

**FACULTY SENATE**  
**January 21, 2015**  
**346 LEON JOHNSON**  
**4:10 PM – 5:00 PM**  
**MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY – BOZEMAN, MONTANA**  
**Minutes**

**Members/Alternates Present:** Arnold (Ag Ed), Adams for DeWeese (Art), Babbitt (Chair-elect), Babcock (Psychology), Branch for Bennett (English), Brester (AG Econ), Bolte (Music), Brown (JJCBE), Burrows (Ext), Cantalupo (Ext), Codd for Larson (MIE), Eggert (Emeritus), Gannon (ChE), Greenwood (Math), Hendrikx (Earth Sci), Herbeck (ED), Hostetler (GC), Kaiser (ECE), Kohler (CBC), Lawrence (CBC), Lu (PSPP), Martin (Mod Lang), McMahon (Ecology), Qiu for Vorontsov (Physics), Ricciardelli (Film & Photo), Rossmann (Library), Seright (Nursing), A. Smith (HHD), Swinford (Soc), Waller (Hist & Phil), Zabinski (LRES)

**Others Present:** Waded Cruzado, Leila Sterman, Frank Wilmer, Nicol Rae, Isle-Mari Lee, Chris Fastnow, Matt Caires, Chris Kearns, Karlene Hoo, Rene Reijo-Pera, Kenning Arlitsch, Terry Leist, David Singel, Seth Urick, Karlene Hoo, Nancy Cornwell

Call to Order and Vote on Minutes – Chair-elect Babbitt

- Chair-elect Babbitt called the meeting to order at 4:10 pm, and a quorum was present.
- Minutes from the January 14, 2015 meeting were unanimously approved.

President Cruzado

- Legislative Session – President Cruzado highlighted discussion topics from the recent legislative session she attended in Helena, one of the most important being the governor’s proposed budget. Currently, there are a number of initiatives:
  - A one-time allocation of \$15M for research for the biennium
    - The research funding is aimed at economic development;
    - Currently, the state only funds Agricultural research; and
    - Every university in the state would be able to apply to receive grants from this fund for research. Distribution of the funds would not be determined by the legislature; an advisor board might be established and made up of members in-state or there might be an out-of-state board conducting an internal selection process by examining the state’s priorities.
    - President Cruzado encouraged faculty to write grants and have them ready when the funds are allocated.
  - Present Law Adjustment
    - Enough dollars to accommodate growth and inflation in the MUS that has occurred in the last few years. The governor’s initiative would back fill growth and inflation dollars not covered with a tuition freeze for in-state students; the BoR will make the final decision about this proposal during their May 2015 meeting.
  - Permanent funding for the Vet-Med program, whose student enrollment has exceeded expectation.
  - \$2.48M in capital improvement funds have been allocated for MAES (Montana Agricultural Extension Stations) and various projects around the state.
  - Long Range Building Plan
    - The number one MUS priority is a \$28M renovation for repurposing Romney Hall for additional instructional and classroom spaces and to showcase successful initiatives on the MSU campus such as:
      - TEAL classrooms
      - Tutoring Space

- Veteran's Center

The Romney project will be funded through a bonding request. For those interested in a tour of the building, it may be arranged through the President's office. Bob Lashaway also has photos of the interior of the building for viewing.

- President Cruzado thanked senators for their work on the Parking Garage initiative. She hopes faculty understand the spirit of this project and that steps are being taken to ensure it is not monetarily detrimental to faculty and students. There was no intention of charging the whole project through parking fees, but that it is time for MSU to take this new step.
- President Cruzado commented on the Funding Prioritization resolution. She proposed the following:
  - Rather than citing specific numbers in the proposal, which may or may not be correct, she recommended that faculty come up with a vision that articulates what they would like MSU to be nationally and internally recognized for and how to accomplish that goal. Once that is known, faculty should compose a document that may act as a catalyst for collaboration and, eventually, move forward.
  - Align the Prioritization Document with the Planning Council, whose membership is made up of over 50% of faculty from all colleges, and work together with them on it.
  - Reevaluate the Endowed Chairs request as funding is difficult for such an endeavor, and some colleges may potentially be eligible for more than the two (2) chairs as recommended in the Prioritization Document.

#### Parking Garage Initiative Document

- Babbitt introduced the initiative which addresses how the parking structure is to be financed.
  - Discussions ensued:
    - O'Neill asked whether the results from the recent parking garage survey had been taken into consideration when crafting the Parking Garage initiative document. Babbitt stated that survey results were referenced and iterated that over 50% of students, faculty and staff were in favor of the garage.
    - Babcock made a motion to accept the document → Brester seconded → discussion;
      - Sterman expressed concern that the \$6M might not be raised in a timely manner and construction would begin anyway and without funding.
      - Leist stated that the project would not be financially viable and could not proceed until the \$6M was donated. All involved, fundraisers, College of Engineering, donor, understand the funding issue.
      - President Cruzado stated that general state funds cannot be used for any auxiliary services which include parking, dormitories, dining and residence halls. Therefore, MSU cannot request, from the legislature, funding for a parking garage or housing facility. General fund dollars are used for instructional purposes only and to run the day-to-day operations of the university.
      - Adams stated that it has been suggested the new Presentation Hall might act as a funding incentive for the Parking Garage.
      - Cantalupo queried whether there was a specific donor directive for a parking garage. Leist stated that the donor's vision, and as stated in his agreement, stipulate that certain elements be part of the engineering complex of which the Parking Garage is a component. The donor envisions a place where people may come and experience something different such as a parking facility that would allow individuals to enter the new engineering complex without battling the elements. If the parking garage was not met with approval, then further discussions with the donor would take place.
      - Babbitt stated that there will not be any SB parking spaces in the Parking Garage, and that about 100 SB parking will be compromised by building the Parking Garage. Funding for the garage debt service will mostly come from reserved parking rates and visitor parking fees.

- Gannon stated that faculty in his college are split 50/50 for/against the garage. He suggested strengthening the language in topic #4, and in the process, entertain such questions as, “How will this impact the Climate Action Plan?” He also noted that there is no language that mentions walking or Streamline or strengthening the commuting options on campus; adding 200 additional parking spaces will not solve the parking problem on campus and this is an opportunity to strengthen the language. Gannon moved to amend the motion on the floor to include stronger language in topic #4: “To promote additional discussions on long-term parking solutions; commuting solutions and how this might impact the Climate Action Plan→seconded→discussion:  
 Wilmer recommended language be changed to, “Must be developed, and must take into consideration the Climate Action Plan...”→all in favor→unanimously passed.
  - Babbitt returned to the original motion and restated it for a final vote:  
 Babcock made a motion to accept the document→Brester seconded→all in favor→senate voted to unanimously accept the parking document.

### Prioritization Document

- Babbitt introduced the document in first draft form based on discussions with leadership, faculty, and administration. It is a proposal that would guide MSU towards quality education, fill in gaps that currently exist, and grow programs in line with needs in order to keep, among others, a good student/faculty ratio. Metrics used in the document were the BoR ratios and, ratios leadership researched and presented.

### Discussion in senate ensued:

- Reijo-Pera asked how, by adding 80 new TT faculty and 40 TT positions, it would impact research. Her interpretation of the document is that it is based on enrollment (an enrollment-based accounting system), rather than discussing how to establish new programs, a new center or a new initiative. Babbitt stated that the document was written to defend research and quality education; faculty are needed to accomplish both. Justifications of the numbers presented in the Prioritization Document are based both on available budgets and on student numbers. The goal is to improve research and education. Language on how the increased number of faculty cited improve research, could be added.
- Reijo-Pera stated that if the document was about research hiring she would probably hire 10 cluster hires of 8 faculty and not spread them about trying to match enrollment needs. Babbitt stated that while strategic initiatives are good, putting all the resources only into strategic initiatives is not a good plan. Every faculty member is an entrepreneur and can be a productive researcher without that research falling under a strategic initiative. To say there are five succinct areas that every faculty hire has to fall into does not make sense; it is too concentrated. A balance will provide greater improvements in research productivity. Reijo-Pera stated that hiring 80 individuals to do 80 different things and using university resources, from a research point of view, would be impossible as MSU does not have 80 labs for people to do different things. Babbitt stated that we do not need 80 labs for 80 hires. Faculty research across campus requires different resources.
- Lawrence asked senate leadership to explain how they envision balancing between the programs and/or services that would be negated in order to implement what the Prioritization Document recommends. Babbitt explained that there would be a shift of the balance between instructional dollars and non-instructional dollars. There is a BoR definition of those numbers and it would shift to 47%-53% in FY14 to 53%-47% in three years. The instructional is already budgeted to go up to 48% in FY15. The document uses BoR standards for these. Different accounting might put the instructional percentage at 70%, but by those standards maybe they should be at 90%. What will have to go? We could list many things that all faculty support, but we need to ask if we want all these other programs funded at current levels or do we put

money directly into faculty teaching. Where is the balance between teaching and all the auxiliary services we do? These services have helped grow our student numbers. Do we need to fund these services at the same levels to keep the enrollment up or is it more important to ensure a quality education for these students? If we cut these services a little, will enrollment even drop? He believes we have had tremendous growth in these auxiliary services and we can cut them some without a drastic loss.

- Jordy Hendrikx stated that the faculty in his department would support the idea to increase TT faculty but would like to know if the money to finance it would be coming from the same pool of money used to support raises in salaries, and does it negate our position to renegotiate our salaries and see real improvement of salaries over time? Babbitt explained that this is not coming out of that pool of money, and that pool would actually rise proportionately. Assuming the budget goes up, salaries and raises would go up proportionally, as well. This is taking money from another part of the university, a non-instructional side, and putting it into the instructional side. Hendrikx noted that MSU needs more than just proportional increases in salaries to make up the deficits, especially the professor salaries relative to their peers. Some of our faculty are at 60% from the national average. Babbitt stated that the document does not address salaries, but its intent is not to sacrifice salaries. The intent is to meet the increasing enrollment with proportionate increases in faculty numbers.
- Franke Wilmer believes it is a good idea use the BoR metrics and their ~ 50% standard. Currently, Dr. Wilmer teaches 120 students in a class that used to hold 49, and the quality has gone down. The time for faculty to write grants has gone down, and she is working seven (7) days a week now as a faculty member.
- Reijo-Pera questions adding 80 more TT faculty only to reduce teaching load. She believes strategic decisions should be made about where we want to go with research graduates. Babbitt noted that priority one of the document is based on quality undergrad education and research experiences; not specifically graduate research. It does recommend adding more TT faculty at associate and full-professor levels.
- Qiu asked where the non-instructional money would be cut. Babbitt stated that the plan for that would require more investigation which should take place after the Prioritization Document is in place. Hendrikx suggested including such language in the document. Babbitt said amendments could be made to address these and other issues.
- Greenwood asked if it would be possible to have language in the document about a proactive plan for retirement. Babbitt remarked that there is such language. He went on to say that speaking for his college, people feel that a retirement is similar to a program review, in that they do not know if it will be filled, or not. We do not know if your programs are planned to stay flat or ramp up or down. The Prioritization Document says in the future, each department should know what the short and long range plan is for program FTE's, with proactive planning.
- Gary Brester stated that MSU has a 24-page strategic plan (SP) that has the word "will" 112 times, but does not say "how" we are going to get anything done. The growth industry at MSU, and at most universities, has been in administration and overhead. While this might create some value, it does not increase teaching and research output or quality. MSU gets research done by hiring faculty; they are the ones who produce the output of this institution. He believes it is time to get to the BoR standards and exceed them by reducing administrative expenditures and increasing faculty numbers.
- O'Neill suggested putting the "Justification" clause on the second page up front in order for the Prioritization Document to read better.

- Babbitt stated that the Prioritization Document will be brought back for more discussion after redrafting for a final vote.

As there was no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:00 pm.

*Signature*

*Randy Babbitt, Chair-elect*