

FACULTY SENATE
January 19, 2011
LEO JOHNSON 346
4:10 PM – 5:00 PM
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY-BOZEMAN, MONTANA
Minutes

Members Present: Biber (Music), Bessen (IID), Caton (COB), Cherry (Math), Eitle (Soc/Anthro), Fisher (PPSP), Gerlach (Chem & Bio Eng), Jacobsen (Extension), Kaiser (EE), Lansverk (English), Lawrence (Biochem), Lockhart (Ed), Lynch (Psych), Martin (Modern Lang & Lit), Maxwell for Engel (LRES), McClure (Micro), Neumeier (Physics), Osborne (HHD), Reidy (Hist & Phil), Rossmann (Libraries), Sobek (M&IE), Sowell (AR Science), Zhu (Computer Science)

Others Present: Joe Fedock, Hugo Schmidt, Martha Potvin, Nic Ward, Bob Maher, Chris Jenkins, Anne Camper, Carl Fox, Warren Jones, Ruhul Amin, Robert Maher

Chair Lansverk called the meeting to order at 4:10 PM. A quorum was present. Chair Lansverk introduced MSU's new Provost, Martha Potvin, to Faculty Senate.

Announcements/Updates

- BoR Report/Update – Chair Lansverk - Chair Lansverk and Vice chair Neumeier traveled to Helena for a half-day BoR meeting on January 13, 2011. Because it is a legislative session, the BoR will be examining and discussing managing the MSU budget specifically, tuition; if the governor's HB 13 passes, then the BoR will be able to hold the line on tuition; if not, tuition will need to be raised. In a meeting with students, the governor stated that if his proposal is not supported, and the 5% cut happens, then MSU will experience a \$5M shortfall and students' tuition will be raised 15%. Additionally, even if HB 13 is funded, it would have to be at 80%; if it funded at 40%, revenue would have to be found elsewhere. Discussions amongst the BoR members included Clay Christian's statement that if the governor's budget is not passed, then tuition must be raised; Regent Buchanan, on the other hand, stated that the BoR would not necessarily raise tuition but is a decision the BoR will have to face in May. Regardless of the outcome, Regent Barrett would like a unified BoR position on tuition.

Other topics discussed by the BoR included:

- Legislative updates.
- Accreditation processes - Vice chair Neumeier stated that the accreditation process is continually evolving. Provost Potvin added that the process involves a stated university mission and how core themes must be developed and instituted across the whole system. Goals, objectives and budget must feed into the core theme. For example, a research institution might have a "discovery" core theme which should be incorporated into dorms, buildings, etc., and would, inevitably, gauge an institution's accreditation outcome. The BoR prefer their own accreditation processes, rather than externally conducted.
- The BoR discussed aspects of their 1.) strategic plan, plus 2.) last year's mission review process for the MUS, as well as 3.) accreditation. They are interested in how the three articulate, overlap and work together, and would rather oversee and develop these elements into their own review processes. It is believed that the BoR might be interpreting the outside accreditation processes as something that requires more administrative hiring when, in fact, it focuses more on the quality

of higher education that students are experiencing. They are, however, intrigued with the assessment outcomes facet of the outside accreditation. The BoR review process includes mission revision (mostly an administrative process) and strategic planning and it cannot be substituted for the external review process which focuses more on input from faculty, core themes and students; neither can be substituted for the other.

- Post BoR meeting, Dennis Jones gave another presentation, the theme of which, focused on the administrators and recommended that the BoR stop micro-managing campuses and surrender a lump sum of money to each of the presidents to distribute as they needed. Additionally, with respect to performance based funding, he proposed that each campus set aside a “slush” fund for BoR so that they may drive new programs and initiatives on the respective campuses. After his presentation, Chair Lansverk and Provost Potvin were able to interact with Mr. Jones. He is still working on budget allocation within the system. Commissioner Stearns will bring Mr. Jones back to have discussions with faculty. Electronic copies of the presentation will be posted on the FS web site.
- Budget Council – Doralyn Rossmann - The Budget Council now has a task force subcommittee to examine the direction of the BC. The BC met last week and decided it will gear their meetings and discussions in anticipation of what budgetary issues the BoR will be discussing. Until the Planning Council forms their mission and planning statements, the Budget Council is on hold; the BC should ultimately follow the overall university plan. A budget orientation will be held on Friday to provide information to BC members on how to read a budget, terminology, etc. BC is still grappling with the level of detail to which they must delve to make budgetary decisions. The BoR approved, as a bond measure, the improvements to Hapner and Langford halls.
- Chair Lansverk stated that University Council and the Deans’ Council have met, and he will report on them next week.
- Planning is meeting next week to develop a mission and planning statement. Another member of FS is needed for the committee. Anyone interested, please contact Chair Lansverk.
- An email will be distributed tomorrow about the retro-active merit pay. The memorandum of agreement is posted on the union web site.

New Business

- The Industrial Engineering Seamless Masters Option is being referred to the whole Faculty Senate by Academic Affairs for feedback and a vote, and a presentation was given by Nic Ward, Graduate Program Coordinator for IE.
- The goal of the Seamless Masters is to increase enrollment in the graduate program and increase retention of the highest quality graduate students into the IE graduate program. The graduate program option will apply only to students registered in the MSU IE undergrad program. The program retains all the current requirements stipulated by the DGE for graduate programs. A limited number of 400 level credits are already allowed for graduate degree credit. This proposal includes a new provision of permitting up to 6 credits of 400 level professional elective credits used for the MS degree to also count toward the BS degree requirements. It was noted that this limited use of credits is limited only to the proposed option in the IE program (not university-wide), undergraduate students currently enrolled at MSU (not to students enrolled at other institutions or coming directly into the IE graduate program after graduating), and professional elective credits at the 400 level in IE curriculum (not 500 level courses and above). Furthermore, the IE’s strategy for funding (GTA and GRA) is to give priority to PhD and regular MS programs students. IE has focused their strategies in creating this program while keeping an eye on the university vision.

- Overview:
 - Students in the seamless master’s program begin taking graduate courses in their senior.
 - Since we offer our graduate courses every other year, this enables students to complete the additional MS course work in one additional year beyond the bachelors.
 - Students must meet all requirements for the BS IE degree and the MS IE degree with the proviso that up to 6 credits from 400-level professional electives used to satisfy the MS degree can also count towards the BS degree.
 - Students completing the program will earn both a BS IE degree and an MS IE degree. However, the BS requirements must be completed before or concurrently with completion of the MS degree i.e., a student could finish the BS degree before completing the MS degree, or complete them in the same semester but cannot earn the MS degree before the BS.
 - The undergrad program is currently 128 credits. Upon completing the BS from IE or any other program, a student may also complete a masters. A student who enters the program, but does not complete it in accordance with the simultaneous enrollment policies of the DGE loses the ability to count 400-level professional elective courses as a graduate towards any future BS degree. If you were to come to MSU and earn the two degrees separately, it would be 159 credits.
- Admission Requirements:
 - Applicant is currently enrolled as an undergraduate IE major at MSU, with a minimum of 12 credits of I&ME courses remaining at the time of acceptance into the program.
 - Applicant must be accepted into the (seamless) MS program prior to the start of their last semester as an undergraduate.
 - Applicant is in good academic standing at the time of application, with a minimum GPA of 3.25.
 - Applicant has completed at least 80 credit hours towards the BS degree at the time of application. Ideally, this would coincide with the junior year and begin with the MS program in the senior year.
 - Applicant must obtain provisional acceptance by DGE and comply with all IE and DGE graduate program policies.
 - Applicant must comply with all regulations governing BS degree requirements (including the ability to reserve up to 9 credits of graduate credits as a BS degree student before enrolling in the graduate program).
- Peer institutions, such as Kansas State University (a land grant institution) and Rochester Institute of Technology, were researched and it was noted that similar seamless masters options that also included “double counting” have been approved and demonstrated to be successful by their IE programs. Attributes the programs offer include:
 - Improved integration of the teaching/research of undergrad and graduate programs;
 - Improves efficiency and incentivizes students to be efficient;
 - Increasing the quality of graduate students;
 - Increased student enrollment (especially grad student populations);
 - Energizes research;
 - Satisfies anticipated PE licensing (+30 rule); and
 - Expands employer base and higher beginning salary;
- The proposal has gone through an extensive review process and has been approved by:
 - IE faculty
 - MIE Department Head
 - COE Graduate Council
 - Dean’s Council

- VP Graduate Ed
- Academic Affairs
- Key Anticipated Questions from Faculty Senate:
 - *How does the program support MSU's vision?* As stated before, this program helps to produce high quality/high achieving students. It will integrate teaching and research for undergrads. It will give the undergrads an early jump start for their research, and will increase grad student population.
 - *Impact on other programs?* One is the shared interest in having a seamless program in other departments. A potential benefit is that by increasing grad students, it may also spur departmental interest and increase student populations in other departments, as well.
 - *What contribution will the program make?* It will increase the number of quality and employable grads.
 - *What additional resources are needed for the program?* None. The resources are with the existing staff.
- Discussion ensued:
 - Durward Sobek (an IE faculty and FS member) has had interaction with students who are anxious to participate in the program. Currently, there are 12 grad students in the traditional program and, at times, there have been 25.
 - Vice chair Neumeier stated that if FS approves the IE seamless masters, it might open the door for other seamless masters across campus.
 - Member Caton stated that the College of Business already had a seamless Masters of Accountancy.
 - *Are there potential conflicts between regular master students and seamless masters students, particularly with regard to funding?* There should be no conflict, as students are doing the same thing with courses. TA-ships and GRA-ships will be applicable to both sets of students. One of the implicit assumptions of the seamless masters' students is that they will be self-funding. The regular masters students will, most likely, still be dependent upon their parent's funding as that program requires an extra year's worth of study.
 - Rob Maher, College of Engineering, Chair of the Curriculum Committee and Department Head of ECE, spoke about his concern of the double counting aspect. A situation where two students on campus receiving identically named degrees and are held to different standards with the number of credits they will need; a student in the seamless masters won't be required to have 6 credits, while a student not in this program will have to earn an additional 6 credits. He stated that this is an issue of integrity of our academic programs that we should not casually enter into. He believes there are several options to consider that wouldn't require a credit reduction. For example, there might be incentives to have students involved in the program, which wouldn't require credit reductions, such as special 6-credit summer internships, practicum's, or other positive incentives that would allow people to finish within the same number of credits. The program could also take their undergrad program and reduce it from 128 credits to 122, and still meet all their requirements, and all the students would be treated the same. All these are options that create more positive incentives, rather than simply telling the students that they are given the ability to complete the program with 6 less credits. Dr. Maher opposes this proposal primarily because of the integrity issue of double counting. Additionally, he stated that this proposal did not go through the regular faculty approval channels in the COE, and if the FS agrees that processes should be exercised as if the faculty own the curriculum, then he believes this proposal should probably be sent back to proceed through the normal channels. He stated that it did not come before the College Curriculum Committee and it was not on the agenda of the Academic

College Council; instead, the program was routed by the administration that did not follow the normal process.

- Anne Camper stated that rather than have it go through the COE College Curriculum Committee, which traditionally deals with undergraduate programs; this was vetted through all the graduate coordinators who then take the information back to their departments. It did go through a faculty review, but it went through a review of the graduate coordinators, not the undergraduate coordinators. An email with all the information was sent out to all dept heads asking for input; a special meeting was not called for this. The intent that if there was an objection, we would schedule a meeting. I did not receive any comments on this proposal at all. *What was the outcome from the grad coordinators?* The consensus was that we move forward with it. *Any opposition?* Some of the other COE departments stated that they didn't know how this would work with their programs, but they didn't see why IE shouldn't move forward.
- A FS member asked if there might be a tendency, over time, as this program grows, for the seamless masters to exist at the expense of the regular masters program or the undergrad program. Nic Ward envisions this option as energizing the overall program by keeping more of the better students who will be doing good MS research, will elevate the research activity in the overall program, more grants and stronger research going on in our emphasis areas which will look stronger to the outside and encourage more masters' students entering from the outside.
- Chair Lansverk asked whether the objection about how this proposal arrived at its present juncture was made because IE did not follow the normal process early on, or because something was objectionable, now. Anne Camper stated that the grad coordinators for each of the programs reviewed at the proposal. Rob Maher stated that the formal committee that should have looked at the proposal, and did not, is the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. Had this proposal been reviewed by the UCC, it would have gone to the dept heads for review at the academic level, and meetings with that body would have had the seamless masters as an agenda item for discussion.
- Member Jacobsen believes process matters and that the undergrad programs are affected by the proposal. He made a motion to bring the seamless masters to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee of the College of Engineering; Wes Lynch seconded the motion.
- Discussions ensued:
- *If someone in this program decides not to do the masters, do they still complete the 128 credits?* Yes.
- Another FS member is concerned that no one (except Rob Maher) has objected to this at any level up until now, even though it was brought up last semester. Nic Ward remarked that others have made comments, but that the majority in favor of the program has prevailed.
- Chris Jenkins stated that the potential inequity argument presumes that the student body is homogenous. It is not; if you look at the courses we transfer in and that we have discretionary judgment over, it is not homogenous and for our students, in order to incentivize the best and brightest going into practice with 153 rather than 128. We think that industries we decide to serve, if the best and brightest decide to go on and pick up the extra credits, it would be to their advantage. We evaluate transfer or advance placement credit as credited.
- Sandy Osborne made a *call for the question* (i.e, take a vote on Member Jacobsen's motion) and 4 voted in favor of bringing it back to the COE Undergraduate Curriculum Committee; 7 voted Nay.

- Member Cherry moved that FS accept the seamless masters as it was proposed → so moved → all in favor? 13 voted Yea; 2 voted Nay. The motion passed.
- Going forward, Vice chair Neumeier would like to propose to DGE's Carl Fox that guidelines for future seamless masters programs should have specific credit requirements.

The Faculty Senate meeting ended at 5:09 PM, as there was no further business.

Signature

Marvin Lansverk, Chair

Signature

Gale R. Gough, Secretary