

FACULTY SENATE
December 5, 2007
REID HALL 104
4:10 AM – 5:00 PM
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY-BOZEMAN, MONTANA
Minutes

Members Present: Amin, Ashley, Bailey, Becker, Cherry, Christopher, Fleck, Gerlach, Gipp, Leech, Longcope, Lynch, Marshall for D. Weaver, Mokwa, Neeley, Prawdzienski, Starkey for Zhu, Watson, Wojtowicz

Members Absent: Ag/ED/AOT, Bandyopadhyay, Bangert, Bennett, Dyer, Ecology, Jackson, Jacobs, Johnson, Lei, Livingston, C. McClure, M. McClure, Nursing On-Campus, Peed, Pinet, Political Science, Taylor

Others Present: Lansverk, Rimpau, Fastnow

Chair-elect Wes Lynch called the meeting to order at 4:10 PM. A quorum was present. .

REALLOCATION MODEL – Jim Rimpau

- The reallocation model attempts to balance, monetarily, the ebb and flow of the student population, and has nothing to do with budget cuts. It is a process within academic affairs, an arrangement between the deans and the provost, and is not a result of UPBAC discussions.
- A mathematical formula is used to distribute the funds; the provost allocates those funds to the colleges; and, the deans decide how funds will be distributed in the colleges.
- The model compares rolling three-year averages for enrollment. Enrollment is the entire annual year (including summer), and compares two 3-year averages, looks at the change across those times, and funds, (e.g., if you have 10 FTE, if you have gone down by 10 it takes away an amount for those 10 FTE). The amount it adds or subtracts comes from national norms of the Delaware data, and depends on the unit you are in. As an example, the English department gets a particular number for FTE; the Physics department gets a different FTE.
- So that the impact would not be large, the add-back and take-away is about 50%. As an example, if Physics receives about \$7,000 FTE, then the take-away is only \$3,500. Included in the calculation are also some marginal costs which help to keep the amount lower.
- Questions about discrepancies within colleges may be a result of a dean's discretionary decision about distribution of money.
- The model is a quantity measure and operates at only 1% of the budget; the provost states that the other 99% of the budget is for quality.
- If there is more money taken from downs than is given to the ups, then the balance is distributed back to departments on a proportional basis.
- Other metrics were looked at but were abandoned, as it did not add another dimension. Therefore, it was a straightforward calculation.
- Discussions ensued:
 - Planning & Analysis uses credit hours translated to FTE because you get slightly more FTE from graduate credit hours than undergrad credit hours.
 - FS noted that the present mathematical formula P&A was using may need modification: Say the last four years the numbers were a, b, c, and d. Then Planning & Analysis' formula was: $(a + b + c) / 3 - (b + c + d) / 3$, which is mathematically the same as $(a - d) / 3$. So the attempt to have a smoothing function that included the intermediate years does not work.
 - Delaware (if departments grow) begins to inch departments back up, but not by a large amount. New enrollment is paid at a higher rate.
- For questions, you may email Jim Rimpau at: rimpau@montana.edu

FACULTY AFFAIRS/EMERITUS – Marvin Lansverk

- Robert Swenson, chair of the Retired Faculty Caucus, was unable to attend the Faculty Senate meeting, but encouraged members to vote for a policy similar to the Washington State University policy where faculty are granted automatic emeritus status.
- Current regents policy on emeritus (and iterated in the Faculty Handbook, Section 350) mandates that emeritus status is available only to tenured faculty.
- Emeritus status (hereinafter referred to as “ES”) major discussion points are: Is there a process for emeritus status, or should faculty automatically receive it?
- Three current proposals from Faculty Affairs:
 - #1 – Original proposal is a decision making process → faculty are nominated via an application → recommendation from dean goes forward → to Provost and, in concert with Faculty Affairs (under Faculty Senate), makes the final decision.
 - #2 - Same as the original proposal, but removes dean as an approving entity.
 - #3 - Automatic nominations (not automatic conferral), so everyone is nominated, but there is still a process of evaluation.
- All three proposals are somewhat similar with subtle differences.
- Motion was made to eliminate the original proposal (and dean’s involvement) → seconded → all in favor → passed.
- Discussions ensued:
 - The Provost is not aware of all retiring faculty; Payroll & Personnel is and they would generate a list and forward it to the Provost’s office.
 - A Faculty Senate straw vote indicated that 50% of the members would like automatic emeritus status without bureaucratic processes. Therefore, some FS members (by way of another straw vote) would like that policy revisited as a 4th option. Chair Lansverk will distribute the Iowa and Washington state University policies to all FS members to review, as they subscribe to automatic ES.
 - Some FS members proposed getting rid of the letters of recommendation in the ES process. Faculty Affairs noted that letters were part of a decision process where more information about the potential ES faculty would be available. Letters are not intended to demean; rather, to celebrate one’s accomplishments. Some FS members suggested using an ES candidate’s vitae instead of the letters.
 - Faculty Affairs reminded FS that they are the link (and reps for Faculty Senate) between departmental approval → President. This is a useful process, because it provides a series of checks and balances. It also endorses that the ES title is an honor.
 - Some FS members suggested a letter in the hiring packet of faculty that explains how you are automatically nominated for ES upon retiring.
 - Faculty Affairs stated that in interviewing faculty, some do not want automatic ES, so it seems counter productive to automatically grant it.
 - It was noted that in the original proposal presented to FS, faculty had other options for nomination if their departments did not do so.
 - Faculty Affairs stated that although not all data had been reviewed regarding automatic ES of the Carnegie Research universities, the information gleaned so far indicates not all schools subscribe to the automatic status policy.

Signature

Shannon Taylor, Chair

Signature

Gale R. Gough, Secretary