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


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

The October 14, 2015 Faculty Senate minutes were approved.
- New process for approving minutes;
  - Chair Babbitt will ask senators if there are any changes;
  - Hearing none, the minutes shall be approved.

Courses and Programs – Chair-elect Babcock
- One (1) undergraduate course was approved in Steering on 10/20 as there were no comments:
  - ANSC 437: Professional Development in Beef Feedlot Systems
- Program with Name Change, only:
  - Change from MEd in Education, School Counseling Option to MEd in School Counseling to clearly notate that the student has indeed taken counseling courses. Without the name change, students who had graduated were required by prospective employers to verify that they had taken counseling courses via letters from MSU.
  - Motion to approve → all in favor → seconded → unanimously approved
• Graduate courses listed on the Faculty Senate web site will be voted on by Steering committee after they have been on the web site for ten (10) days for senate to review.

**Announcements – Chair Babbitt**

• **Draft Budget Model**
  - Charrettes for the model will be conducted on October 27, noon – 2; October 30, 1-3 pm, SUB 233;
  - Model will be presented in senate on Nov 4; and
  - Model will be discussed in the Budget Council meeting on Oct 23, if faculty wish to see it prior to later roll-out dates.

• There will be a closed senate meeting on 10/28/2015 to discuss administrative reviews.

**Parliamentary Procedures – Chair Babbitt**

• Babbitt presented a summary of Robert’s Rules of Order (RRO) Newly Revised procedures for making amendments.

• Motions during the latter part of the last senate meeting were conducted in accordance to RRO, except for there were several out of order comments by several guest and some faculty that we did not stop the meeting to call out of order.
  - Motions may take numerous paths before being seconded and approved.
    - We can have presentation and discussion before a motion.
    - We have discussion after a motion and second. Amendments to motions are address before returning to main motion.
    - A call of the vote (“previous question” in ROR) stops debate if passed by 2/3 majority, but a call of the vote is out of order if there has not been debate on a debatable motion. Limiting time of debate also requires 2/3 majority.
    - A flow chart will be placed on the FS web site that illustrates these mechanisms.

• Status of motions made during the 10/14 Faculty Senate meeting was as follows:
  - Motion to postpone the vote → failed; No motion was on the floor at the time to postpone.
  - Faculty Senator Gannon made a motion to approve “the program.”
    - It is not clear what “the program” was since the proposal has two Level II programs – AAS in Culinary Artsand a BS in Hospitality Management. This needs to be clarified before we start debate.
  - Gannon’s motion was seconded → discussion: Chair clarified with proposer that this was not a call to vote. Proposer stated that if seconded, there should be discussion afterwards.
  - There was then a motion to table (“postpone’) the motion and discussion until the next meeting (this week). → seconded. Chair
clarified that this was a motion to postpone until next week. → (14 in favor of tabling) (11 opposed to tabling) → motion to approve the program was postponed until the 10/21/15 Faculty Senate meeting.

- This postponed our closed meeting until 10/28/15.
- Chair Babbitt pointed out that RRO cover the rules and privileges of the members. In Faculty Senate, we enjoy having visitors, asking them questions and recognizing them. In deference to members, the chair will call on members first, before calling on guests.
- Chair reminded guests that shouting out comments is out of order, for them as well as members. Raise your hand to be recognized.
- Going forward, presentations will have time limits.

**Presentation by Invited Guest, Dr. Greg Gilpin**

- The A(cademic) P(rograms) W(orking) G(roup) asked Associate Professor of Economics, Dr. Gilpin, to address portions of the APWG report on the Hospitality Proposal last year; specifically job analyses. With the influx of new proposal materials, APWG asked Dr. Gilpin to update his report and present to Faculty Senate this year.
- Chair introduction of Dr. Gilpin included: Greg has a PhD in Economic and his field of expertise and research is in educational attainment and labor market outcomes. He has no conflict of interest with the proposal. He was asked by APWG as the resident faculty expert to do the analysis in response to the claims made in the proposal. Greg will be held to a strict 10 minute limit on his presentation, after which he will answer any questions.

**Tourism**

- Not a sector of any economy; it is a label.
- It is attached to four (4) sectors of the economy:
  - Retail trade;
  - Transportation;
  - Arts & entertainment; and
  - Accommodations and food services.
- It is difficult, from the data, to tease out what dollars are considered tourism and what dollars are not considered tourism. Examples:
  - Buying a shirt at the mall: You are in retail trade. Is that tourism?
  - Filling your vehicle’s gas tank: You are now in passenger transportation expenditures. Is that tourism?
- Tourism numbers can be overstated because you are including things that would be considered non-hospitality and not related to travel or tourism.
- The Montana’s Industries by Earnings information is taken from Barbara Wagner, Chief Economist at the Dept of Labor for the State of Montana.
  - Ms. Wagner and her group define leisure activities as:
    - Hotels;
    - Ski resorts;
    - Restaurants and bars;
- And other tourism-related activities account for 5.3% of the Montana economy; or, the 10th largest sector in Montana.
- Lumpling in retail trade and transportation, we get a much larger number.
  - It is not clear if the proposed Hospitality program has anything to do with transportation or retail trade.
- Montana tourism is a drop in the bucket of US tourism – 0.5%.

**Montana Earnings**
- It is difficult to find individuals with bachelor’s degrees who are engaged in hospitality.
- 97% of US accommodation occupations do not require formal schooling.
- The 3% in hospitality that might have formal schooling do not necessarily have a degree in hospitality but might have some formal schooling in any degree such as Certifications, AS, BA.
  - Examining the 3% group, the Montana Department of Labor has estimated median annual earnings for a typical mid-career individual, and they are at the lowest end of all management positions comparable to day care center directors. Well away from any other management position in any industry you can think of – at least 25%-40% away in terms of pay, and it is the lowest of all.

**Montana Employment Growth, 1998-2013**
- Montana’s annual employment growth rate is 1.6% and follows, mostly, population growth.
- The accommodations industry annual growth is 1.4% growth – slightly slower than Montana’s economy.
- Food service’s growth is 1.7% and around the same employment level as the Montana’s economy.
- If all industries have different growth rates, that means we will see compositional change in our sectors over time; we will have low growth sectors over time and high growth sectors over time.

**Montana’s Employment Compositional Change**
- Low growth sectors will be:
  - Accommodations
  - Food services
  - Trade and transportation
  - Farming
  - Two of MSU’s program options are in the low growth sectors.
- Fast growth sectors will include:
  - Business services
  - Health care
  - Financial activities
  - State and local government
  - Two recent program proposals; Masters in Nursing; Bachelor’s in
Financial Engineering are in the fast growth sectors.

- Leisure activities have grown, but it grew in the 80’s; since then it has grown at the rate of the state’s economy.

- **Montana’s Demand for Hospitality**
  
  - Growth rates were translated into jobs.
  
  - **Hospitality Management (BA):**
    
    - 97% of the jobs are irrelevant to the proposal at hand.
    
    - Trying to find BA in Hospitality jobs in Gallatin County, where there is more tourism than in other parts the state, Gilpin found:
      
      - We need two (2) accommodation managers with some formal school be it a Certificate, Associate or Bachelor and it is irrelevant if it is in hospitality.
    
    - For the state, we need about 3-4 accommodations managers;
    
    - For the state, and regarding food service managers, we need about 2.1 additional per year with some type of formal schooling.
    
    - Nationwide, we have an excess of 2,000-5,000 graduates in hospitality that will not be getting employment over the next ten (10) years.

  - **Culinary Arts (AAS):**
    
    - Those who receive schooling in this field, expect to be compensated for the educational experience.
    
    - Gallatin County would need 12 additional food service workers.
    
    - Montana would need about 52; only 5 of those would be chefs or head cooks.
    
    - The proposal’s own employment outlook is -17.5% in the Northwest region: people are being fired and those retiring are not being replaced.
    
    - In terms of demand, there is some local demand, but not enough to justify the program.

- **Montana’s Annual Supply of Hospitality Management and Culinary Arts**
  
  - Tremendous overlap with existing and well established MSU’s College of Business, Economics, and Ag. Business programs.
  
  - U of M is beginning their new associate’s degree in hospitality management this month, and should MSU’s Hospitality Management proposal go before the BoR in November, it will be at the same time U of M presents their program.
    
    - U of M already has a building, faculty, and courses and 35 years experience in hospitality programming at no additional cost.
  
  - Re: the Culinary Arts, Flathead Valley, Missoula College and U of M have bachelor’s in sustainable food and farming emphasis.
  
  - Missoula College has a new building providing a three-fold capacity increase.
  
  - Nationwide, there are 465 Hospitality Management programs; 82 in the Pacific NW region. On the Culinary Arts side, there are 3,358
programs in the US; 113 programs in the Pacific NW region.

- **Business/Management Overlap, Redundancy, Competition for Students**
  - Tremendous overlap with existing and well established College of Business, Economics and Ag Business programs.
    - Students from those programs are already running hotels in Bozeman.
  - Why is MSU competing against U of M’s hospitality program?
    - Letters from U of M expressed a concern about redundancy.

- **External Letters of Support**
  - Most letters of support attest to entry level, low wage job, few management positions available, and you begin at the bottom and work your way up.
  - Proposed HM program is not in alignment with employer’s demands.

- **Questions Regarding Viability of Program**
  - Where do hospitality and culinary arts programs fit within public higher education in Montana?
  - How much hospitality and culinary arts program capacity does Montana need?
  - What are the employment and earnings outlooks for Montana hospitality and culinary arts graduates?
  - Will the HM program attract 65 new in-state and 35 new out-of-state students or will it transfer students from existing programs, especially with 82 hospitality programs in the region?

- **Babbitt asked senators if there were questions about Dr. Gilpin’s presentation, and there were none. Presentation is on Faculty Senate Web site**

**Questions on APWG report - APWG Chair Mike Babcock**

- Repasky asked for clarification about the 3 FTE - 2TT, 1 NTT. Will the NTT be running the test kitchen and will they also be participating in the teaching endeavor. Babcock referred that to Dean Harmon.
  - Harmon stated that they would be teaching and coordinating the lab space in collaboration with GC.
- Is Hospitality Management a three-year or four-year program?
  - Babcock noted that a student can finish in three years, but they would go to classes in the summer; otherwise, it is a four-year program.
- There is a concern that 1/3 of the curriculum has to be offered during the summer. Were the business courses and sustainable food courses, e.g., taken into consideration in terms of the budgeting?
  - Babcock stated that it was discussed and the plan was that they would have additional sections money and staff to accommodate that.
- O’Neill asked about the line item for new equipment, facility renovation, design, etc. which was at $0 and of concern to APWG.
Was that issue addressed to APWG’s satisfaction?

- Babcock stated that there is currently a feasibility study being conducted to examine repurposing space on campus, and the report is not complete.
- Is it appropriate to consider a budget which doesn’t include, potentially, a very large line item?
  - Babcock stated that was APWG’s concern, as well.

**Open Discussion of Motion to Approve Hospitality Management BS and Culinary Arts AAS**

- Babbitt asked for clarification of the motion that was on the floor from the 10/14 senate meeting
  - Gannon restated the motion: Motion is to approve both Level II proposals: the Bachelor’s Degree in Hospitality Management and the Associates in Applied Sciences Degree in Culinary Arts
- Discussion of the motion:
  - At this moment, we are discussing Gannon’s motion. The motion can be amended, postponed, or vote can be called. Eventually, when the discussion has ended, the Chair will ask, “Are you ready for the question?” If no one says anything, we will have the vote.
  - Current motion was repeated.
  - Repasky is concerned with the 19-20 new classes that there are not enough resources in terms of faculty to generate the classes, advising of the students and no clear role about how faculty are going to be involved in any creativity/research activities or what their service components will be. Resources for the summer classes are of concern, also. The most recent budget does not reflect the cost of the program because it does list all faculty listed or additional summer classes listed.
  - Babbitt clarified that there are 2 new TT faculty; 1 NTT and 1 TT faculty that has been moved over to from food and sustainability to EHHD; essentially 4 faculty. Originally the program was budgeted for 7 faculty, though no change in the curriculum being taught. There no longer is a school.
  - Brester stated that given the growth MSU has been experiencing, there are tremendous needs for faculty in various core missions. MSU is woefully understaffed in TT faculty positions. Should this program move forward it would mean that there are 2-3 positions that cannot be used in the things we are already good at and in desperate need of. This program does not work for this institution at this point. However, if a two-year program meets some of the needs of the culinary industry as expressed by our guests at the last senate meeting, I would like to see a separate vote for these two programs.
  - Babbitt – There is currently a motion to approve the combined programs; an amendment would be needed to separate the vote.
Wilmer shared concerns of her faculty:
- We need to serve the students we already have and until we fully fund the current programs, we should not be funding new programs. Currently, we need to address:
  - Class sizes
  - Student to Faculty ratio
- The pay for the new Hospitality faculty would be 100% of OSU salaries; currently faculty make 70%-80% of OSU. What impact would that have on morale?
- MSU has an obligation to the community, stakeholders, and guests who came to senate, but MSU has an obligation to make sure new programs do not diminish current students’ experiences.
- $0 cost for the building and remodeling is an unknown that is of concern.
- Student and faculty travel seemed high compared to what their department allocates.
- 5 GTA’s @ $20K/person led some to ask whether the proposal presumes there will be a master’s program at some point or whether GTA’s would come from other programs.

O’Neill shared concerns of her faculty:
- Cost of renovation, restoration, engineering, design is going be of some significance, even if you don’t know what that number is.

Merzdorf shared concerns of her faculty:
- Understaffing of programs, salary inversions, the funding of start-up packages.

Brown shared his colleagues’ support of the program:
- Business faculty will be teaching some of the courses.
- Brown is a member of the APWG who examined the program and helped to write both reports last year and this year.
- On behalf of the business faculty, he will be voting in favor in the proposal because of the tremendous interest in the community and its consistency with our mission as a land grant institution.

Zabinski asked if there was a motion to split the two (2) proposals.
- Babbitt – There is no motion to that effect, but one could be made. It could be a friendly amendment only if original proposer concurs.

Zabinski moved to separate the Hospitality Management Program and the Culinary Arts Associate Degree Program on the ballot as two separate voting entities seconded discussion:
- Greenwood, who is also on the APWG does not know the viability of the GC program if it isn’t connected to the MSU BS program. That information would be pertinent to know if we
were to split the vote.

- Babcock noted that the proposal stated that the programs are linked and would have to happen together.
  - There being no further discussion Babbitt called for a vote on the motion to have the two programs as separate votes on a single ballot→11 in favor; 15 not in favor.
- Babbitt asked if there was further discussion on the original motion.
  - Branch stated that his faculty had many of the same concerns as previously mentioned, and that they would like to see reference to 2-3 models of the same type of Hospitality Program as that being proposed.
  - Zabinski asked if this was an appropriate time to ask for a paper ballot.
    - Babbitt – Yes
- Zabinski made a motion to conduct the voting via paper ballot→seconded. Seeing no more discussion, motion was voted on my hand. Overwhelming majority voted for the motion: motion passed.
  - Babbitt suggested that the paper ballot would have a place for the name of the senator on one side and the other side would have the vote with a single yes/no vote for approval of the combined Level II Hospitality Management BS and Culinary Arts AAS Programs. The ballot should be folded with the name on the outside.
    - When voting is completed, senators will pass to Gale; she will view only the name side of the ballots and verify only eligible voters are voting. The valid ballots will then go to senate leadership for counting.
    - Babbitt asked if there was any objection. Hearing none, the above voting process was adopted.
- Continued discussion of main motion. Hearing none, the vote was taken.
- Reminder that only Senators can vote, unless a senator is not here, in which the Senator’s alternate can vote.
- The ballots were collected by Gale and she verified that all the ballots were from valid voters.
- Senator from HHD was asked to assist the Chair and Chair-elect in the counting of the ballots.
- The motion to approve both the Level II Proposal for an Interdisciplinary Bachelor’s Degree Program in Hospitality Management and the Level II Proposal for an Associate of Applied Science Degree in Culinary Arts failed: 12 yes; 16 no.

**Discussion while Ballots were verified**

- Can both senators and alternates attend closed meeting next week? Babbitt check prior discussion on reviews and by-laws and send out announcement.
- A senator suggested we continue discussion of long term planning for faculty senate.
• Babbitt would like to have a discussion on our adaptation of RRO. RRO does not address how to conduct open meetings, especially open meeting with visitor participation in discussions.

• After vote on Hospitality Management and Culinary Arts was counted and announced. Motion to adjourn ➔ Hearing no objection ➔ meeting adjourn.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 pm.

Randy Babbitt, Chair
Michael Babcock, Chair-elect