

**FACULTY SENATE**  
**February 17, 2016**  
**346 LEON JOHNSON**  
**4:10 PM – 5:00 PM**  
**MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY-BOZEMAN, MONTANA**  
**Minutes**

**Members Present:** Adams (Art), Anderson (Film & Photo), Arnold (Ag Ed), Berry (CE), Babbitt (Chair), Babcock (Chair-elect), Bolte (Music), Brown (JJCBE), Burrows (Ext), Cantalupo (Ext), Downs (English), Gannon (ChBE), Geyer (Math), Greenwood (Math), Herbeck (Ed), Larson (MIE), Lawrence (Bio Chem), Lu (PSPP), Martin (Mod Lang), McMahon (Ecology), Meyer (Hist & Phil), Neeley for Swinford (Soc/Anthro), Olson for Mosley (ARS), Repasky (ECE), O'Neill (Arts & Arch), Rossmann (Library), Running (Nursing), Scott (Psych), Smith (HHD), Sterman (Library), Vorontsov (Physics), Wiedenheft (MBI), Wilmer (Poli Sci), Zabinski (LRES)

**Others Present:** David Singel, Ron Larsen, Kellie Peterson, Kenning Arlitsch, Gail Schontzler, Jeff Key, Bob Lashaway, Candace Mastel, Steve Cherry, Helen Melland, Terry Leist, Ian Godwin

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

The February 10, 2016 Faculty Senate minutes were approved.

**Courses and Programs – Chair-elect Babcock**

- The following undergraduate courses were approved in the FS Steering Committee on February 16, 2016:
  - **UNDERGRADUATE COURSES**
    - EDEC 453; P-3 STEAM
    - EDEC 455: P-3 English Language Arts and Social Studies
    - LIT 202 CS: The Environmental Imagination
    - LIT 203 IH: Great Books
- The following undergraduate programs will be discussed in a future FS meeting:
  - **UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS**
    - BSCD-BS: Bachelor of Science in Early Childhood Education and Child Services-Child Development Option
      - State of Montana adopted a new early childhood education teaching endorsement;
      - The option will appeal to students seeking teaching careers in Head start, child care, preschool, and K-3 public school classrooms;
      - Linked to two courses already:
        - EDEC 453; P-3 STEAM
        - EDEC 455: P-3 English Language Arts and Social Studies
    - FCSI-BS: Bachelor of Science in Family and Consumer Sciences-Human Development and Family Science-Option
      - Renaming and adding one new class (FSC 260: Middle Childhood and Adolescent Development) are the only modifications to this option.

**Announcements – Chair Babbitt**

- Bern Kohler's (STEM) membership on the Research Council needs to be filled; senators are asked to canvas their depts. and provide suggestions to Chair Babbitt.

- Representatives from the three President's Task Forces were asked to present updates to senate on 2/24.

**MSU Parking and Transportation Master Plan – Bob Lashaway/Jeff Key**

- Lashaway provided an introduction to the presentation:
  - Bozeman has a transportation coordinating and an area transportation plan that is updated periodically;
  - Key is a consultant with Peccia and who the city has hired to update the transportation plan; they did the original trans plan in early 2000's as well as one previous update;
  - MSU-Bozeman, as a single entity, would be the 8<sup>th</sup> largest "city" in Montana and therefore has a large influence on Bozeman transportation issues;
  - Lashaway asked Peccia to produce an MSU-centric traffic plan in concert with the city's.
- This is MSU's first stand-alone parking and transportation sustainable plan that interfaces with other campus plans; goals and objectives of this plan come from those established plans:
  - Goal 1: Enhance mobility for MSU's employees, faculty, students and visitors.
  - Goal 2: Protect existing parking facility investments, and identify future parking needs and locations based on projected demands.
  - Goal 3: Improve multi-modal connectivity between the campus and off-campus destinations.
  - Goal 4: Reduce the number of single occupant vehicles on and around campus.
- Sometime in late summer/early fall a draft plan and recommendations will be presented.
- Outreach includes conferring with other committees and councils.
- Parking:
  - Peccia canvassed 26 existing campus parking lots; conducted a utilization study to establish a baseline from a snapshot in time to determine where issues of concern might be:
    - Done in late September; snow was present.
    - Nothing done west of 19<sup>th</sup> or family housing, however.
    - Parking was observed every hour (on every lot) of every week day (early in am to 6 pm) and produced an existing average parking utilization data set.
    - Identified, in addition to 26 parking lots, other areas on campus;
    - Count # of spaces available and cars parked;
      - Campus core shows the lots are fully utilized;
      - Peripheral locations shows excess capacity;
      - Reserved spaces are not fully utilized even though all spaces are sold as not all are used every day.
    - Peak hour is the one-hour period over the course of the average weekday where the demand is highest and utilization gets more compromised; lots that were used less than 80% are now 100%.
      - This changes on a daily/weekly basis predicated on snow (which might occupy some spaces);
      - Colder weather encourages people to drive.
    - Peripheral lots might be structured to accommodate shuttling in the future.
  - Parking ratios:
    - Commonly referred to as the parking ratio/enrolled student; also see it as student/faculty/staff but closely mimic each other.



- Establish future conditions;
- Develop recommendations;
- Develop implementation; and,
- Develop PTMP document.
- Discussions ensued:
  - Re: intersection level of service on 13<sup>th</sup> coming out of a parking lot, there is sometimes a 15 minute wait to take a left. Why hasn't that been included in your data collection?
    - Budgetary constraints due to limited resources; Peccia is trying to focus on intersections involved in commuter traffic; however, it will still be examined. Since there is a roundabout in close proximity, it is encouraged that commuters take a right onto College and go around the roundabout, as it is faster than waiting 15 minutes to take a left.
  - Parking lot off Lincoln and 19<sup>th</sup> – will it be maintained and accessible for parking?
    - Parking regulations allow campers to park in that area, and it is used for snow storage area.
    - Peccia is looking at the lot differently and not just in terms of maintenance; they see the lot as a potential space for campus shuttles.
  - Re: the new engineering building/parking structure, the new travel and entrance corridor (7<sup>th</sup> from Kagy) will have an adverse effect on traffic flow.
    - The NAIC is developing the project, has the site layout and it is very clear how that layout will work.
    - A parking garage introduces more traffic. However, the garage is adding 150 spaces. Peccia has not seen traffic reports or initial studies of this project.
    - Peccia is involved in the following way with the project, although it is not directly affiliated with the project or its design:
      - Does the garage adversely impact the roadway and the intersections along that roadway, and does it fall within the purview of what Peccia is trying to accomplish?
      - Impact and access point - does it adversely affect 7<sup>th</sup> and/or Kagy?
  - Without including the garage, Peccia's plan is outdated before it is completed, then.
    - Life span of the plan is a ten-year horizon, but with intersections and roadway treatment, Peccia is extending it further out because it takes time to develop projects and recommend infrastructure. There is no ideal time. The city's transportation plan is very extensive and we must keep moving forward.
  - What are the bicycle transportation plans?
    - Campus has been preparing a bicycle master plan for the past twelve months. A benefactor has provided funding and there are very robust visions to provide trails, parking in good spots and identifying where gaps are. Peccia will be pulling the plan into theirs and capturing it in the transportation plan.
    - We have a nationally acclaimed bicycle planner on the team and he has identified mode share, which MSU should strive to be at 15% or more; MSU should increase their mode share by incentivizing students/faculty to get out of their cars.
  - Two thoughts about reducing the need of parking on campus: 1. Has Peccia looked into MSU having a specific policy for students living on campus, allowing them to only park on the periphery of campus? 2. Has MSU looked to coordinate with

Streamline and provide a shuttle service so MSU employees would not have to drive to campus?

- Peccia examined other universities and found that they have parking restrictions for students and who are only allowed to park on the periphery of campus. Pricing structure have also been implemented that incentivize students to not bring or use their car on campus.
- Trend nationally is to provide reliable shuttle service and MSU is examining that option.
- Peccia is developing a map that will show where a 5-minute walk will get you. If you can walk to your destination in 5 minutes, that is adequate.
- Intersection of 7<sup>th</sup> and Kagy is dangerous for cyclists and pedestrians. What are your plans to correct these problems?
  - Purposely left out Kagy out of the plan because it is a key feature of the university and community and is the #1 priority of the City of Bozeman. There is currently a design team working with the city to try to understand what the best mitigation for that roadway is. There is a debate going on for an enhanced three-lane roadway or a five-lane roadway with signals, roundabouts, etc.
  - The speed limit on Kagy also needs managing.

#### **Faculty Review of Deans/DH – Chair Babbitt**

- Deans have approved a formative review process for this year; next year it may be a policy and may be different.
- Faculty Senate voted to entrust the Steering Committee to be in charge of the review.
- Overview of Process developed by Steering Committee and Deans:
  - Review will take place after Spring Break;
  - Objective of formative reviews will be to 1) provide faculty input to the Reviewed on successful practices, on areas of current importance, and on concerns in the functioning of the university, college, or department; and 2) to stimulate a discussion between faculty and the reviewed related to strategies or plans to address the faculty input provided in the review.
  - Deans and department heads will be reviewed in early (mid this year) Spring Semester. The president, provost, and vice presidents will be evaluated late Spring Semester.
  - The review will be implemented in such a way to assure the anonymity of reviewers and to respect the personnel rights of the Reviewed.
  - For the reviews of the president, provost, and vice presidents, the reviewers will be all TT, NTT,, and research faculty, .5 FTE and above.
    - For the reviews of the Dean of the Graduate School and the Dean of the Honors College, the reviewers will be faculty across campus with an association with either the Graduate School or the Honors College, respectively.
    - For all other deans, the reviewers will consist of faculty within the college or unit of the Reviewed.
    - Reviewers for department heads or directors will consist of faculty within that department or school.
  - The Faculty Senate Steering Committee, in consultation with senator(s) from each college, will develop a questionnaire for the reviews. One third of the questions will be asked of all Deans. One third of the questions will be specific to the college of the Reviewed. Up to one third of the questions will be provided by the Reviewed after viewing the questions developed by FS Steering Committee.

- The questions in the review should focus on the desire of all for successful practices to continue, areas of concerns to be addressed, and continuous improvement with sustained benefits being achieved. The question should address the *functioning* of the administrator's office and unit, to which many (including associate administrators) contribute, but for which the administrator is ultimately responsible.
- The Faculty Senate Leadership (Faculty Senate Chair and Chair-Elect) will provide the Reviewed and supervisor a copy of the review form to be used and an explanation of the review process and deadlines.
  - The Reviewed and supervisor may recommend changes to the proposed review form.
  - The Reviewed may provide a narrative of their responsibilities, achievements, challenges, and vision and the strategies and plans for their unit, which will be included in or linked to the review documents.
- Faculty Senate Leadership will not be evaluating the results. They will prepare a summary of the numerical responses and a compilation of the written responses to the review. No summary of the numerical and written responses will be prepared by Faculty Senate Leadership.
- For each college, the Reviewed and the College's senators will come to a mutual agreement as to whether the Faculty Senate Leadership, the Senators from the Reviewed's college, or their college representative on the Faculty Senate Steering Committee will meet with the Reviewed to discuss the results of the review and to discuss plans to continue and improve successful practices and/or to address areas of concern or of particular current importance to the college.
- The Reviewed will report (orally or in writing) to the faculty in the Reviewed's college as a whole in a manner of the Reviewed's choosing to address part or all of the review and plans to continue and improve successful practices and/or to address any areas of concern or of particular current importance to the college.
- The loop mechanism will be those who have seen the review, may comment and provide feedback.
- DH form this year might be the same form used in the past; VP's and President will be similar in design to the Dean's review
- Discussions ensued:
  - Change is that these will be formative; not substantive and faculty will, therefore, be reviewing the "Dean's office" and a collective, administrative experience. Since this is a new concept, it would be helpful if that was re-enforced throughout the process.
  - Those seeing the reviews will be:
    - Faculty Senate Leadership;
    - Member of the College on the FS Steering Committee;
    - Others at the Dean's discretion.
  - How are these types of reviews done at other universities?
    - Our procedure at MSU is that we are trying to move away from a "personnel" review; we would like to have an improvement concept-formative review.
  - How will questions be formulated?
    - Scale from 1-5 for each question on perhaps a "disagree/agree" scale or other different labels.

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

- Grad Council approved a change in their policy and would like FS endorsement.
  - Change - Grad Committees will be as they are now, without a Grad Rep.
- Discussions ensued:

- Why the change?
  - Feeling is that it is not accomplishing what it was intended. Eliminate it and observe what happens. Grad School staff has experienced faculty who are, in many instances, too busy to participate.
- Is there a grievance path someone could take should they disagree with the council findings?
  - Dean gets involved and speak with the committee to try and resolve.
- Where is the protection for the grad student? The point of having an external grad rep is that they are not affiliated with the organization and they provide an impartial view. Senate suggested an option to the Dean, to have a pool of TT faculty who would be interested in participating, and it doesn't seem as though those suggestions were taken into account.
- Another senator stated that from the perspective of his faculty, they believe it is having a grad rep is an important aspect of the process, and that it seems that the process was more of an administrative burden to the grad office. If that was the case, then examining how to alleviate the burden should be examined so the process runs more efficiently.
- If it is eliminated, then there should be a more developed grievance system to take its place rather than nothing.
- The existing system is broken as you cannot ask a first year untenured professor to assume the task of reviewing a PhD candidate; that doesn't provide the student with any protection, either. Definitely the current system, and not replace it with nothing.
- Would be helpful to have alternative ideas next week.
- Motion to table discussion→seconded→all in favor→unanimously approved. (Note: no motion was on the floor, so motion to table discussion is moot. Thus, subject can be discussed at the next meeting.)

**Prioritization – Chair Babbitt**

- Babbitt asked senators to come with ideas about priorities for discussion next week.

The meeting adjourned at 5:02 pm.

*Randy Babbitt, Chair*

*Michael Babcock, Chair-elect*