

FACULTY SENATE
November 4, 2015
346 LEON JOHNSON
4:10 PM – 5:00 PM
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY-BOZEMAN, MONTANA
Minutes

Members Present: Adams (Art), Adams for Berry (CE), Babbitt (Chair), Arnold (Ag Ed), Babcock (Chair-elect), Bolte (Music), Branch (English), Brester (Ag Econ), Brooker for Scott (Psych), Brown (JJCBE), Burrows (Ext), Gannon (ChBE), Geyer for Greenwood (Math), Herman (NAS), Hostetler (GC), Herbeck (Ed), Karcaewska for O'Neill (Arch), Larson (MIE), Lipfert (Film & Photo), Martin (Mod Lang), McMahan (Ecology), Meyer (Hist & Phil), Merzdorf (CBN), Olsen for Mosley (ARS), Repasky (ECE), Rossmann (Library), Running (Nursing), Sterman (Library), Swinford (Soc/Anthro), Vorontsov (Physics), Wathen for A. Smith (HHD), Wilmer (Pol Sci), Zabinski (LRES)

Others Present: Dan Miller, Chris Fastnow, Kathy Attebury, Megan Bergstedt, Rob Maher, Maureen McCarthy, Kellie Peterson, Martha Potvin, David Singel, Terry Leist, Jerry Sheehan, Chris Kearns, Jeff Heys, Levi Birky, Holly Capp

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

The October 21, 2015 Faculty Senate minutes were approved.

Courses and Programs – Chair-elect Babcock

- One (1) undergraduate course and five(5) graduate courses were approved in Steering on 11/03 as there were no comments:
 - Undergraduate courses
 - WLDG 155: Welding Design and Fabrication
 - Graduate courses
 - LRES 533: Wetland Ecology & Management
 - LRES 572: Frontiers in Remote Sensing
 - M 580-581: Common Core Mathematics for HS: Content and Practice
 - NASX 554: Indian Education for All: A Model for Culturally Responsive Pedagogy in Practice
 - PHSX 525: Current topics in General Relativity
 - Undergraduate courses
 - BIO 428: Molecular Basis of Neurological Diseases
 - COMX: Studying Human Behavior
 - FRCH 301: French Oral and Written Expression
 - Graduate courses
 - BIO 28: Molecular Basis of Neurological Diseases

Announcements – Chair Babbitt

- **Follow-up Discussions on Culinary Arts/Hospitality Management**
 - Senate leadership will not be using the newspaper or mass emails to discuss the CA/HM programs. Instead, Babcock and Babbitt will meet with stakeholders in the community, MSU, and GC, and keep senate apprised of progress. Several meetings have taken place; more are planned. Two themes of the meetings have been:
 - Clear up misinformation about the process/procedures by which the program was voted upon. Review of the meeting audio confirms rules and procedures were conducted properly when senate voted on the program; and,
 - Exchanging thoughts/ideas on the paths forward for the two programs.
 - A senator believes that a frank, open review, and discussion of the Hospitality Program was not able to transpire when the proposer, several administrators, and community stakeholders who supported the program attended the senate meeting. Additionally, information was missing.
 - Levi Birky, ASMSU president, stated that the student senate will be discussing and voting on Hospitality program at their next meeting.
- **Senators Meeting with Deans**
 - Chair Babbitt reminded senators to schedule meetings with their deans.
- **Changes to Medical Benefits, Effective January 1, 2016**
 - During 2015 the MUS Benefit Plan saw several adverse factors, including a few very large claims, resulting in a drop in our financial reserves that health care costs. Therefore, there will be a significant increase in our coverage.
 - Senate leadership will find out more about the benefit plan changes
 - It was suggested that Dr. Doug Young, past chair of the Interunits Benefits Committee could be contacted for more information.

Budget Model – Presentation by Terry Leist and Jeff Heys

- VP of Admin & Finance, Terry Leist, is working on the MSU-Bozeman portion of state allocations which went to the four campuses: Bozeman, Billings, Havre and Great Falls.
- How our piece get allocated, along with tuition dollars and general fund money was discussed. The presentation concentrated on the general fund, here and a Version I draft has been produced.
- An MSU Budget Process Working Group was formed to provide input for Desired Outcomes of the Budget Model.
 - Deans, dept. heads, surveys from those intimately involved in the budget, Budget Council, Planning Council were also canvassed for their input.

- Least focused on the academic portion of the model.
- There has been confusion about what percent is spent on instruction from our general fund.
 - In 2008, the COHE changed the way they measured the amount spent on instruction:
 - 48% is spent on instruction when the total includes waivers.
 - MSU uses waivers to recruit non-resident students.
 - Prior to 2008, waivers were not included in the calculation.
 - MSU is not able to spend waiver-dollars as they are discounted off of our list price.
 - This September 2015, the COHE recorded waivers in both scenarios.
- We are at 54% and in raw dollars from 2009-2015, the actual numbers show an increase in the instructional budget from \$64M to \$91M.
 - Academic Support, which has gone from \$17M to \$24M, includes the library, deans offices, portion of IT for instructional computing,
 - Research payroll gets funded through general funding.
- Heys described how the instructional/instructional support formula was formulated:
 - Many other options were examined, including other university models.
 - Current model has the ability to take the budget to the departmental level, but it is actually used to determine the overall academic affairs budget.
 - Goals for the model:
 - Responds to change. For example, Student Credit Hour growth, faculty salaries across the nation, etc.
 - Recognize the differences between departments; some are more research oriented; some more teaching oriented.
 - Adequately fund instruction in times of growth and would include the following components: salaries; student support; and, operating budget.
 - The formula for the largest component, salaries, is:
 - Forecasted SCH/Benchmark SCH Instructor Type (TT/NTT) x OSU Benchmark Salaries
 - This formula of determined as follows:
 - Forecasted SCH are trended SCH at departmental/college level over the past few years.
 - Delaware data is examined in terms of how many student credit hours are taught by different types of instructors (TT/NTT).
 - Benchmarks – How many people do you need? Multiple the number of people that have been benchmarked and that are needed by OSU salary data (or some percentage thereof) that determines the large salary piece.

- Many benchmarks are referenced in this model to provide trends of what is happening around the country.
- Instructional/Instructional Support formula:
 - Total Majors x Support Cost for Majors
 - Compared other universities vs. MSU, and the number of majors a university has, has a strong impact on student support needs.
 - Within the formula, the number of majors is multiplied by some costs per major.
 - It was noted that those currently working on the Budget Model do not have a good number, here. It was thought that for one term one could use the current MSU average; or, one could try to find some benchmarking.
 - If anyone has ideas, please email Heys.
- Instructional/Instructional Operating formula:
 - Total forecast SCH/Total Benchmark SCH x Number of Faculty FTE's in Department (Operating cost per FTE)
 - Larger departments have larger operating costs.
- Discussions ensued:
 - A senator asked if the OSU salaries number will include a percent.
 - Heys - You could use 100%; this model would predict that we need a much larger instructional budget than our entire general fund; and, you would need to scale back.
 - Leist – No model will perfectly replicate our world. The model will need to be managed. The Budget Model Working Group has been working toward improving the percent OSU salaries, they have made some headway, and that will continue to be the case. MSU will not be able to fund 100% of OSU average salaries in year one, but if our average is 80%, we can strive to be a percentage, or two, higher than that.
 - Senator followed up: MSU is at 80%.
 - We hire assistant professors closer to the OSU benchmark, however.
 - Senator question- does this formula represent a change from past years and if so, how?
 - Currently, the approach to the current model is based on historical information in which a base budget some department had grew or shrank over time with some strategic thought given to it. It was not activity driven, however. The new Budget Model is designed to put funding where the activity is. Past operating budgets are of little use, now: They were used to supplement

- salaries or hire new people, and that approach has hurt our operating budgets to some degree.
- Senator question: What is the timeline for the forecasted SCH and how does this accommodate growing/declining programs?
 - We would implement a linear or slightly weighed linear projection for the last year. That would help departments on an upward trajectory trend and for a department who has gone down.
 - Senator question: At what time would this forecast budget be available?
 - Ideally, the model would be available by December 1, or earlier, of each fall. That would allow us to put the actual plans together for the new July budget. Currently, the budgets do not get allocated to the depts until May and that is too late.
 - A senator on the Budget Model Working Group commented that this Budget Model references how much money is being allocated to colleges based on numbers from departments. When deans receive money, they have the discretion to decide how that money is used within that college. If there is growth in one dept. and shrinking in another, the model does not necessarily mean that the dean will allocate that money specifically as this formula puts forth. Concerns are that if your dept. does not have the resources it needs, this scenario will not solve those issues and might even present the college with a different scenario.
 - The Budget Model would allocate at the college/division/provost level and the provost, working with the deans, would allocate to the colleges. We know there are many benchmark variances which differ from how we operate on our campuses; that is where human intervention is needed.
 - Senator question: Does the Instructional Support Formula suggest that depts. heavier in research and lighter in teaching are trending towards the average?
 - This formula looks at, in part, how many grad classes you teach. Those are typically smaller numbers of SCH per faculty FTE. If you teach more grad classes than a physics dept., primarily teaching focused, this formula will capture that. Research activity is revealed through grad student credit hour teaching.
 - MSU has some unique aspects to it. We would never suggest applying this formula at the departmental level; it would be applied at the division or college level where decisions about our uniqueness can be made.
 - Senator question: What are the implications of this model in reference to what gets included as a CORE class and in which dept.?
 - When crafting the Budget Model, we were concerned that it might be entirely focused on SCH. Considering the model and what it says about the dept. level, we concluded that it should not unconditionally follow at the dept. level.

- We are assuming we have exactly the right amount of administration and overhead on campus, and this formula says we have allocated perfectly in those areas. This formula also deals with forecasted SCH and not efficiencies in the whole system.
 - This is only part of the model. We do not have solid benchmarks, nationally, for administration other than IPEDS. We are in line or below averages, to about the same degree we are with all of our costs in terms of student support, administration and non-academic areas, and we examine those as well. Budget Council may make recommendations as to where money may be allocated.
- Senator - The question we should be asking is, “Do we create enough value by spending money on “X” to offset hiring faculty in Math, Business, Engineering, etc.?” The senator believes that is the model to follow in the bigger picture from an efficiency stand point, and that is why senate believes MSU need 80 more TT faculty.
 - We discussed this at length and acknowledge the enormous growth that has taken place. We looked at the non-faculty staffing per student. If we had kept that ratio the same, vs. what we are, what’s the difference? If we had been at the levels we were at 2010, now, we would be spending \$5.67M more dollars per year on support staff. Over \$5M of that would be outside of the academic enterprise. We have not added staff during the increases in most cases. The ratio (savings) is very significant. We are benchmarking against ourselves since there are no national numbers. We want the money to go to where it has the most impact on faculty and students.
- Senator question: Can you define the kinds of activities that fit into the student support category in more detail, since a great deal of student support comes through other channels? What are we going to do with the student support dollars? Would it go towards financing graders, recruiting new students, laboratories, student teaching assistants? Where do we draw the line?
 - It includes staff in academic advising, tutoring within your department. All were mentioned in our Budget Model discussions, except student recruitment. Student support at the department level includes all activities that help our students to succeed. In the current model, this is a small piece and only covers current departmental costs.
- Senator question: Will there be a change in the way that the responsibilities will be allocated? We will be operating our departments the way we have always done?
 - Right now there is no change in that model, and that is another conversation.
- Senator - If enrollment grows there is always the decision to teach

students with either TT, NTT or grad students. Is that decision independent of the Budget Model?

- The budget will come based on national benchmark costs and if you produce something that is different than your average, we have to balance the quality and overall budget.
- Senator – If you do take into consideration whether a dept. is more research or teaching weighted, have you thought about using the actual LOH assignments that distribute responsibilities and are an indicator of whether a dept. is more teaching or research and where it might be weighted?
 - We don't have that information. We are relying on the national statistics and our ability to manage within that. As an example, if English departments all across the country teach more SCH per faculty FTE and Physics teaches less, then the model will project adequate instructional funding and those types of realities.
 - These are not university averages; these are at a specific departmental level – graduate, undergraduate – and as they are at similar Carnegie institutions.
 - Benchmarks are against research universities cohorts.
- Senator: Have you compared this new Budget Model to the old model?
 - There will be variances, e.g., where there is high growth but had little or no change in budget. The model will reallocate. We do recognize if there is too big of a jump in a budget, it might take years to transition. The current process is not addressing activities transpiring in each area and how much we should be investing in those areas, e.g., SCH, majors.
- Senator: Institutional Costs – who will review those?
 - A group will examine these more carefully.
- Senator recommends having more faculty membership on the Budget Council, as they would provide insight and a more in-depth snapshot of specific academic areas, leading to more effective input.
- Senator: Is there a model for how to distribute money between all the different programs?
 - It is in the new model, but it is not robust and there are no benchmarks. For now, it more closely emulates the old model.
- Senator: What are the implications to the Native American Studies department, as it has a masters programs, non-teaching minor, but no four-year programs like Missoula.
 - There are a number of specific programs similar to yours and we will need to discuss with the deans/provost about them.

Senate Procedures – Follow Up on Prior Presentation and Discussions – Chair Babbitt

- Since we are running out of time, Chair Babbitt will discuss at the next senate meeting.

Administrative Reviews – Discussion of Next Closed Meeting for Deans’ and Other Reviews – Chair Babbitt

- Two remaining fall 2015 senate meetings: November 18 and December 2.
- November 18 will be a closed meeting to continue review discussions.
- December 2 – Along with other business, Senate will begin discussions about P&T documents, which will continue into the next semester.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 pm.

Randy Babbitt, Chair

Michael Babcock, Chair-elect