

FACULTY SENATE
September 21, 2011
LEO JOHNSON 346
4:10 PM – 5:00 PM
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY-BOZEMAN, MONTANA
Minutes

Members Present: Biber (Music), Burrows (PSPP - Extension), Caton (Business), Donahue (Library), Dougher (PSPP), Engel (LRES), Greenwood (Math), Hendrikx (Earth Sciences), Herbeck (Ed), Hostetler (Gallatin College), Hutchison (Psych), Kaiser (EE), Lansverk (English), Letiecq (HHD), Martin (Mod Lang), Mokwa (CE), Moreaux for Olson (ARNR), Neumeier (Physics), Newhouse (Art), O'Neill (Architecture), Ricciardelli (Film & Photo), Schachman (Nursing), Zhu (CS)

Others Present: Larry Carucci, Peter Fields, Camie Bechtold, George Haynes, Ritchie Boyd, Victoria Drummond, David Singel,

Chair of Faculty Affairs, Larry Carucci, called the meeting to order at 4:10 PM. A quorum was present.

Announcements – Larry Carucci

- Please take the Tobacco Free Campus Policy Survey.

MSU Athletics Report – Peter Fields, Camie Bechtold, George Haynes

Former Athletics Committee Chair and current Faculty Athletic Rep, George Haynes, presented, for the first time, the athletics annual report to FS. The data collected was from five categories: student well-being, academics, gender equity, finance and compliance. The first portion of the survey polled those athletes having no more eligibility, and in the category of student well being, the five (5) subgroups of strength & conditioning, sports medicine, academic services, coaching and administration were all within 90% satisfaction for both men and women athletes. Time demands were also chronicled and athletes in different sports varied between 0-24 hours out-of-season athletic participation versus 15-30 hours in-season athletic participation. The eligible athlete survey for student wellbeing was taken from 167 participating students. First, and to find out who is actually participating, data for the percentage of time athletes spend participating in their particular sport and data of athlete representation by college/gender/ethnic group was gathered. The overall academic experience broken out into subgroups: overall quality of your academic experience, overall experience in your major area of study, quality of support from the instructors in your classes, quality of support from academic services, and coaches support of your academic success. Men and women were satisfied in all sub groupings and their responses ranged 80-90%, with women consistently more satisfied with the exception of the quality of support from academic services staff. Minority satisfaction ranged from 72-90%. Athletic experience was rated according to sub groupings: Overall quality of your athletic experience, quality of care received by coaching staff, coaches' support of your personal development beyond athletics, overall quality of administrative staff, and MSU's commitment to a safe and inclusive environment for student-athletes. Overall quality of the experience ranged from 80-89%. Women are more satisfied in the sub groupings of overall quality of administrative staff and MSU's commitment to a safe and inclusive environment for student-athletes. They were a bit lower in the other categories of overall quality of your athletic experience, quality of care received by coaching staff, coaches' support of your personal development beyond athletics. Minority students show a little lower quality of experience in all sub groupings except MSU's commitment to a safe and inclusive environment for student-athletes.

The Academic Subcommittee, geared to finding if there is a high level of satisfaction with the academic approaches, support and resources among student-athletes, showed that grade checks were more of a concern by the men athletes than women athletes. Minority students were more concerned than non-minority students about scheduling of courses around their sport. Recommendations from this committee were: Discover why minority students are not satisfied with grade checks and scheduling issues; work with student-athletes, faculty, and departments to address general scheduling issues; work

with student athletes, faculty and departments to minimize the effect of traveling on course work and grades.

The Gender Equity Committee, discovering if the Department of Athletics is sincere and mostly effective in its desire to achieve gender equity, found that issues and concerns included scholarship support for women, recruiting expenditures and what the impact of fundraising clubs are. This was reviewed by the president's office and Diane Letendre has been recruited as a member of the committee to address gender equity issues.

The Finance Committee monitors financial audits. Currently, there are no issues or concerns. One recommendation was that the University Athletics Committee may want to be more involved in the NCAA audit, which occurs in October 2011.

The Compliance Committee showed that MSU had 12 violations in 2010/2011, which were all secondary in nature. There are no issues or concerns.

Camie Bechtold discussed how the Athletics Department is resolving the compliance violations. There are criteria for the academic progress rate, a measurement of how each student does with their scholarship each semester and how they compare to peer institutions. She discussed how many credits student-athletes must take, when they must declare a major, and whether they have the allotted number of credits going towards that major. Other benchmarks of when specific numbers of credits must be achieved towards their major were also discussed. Student success rates are measured against federal rates, institutional rates and student-athletes rates.

Peter Fields described how the football and basketball teams have risen in conference standings in comparisons with peer institutions on a four year average. Fitting the student with the institution is the over arching success metric. Scholastic excellence is emphasized as being the most important reason student-athletes are at MSU. The average team GPA in the spring 2011 was 3.26; sixty-three percent of the athletes have a 3.0 GPA or better. The overall student-athletic GPA's are higher than the non student-athletic population. There is a mentoring program that provides student-athletes with support or an outlet where they may speak to someone outside of the Athletic Department. This mentoring also helps student-athletes to understand that they are a part of and connected to the larger university community.

Processes and Upcoming Meetings in the Classroom Remodeling – Ritchie Boyd

The UFPB Classroom Committee, which Walt Banziger and Ritchie Boyd co-chair, is tasked with, among other things, making recommendations to the administration regarding which campus classrooms and lecture halls should be most urgently considered for renovation.

Last year, for example, based on the recommendations of the committee and with considerable input from faculty, \$360k was spent on the renovation of AJM 222 and 224, Wilson 1-131, and Roberts 307. The committee has also been centrally involved in creating a Classroom Design Guidelines document, which is currently being reviewed by UFPB and available for review by the greater campus community. Input from Faculty Senate on these related efforts is welcomed and the draft Campus Classroom Guidelines may be viewed at this link:

<http://www.facilities.montana.edu/pdc/planning/files/MSUClassroomDesignGuidelines.pdf>. Boyd asked Faculty Senate to review the document and provide comment to Lindsey Klino at lklin@Montana.edu by October 7, 2011. The Classroom Committee will then evaluate the comments along with those received from ASMSU, Professional Council, and Staff Senate for incorporation into the final draft document. The final document will then be reviewed and forwarded to President Cruzado for approval as the official MSU campus Classroom Design Guidelines.

Related to the classroom renovation effort, the committee is also in the process of expanding the current prioritized short list of registrar classrooms to recommend for renovation, should additional funding be made available in the future. As part of this process, the committee is soliciting input from a variety of campus constituencies, including ASMSU, faculty senate, campus deans, and staff. The essential question is: Are there campus lecture halls or classrooms that you believe should be prioritized for renovation and updating, due to general wear and tear, limited functionality, lack of technology, or all of these elements in some combination?

The classroom committee currently has three faculty representatives, Abigail Richards, David Parker, and David Eitle who actively represent Faculty Senate. In addition to these standing representatives, we would like to invite guest faculty members from Faculty Senate to participate in the discussion and prioritization process. The meeting is scheduled for the Wednesday, October 5, at 9:00am in the Facilities Planning Quonset. Faculty who have concerns (handicap access, equipment availability in classrooms, e.g.) are encouraged to attend.

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

Signature

Marvin Lansverk, Chair

Signature

Gale R. Gough, Secretary