	Extension/Off Campus	x
Meyer, James	LS/History & Philosophy	x
Schmidt, Edward	AG/Microbiology & Immunology	x
Sly, Teresa	Gallatin College	x
Stowers, Steven	LS/Cell Biology & Neuroscience	x
Watson, Bradford	AR/Architecture	x
Yeoman, Carl	AG/Animal and Range	x
Young, Scott	Library	X

ALTERNATES	Dept	Attended
Dunbar, Ed	EHHD/Health & Human Develop	x
Ready, Richard	AG/Agricultural Economics	x
Tillack, Peter	LS/Modern Languages	x

OTHER ATTENDEES	Dept	Attended
Babcock, Michael	Earth Sciences	x
Kohout, Susy	Microbiology & Immunology	x
Lefcort, Frances	Microbiology & Immunology	x
Mazer, Jamie	Microbiology & Immunology	x
Mokwa, Provost	Office of the Provost	x
Parker, David	Political Science	x
Shanahan, Elizabeth	Political Science	x

- I. Call to order
 - a. Meeting was called to order at 3:10pm
- II. Approval of the October 30th meeting minutes
 - a. Ed Dratz moves to approve. Tomas Gedeon seconds. Approved.
- III. Informational Items
 - a. Structural Regents Level II Proposal-CBN/Micro & Immunology Merger
 1. Will be on the November Regents Agenda – 11/21-22
 2. Structural Proposals don't come to FS for a vote
 3. Opportunity and channel to provide comments and feedback through FS, Public Comment at the Regents Meeting
 - A. Today and to Michael and I until COB Monday, 11/18
 - B. Public Comment at the Regents Meeting
 4. **What:** Request for authorization of an administrative organizational change to merge Departments of Cell Biology and Neuroscience and Microbiology and Immunology to form a consolidated and unified Department of Microbiology and Immunology that will represent an interdisciplinary department in the College of Agriculture at Montana State University. (From the Proposal Request Form)
 - A. Summary of what is on the proposal
 5. **Why:** Aligning the eight tenured faculty members and two instructors in CBN with the 19 tenured and tenure-track faculty, plus over 10 research faculty and instructors in the Department of Microbiology and Immunology will provide a stronger foundation for sustainability and future growth of graduate and

undergraduate academic programs and associated research opportunities for students.

A.

6. **Resources:** The merger of these departments did not change any of the terms and conditions of employment for the faculty members in either unit. The tenurable faculty still retain all rights of tenure. Their offices and laboratories have not moved. The merger has not resulted in any changes to the undergraduate programs that were delivered previously by each of the two units. The merger is budget neutral, no additional resources are necessary as a result of the re-alignment.
7. **Comments/Questions-** Feedback can be sent to Eric Austin and Michael Brody
 - A. Agenda for BOR meeting has not yet been posted on their website
 - B. Will have an opportunity during BOR meeting to give feedback
 - C. Need feedback back by close of business on Monday
 - D. The Level II HAS been submitted or WILL be submitted? It is on the agenda next week, so it has been submitted.
 - E. Ed Schmidt: On behalf of the TT faculty of involved departments: Understood that we were already merged six months ago. Have been working together. The new merged department is overwhelmingly in favor of this merge. New courses are being discussed with all involved. Research base has grown amazingly working together. Have been able to add classes and students and offering more graduate programs due to the merger. We need more help. Asking administration to join with the faculty from new merged department and realize their great potential. A copy of this statement is available. Please contact Keely Holmes, keely.holmes@montana.edu.
 - F. Seems like a turn around. Sounds like people have a different attitude from how they felt last year. There may be bad feelings about how things were handled, but not about moving forward as a merged dept. Everyone is committed to moving forward, but there are wounds that still need to be healed. Can you give us a rough number of how many are for this? It is overwhelmingly positive.
 - G. There is a difference of three faculty when doing the math in the info from above. Have had retirements and have had people leave, so it is five people that have come on board. Not authorized to use those additional lines for hires yet.
 - H. How many classes had to be cancelled? Four courses, but would have been more if they had not combined. Microbiology/Immunology faculty stepped in to teach some of those courses that may have been cancelled.
 - I. What do graduate students think about the merger? Cannot answer that. Would hope they are concentrating on their labs. Would be a good questions to ask the students.

- J. No graduate programs are going to change. Title will remain the same. Merger is structural only, doesn't affect degrees.
 - K. The last line of RESOURCES states this merger is "budget neutral", but it sounds like you need more faculty. Thought we would be able to hire by now. This is about the merger and not the delivery of the curriculum. Will ask this questions and get more info.
 - L. Neuroscience graduate program is, basically, in moratorium until they can get more faculty. Where did the money go that supported those faculty who have left? "Budget Neutral" would insinuate that we should be able to hire.
 - M. Faculty resources are a bigger issue than just this. We will need to have more conversations about this at another time.
 - N. What is proposed here, has it already been done? Is it always done this way? There was controversy over this potential merge, but then it happened anyway. Do not have the information needed to answer that questions.
- b. Athletic Committee Update-George Hayes
 - 1. Carried-over to next meeting
- IV. New Business
- a. New Courses
 - 1. There are a few courses that were approved by CPC yesterday. Can be reviewed on Faculty Senate website, but won't be discussed until next meeting.
 - b. New and Revised Programs
 - 2. None
- V. Old Business
- a. Courses Approved in Steering
 - 1. ARTZ 323: Cezanne's Path: The Birth of Modernism
 - 2. CHMY 415: Structure and Bonding in Inorganic Chemistry
 - 3. EGEN 420: Ice and Snow Mechanics
 - 4. PSYX 358: Drugs and Behavior
 - 5. EARTH 523: Weather for Elementary Teachers
 - 6. EARTH 597: Vertebrate Paleontology for Teachers
 - 7. MEDS 501: Independent Investigative Inquiry(III)
 - 8. MEDS 504: Independent Investigative Inquiry Final Project
 - 9. Course Changes
 - A. GEO 305: Igneous and Metamorphic Petrology
 - B. GRMN 303: German Through Cinema
 - C. NUTR 430: Food Processing
 - D. MEDS 595: Research Methods
 - 10. Program Changes:
 - A. Minor in Photography-Non-Teaching (Deactivation)
 - B. MUS-MINOR: Minor in Music-Non-Teaching
 - C. BLEN-BS: BS in Biological Engineering
 - D. EGIS-BS: BS in Earth Science-GIS/Planning Option
 - E. ESGL-BS: BS in Earth Science-Geology Option
 - F. ESPL-BS: BS in Earth Science-Paleontology Option

- G. ESGR-BS: BS in Earth Science-Geography Option
- H. ESSS-BS: BS in Earth Science-Snow Science Option

b. PPA-PhD Program Proposal

1. Questions and Discussion

A. None

2. Action?

A. Colter Ellis moves to approve. Susan Dana seconds. None opposed. No abstentions. Approved.

c. Center Review Guidelines Discussion

Faculty Senate Guidelines for Approval of Center ["Entity"] Proposals and Periodic Review of Activities

In this document, "entity" means a center, institute, bureau, station or similar entity requiring approval by the Board of Regents pursuant to Policy 218.

1. Designation

A. The entity should be appropriately designated (i.e. as a center, institute, etc.) to meet the definitions and functions described in the MSU Policy on Forming and Reviewing entities and Institutes [which does not yet exist]

2. Contribution to the Mission of the University

A. The entity should have the potential to make significant contributions to the teaching, research/creative activity, and/or engagement missions of the University

B. The entity should have the potential to enhance the reputation of the University by providing state-wide, regional, national, or international leadership in teaching, research/creative activity, and/or engagement

C. The entity demonstrates a commitment to a culture of diversity, equity, and inclusion

D. The entity has a systematic plan for regular assessment of its contributions to the mission of the University

3. Governance

A. **The entity has policies that ensure research, academic, and curricular independence, including an explicit commitment to compliance with all MSU policies**

B. The entity has systematic and credible mechanisms for regular independent review of its activities, that include an external advisory council and/or an external review board

C. If the entity hires faculty and/or staff, the entity has hiring processes that ensure independence from the entity's external funding source(s)

D. The entity will issue a public annual report of funding sources, expenditures, and measurable outcomes

4. Financial Sustainability

A. **The entity should have a plan for, and the potential to be self-supporting through external funding and other revenue sources after a reasonable initial period (approximately 3-5 years)**

~~B. In order to ensure academic independence and financial sustainability, the entity should have a plan for diversifying its funding beyond a single source within a reasonable period of time (approximately 5 years)~~

- C. The entity should have a contingency plan for how it will manage potential major funding shortfalls that could threaten the entity's continuity (e.g. unexpected withdrawal of funds by the primary funding source)
5. **Standards and Criteria for Approval of Continuation of entity (5-year review)**
 - A. Entities will be reviewed every 5-years for adherence to MSU policy, the guidelines described herein, and the review criteria outlined in its initiating proposal. This review process will follow procedures established in the University's Operating Policy on entity Review.
 6. Discussion and Adoption Process
 - A. Website hasn't been updated with the newest version yet.
 - B. Wasn't there wording that said you could choose not to renew? Many centers run for years on grant funding. Need a plan for if the grant money doesn't come in. Trying not to complicate the language.
 - C. These are guidelines. We can revisit them at any interval amount of time. Or after we receive a certain number of proposals. Would like to figure out this process of when/how we receive proposals.
 - D. We shouldn't change the rules for those who are in the middle of a center proposal. We would grandfather in anything that it is the process.
 - E. What do FS by-laws say about reviewing policy? Could any senator make a motion to review a policy at any time? Yes. The absence of process will become an issue. Would like to see that flushed out. Are we confident that we will do that on a regular enough basis, or do we need to put in language about review timeline?
 - F. Formally - First and Second Reading, Discussion, Motion, Simple Majority Vote
 - i. Would like you all to take this to your faculty
 - ii. Interim guidelines: Paragraph one says it will be reviewed based on MSU policy, which is not in place at this time. Are we going to ignore it? We can remove that language and bring it forward as a revised version.
 - iii. Paragraph A: Plan for external funding-do we not have internal centers focused on other areas? Do they have to find external funding options as well? Will try and get cleared up. Do not know how many internally funded centers there are. Will get that information for the next discussion. Any other comments send to Eric Austin and Michael Brody.
 - G. Informally – Can you live with the guidelines?
 - i. Are there “deal-breakers” that are missing or that must be removed?
 - H. Interim Status – pending an umbrella policy and process, and in order to assess and revise
 - i. Additional trigger to review the guidelines? Time or experience?

VI. Announcements

- a. University Council-Policy Proposals
 - 7. Student Field Trips and Domestic Travel
 - 8. Restricted Research Policy
 - A. Restricted access, confidential, “top secret”
 - B. Proposed policy was reviewed by JAGS
 - C. Aim is to establish guidelines/parameters around this type of research.
 - D. Protect those who may be at risk if they don’t have all of the information.
 - E. These are on University Council’s webpage
 - b. Campus Climate Survey Results and Discussion
 - c. Board of Regents Meeting – Bozeman, November 21st and 22nd
 - d. MUS Regents Teaching Scholars Program – Deadline extended - **Tuesday, November 12th by 5:00 pm.**
- VII. Public Comment
- a. Frances Lefcort-Do not agree with the way this happened, from the top down. Due process was not protected. Feel that BOR violated its own policy by eliminating the CBN department. Had 10 TT faculty at end of Spring semester, started Fall with 5. No longer have enough labs for research. Have cancelled 5 courses. Foundation course is being taught by adjunct who is not familiar with the subject. The students are the losers in all of this. They need that foundations course to be taught effectively. It’s wrong to lure students here and then have them compete for the few spots that are available. When will the Faculty Senate do something about this?
 - b. Steve Stowers-A complaint was submitted to OCHE and BOR about three weeks ago: Submitted by Lefcort, Stowers and Mazer-Complaint was read aloud (is available by contacting Keely Holmes, keely.holmes@montana.edu), stating that BOR policy was not adhered to. Talks about the success of the CBN department prior to the merge. The dept was bringing in grant money and was very successful. Now, many talented faculty have left the university. Now, the programs are in jeopardy because of the lack of faculty. Feel that if the Provost would have followed protocol, many of these issues could have been avoided. Reading of BOR policy that states that Provost Mokwa did not go through the proper due process before moving Microbiology/Immunology under the college of Ag, or with the merge of the CBN and Microbiology/Immunology departments. CBN major is no longer sustainable.
 - c. Jim Meyer-Are you optimistic, as our colleague stated earlier, or not? It can’t be successful without additional resources. In favor of the merger, in favor of the larger department, but need more resources.
- VIII. Adjournment
- a. Ed Schmidt moves to adjourn. Clemente Izurieta seconds. Adjourned. Meeting was adjourned at 4:30pm.

**Reminder: Next Faculty Senate Meeting
 December 4, 2019
 3:10-4:30pm
 SUB 233 OR 235**