

FACULTY SENATE
October 21, 2009
President's Conference Room, Montana Hall
4:10 PM – 5:00 PM
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY-BOZEMAN, MONTANA
Minutes

Members Present: Bangert, Eiger, Eitle, Fischer, Gerlach, Kaiser, Lansverk, Lawrence, Livingston, Lynch, Meade, Neumeier, Savoie, Schachman, Osborne, Thompson, Versaavel, Wojtowicz, Zhu

Members Absent: Bessen, Chen, Cherry, Fields, Fleck, Frick, Gee, Jacobsen, Locke, Mokwa, Mosley, Political Science, Rotella, Sobek, Sowell, Waller, D. Weaver, Wisner

Others Present: Shannon Taylor, Tim Dunnagan, David Singel, Tom Hughes, Betsy Palmer

Chair-elect Lynch called the meeting to order at 4:10 PM. A quorum was present.

Announcements –Chair-elect Lansverk

- Regents Workgroup – Faculty are on the agenda for the BoR Workgroup discussions in Helena, October 22, 2009. Chair Lynch and Chair-elect Lansverk will attend the meeting. Please go to the link Chair Lynch provided, as Workgroup discussions and subsequent decisions will have an impact on faculty.
- Chair-elect Lansverk is reviewing revisions of the most recent P&T document. Chair Lynch will send out before next week's meeting for FS review, and would like two of the three sections to be approved.
- Expedited, special tenure review process (for the most recent 7-8 individuals hired) is now on-hold. Interim Provost Fedock will provide another iteration of his proposal. So far, FS members' general comments are not in favor of an instantaneous process.
- Chair Lynch congratulated FS member Sandy Osborne on her recent election as president of the AFMSU union.

EHHD Administrative Reorganization – Sandy Osborne

- EHHD restructuring relates to cost savings discussions with the BoR; base cuts, cost of department head searches, etc.
- Faculty of EHHD had an opportunity to review and define their new structure. The final outcome produced a restructuring of administration.
 - Currently there is a dean, associate dean and two department heads. Under restructuring there will be four clusters, each with a chair. The move is to have department heads (2) become associate deans and the four chairs would serving underneath them. The chairs would be released, half-time, and would receive a stipend and would have fiscal implications that would save money.
- Member Osborne stated that FS's role would be an advocate in the decision-making process, as there are restructuring concerns of faculty.
 - The standing committee that examines new majors/minors/new programs is the Academic Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate and upon receiving a written document from EHHD; it would review the new structure as it relates to faculty and courses.
- A tentative timeline for the restructure would be to identify chairs in January and they would begin their role in July. Release time would be a class a semester and a stipend. They would still be in a "faculty" role. Questions: Will they conduct reviews? Are they "administrators, or not?" What would happen to P&T within the new structure?
- Education – The reorganization has potential implications for those teaching in the K12 education program:
 - In the middle of accreditation
 - One of the four clusters would, most likely, take up the K12 program and the coordination of this program is almost incomprehensible.
 - Does the move from having a department status to a non-department status have implications?
- Chair Lynch directed FS members who have comments about the new restructuring to email lansverk@english.montana.edu

F&A Redistribution Plan: Revised Proposal from VPR, Tom McCoy

- Recap – Tom McCoy spoke to FS on 9/23 about what his intentions with distribution of F&A; chair Lynch subsequently requested a written plan; presented Dr. McCoy's plan to the Faculty Senate Steering Committee on 10/13, at which point Pres Gamble was requested to slow the redistribution process and allow FS to comment; subsequently, Chair Lynch received a memo dated 10/14, which was supposedly the written version of what Dr. McCoy talked about at Faculty Senate on 9/23, and it was assumed it would be the plan that would be instituted

after a two week delay. On 10/16, Chair Lynch received a revision to the 10/14 document. There are differences in the two documents. After today's FS meeting, Chair Lynch would like to present to Cathy Conover (Chair of VPR Faculty Advisory Committee) and Tom McCoy FS's comments.

- Tom Hughes – I am a department head of Cell Biology & Neuroscience and I'm on Tom McCoy's Advisory Committee, so I've seen lots of versions of this. I have never seen this [10/16] version. The first sentence gets me excited. The second clause of the first sentence gets me really excited. It's a new clause which says, "The F&A Investment Committee (FAIC) will annually identify the central investments which should be made with recovered F&A funds..." that was their original intention. Here comes the second clause, "...and the procedure for the distribution of the balance of funds." So, the way this sentence reads, every year we're going to have the FAIC committee decide, a new, how to distribute the IDC funds. And that language just appeared, and it is a disaster.
- Wes Lynch - Explain why that would be a big problem
- Tom Hughes - I run a research department and I try to keep it going and they took funds off last fall and I didn't know when they were going to come back on. Then they came on and they come on in a trickle. Then they went off in June, supposedly for a month. They still haven't come on. I am in the red. The admin won't let me buy a, a, nickel off of my account. We're bringing in IDC's. And I don't know whether we should hire people, fire people or I should be getting on an air plane and look for a new job. So, we need a consistent pattern for IDC distribution, whatever it is, that the department heads can plan on.
- Wes Lynch – So, it is the inconsistency?
- Tom Hughes – Absolutely.
- Shannon Taylor – I've heard VP McCoy articulate that same concern two or three times, now, when he makes this presentation. And I think later on, in his paragraph where he is giving the demonstration about how they are going to pull out money for commitments and then redistribute and try to keep consistency. The rest of it, I think, reflects that. But you're point is very well taken. That is not what is says now in that first sentence.
- Tom Hughes - Some of the logic in the Advisory Committee for why he is readjusting that was that at that time there was no checks and balances at the FIAC committee to not put more fixed costs in Tom's budget. With this new thing there is no checks and balances. So, I see this as very dangerous.
- Shannon Taylor – I am just kind of echoing and agreeing with you. He says he wants to bring consistency to the process. His demonstration of his calculations in the rest of this memo demonstrate that he is trying to keep a process that you can count on; you're going to know how much you're going to get, and he used the example of chopping it into 10 months but what he writes there is that it can be renegotiated annually. Wes, are you going to get feedback to give back to Tom?
- Wes Lynch – Yes. At least send it to him.
- David Singel – Even if what the FAIC does this year is a subtle adjustment of the numbers, what we have already discovered is that it will take months for that to reach closure. Someone in my office is asking how much can they spend on graduate programs, and I have no idea. In other words, we really need to have these numbers July 1st, settled. Not half way through the fiscal year. Ridiculous.
- Dana Longcope - I've been flying blind for a whole year. Blind!
- Wes Lynch – My understanding at our last meeting was that as soon as this is settled, then 4 months distribution would be sent to the departments. So that you would be caught up: Back in the black, or close to it,
- Robin Gerlach – On the segment of what Tom said, it doesn't only go for departments; this also goes for a lot of PIs that operate facilities that actually support themselves through the IDCs: cryogenic gases, repairs, maintenance contracts that we can't necessarily pay from, from grants. Is we, as PI's, don't have any idea what's coming back, we can't make ... we can't even run our instruments.
- Wes Lynch - So, there is no specification in here of what would go to PIs. In fact, in this most recent version, is there any specification of what would go to the departments? No. Although departments are mentioned in the calculation, the departments themselves are not mentioned in terms of the percentage return.
- It says the deans and dept heads are responsible for the distribution to the PI.
- Wes Lynch - In the previous document it says 25% to the deans and 25% to the department heads.
 - Dana Longcope - In both documents the idea of returns to directly to PIs are eliminated.
- Wes Lynch - When we heard this speech before we got the written document, it was the understanding of some of us, and I think John (Neumeier) made this point, that his understanding was that there would be 75% redistribution to colleges and departments; with 50% going to departments and 25% going to colleges. So, I don't know if that was ever absolutely true. I asked gale to listen to the actual transcript and it was confusing. It wasn't actually clear.
- John Neumeier – But I think he responded to a question of mine and when I read through the transcript that Gale sent, it was clear that the numbers I written down were correct.
- David Singel – I asked Tom about that, and the reason that changed is that is was related to these additional fixed costs that are not considered under fixed costs namely the 100,00 to support the block grants and the 420,000 for prior institutional commitments for INBRE and COBRE.
- Wes Lynch - Those are included in fixed costs.

- David Singel – In the October 16th document, they are not included as fixed costs; they are additional costs that are fixed, at least for the time being. So they were handled separately. And that is what is connected to that switching of department and central retention of the 25% and that is my understanding of the conversation with Tom.
- Wes Lynch - Has anybody done the calculation to find out if 1.8M is in fact 50% of the differential of the fixed costs and actual income?
- FS Member - We're never going to know ahead of time what Tom does.
- Wes Lynch – Yes, but based on his \$16M total F&A, I just can't do it in my head here. I'm a psychology, whether this 1.8 represents the 50% differential that is supposed to be coming back to the colleges.
- Robin Gerlach – It is \$2.36M and \$1.84M that would come back, so that is more than 50%. I guess from the 10/14 version, the VPR is actually refrained from taking another 50% from the \$2.36M and that is a step forward for departments and colleges. But we still need a formula and some long-term prospective that allows us to budget.
- David Singel - When they make the payments, there will be a formula. But it would be very nice to see it now, in a spreadsheet.
- FS Member - When was it decided that the PIs would be zeroed out?
- Wes Lynch - I think that what was decided was that the PIs will go to their heads for their distribution. But I don't know the answer to that. And that is a problem.
- John Neumeier – The way these numbers work out is more than 75% is coming back to the deans and departments? It's a little bit more than what he told us when he visited us the first time the 23rd of September. It's a little bit larger.
- Robin Gerlach - Our faculty is wondering what incentive is there to actually to keep the annual cost the VPR has at the current level or even lower. There is no incentive. He just skims off whatever he needs from the top and he gives us whatever is left over if there is any.
- Sandy Osborne (reading from a quote from one of her faculty) – It's generally a pretty crappy deal for the people doing research but everyone seems to know that already.
- Wes Lynch – It's not a crappy deal for everybody doing research. Because the money is in fact going into research activities. It's just not going by the way of the individuals who generated the money. Tom is spending the money on things related to research but I think the question is who is benefitting from that if the money is not coming directly back to the researcher. Some people might argue it's not all going to research.
- FS Member - Could I revise this? It was said that there is no incentive for Tom to keep fixed costs from going up. The fixed costs are actually decided by the FAIC committee and there is no incentive for THEM to not put more on, and they are central admin and are not researchers.
- Steve Eiger - The other thing I would like to add is, and there are probably economists in this room, that if the university wants research to be done, then one makes incentive to have that done. There's this free-market aspect.
- David Singel – I just wanted to check back on John's point. That is, notwithstanding the language of October 14: 25% dean. That is different than the previous language which says 50% goes back to the dean. Of the \$2.36M that total amount that is coming back \$1.84M is about 75% and so it is consistent with the original fit, 25% to the deans. The whole idea of the PIs coming back to the department heads for the money is easy when the dept heads are getting 50%; impossible when the dept heads are getting 25%. And so, I'm not really sure what is going on here.
- John Neumeier - The main thing to get across is that departments have real costs; electronic techs, machinists, and we need to be able to cover those costs in order to do business and research. We need to be able to plan accordingly. I think it makes sense to give departments control over that money because then they are able to make decisions for hiring, compensation at that level where it should be. It appears to me that trying to increase control over the funds and our research domains.
- FS Member - I actually would feel more comfortable of the VPR had control over the IDC string. Instead it's Craig Roloff, Cathy Conover, Jim Rimpau; that's the FAIC committee. And this language says THEIR control, not Tom which is a concern.
- John Neumeier - And maybe that's why some of the money is being used in ways Tom is not happy about.
- David Singel – I think this was one of the recommendations of the accreditation committee that there has to be a better quality communications between VPR and administration. Tom McCoy doesn't have any authority to go over Craig Roloff but if Roloff says 4%, then that is one of the things that is immediately taken out. I don't know how this works with IT, for example for support and indirect costs. I would like to see much greater transparency at the very least at that point. What are the demands being put on the money being generated by research are they consistent with state guidelines and the use of IDC which, are historically, been used for growth of research enterprises.
- Chair Lynch will try to get clarification on the present document. Additional comments should be sent to chair Lynch. At which time, he will compile and send to Cathy Conover and Tom McCoy before the November 1st deadline.

The Faculty Senate meeting ended at 5:00 PM, as there was no further business.

Signature

Wes Lynch, Chair

Signature

Gale R. Gough, Secretary