

**FACULTY SENATE**  
**November 5, 2014**  
**346 LEON JOHNSON**  
**4:10 PM – 5:00 PM**  
**MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY – BOZEMAN, MONTANA**  
**Minutes**

**Members/Alternates Present:** Adams for DeWeese (Art), Babbitt (Physics), Babcock (Psychology), Bonnard (Library), Eiger (CBN), Hendrikx (Earth Sciences), Hostetler (GC), Hughes (CBN), Larson (MIE), Mosley (ARS), Ricciardelli (Film & Photo), Rossmann (Library), Seright (Nursing), Wathen (HHD)

**Others Present:** Waded Cruzado, Martha Potvin, Renee Reijo-Pera, Chris Fastnow, Bridget Kevane, Terry Leist, Tim McDermott, Robert Lashaway, Robert Putzke, David Singel, Leila Sterman

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

Call to Order and Vote on Minutes – Chair Reidy

- The meeting was called to order.
- Minutes from October 29 will be approved at the next meeting, as will the current meeting's minutes.

Announcements

- There will be no Faculty Senate meeting on November 19, November 26, 2014. Senate will resume on December 3, 2014.
- Courses and Programs to Review:
  - The APWG is reviewing the Nursing Associate to Masters Proposal. Discussions in senate will resume the first week of December.
  - The only undergraduate course senators are asked to review is the Geography of Energy Resources which is posted on the FS website.
  - There are no graduate courses to review at this time.
- Faculty Handbook Sections Review:
  - The new draft of the FS Bylaws is on the web for review. The old version is also posted for comparison.
  - Appointment and Employment of Faculty will be discussed at next week's senate meeting.
- Honorary Doctorate – Bridget Kevane
  - As chair of the Honorary Degree committee, Kevane emphasized the importance of the honorary doctorate.
  - The new deadline for submitting candidates is November 17, 2014.
  - Faculty are encouraged to speak to constituents in their department about candidates for the degree, and Kevane will gladly speak to anyone who would like more information.

12 Update MSU Working Groups – President Cruzado

- MSU is the largest university in the state of Montana, and has made headlines with excellence in scholarship, research, academic endeavors in student success, etc.
- To ensure that MSU maintains its competitive edge, it adheres to the goals of the Strategic Plan (SP). MSU has placed most of its emphasis on three of the SP's goals:
  - Learning
  - Discovery
  - Engagement
- Three other goals in the SP that MSU must also focus on are:
  - Access
  - Stewardship

- Integration

Moving forward, the President proposed using these last three goals to free up resources, allowing redirection of money, time and energy to continue enhancing, strengthening learning, research and engagement at MSU. She noted that MSU has been growing, externally, and a concentrated focus should be placed on MSU's infrastructure such as classrooms and labs.

- Information Technology (IT) – MSU's IT department is highly decentralized. While Cruzado does not advocate centralizing IT in its entirety, she does advocate addressing needs for teaching and research by pulling resources together to make IT more functional.
- Student Scholarships – Millions of dollars are not being accessed by students, as money is scattered throughout departments, colleges and within The Foundation. Centralizing funds would make their access easier.
- Procurement – How do we purchase materials? Cruzado is not certain what that answer is, and a working group has been formed to research short and long-term solutions.
- Cruzado noted that the optimal number of participants to accomplish goals in working groups, and as advocated by management research, is no more than seven. Other working groups have larger memberships as they were already formed prior to formation of the other groups; they also have different missions within the constellation of the other groups (the Faculty Handbook working group, e.g.).
- Launching the groups at the same time provides a sense of vibrancy, community and encourages discussions among employees on campus. We should be asking, "What are the things we are doing right? How can we improve and how do we get there?" Groups have been asked to convene without preconceived ideas of what the outcomes will be. Consultation among faculty, staff, students, and administration is as important as the outcomes.
- Discussions ensued:
  - *How are the working group memberships determined?* A concentric circle concept is used to accommodate all strata of the campus community. If anyone is interested in membership, they should contact the lead about their desire to do so.
  - Cruzado recalled that about two years ago, senate expressed a desire to have more participation in administrative decisions. The current process, involving all campus constituents, is more desirable because it includes the entire campus community.
  - Cruzado referenced recent published articles in the Chronicle of Higher Ed where other institutions engaged in similar processes have hired outside consulting firms. Cruzado believes conversations and outcomes will be richer with MSU participants.
  - *What is talent management?* Anything and everything related to the positions (employee) needed to make the university thrive – faculty lines, staff lines, etc.
  - *A senate member asked if the working groups were predisposed.* The President stated that there is no bias. Her frame of reference in forming the working groups is how MSU sustains excellence, understanding that infinite growth is impossible. She believes additional resources are to be found internally. She noted that MSU's current structure might be the structure we need, but does not know the definitive answer. She will be looking to the working groups for answers. She believes working group progress will happen in stages and she will consult with the committees on how to reach their goals.
  - *Is there a timeline for the working groups to accomplish their goals?* The President will ask the groups, after their initial meeting, when they foresee implementation of their discoveries. She does not, however, want the groups to continue on ad infinitum.
  - *Are there guidelines for budget restrictions for proposed restructuring or some of the new ideas that might come out of the working groups? Do the working groups need to be budget neutral, budget salient?* The President iterated the goals as stated on the handout (1. Free up resources currently tied to administrative duties and reallocate them to the Learning, Discovery and Engagement goals of the strategic plan. 2. Better coordinate functions across departmental lines and diminish the duplication of efforts. 3. Examine economies of scale to

enhance administrative efficiency and effectiveness) and noted that there is one working group specific to the budget process. They will be examining the following:

- Finding a mechanism for each department to internally assess what is needed to budget for the new fiscal year. The nebulous budgeting process and revenue assigned to each department/entity have been implemented for decades. Historically, budgeting has consisted of keeping the same budget and adding to it, annually. This is a restrictive process and its resolution will empower the university.
- Updating a process whereby the Board of Regents, instead of discussing the budget in September, are discussing the budget in March or April and before it is implemented.
- How departments/colleges may align their budget requests in concert with the implementation of the Strategic Plan and which will involve input from many sources.

Leist noted that the current budgeting process has been frustrating. Since the problem is so obvious, it is hopeful that implementation of a new process will be incremental, at first, and then more immediate as a process evolves.

- *How will the information flow from these working groups, who will make final decision on their recommendations and what happens after the working groups have completed their function?* Although a definitive process is not yet known, the President stated that she is placing her trust in the groups' expertise and believes they will be making policy and recommendations to the Provost and President without restraints. The groups will examine the areas that work well on campus and those that do not. The 12 groups are not exhaustive, and their formation is a beginning for innovation and improvement; it will empower the campus community and strengthen the academic core. Background activities such as purchasing, IT are seldom discussed yet it is important that we provide synergy of all the different groups as it will help identify opportunities in academics and research.
- *A senator stated that the ideas presented and vetted by the working groups to organizations (FS, UC) is important especially if there are significant changes.* President Cruzado believes presenting in small groups (3 or 4 at a time) is manageable.
- Babbitt concluded that he, Chair Reidy and the President were working on how to implement a feedback loop for the working groups.

#### NAIC Parking Committee – Tim McDermott

A general discussion about the garage ensued.

- The NAIC Parking Committee is in favor of moving forward with the parking garage, the only caveat being how to finance it.
- McDermott iterated that the garage will provide 625 spaces, negating 400 spaces with the garage footprint, giving an approximate net gain of 220 new parking spaces.
  - A senator recalled that for the 6,000 parking spaces available, 9,000 permits are sold – an overage of 30%. The parking garage is a large financial commitment for a small gain of 225 spaces.
  - McDermott asked senators to consider the parking garage, with parking spaces costing \$20,000 per space. Would you rather pay \$2,000 per parking space with flat asphalt lot?
  - It would be helpful if the state financed half of the garage.
  - Campuses half our size are also building vertical lots and fees are increasing to \$1,000 per year per space. MSU has experienced nominal parking fee raises. Six million dollar donations for half the cost of the garage is one way to look at the financing.
- The only alternative is creating a horizontal parking lot with the same amount of spaces far away from the heart of campus, near the stadium. Do we want to expand MSU's footprint and move away from campus, or do we want to be more centralized?
- A senator noted that the difference between parking in an SB and F lot, is \$10 per month and not enough for him to endorse the parking garage. He remarked that if parking in the F lot was \$30-\$40

less a month, many might park there. Is it feasible to consider paving the tailgate lot near the stadium for cheap parking so that people would not mind parking there, thereby freeing up spaces closer to campus? He also noted that paying people \$20,000 per year (the same amount that a space would cost in the parking garage) would provide an incentive for employees to never park on campus again.

- Currently, financing is to be \$6M in donations, and if other entities are referenced in association with the garage such as retail space, enhanced facilities for bicycle users, donors may be more inclined to contribute.
  - Bozeman residents might be in favor of the bicycle facilities, but residents of Belgrade would not find it useful – they would still commute to campus.
  - Conversely, why not construct academic facilities in the proposed parking garage space for lectures, teaching, and research facilities.
    - McDermott noted that there should be some type of convenient parking near the heart of campus to accommodate MSU-sponsored programs and private/public functions that utilize the SUB facilities.
- Placing the garage where Facilities is currently located is not possible, as Facilities would have to move somewhere. Also discussed was the area between 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> avenues which is still an option.
- Financing for the parking garage would be distributed across campus where an R5 parking permit would increase by \$49 per year; a \$12 increase would be implemented for all other parking categories over two years, making a total increase of \$24. To sustain parking, athletic events, concerts, rodeo also contribute. For the new parking garage, Athletics has committed \$50K; Events has committed \$12.5K.
  - Organic Excel spreadsheets are available for manipulation on the FS web site under the heading “Parking Garage.”
- Other factors to consider about the parking garage:
  - The life span of a parking garage is at least fifty years (or longer) with maintenance. It is believed that they are self-sustaining.
  - Comparisons show that similar state properties in Montana provide free parking, as in the case of Helena, and paid parking at MSU-Bozeman.
  - Visual features of such a structure are not esthetically pleasing.
  - The cheaper construction option, a flat, horizontal parking lot near the stadium, might impact athletics events.
  - Repair & Maintenance per year has been estimated to be approximately \$25,000.
  - Vertical construction preserves the campus for future growth.
  - Maintains focus on events transpiring in the heart of the campus and those events would contribute to the cost of the parking garage.
  - Would provide 110-225 new parking places.

As there was no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:00 pm.

*Signature,*  
*Michael Reidy, Chair*

*Signature*  
*Randy Babbitt, Chair-elect*