

**MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES**

**April 20, 2005**

**101 Reid Hall**

**Montana State University-Bozeman**

**4:10-5:00 PM**

**Members Present:** Ashley, Becker, Bennett, Bradley, Cherry, Erickson, Gipp, Giroux, Idzerda, Jones, Kawabata for Metz, Kommers, Levy, Lynes-Hayes, Mathenia, C. McClure, M. McClure, McDermott, Neeley, Pratt, J. Schmidt for Peed, Seymour, Taper, Taylor, Thompson, D. Weaver, D. J. Young

**Members Absent:** Amin, Babcock, Croy, HHD, Hoffman, Jackson, Knight, Prawdzienski, E. Schmidt, Zhu

**Others:** Dooley, Fedock

The meeting was called to order at 4:15 PM. A quorum was present. Minutes from the April 6, 2005, 2005 Faculty Council were approved.

***CHAIR'S REPORT – Chair Warren Jones***

- As an advisor, be cognizant of who has not contacted you for registration materials, and contact those individuals. Retention of continuing students must be a high priority for everyone at MSU, but particularly for faculty.
- Design Team for the HP&E has physical plans that may be viewed at <http://www.dowling-arch.com/pages/profile.html>; click on the MSU logo in the lower right hand corner.
- Allegiance will use social security numbers and Chair Jones will inquire as to how they plan to protect our privacy/identity.

***DISTRIBUTION OF RAISE POOL – Chair Warren Jones***

Chair Jones opened up the floor for comments from FC members, received from their departments, on the distribution of raise pool for the provost and president to consider:

- Trepidation of precedent being set for provost/president deciding who gets raises and how the pool of money is allocated.
- Provost stated that equity issues will have to be addressed and as many as possible will be dealt with.
- Some campuses across the country have looked at equity, solely, and it was not advantageous.
- Could departmental funds be co-mingled with the raise pool funds to buttress the amount of money distributed?
  - Provost stated that the BoR will be calculating what our total increases in salaries are, as we proposed they should be, and will be comparing that with the 3.5%; may be exceptions such as retention, but they will be, most likely, looking at the 3.5% very closely.
- FC noted that a statement was made that discrepancy between best paid and poorest paid departments was not totally market driven. What evidence is there for that?
- A statement was made that discrepancies were going to be dealt with by looking at the rankings of MSU average salaries and the differences of new salaries. There is no relationship between those two and there is confusion on how both pieces of information will be taken into account.
- Faculty would like more flexibility in the equity pool and how that is ultimately distributed.
- Long standing employees' salaries are the most divergent from new hires.
- Adjunct compensation not compensatory for amount of time spent teaching.
  - Provost stated that departments with an adjunct pool are considered in the calculations.
- More aggressive departments may get more of the pool for recruiting.
- FC members are glad about dialog as there has not been any in previous years.
- Some thought .5% should come from some place else and push legislature to do so.
- Inquiry was made that since housing is so expensive in Bozeman, was the university looking into some type of housing assistance. Provost stated there MSU was looking into that strategy.
- FC member proposed that a signing bonus be offered.
- Some departments concerned about withholding anything to new hires, especially COLA and merit.

- Some had not seen raises in such a long time, that they advocated a 3.5% across the board raise for everyone.
- How are calculations made with mixed departments ranked at one department; archeology/anthropology/.sociology, e.g. ?
  - Look to the closest analogy to the mix (OSU comparator) and weigh it.
- Would like a level established for new hires at a certain peg to OSU so equity is built in from the beginning.
- Chair Jones asked for consensus on the 2% COLA; 1% merit distribution.
  - Some departments felt that all should have gone to COLA;
  - Some felt is should all go to merit; but
  - On the average the 2%/1% division seemed to meet the average departmental desire.
- Chair Jones asked for consensus on the .5% equity issue; .25% go to more traditional issues such as gender, compression issues; .25% would go to boost the cost of living for faculty who have low salaries and cannot afford to live in Bozeman.
  - FC members don't like the idea of having to carve .5% out of the state pay plan to address equity issues; if there were any other way to do that, we would prefer that. The division that has been proposed is unusual, ought not to be done as a general method and should be brought back each year to discuss and/or revise.
- Our range of freedom is slim this year and next, but we should think about a strategy for retention, bas cost of living, etc. UPBAC has advocated this strategy and will continue to be devoted to it.

***MINIMUM COURSE GRADE QUESTION – Chair Warren Jones***

- Concern regarding a minimum grade is a C- or should it be a D-?
- BoR should base their decision-making on good data, rational input from their constituents (legislative audit), and experience of faculty running programs.
- FC consensus was to maintain the C-.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:15 PM, as there was no further business.

*Signature*

*Warren L. Jones, Chair*

*Signature*

*Gale R. Gough, Secretary*