

MSU FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

April 21, 2004

301 Reid Hall

Montana State University-Bozeman

4:10-5:00 PM

Members Present: Becker, Cherry, Christopher, Conant, Coon, Gipp, Giusti for Kevane, Idzerda, Jones, Kommers, Lansverk, Leech, Levy, Lynch, Lynes-Hayes, McDermott, Monaco, Neeley, Pratt, Prawdzienski, Rucker, Schlotzhauer, Seymour, Taper for Weaver, D. Weaver, Taylor, Yoo

Member absent: Ashley, Bradley, Giroux, Hoffman, Howard, Jackson, Knight, Microbiology, Puffer, E. Schmidt

Others: Bandyopadhyay, Fedock

Chair Warren Jones called the meeting to order at 4:10 PM. A quorum was present. The minutes of the Faculty Council meeting on March 31, 2004 were approved.

CHAIR'S REPORT – Warren L. Jones

UPBAC

- Budget** projections were presented and indicated where we are likely to be if MSU recruited new students in/out of state:
 - Budget fluctuates \$1M depending on in-state/out-of-state recruitment.
- How do you write a specific budget plan if you have so much uncertainty?
 - Recent adjustments within the basic budget are \$150,000 short from being exactly balanced, based on current semi-conservative recruitment for retention next year.
- UPBAC approved a debit of \$150,000 against each of the executives' budgets so everyone gets a proportional-to-the-size-of their-budget cut.
- Still some sizeable mandatory budget adjustments need to be made.
 - \$318,000 budget amendment to fund CORE 2.0
- Unclear what exactly what will happen to budget.
 - Leave as it, and executives will have authority to fund budget amendments shown in the first tier and deal with cutbacks in the future.
- Chair Jones believed adjustments should be in place with UPBAC members' input; should be part of the final budget process, and not just left to executives' sole decision.
- The more campus input to UPBAC, the better the self-governance process.

RETENTION

- Still trying to find better data as to why students are leaving so we may implement programs to improve retention.
- Recommendation to advisors:
 - Make sure students pick up their PDF's.
 - Particularly important in regards to non-resident students/out-of-state – follow up.

LIBRARY

-**Library** will begin accepting electronic renewals, July 1, 2004.

-Not sure who this applies to. Students? Faculty? All? Will f./u with Bruce Morton.

-A request from FC indicated they would like library to subscribe to sites offering pre-written term papers for students thus enabling professors to check students' written work for originality.

-Library Committee discussed and concluded that subscriptions to these sites would be supporting the very sites they do not want to endorse.

-Physics Professor from Duke or North Carolina developed software that goes out on the web to search for phrases, finds where they occur in previously written papers, and bookmarks.

-FC member read about a site that actually indexes the pay sites where students may be getting written papers. It was suggested that sometime in the future, the library may need to become more heavily involved with plagiarism problems and pay to have access to these sites.

-Library will help professors with student papers by providing url's and other websites addresses to find plagiarized papers.

-Provost's office believed this should be addressed by Academic Affairs office.

-Dean of Students should become involved also.

-More information is needed to proceed on campus involvement, and any help from FC would be appreciated.

FACULTY AFFAIRS – Chair, Marvin Lansverk

-Working on **sabbatical** issues.

-Trying to improve forms used to rank sabbaticals, as they are not quite in line with the BOR policy.

-Cover letter which comes from Provost to faculty regarding sabbaticals will have changes, also.

-Working on an instrument to retrieve data from faculty.

-Will be ready next year for FC discussion.

-**Ad Comp** policy reworked and presented to Provost by WJ and Marvin Lansverk

-Wording accepted by Provost's office, and ready to be implemented this year.

-**Program Review Proposal (Academic Affairs Committee)**

-Copies sent to all deans and UPBAC and asked for feedback.

-**Positive** comments stated that the AAC's review would be important for a pre-approval process when colleges move towards their goals in their specific departmental strategic plans (e.g., institutes and centers proposals with NSF).

-Questions coming from AAC are more pointed and specific. Grad Council may not ask questions about budgetary issues, but the AAC would.

-More global discussion in FC about new programs.

-**Negative** comments are related, but two –fold.

-Aren't the AAC's tasks the same tasks the Graduate Dean already undertakes? Redundant?

-Aren't most of the questions the AAC would ask already being asked by BOR and Grad Council?

- AAC lengthens process to an extra bureaucratic step.
- When AAC get programs to review, the committee would like to do it ASAP.
- Bruce McLeod offered to help set up website providing electronic feedback to streamline process.
- If FC ratifies proposal, AAC needs to proceed with committee charge and other processes to make it a standing committee.
- If committee begins working this summer (addressing the Ph.D. degree in History and the MBA program with Billings), we need to get committee members for it.
- Process flow: Undergrad Proposal→Undergrad Studies or→Grad Council→Academic Affairs Committee→FC→Provost (has the authority to override AAC)
 - Wording not clear in proposal Page 3, short sentence: Change the word “recommendation.”
 - “The review and advice.....” “The conclusions and review....”
- Motion to approve AAC program→seconded→discussion→approved 17→opposed 8

CHAIR’S TERM

- WJ emailed proposal to lengthen position from 1-year to 2-year commitment and a way to accomplish that.
- Provides for significant continuity.
- With current bylaws, Provost’s office provides 60% release time and one-month summer salary for Chair, and 35% release time and one-month’s salary for Chair Elect.
- Drawbacks
 - 35% and 60% is representative of the amount of time you would put in.
 - If you wish to pursue other things in your career, this may stall your progress.
- Positive
 - Continuity of committee progress and familiarity of procedure to accomplish important issues.
- Discussion:
 - Make Chair’s position re-electable for an addition year.
 - What to do with your Chair-Elect?
 - Call Chair-Elect “Vice Chair.”
 - Need more time for discussion for this important issue.

Meeting adjourned at 5:20 PM

Signature
Gale R. Gough, Secretary

Signature
Warren L. Jones, Chair