

FACULTY SENATE
October 8, 2014
346 LEON JOHNSON
4:10 PM – 5:00 PM
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY – BOZEMAN, MONTANA
Minutes

Members/Alternates Present: Adams for DeWeese (Art), Arnold (Ag Ed), Babbitt (Physics), Babcock (Psychology), Brown (JJCBE), Bolte (Music), Brester (Ag Econ/Econ), Cantalupo (Ext), Eiger (CBN), Geyer (Math), Hendrikx (Earth Sciences), Herbeck (Ed), Hughes (CBN), Kohler (Chem/Biochem), Larson (M&IE), Lu (PSPP), Martin (Mod Lang), Miller (CE), Mosley (Animal & Range Sciences), Reidy (Hist & Phil), Ricciardelli (Film & Photo), Rossmann (Library), Shanahan (Political Science), Smith (Ag Econ/Econ), Swinford (Soc), Wathen (HHD), Zabinski (LRES)

Others Present: Tim McDermott, Terry Leist, Ron Larsen, Larry Carucci, Robert Swenson, Leila Sterman, Kenning Arlitsch, Karlene Hoo, Isle-Mari Lee, Chris Fastnow, Robert Putzke, Robert Mokwa, David Singel, Nicol Rae

Chair Reidy called the meeting to order at 4:18 pm, and a quorum was present.

Call to Order – Chair Reidy

- The meeting was called to order.
- Minutes from the October 1, 2014 Faculty Senate meeting were approved, with three abstentions.

Announcements

- Babbitt reminded senators to review the PhD in Education proposal on the FS website and be prepared to discuss it at the October 15, 2104 FS meeting.
- Rossmann, the FS rep on the Budget Council, will meet with Leist, Attebury, Babbitt and Reidy next week to field questions that came out of the October 1, 2014 FS meeting. Senators and constituents who would like to submit additional questions, please do so to the following email address: facultysenate@montana.edu
- Department of History met with Dean Rae to discuss the priorities of the Department. All deans will meet with Reidy and Babbitt to informally discuss what senate is doing in relation to the prioritization of the activities of the colleges and how they align with the Strategic Plan.

Parking Garage Subcommittee (Norm Asbjornson Innovation Center) – Tim McDermott

- MSU needs a parking solution.
- We are still exploring the shuttle solution which is already included in the parking garage scenario.
- There are currently 6,000 parking spaces; about 9,000 permit holders.
- Surface spaces all around the stadium, especially the east side, the antelope lot – all might provide an opportunity for parking.
- The new engineering building complex would displace 400 parking places and a new parking garage would create 600 spaces (net gain of 200 spaces) at about \$20,000/space for \$20M.
- More difficult to raise money for a parking garage than a building.

- Romney Gym is the currently the state's highest building funding priority.
- Worst case scenario- \$12M @ 4.5% for 30 years about \$730K; about \$2,000/per space/year.
- Suggestions for garage placement:
 - Clear out Quonset huts and utilize that space. Renovation would cost millions of dollars.
 - Add 120 parking spaces north of Chemistry & Biochemistry, which is potentially prime campus expansion space and would cost millions of dollars.
 - The cost of running a shuttle system, in perpetuity, would equal the cost of the debt retirement of the parking garage.
 - A single tier asphalt parking, south of the proposed building site, across the street from the Antelope parking lot would cost ~\$2,500/space.
- Leist commented that research into parking garages has shown the cost being ~\$20,000 per space as the norm. The new parking garage in downtown Missoula cost ~\$26,000 per space.
- Discussions ensued:
 - A faculty member asked if there was money in the donation to go towards the parking garage.
 - Leist - In conjunction with a portion of Mr. Asbjornson's donation, MSU must comply with a non-specific matching agreement representing a presentation hall, an open space plaza area, and a parking garage. Ideally, the entire \$20M for the garage would come from external donors. However, fees from parking tags might also be an option, but we would want to minimize that if it is implemented. As an example, the impact on current parking fees for a typical SB space would be an increase of \$15 one year, and \$15 the next.
 - Has anyone thought about underground parking to maximize green space?
 - There have been those discussions.
 - Smith noted that: (1) Just to maintain a parking space costing \$2,000/year at a rate of 4% depreciation rate and forgetting the capital cost of the garage, you will need to charge people (4% of \$20,000) \$1,000 per space; and, (2) This does not include money covered in capital debt taken out.
 - Leist noted that as a tax exempt entity, MSU does not depreciate its buildings and a parking garage does not require as much maintenance as an academic building.
 - Leist cited the three parking advocacy factions on campus:
 - Those that want vertical parking and endorse the parking garage; concerns about taking up green space going south make the vertical parking a more desirable option.
 - Those that advocate horizontal parking, thereby keeping the cost low, and going beyond the very tight MSU perimeter to build more surface lots;
 - Those that believe we have enough parking and prefer people take mass transit and/or walk to campus.
 - Question/concerns/suggestions may be directed to Tim McDermott at: timmcd@mmtana.edu

All-Faculty Discussion on Priorities Document – Chair Reidy

- Outcomes from the October 1, 2014 FS meeting reaffirmed Faculty Senate priorities and identified new ones, all of which Steering Committee organized into a draft document. The goal was to prioritize steps within the Strategic Plan (and endorsed by the BoR), ensuring

concrete action plans are in place and implemented over the next three years in order to achieve the highest quality education for MSU students

- The priorities might be attained by placing a higher proportion of monies into instruction. This is consistent with the goals of the BoR, the faculty and administration at MSU, and the 12 Update MSU working groups.
 - As enrollments have grown, the actual instruction percentage we spend has gone down. Raising instructional dollars to 51% would cover the costs of the proposed prioritization but there would be difficult decisions made on the part of Budget Council, Planning Council, Research Council and Faculty Senate.
 - Via the 12 Update MSU working groups, efficiencies will be discovered and freed-up money may be funneled into instruction.
- Senate proposes that external university resources be acquired through fund raising, the Capital Campaign, and a small proportion of IDC's from the VPR.
- The cost to educate a student is rising. The figure is arrived at by taking how much money MSU has, divided by the number of students: It is an indication of how much money we are spending per student.
- There are many state and federal mandates that exist at MSU and which cost money. Other entities on campus are here as a result of choices that MSU made and which costs money and might not be necessary.
- Enrollment is going up, and what we have to spend is going up; instruction is not rising with the percentage of money coming in. MSU is spending it on other things.
- Discussions ensued:
 - Eiger – What would happen if we did not increase graduate students? Many times, and after students receive their PhD's, they cannot find jobs commensurate with their training. What if we put money that would go into research labs, into training undergraduate students? It might set us apart from other universities. Does anyone care about Carnegie other than us? If we are in the top research dollars, we are doing great and are an engine for the state.
 - Geyer stated that it depends on each department. In the math department it is not possible to do undergraduate research, only. Without graduate students our research would not do as well. Additionally, math has many graduate students that are also TA's.
 - Reidy commented that the Engineering Master's program is very successful, and so we cannot just focus on PhD's because of Carnegie. The reason we do focus is so that more undergraduates have more undergraduate research experiences. Successful student recruitment is often based on touting the undergraduate research experiences and Carnegie Tier 1. Reidy believes we have excellent research faculty and students want to participate. These are the same goals shared by faculty and administrators, as well.
 - Babbitt noted that in the Physics Department graduate research is essential for promoting undergraduate research. Without graduate research, there would be very little research opportunities for undergraduates. Undergraduates work together with the PhD's and that collaboration creates the undergraduate research experiences. The ratio of undergraduates to graduates should be maintained. The document is not advocating putting everything towards PhD research.
 - Eiger stated that the NAS believes there are enough PhD's and has said so for many years.

- A faculty member from Engineering stated that there are many opportunities for undergraduate research experiences. In her lab, she has 4-5 undergraduate research students, at any one time, who are winning awards e.g., the Goldwater Award. There are many programs on campus that do a great job in this respect.
- Swenson noted that the document Reidy presented to senate speaks primarily to instructional activities. Would a similar document be produced to speak to creative activities and research?
 - Reidy stated that he does not separate the two concepts and believes they are similar processes at MSU - TT teaching faculty are TT research faculty. Faculty researches and faculty teach and most view them as the same thing. Perhaps the language of the present document might be modified to highlight research, more, and Reidy welcomes input from faculty.
- Smith asked Reidy to explain how FS's leadership will address the reallocation issues/processes.
 - Reidy believes the issues/processes cannot be something senate demands. Rather, it may be a beginning of conversations within the Budget Council, Research Council, Deans Council, the 12 UPDATE MSU working groups - all should have ideas on how senate might best reach the goals of the SP and improve the quality of education. This document distributed in Senate will serve as a locus for discussions going forward.
- Following up and from discussion in last year's senate meetings, Brester (and others) have watched dollars spent on campus that are not directly contributing to teaching/research at MSU. The document produced provides concrete steps to take to improve teaching/research.
- Hughes asked where the 51% [for instructional dollars] number originated from.
 - Reidy stated that 50%-51% is the ideal number and where MSU should be.
 - Leist stated that MSU is currently at 49%, the result of which has many financial and budgetary nuances. For example, the waiver piece from non-residents counts from the net revenue we get, and MSU cannot spend dollars we do not receive, and MSU is doing very well in that regard. Leist would like to further discuss with the Budget Council and bring back more information to senate.
 - Brester noted that whatever the percentage, MSU should increase the number of faculty for teaching/research.
 - Reidy stated that the 49% is for all the MUS. MSU is actually lower – more in the realm of 47%.
- Adams asked if facilities were examined.
 - Reidy noted that part of the facilities issue was addressed by raising the administrative fee for everyone, to 6%. However, more might be done.
- Athletics might also be examined.
- Hendrixx noted that the document examines how to increase faculty; however, there is a large salary disparity and it is not included in the discussion. How to address that?
 - Reidy stated that salaries are not mentioned in the document, purposely, as they are controlled by the legislature. Salary is a different issue and the Provost and President are in agreement with higher salaries. As a university, we may attempt discussions with the legislature and the BoR.
- Ricciardelli asked how much the Office of Student Success cost MSU?

- Reidy stated that we need to examine what expenses there are, and that will take place in a meeting with Terry Leist, Doralyn Rossmann, Randy Babbitt, Kathy Attebury and Michael Reidy, next Tuesday. He also noted that many faculty senates at other institutions are creating budget audits of administration. If our senate were to do the same, we would be following in tow. Senate needs to understand what we are spending money on and what the benefits of those expenditures are.

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

Signature,
Michael Reidy, Chair

Signature
Randy Babbitt, Chair-elect