Members Present: Bolte (Music), Brester (Ag Econ Econ), Brown for Gannon (Chem & Biochem Eng), Burrows (Ext), Cantalupo (Ext), Christopher (HHD), Dougher (PSPP), Durham (COB), Gibson (NTT), Greenwood (Math), Herbeck (Ed), Igo (Ag Ed), Kaiser (ECE), Kohler for Lawrence (Chem & Biochem), Larson (M&IE), Lynch (Psych), Martin (Mod Lang), McMahon (Ecology), Miller (CE), Newhouse (Art), O’Neill (Arch), Reidy (Hist & Phil), Ricciardelli (Film & Photo), Rossmann (Library), Seright for Schachman (Nursing), Swinford (Soc/Anthro), Waller (Hist & Phil), Wiedenheft (IID), Zabinski (LRES)

Others Present: Robert Mokwa, Chris Fastnow, Larry Carucci, Bob Swenson, Martha Potvin, Joe Shaw, Paul Gore

Chair Mokwa called the meeting to order at 4:10 pm, and a quorum was present.

Senate Business

- The minutes of October 23, 2013 were unanimously approved.
- The following programs/courses were unanimously approved by senators:
  - COURSES
    - ACT 129-001 - Circuit Training
    - ACT 150 - Aikido
    - ACT 158 - Taekwondo
    - ANTY 221 IS - Anthropology, Pop Culture and Everyday Life
    - ANTY 357 - Foragers of Sub-Saharan Africa
    - BIOH 465R - Gene Expression Lab; From Genes to Proteins to Cells
    - BMGT 458 - Advanced Entrepreneurship Seminar
    - DDSN 245 - Civil Drafting
    - EELE 456 - Power Systems Protection, Operation & Control
    - HORT 440 - Urban Planning and Design
    - M 088 - Mathematical Literacy
    - NRSG 240 - Complementary and Alternative Healing and the Art of Nursing
    - SOCI 327 - Sociology of Deviance
    - SPNS 371 - Latin America in Focus
    - SPNS 196 - Experiencing Latin America Today I
    - SPNS 296 - Experiencing Latin America Today II
    - SPNS 396 - Experiencing Latin America Today III
    - SPNS 496 - Experiencing Latin America Today IV
  - PROGRAMS
    - LRES - Realignment of Undergraduate Majors
    - COB Management of Information Technology Minor Moratorium
    - Optics Minor LEVEL II
    - Optics MS LEVEL II
    - Gallatin College - Business Management Professional Certificate
- In regards to the MSU associate degree to masters nursing proposal and after researching other nursing programs, nationally, Reidy found that not many had programs similar to the one being proposed at MSU. Differences noted were:
  - Some offering similar programs offer a dedicated BS rather than having one that segues directly into the masters.
The majority of schools examined combine the BS with the masters so students in their final year of achieving a BS, are taking some courses that lead to the masters: This is an incentive to continue on to the masters.

Some universities do not require a BS in nursing, but do require a BS in some other field.

Some skip the BS and require students to show years worth of year work experience.

Other universities have an expansive number of bridge courses totaling 45 credits.

Reidy concluded by saying that the initial nursing proposal will be written.

Mokwa reminded senators about the PBF focus groups (Nov. 14).

Mokwa asked senators to contribute their ideas via email to him, for the VPR letter.

Research Discussions

Chair Mokwa engaged senators in discussions about the recent research shortfall and how future decisions might be made to avoid it. Two major areas of concern regarding the shortfall:

- Use of F&A’s in departments, and
- Status of faculty searches and vacated positions.

In the form of a homework assignment, Chair Mokwa posed questions that might be asked and data that might be collected in regards to:

- How have F&A returns to the department typically been used over the past 4 years?
- What is the status of open or vacated TT faculty lines and ongoing searches in the department within the last year and what is the status of faculty searches in the department?

Discussions ensued:

- Chris Fastnow volunteered to produce a list, by year with fall data beginning with 2009, of tenured/tenurable faculty according to BANNER data, FTE and whether they have been at MSU in successive years. Cantalupo for Extension asked about non-tenure track faculty, as they make up the majority of their new hires. The NTT numbers would be helpful, as that data has been instrumental in recruiting the new Extension director.

- Brester - Context for gathering information would be valuable, and asked what the metric would be. He suggested student hours generated. He asked other senators to ponder how many majors are in their departments now, as compared to four (4) years ago.

- Reidy noted the transition that happened from a decade to about four years ago when metrics were about students in seats; growth was predicated on how many students faculty were training and hires were based on that. That changed and now MSU has a model based on majors. In gathering data, do we now examine majors or both - number of students we are training and majors and try to correlate it or, not take that into consideration, or just go for straight numbers? Brester – Commented that movement in sectors is continuous (with regards to faculty) and there should be context. Fastnow has credit hours and major numbers for last AY year but only credit hours, so far, for this fall. Mokwa stated that examining both factions might be valuable.

- Kohler believes each dept knows best about what their needs and efficiencies are. He cited that some departments have some strong and large PhD granting programs focusing on graduate student enrollment and number of TT faculty while other departments have extension agents and service teaching. Making those kinds of observations and articulating them would be helpful.

- Kohler commented about F&A returns. He noted that it wasn’t long ago when F&A’s were directed to the departments and to PI’s as well. In 2010, MSU had a transition, and data on how that entire landscape changed would be helpful. It was expressed at the time of change that
deans were expecting department heads to provide some money to faculty, and he believes it happened in some departments, but not all. That facet of distribution should be explored. Mokwa explained the four year data collection timeline he chose for this exercise was because of the F&A distribution transition. Reidy restated Kohler’s questions: 1. How have F&A’s been returned to dept and 2. How were F&A’s used once they were returned?

- Mokwa stated that Kohler’s observations were the core of discussions in the Rapid Action Task Force: They are looking to fiscal year 2015, and asking what kind of changes can be made in the research budget appropriation that can help us to be more efficient? Perhaps there are some items currently paid for by F&A returns that could legally and appropriately be covered under some other general fund category.
- Swenson stated that the departments should choose the time scale within which to provide data and a recent historical perspective of how F&As are used and how they affect the environment for TT faculty. Maybe six years would be a useful timeframe for a department instead of the five already chosen. Reidy stated that we could ask departments additional questions, such as, “What didn’t we catch, that you would like us to know?”
- In response to Kohler another senator observed that one might ask how critical F&A’s are to the way a department functions. For example, from a social science department, F&A returns are not as critical as they would be in a science department.
- Lynch asked what the implication is: Only funds that come directly from the VPR to dept heads? Does it also include what might go to the dean→dept heads? Or, might it also include other routes by which F&A’s reach the departments? Reidy is most concerned about what is coming from deans, and posed an additional hypothetical: If we didn’t have returns, what would we lose?
- Mokwa stated that a document that answers all the questions posed (above) in one place would be instrumental in assessing the research shortfall and preventing it in the future.
- Kohler stated that his dept has been asked to put a lot of F&A into personnel and it has eroded the pie.

Provost Potvin – Status of Hiring

- Since no mechanism for search status exists, Provost Potvin has begun to formulate one.
- Current statistics:
  - 2103 – 10 hires; 14 searches are approved, but not started; another 11 in progress.
  - Since July 1, approved 9 searches and awaiting paperwork for two more.
  - 16 searches approved for assistant level and above; 22 approved at assistant levels.
  - Not everyone who has approval for higher ranks succeeds at those higher rank searches.
- Kohler asked if failed searches need to be approved year by year; Potvin stated that it depends on the college and dean.
- Kohler also queried about net figures in terms of numbers of hires and whether the provost tracks comings and goings of faculty. Potvin stated that when someone resigns or says they are leaving, their office does not have an official resignation unless the BANNER system releases them; the Provost wants to hone that process and also consider adding information on hiring forms, used to request lines, which asks: anticipated startup, where money will come from, is there office space, etc. This will assist in gauging funds before a hire.
- It was noted that in CLS, there is currently only one TT search across all of the college’s PhD granting departments, and Kohler asked whether startup is playing a role, given the restructuring taking place, status of the F&A system and not having funds for startup. Potvin stated that if deans
have money for searches, they may proceed. She also acknowledged that the uncertainty of $1.5M from F&A has stalled responses to other things and spurred creativity in funding startups.

- Mokwa noted that net numbers are important. Two years ago it was reported that we had 29 departures. Last year, we covered those departures and then some with 45 new hires.

Chair Mokwa will solicit more information and get back to senators with the “homework assignment.” Feedback from senators will be most useful if they are able to obtain answers to specific questions. This will provide Faculty Senate with information in a consistent form that can be compiled to examine trends, which we will use to work with administration to help guide future decisions in these two important areas.

Emeritus Policy – Larry Carucci

- Preliminary voting of senators shows the majority in favor of Version IV of the emeritus policy, which includes TT and NTT faculty.
- The BoR policy changed their wording to “meritorious faculty,” giving it a broader interpretation.
- Carucci addressed a query regarding a grandfather clause by highlighting verbiage in the fourth paragraph of Version IV (Section 352.00) where research and tenure lines have up to three years, after retirement, to request that they be included in the emeritus pool. NTT are not included, but wording could be changed to accommodate that. Language is already present for exceptions for years of service, but wording might be added to accommodate faculty, especially research faculty, who might have been grandfathered in but because of recent changes, are now not eligible. The last BoR modification was 2011 and Mokwa suggested using that date as a *grandfather* anchor.
- An explanation of the 300 credit hours means 15 years w standard 3/3 load, you would have 270 taught credits and this number pushed it a small amount above that. For NTT faculty do not get tenured and, the burden falls on teaching and, as such, 15 years is the requirement.
- Kohler believes a less rigid policy is appropriate since his department has many outstanding NTT faculty who teach year to year and have not been with MSU for 15 years. He believes the departments know best what is transpiring within them.
- Igo made a motion that FS adopt the revision to include TT, research, NTT for emeriti status → seconded → the motion was tabled until the next meeting → seconded → unanimously approved.
- The grandfather language will be reworked.

As there was no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:08 pm.

Signature,
Robert Mokwa, Chair

Signature
Michael Reidy, Chair-elect

Minutes were transcribed by Gale R. Gough, Administrative Associate, Faculty Senate.