

**FACULTY SENATE**  
**January 28, 2015**  
**346 LEON JOHNSON**  
**4:10 PM – 5:00 PM**  
**MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY – BOZEMAN, MONTANA**  
**Minutes**

**Members/Alternates Present:** Arnold (Ag Ed), Babbitt (Chair-elect), Babcock (Psychology), Berry (CE), Branch for Bennett (English), Brester (AG Econ), Bolte (Music), Brown (JJCBE), Gannon (ChE), Greenwood (Math), Herbeck (ED), Herman (NAS), Hostetler (GC), Kaiser (ECE), Kohler (CBC), Larson (MIE), Martin (Mod Lang), McMahon (Ecology), Mosley (ARS), O'Neill (Arch), Qiu for Vorontsov (Physics), Reidy (Chair), Ricciardelli (Film & Photo), Rossmann (Library), Seright (Nursing), A. Smith (HHD), Swinford (Soc), Zabinski (LRES)

**Others Present:** Bridget Kevane, Larry Carucci, Chris Kearns, Chris Fastnow, Terry Leist, Martha Potvin, David Singel, Seth Urick, Megan Bergstedt, Ron Larsen

Call to Order – Chair Reidy

- Chair Reidy called the meeting to order at 4:10 pm, and a quorum was present.
- Chair Reidy discussed the meeting structure of senate:
  - Senate has an open meeting policy as mandated by the state of Montana; meetings are closed when discussing confidential personnel matters such as today's Honorary Degree candidate.
- In order to accomplish more business in senate Chair Reidy proposed, using the BoR model, that a designated time be made for senators, only, to speak during meetings and that they have a designated seating area.

Honorary Degree – Bridget Kevane, Chair of the Honorary Degree Committee

- The Honorary Degree committee unanimously nominated the candidate brought forward to senate for approval.
- Motion was made to approve the candidate → seconded → all in favor → unanimously approved.

Announcements – Chair-elect Babbitt

- Programs and Courses
  - Babbitt reminded senators to review programs and courses posted on the Faculty Senate web site and send comments to him; if there are no comments, the Faculty Senate Steering Committee will vote to accept.
  - Of the courses/programs currently listed on the senate web site, Babbitt would like senators to expedite review of the Statistical Consulting Center and the PhD in Psychological Science for a vote in senate next week.

Prioritization Document (PD) – Chair Reidy

- Brief Document History
  - The intent of the PD is to be pro-active about visions and priorities that are important to faculty.
    - Many priorities in the Strategic Plan, such as performance-based funding, are at the behest of the legislature and/or OCHE.
    - As repeatedly stated by faculty in senate meetings, the top faculty priorities have been to retain and enhance our Carnegie Tier I status and to focus on quality scholarship, research and teaching. Senate leadership has incorporated that philosophy into the PD.
    - After a first reading of the PD in September, and subsequent modifications and meetings with academic deans, the Planning Council, administration, and other

faculty, the second reading was done during the January 21, 2015 Faculty Senate meeting.

- The PD has a new format senate leadership hopes will be well-received by the Research, Budget and Planning Councils, that articulates the visions and priorities of faculty.
  - The document begins with a student/faculty ratio narrative instead of just numbers.
  - The document prioritizes aspects of the Strategic Plan. Senate leadership is in the process of linking verbiage of the PD directly to language in the SP.
  - Salary was not included in this document, even though positive strides have been made in that area, as it is a legislative and BoR directive. If senate desires, it may be addressed, separately, in the future in another venue.
- Chair Reidy asked for comments/suggestions about the document and discussions in senate ensued:
  - Babbitt recited Objective A-1 of the SP, “We want to increase the numbers of students while maintain high quality education.” and went on to say that all metrics are focused on the increased student numbers, but there is no sense of how to maintain quality. “The faculty are those who deliver the quality education and the gatekeepers of quality; they know it when they see it and that is why having a good faculty/student ratio (low) is important to maintain the quality and keeping up the numbers. My analogy is that you have a great service organization and you cannot double your customer base without increasing your service employees.”
  - Brester, a member of the Faculty Senate Steering Committee, stated that although no formal committee has been formed to work on the PD, the dedication and input from all faculty and senate leadership has produced a document we should be proud of.
  - Swinford noted the verbiage “80 TT and 40 NTT” was removed in Topic #1 and student ratio was no longer mentioned. The importance of hiring TT faculty is specified in two other places throughout the document, however, and he suggested there be some sort of middle-ground verbiage about percentages, as in a percentage breakdown, of the growth in the TT and NTT areas.
  - Carucci stated that he found the earlier draft language, which stated the 80 TT and 40 NTT were targets only, useful and very positive; it provided a tangible goal to be reached.
  - Reidy remarked that the 80 TT and 40 NTT numbers in the previous version of the document came from linear projections of students’ growth over the next three years as mentioned in the SP. He made further comments about this version of the PD:
    - Maintaining an 18/1 student/faculty ratio translates into 96 new faculty, which is included in the table under “Justification.”
    - The statement about a 2 to 1 distribution TT vs. NTT was modified because there has been a movement, in the past, towards hiring more NTT faculty. There is no reference in the SP about the numbers of TT vs. NTT or how many of our courses need to be taught by each.
    - We believed it was important to focus on TT hires. It is also Carnegie Tier I (CT1) institution and the bedrock is research-oriented faculty who have a passion for bringing that discovery to the classroom: TT faculty are very good at that. It is important for quality of education and research experiences to hire TT faculty. Senators might want to think about revisiting the 2:1 ratio.

- Rossmann expressed concern that the entire document focuses on increases; not decreases. Where are our priorities in decreasing? The document should be more specific with its suggestions since it will be presented to administrators. Because the document, as it is, provides no guidance in such things faculty may have those decisions made for them. Reidy stated that the PD document states priorities without being mired in details. Department heads and deans, working with faculty, set large-scale strategies and priorities. If a transfer of 6% to instructional from non-instructional occurs, the cuts will be difficult, but that is not Faculty Senate's job; administrators and university councils should work with faculty on those issues.
- Kohler spoke briefly on balancing TT/NTT. He believes both categories of faculty are important at research universities like MSU. NTT are heavily involved and invested in teaching large enrollment sections which become more numerous at universities like ours whose enrollment is increasing. Meanwhile, the majority of the TT faculty are PI's, they do graduate teaching, and bring in the grants. What should the ratio be? Examining the Carnegie 108 in the RU/VH category, MSU has relatively more TT than NTT compared to the other places. He is in favor of communicating a message that we need both and not comfortable trying to put down numbers, as he is not sure what those numbers should be.
- Reidy gave two examples: Faculty who teach 1/1 is 1 FTE; a NTT who teaches 4/4 is teaching 8 courses to 2 although the numbers suggest it is one (1) person to one (1) course. Planning Council is discussing this metric: It might indicate we do have more TT than NTT, but it is not certain.
- Qiu asked for clarification of the definition of research faculty (RF) and NTT faculty. Her understanding is that RF do not have a high teaching load, bring in grants, and do not pose a financial burden to the school.
- Brown, in the context of the previous PD, reported that his TT and NTT colleagues were universally supportive, particularly in regards to the emphasis on accomplishment and the idea of adjusting existing resources to be directed towards instructional programs. What would be the impact of this in the non-instructional area? No one knows. If we did that, something you really care about would be eliminated. Do you care about this enough to put the numbers back to 50% (or more)? Their answers were 100% yes.
- Larson distributed the previous version of the PD to his department's faculty and most were in favor of prioritization of allocations suggested in Topic #1: "These new faculty should be allocated in the following order: (1) fill existing gaps in academic programs, (2) support areas that have demonstrated program growth, and (3) new academic programs." The 18:1 wording in this most recent version would double faculty in MIE and indicate a loss of half our students in his particular program because wording is not program or dept specific. The document should have more specifics about a statement of direction with supporting growing programs.
- Singel – NTT faculty who are research-only faculty (referred to as research faculty) are not included in the metrics. NTT who have an instructional component are included in the metrics.
- Kohler asked if research faculty are included in the common data set. Fastnow stated that the table from the BoR (and included in the PD) would not include NTT research faculty; KPI's do not include them (only instructional faculty); and, she is not sure if IPED's, which have a third calculation include research. They only include instructions, fully-funded faculty. Researches, soft-funded faculty, represent a small number of faculty as related to the whole.

- Potvin favors citing a ratio of 18:1. It allows the institution to be flexible and able to respond to immediate change. However, when you only cite numbers, there is a discrepancy and does not match to our goals – adding faculty if there is a decrease in enrollment, e.g. Babbitt noted that tracking ratios (versus asking for a fixed number of faculty) will continually keep student/faculty ratios balanced, thus addressing enrollment increases.
- Kohler noted that the idea behind the PD is that while MSU has grown 20% in enrollment, faculty numbers have remained flat. MSU is increasingly out of step with our peers who have added faculty even when their enrollment has not been as strong as ours. MSU is a research university, and we need to add more faculty.
- Mosley suggested that the bolded text in Topic #1 might be changed to “On-campus teaching or instructional faculty” making it clear that it does not count research faculty or extension faculty but does count NTT instructional faculty in the ratio.
- Reidy stated that the success of the document will be as a result of trust between faculty and administrators who will engage in its evolution, cooperatively.
- Babcock asked for a straw vote to determine who, in senate, would vote in favor of the PD. A motion was made to determine, via a straw vote, if senators would be in favor of the PD → seconded → all in favor → unanimously approved.
- Bolte moved to amend the PD to specify exactly what is meant by “faculty” in Topic #1; and, in (b) to add the sentence about where possible new faculty should be allocated in the following order: (1) fill existing gaps in academic programs, (2) support areas that have demonstrated program growth, and (3) new academic programs → seconded → all in favor → unanimously approved.
- Swinford did not vote because if senate does not know what non-instructional component includes, how can one vote to shift 6% to instructional. Leist stated that the 50% is determined via the following: if a program is instructional, funding for it is in a specific instructional index number. If something is non-instructional, it is outside of the specified instructional index number. An example would be the Library providing academic support – that would be categorized as is non-instructional as would be waivers, scholarships, and renovating classrooms.
- Leist clarified that the BoR instructional component percentages are not policy; they are only guidelines.
- Rossmann moved that senate vote to approve the PD with the two amendments → Brester seconded → all in favor → unanimously approved with one (1) abstention.

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

*Signature*

*Michael Reidy, Chair*

*Signature*

*Randy Babbitt, Chair-elect*