FACULTY SENATE
February 5, 2014
346 LEON JOHNSON
4:10 PM – 5:00 PM
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY — BOZEMAN, MONTANA

Members Present: Arnold for Igo (Ag Ed), Babbitt (Physics), Bennett (Eng), Brester (Ag Econ), Burrows (Ext), Christopher (HHD), Davis for Greenwood (Math), DeWeese for Newhouse (Art), Durham (COB), Engel for Zabinski (LRES), Gannon (Bio & Chem Eng), Herbeck (Ed), Herman (NAS), Hostetler (GC), Kohler (Chem & Biochem), Larson (M&IE), Lynch (Psych), Lu (PSPP), Martin (Mod Lang), Miller (CE), Moreaux (ARS), O’Neill (Arch), Reidy (Hist & Phil), Rossmann (Library), Schachman (Nursing), Swinford (Soc/Anthro), Wiedenheft (IMID), Wilmer (Pol Sci)

Others Present: Waded Cruzado, Martha Potvin, Chris Fastnow, Robert Mokwa, Ils-Mari Lee, David Singel, Terry Leist, Renee Reijo-Pera, Kenning Arlitsch, Leila Sterman, Karlene Hoo, Helen Melland, Nicol Rae, Gail Schontzler

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

Senate Business and Announcements – Chair Mokwa, Chair-elect Reidy

- The minutes from January 29, 2013 were unanimously approved.
- Mokwa reminded Senators to view the Legal Counsel website where policies are posted for final review and comment. Recently, University Council proposed new policies, and they may be accessed using this link: http://www.montana.edu/legalcounsel/proposedPolicies.html
- Mokwa asked that the administrative survey email he sent to senators on February 4, 2014 be distributed to departmental colleagues. Any questions about the survey, may be directed to Gale Gough: gough@montana.edu
- Mokwa thanked the senators for their input, engagement and hard work. He passed on compliments that he has received regarding the accomplishments that senate has achieved this year. Senate is actively involved in numerous aspects related to academic, policies, research issues, and other important initiatives across campus and at the MUS level. They have accomplished much of this by working together collaboratively with administrators. Mokwa thanked the Provost, Deans, VPs and Directors for their regular attendance at senate meetings this year.
- Mokwa gave a brief overview of the next two FS meetings:
  - February 12 – Dr. Anne Camper will discuss the FY15 research budget plans and the Rapid Action Task Force recommendations (this is a snapshot of the present fiscal state of our research enterprise).
  - February 19 – Dr. Rene Reijo-Pera (new VPR) will discuss research issues and concerns that faculty have and more importantly she will engage in a discussion with faculty regarding a vision for moving forward.

Opening Comments and Dialog with President Cruzado

- Cruzado welcomed new members of MSU: Karlene Hoo, Renee Reijo-Pera and Jeff Bader.
• Cruzado encouraged faculty to attend the public forums being conducted for the CIO of IT candidates.
• Cruzado next spoke about teaching, research and outreach.
• Teaching:
  o Enrollment numbers are measured from fall-to-fall and spring-to-spring. Our spring enrollment numbers show an increase of 372 students. Much of this could be attributed to increased fall to spring retention.
  o Ils-Mair Lee reported on the number of Presidential Scholarship (PS) to MSU:
    ▪ Numbers of students applying for PS to MSU over the last three years have increased, and are indicative of the number of incoming freshman.
    ▪ Three years ago - 218 students; last year – 319 students; this year – 482 students.
    ▪ MSU has twenty-five PS (an increase from the 20 that were offered in the past),
    ▪ Stipends have substantially been increased,
    ▪ Twenty (20) Provost stipends were awarded.
  o Students surveyed indicate the main reason for choosing MSU is the quality of education offered (not skiing).
• Research:
  o Cruzado thanked the Rapid Action Task Force for their budgetary recommendations.
  o Renee Reijo-Pera has been immersed in a potential legislative initiative to help advance research in Montana.
• Extension:
  o New Extension Director, Jeff Bader, is in Lewistown meeting with his faculty and others.
  o The Smith-Lever Act of 1914 that established a system of cooperative extension services connected to the land-grant universities in order to inform people about current developments is celebrating its 100th year anniversary. The act has transformed and strengthened our system.
• Discussions about the upcoming legislative session have included:
  o LRPB – Reinvigorating the Romney building renovation discussions.
  o More specific details will be shared with senate in the future.

Academic Strategic Plan – Provost Potvin
• Academic Strategic Plan (ASP) followed from the University Strategic Plan (USP).
• As you examine the plan, keep in mind that assignments of portions of the plan were given to responsible individuals.
• The ASP has the same goals/objectives as the University Plan, but suggests more/specific strategies to help MSU achieve its goals. Under learning; e.g., there are additional objectives related to our accreditation. Ron Larsen has orchestrated successfully student outcomes for 100% of our courses.
• Many campus factions have contributed to the ASP (Dean’s Council and a charette) and the priorities were set.
• Planning Council is still determining some of the benchmarks and metrics. Some are determined by the UP.
• Under “discovery”, one of the goals is to continue our Carnegie status.
• A retention pool, being matched by the Provost’s office, has been created.
• Focus on growing PhD programs and number of PhD’s we produce.
• Engagement:
  o How do we track engagement and increase faculty participation?
  o How do make it part of how we think about what we do?
  o How do we use our office of international programs to engage students outside of the country or in diverse communities?
  o Many aspects of leadership are represented.
  o How to intergrade learning, discovery and engagement at MSU – how do we intergrade all three.
  o Access - Strategies for recruiting undergrads and Native American students. Provide additional support for grad students with a focus on retention and access. Encourage undergrads to stay for grad degrees.
  o Sustainability – How do we make sure the technology in our classrooms remain at a level where we can teach with the best pedagogy?
  o Efficiency - How to get grades from D2L into Banner without entering them manually.
  o Fifty percent of tuition and state dollars should be going into instruction and we have worked to further increase that amount as enrollment increases.
• Discussions ensued:
  o Bennett asked whether the SP would drive curricular change, or is that FS’s responsibility? Potvin stated that if the curriculum is the realm of the faculty, we look to the faculty to determine how that will happen. What kind of task force or committee will be formed to change the curriculum to accomplish university goals? Potvin - conceptually, let’s talk about it when we talk about the CORE.
  o Babbitt asked which ASP version faculty should review, and Potvin stated the matrix as the current version.
  o Lynch asked about the relationship between the Planning Council and Budget Council. When these were first formed, it was understood they would be fully integrated and work together in a cycle. Is that still the case, and how is the ASP effected by and affecting the budget? Potvin stated that the focus of the Planning Council, currently, is to help define the metrics within the UP. Potvin took the UP and delved into strategies to help achieve the SP. With the ASP, she ties the resources of Academic Affairs to achieve the priorities of the ASP and the Planning Council, helping to decide how to begin making measurement about where we are going, and to help identify the priorities discussed in Budget Council. When we ask for new funds, they are to be aligned with university’s priorities as established in the SP. The Budget Council helps to establish those priorities.
  ▪ Fastnow (Planning Council) - Noted that there is cross-membership on the councils and they communicate with one another. We are still figuring out how the process works. As each unit develops its own strategies, it will align their resources towards meeting those strategies. At Academic Affairs’ level, Potvin’s budget is aligned with strategies in the Academic Affairs Plan. At the university level, all resources should be aligned to the university plan. When Potvin, for example, had vacancies savings, she made sure she had
good technology in the classrooms, money for start-ups for new faculty, addressed retention, and examined faculty salaries.

- Lynch asked how the priorities themselves are established with a finite amount of money? Additionally, to what extent does the Planning Council in a given meeting/year, establish the priorities that you apply to your budgets? Is the PC engaged in setting those priorities? How does the budget align with the strategic plan metrics? Potvin responded that the PC is engaged at the university level, and that she uses the Dean’s Council to establish priorities for the Academic Affairs budget using the ASP.
  - Leist (Budget Council) – Linking to the plan at the highest level, and getting money to academics, in general, is my main goal. Martha, with deans, focuses on exactly how money is spent vs how the Budget Council makes determinations on every single line item.

- Rossmann asked Leist to elaborate on the idea of responsibility centered budgeting. Leist responded that a number of models are being reviewed to help manage all types of funds. Budget Council has focused mainly on general funds. We need to examine all resources to best segue the SP. Rossmann stated that the aim should be to secure a model that allowed aligning what the BC is working on with the SP.

- Mokwa stated that the ASP is detailed, involved and multi-layered. Faculty are the gatekeepers of academics and uphold academic standards and quality in the classroom. The strategic plan should focus and align resources with future academic goals and the ASP should help us make decisions regarding budget planning and resource allocation as they relate to the academic mission and goals of the university. The ASP is essentially our navigation tool for charting the future of academics.

Question - how should Faculty Senate proceed with this? Ultimately, it would be useful and beneficial for our university if FS can support or endorse the ASP. What is necessary to reach that step?

- Bennett stated that his training is in teaching literature. He does not want to be asked to teach the literature of Bozeman so as to engage students. He teaches literature about New York City. He asked if there were resources available to get his students engaged in his field of expertise? Where are the resources for a service learning course? He stated that faculty have to understand parameters, and he does not know what they are. Potvin stated that a number of goals in the UP are “stretch-goals,” and that this is a new area for us to start a conversation. She continued by saying that we now have a Center for Faculty Excellence to facilitate and provide rich examples of how others might do this. How, during the time students are here, do they get the experience they need? Faculty will help shape what that looks like and what resources are needed. It is a priority as it is part of our mission statement. Ron Larsen is developing a team (including faculty and those that sit on CORE) to go to the American Association of Colleges and Universities’ seminar to have a general education workshop. They ask you to write a proposal and contribute that effort to part of the conversation of the group attending. The team would then return in the capacity of a broader resource for faculty at MSU.

- Wilmer provided some history regarding the CORE committee. She mentioned that capstone and the original purpose of it was never financed and is still struggling with different models, to this day. The current models still need resources. It’s not just
about moving faculty responsibilities around. Please keep this in mind with the integration piece. Potvin remarked that the integration piece is a key priority.

- Reijo-Pera inquired about long-term outcomes of student-faculty measures of success. Potvin, in terms of engagement and taking the accreditors point of view, stated that we have not done it before; it stresses our culture and accreditors would be looking for progress, not necessarily just results. Communication requirements will increase and we don’t have an infrastructure to measure what we have done in the past so we have to figure out where we are right now. In places, we do know where we are, we have firm metrics for where we would like to go and that includes “stretch-goals. “

- Lynch would like to see some clear, transparent reporting, at a specific time of the year, maybe after the legislature, and specification of priorities should be established for a year or two. The ASP is too big and while we may have all agreed about what the big plan is, we might not have agreed on what the top ten priorities are. Potvin stated that we know them and some are driven by the BoR. - For example, grad rates, retention rates, retain faculty, etc. She suggested an annual or bi-annual report on what progress we’ve made and has noted that in the ASP matrix.

Mokwa thanked Provost Potvin for bringing this discussion to senate. Faculty Senate leadership will discuss this in more detail with the Provost and solicit suggestions for achieving more and broader faculty input.

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