The March 2, 2016 Faculty Senate minutes were approved.

Courses and Programs – Chair-elect Babcock

- The following undergraduate program was approved during the March 8, 2016 Steering Committee meeting:
  - **UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM**
    - The MS HHD: Family and Consumer Sciences Option
- The following undergraduate courses were approved in CPC on March 9, 2016 and are posted on the FS web site for senator review:
  - **UNDERGRADUATE COURSES**
    - ARTZ 494: Undergraduate Seminar*
    - ARTZ 210: Professional Practices: Careers in Art
    - EMEC 436: Computational Fluid Dynamics*
    - EQUH 133: Horses: Ground Level*
    - HORT 435: Landscape Planning
    - KIN 412: Field-Based Fitness Assessment*
  - Asterisks notate those courses offered in the fall 2016 and Steering Committee would like to approve on Friday.
- The following undergraduate and graduate programs are posted on the FS web site for senator review:
  - **UNDERGRADUATE AND GRADUATE PROGRAM CHANGES**
    - WMNS-MINOR: Minor in Women’s, Gender, and Sexuality Studies
      - Added “Sexuality Studies” to title to reflect nationwide trends;
      - Courses have been added/a couple dropped
        - Some courses are WGSS were approved recently, and others have been discovered on campus and instructors have been consulted about whether they would fit into the framework of WGSS.
    - Individual Interdisciplinary PhD Program
      - The APWG report is posted beneath the program proposal on the FS web site.
**Announcements – Chair Babbitt**

- The Chair-elect position for Faculty Senate is open to volunteers:
  - The Chair-elect receives 35% of their salary plus one month summer salary.
  - The Chair receives 60% of the salary plus one month summer salary.
  - How budget is used is negotiable with the Provost. For example, you may use the stipend for:
    - Buy-out of classes, travel for research, support of grad students, etc.
- Rossmann’s term on the Budget Council is ending at the end of this AY; the term is three years and the council meets once a month. Please see Randy or Mike if you are interested.
- Motion was made that Seth Walk of Microbiology & Immunology become the new STEM member on Research Council, replacing Bern Kohler’s place. seconded unanimously approved
- BoR Update:
  - New program submission procedures were proposed:
    - Colleges must submit list of upcoming programs for the next three (3) years to the BoR before the end of April for approval at the next May BoR meeting, with a paragraph description of each program.
    - The three year list can be updated every year.
    - A “intent to plan” is submitted, discussed by chief academic officers and announced at next BOR meeting.
    - Proposal is then submitted and can be voted on at next BOR meeting.
    - Goal is to increase transparency to other campuses and give the BoR more notification rather than having to approve the final proposal given to them.
  - There is now a Kalispell campus for nursing.
  - WAMI and healthcare disciplines will report at the next BoR meeting on how the MUS prepare students for occupations in medical fields.
  - Legislative audit discuss MSU and UM spending on administration and staff.
  - Dual enrollment policy has been very successful, but requires continued vigilance to maintain its quality.
    - Dual enrollment courses are courses that faculty offer in high school or faculty approve the qualifications of high school teachers to teach courses in high school for college credit; students pay half the tuition of GC to take the courses;
    - MSU and Gallatin College faculty offer college courses for dual credit that have become very successful.
  - Presentation on the importance of arts and humanities in the MUS was received very well at BOR.
- Senate leadership met with the COHE Commissioner Clay Christian and President Cruzado to discuss results of her annual review; both will be invited to senate.
- The Annual Review of Faculty (Faculty Handbook Section) passed in Deans Council on March 8, 2016.
- Annual Review of Deans questions were submitted to Deans Council for their review and senate leadership is targeting week of March 21 to begin the reviews.

**Athletics Report – George Haynes**

- Administrative changes:
- MSU has a new football coach;
- A national search for a new athletics director has begun; as well as,
- A search for a commissioner for the Big Sky Conference.
- Some changes in the NCAA:
- MSU is now in two categories of Division I:
Inclusion in the Big Five, made up of larger schools; and,
- Inclusion in the category of smaller schools

- Big Five inclusion has a substantial financial impact on MSU e.g., cost of attendance which is about 1/2 million dollars.
- Gender equity issues and inclusion (LGBT) are priority issues.
- Academic Summary at MSU and how the NCAA is trying to accommodate compliance.
- Compliance is being transformed from auditing (although it will not be completely eradicated) to institute disclosure through their committee, the Institutional Performance Program.
- In terms of APR’s (Academic Performance Rating), MSU must have a score of 930 or above, otherwise you don’t participate in the post-season competition. MSU has an average 970-974.
- The graduation success rate (a 6 year measure) shows MSU graduates 84%; we rank 50% with the federal rate, and compare very well with our conference.
- Financial summary indicates:
  - Athletics is approximately a business with $19.3M in revenue and $18.8M worth of expenses.
  - The majority of revenue comes from direct institutional support, about 40%;
  - Expenditures include student aid, scholarships, etc. and makes up about 26%;
- In gauging the academic environment, eligible athletes participate in a survey (starting in April) to determine what the academic and athletic experience is for student athletes. This survey has been conducted over the past five (5) and the NCAA is instituting the same across all NCAA schools beginning this AY.
  - Survey reveals that minority students do not have as good an experience with academic or athletics as non-minority students.
  - NCAA will be looking for progress in this area.
- Athletics participates in Skyland, an academic journal for students in the Big Five Conference, and Haynes encouraged submissions to the publication, worth $500 for student submissions accepted.
- Haynes will bring back more data (IPP Program) next year to show how MSU compares to the other Division I and Big Sky Conference schools. A safety and wellness survey will also be presented at that time.
- Discussions ensued:
  - What is meant by minority students not having as good an academic/athletic experience? When we submit questions like, “How is your academic, athletic experience?” “What is your feeling, in general, about what is going on with administration, your coaches, etc.?” all numbers are lower for minorities and from a list of 35 items, we see strong data pointing to dissatisfaction. However, there is also an issue with small sampling.
  - Does revenue for athletics come from outside or are there state funds? What about fee waivers? State funds are an important component, as are ticket sales; contributions from athletic scholarships; other contributions are in-kind. Leist stated that of the scholarships ½ come from donors; ½ from waivers. The university contributes cash for coaches and administrative salaries; not all expenses are covered by state funds.

**Research Task Force Update – Renee Reijo-Pera**
- Pera congratulated faculty in humanities, arts and social sciences whose proposals qualified for a grant provided by the President’s office. The proposals were:
  - Western Lands & People
  - DSEL
  - Genius Loci
  - Center for Environmental Humanities
- Student Success and Well-Being
- Center for Digital Story Work

- Research Task Force Status:
  - Three goals to address:
    - What should we measure as success?
    - To whom do we compare ourselves?
    - Are our assessments well integrated into the rewards system - promotion & tenure?
  - We, like most universities, are focused on expenditures, as a measure of our research success. The optimal goal is a finished product which changes things such as our agricultural practices, insights into human development, etc. As an institution, MSU has never collected information on who we are and what we have produced; this task force will provide us with that opportunity.
    - One of the most important things for the first goal is dept. by dept., how we measure success; a yearly report would be generated by dept chairs showing what was accomplished. With such reporting, Pera believes we would be surprised to see the extensive body of work MSU has accomplished.
  - MSU should decide if it wants to compare itself to “someone.” If, so who do we compare ourselves to? Although the task force believed MSU was incomparable, some institutions mentioned were:
    - Colorado State (Ft. Collins)
    - New Mexico State
    - No. Dakota State
    - So. Dakota State
    - University of Colorado (Boulder)
    - University of Wyoming
    - University of Idaho
    - Oregon State
    - University of Oregon
    - Washington State
    - Utah State
    - Why do we want to compare ourselves? It is out of MSU’s control, as institutions are always compared to another and we might want to gauge where we stand, annually, with peer institutions.
  - Do P&T decisions reflect research and creative activities, teaching/research across the board? Being a tenured faculty member means, in addition to being outstanding in teaching and outreach, being outstanding in creative activities and research; these distinguish TT from NTT teaching and research. Important to remember if one is teaching without doing research, the TT line is probably not the correct line. Singel recently gave a talk on tools and metrics for P&T; Fastnow also provided what is available for data in this area. While many colleges/depts. are working towards this goal, some are not; we would like to see research/creative activity be given credit in the P&T process.

- Discussions ensued:
  - Senator noted that while the task force is focusing more on outputs of research products rather than inputs, there is a perception among his peers that money for scholarship & creativity has been reduced in recent years and that the entire pool has been limited. Potvin stated that money might have been reduced in some areas; and increased in others and the provost’s office backfilled those gaps. Pera and Potvin will look into whether the entire pool has been reduced, or not. Pera stated that the whole exercise was to increase the amount while trying to stimulate some new, larger collaboration while
not harming the individual creativity in scholarship/creativity programs. In the past, there has not been a mechanism to request a large grant through S&C’s. We are attempting to provide an approach to providing larger lump of sums to establish an institute. In trying to establish larger entities, the perceptions have been that VPR does not care about individual endeavors. Pera’s interest has been what can we do on a grand scale, but it is not to discourage or end smaller projects.

- Senator noted that the chart of research products make no mention of students. Pera stated that the chart is meant to only show research and nothing about teaching. The purpose of the chart was to say, it doesn’t matter if you want to talk about companies, students, here are what the products are.

**Optional Graduate Representative Policy – Chair-elect Babcock**

- Dean Hoo has taken into account the feedback from faculty with respect to grad reps. This policy allows students to have a grad rep, should they want on, in two instances:
  - You could have a grad rep at the beginning of the program;
  - You can have a grad rep anytime during the program.
- If one person wants it and the other does not, the student may visit the dean and she will assist in finding a solution and not to have an element of surprise on either side.
- Grad rep must be a TT faculty, not in the dept where the grad rep student resides, selection inviting the grad rep is up to the student and chair. The mechanism for selection is purposely non-specific to provide flexibility.
- The grad rep must sign the student’s program of study and committee form and Grad School will have final approval.
- Exam reports are not required.
- Discussions ensued:
  - If the new policy is approved, what becomes of the status of the current grad reps? You may contact the grad rep and ask them if they still want to serve, should the student want them. If not, they do not need to continue.
  - It would be nice if there was a list of people who would be willing to serve and housed somewhere.
  - Haven’t heard much from grad students about this policy; sometimes senators make decisions for students thinking they are in the best interest of students when they might not be. Dean Hoo stated that there are students on the Grad Council, but sometimes they are not available to attend. She will follow up and appoint someone to attend.
- Motion to adopt this as a recommendation to the Grad Dean for implementation→seconded→all in favor→unanimously approved.

The meeting adjourned at 5:05 pm.

_Randy Babbitt, Chair_

_Michael Babcock, Chair-elect_