

FACULTY COUNCIL
December 6, 2006
SUB 275
4:10 AM – 5:00 PM
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY-BOZEMAN, MONTANA
Minutes

Members Present: Ashley, Becker, Catoira, Cherry, Christopher, Croy, Dyer, Gipp, Jones, Lynch, Larkin, Lei, Livingston, Marshall for D. Weaver, M. McClure, Neeley, Prawdzienski, Scott, Seymour, Taylor, Watson, Yoo for Zhu

Members Absent: Ag Ed/AOT, Amin, Bailey, Chem/Bio Chem, Erickson, Idzerda, Jacobs, Johnson, Levy, Nursing On Campus, Stroup

Others Present: Fedock, Lansverk

Chair Taylor called the meeting to order at 4:10 PM. A quorum was present. The minutes from November 15, 2006 were unanimously approved.

Announcements –Chair Shannon Taylor, Vice Chair Jones

- The Committee on Service is a standing committee and needs two tenured faculty (one as a member and one as an alternate) elected by faculty to serve. There are three faculty members on the committee; one faculty member is appointed by the Commissioner, one by the President and one nominated by faculty. The Committee meets in response to two circumstances: an unfavorable outcome of a post-tenure review or proceedings to dismiss for cause, absent a post-tenure review proceeding.
 - Gale will email volunteers' names to all Faculty Council members for a vote December 7, 2006, and will have responses back by Wednesday, December 13, 2006 at 5:00 PM. A motion was made to have the process move forward in this manner→seconded→all in favor→passed.
- The Academic Affairs Committee needs two faculty members. The purpose of the committee is to provide Faculty Council oversight for programs that go forward to the BOR for approval. The committee meets when it is needed and reviews proposal details, uses that information to interpret how it will fit into the university collectively, and conducts a question and answer session with the PI's. There are two undergraduate minors ready to be reviewed. One is a Latin America Studies joint program with Modern Languages and History and Philosophy. The other is the minor in Bioengineering through Chemical and Biological Engineering. There is a vacancy on the committee from the ranks of Faculty Council and one member at large.
 - Steve Cherry volunteered as the Faculty Council member. Motion to accept Steve Cherry→seconded→all in favor→passed. The member at large will be identified at a later date.
- Administrative Review – Faculty were encouraged to contact Wes Lynch with any questions or concerns, and they did. A motion was made that the Administrative Review be carried forward as is and with additional FC input to the next step (placing it on the web)→seconded→all in favor→passed.

P&T Implementation Committee (P&TIC) Discussion – Chair Shannon Taylor

- As a recap of what has transpired so far with respect to the P&TIC: The P&T Task Force was formed and provided input on the P&T process→Faculty Council discussed all points from the P&T Task Force in three meetings and formulated recommendations on specific points →FC Steering Committee discussed that the P&TIC's duties should be guided by those documents created by the P&T Task Force and input from Faculty Council→P&TIC is moving forward in a capacity that is not clear.
- A Faculty Council member stated that they believe issues agreed upon by the P&T Task Force and reviewed and agreed upon by Faculty Council should not be reopened for discussion by the P&TIC.
- The moving target was discussed again in Faculty Council Steering Committee. Does the faculty member get to choose which document they come up under; the one in place when they were reviewed during retention, or a new document the department approved since their time of retention to the time of tenure? Faculty Council's recommendation to the P&TIC was that the faculty member would choose which document they would like to be reviewed under. The Provost's office would like faculty

to go up for tenure with the most recent document, no matter which document they were under during their retention. FC is awaiting the P&TIC's recommendation.

- FC also recommended service being weighed more heavily.
- Who will look at new roles and scope coming from departments?
- A FC member asked what the process was for implementing FC discussed issues that they wanted modified in the P&T Task Force document. If FC makes recommendations to the P&TIC, what happens next? If P&TIC agrees or disagrees, does the issue come back to FC for another vote? And then what? At what point does FC's position represent a final position on any given issue? Joe Fedock acknowledged that there was a process issue. Procedurally, some of the issues would be implemented via the Faculty Handbook. A question was posed by a FC member that asked whether tenure is faculty-controlled or administratively-controlled.
- Vice Chair Jones noted that Provost Dooley is guided by the role and scope from each department that is, presumably, crafted by faculty. It is hopeful that faculty provides enough quality information to him so that he may make an informed decision about dossiers.
 - Frequently, when a dossier is returned to the department it is because of deficiencies in the role and scope statements. If the faculty are not presenting a clear set of criteria in their authored role and scope document about what promotion and tenure is, the administrator is left to make the final decision about dossiers. Someone needs to critically analyze the role and scope documents. Formation of another committee, in addition to the P&TIC, was suggested by Provost Dooley last semester when this issue was first addressed.
- It was noted that some faculty may have letters addressing research when the candidate is going up for teaching.
- There have been some cases where the UPT has made recommendations to the Provost and he has noted that he does not have enough information and sends it back to UPT→back to the department, etc. It would be helpful to have a definitive answer about what the P&TIC is; Task Force II or an implementation committee?
- Joe Fedock reminded FC that the UPT committee is made up of faculty members, who have also sent dossiers back.
- Chair Taylor stated that MSU is a great institution because the present P&T process works. The P&T Task Force report noted that, for the most part, everyone across campus was satisfied with the process.
- What is the difference between an in-depth assessment and an external peer review (EPR)? Is the EPR part of the in-depth assessment (IDA)? The EPR implies research and the IDA implies teaching. It is believed that these are two separate things and should be articulated as such. This should be a task for the P&TIC to sort out.
- A FC member would like the P&TIC address the in-depth assessment of teaching report authored by Jeff Adams and others.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 PM, as there was no other business. The next Faculty Council meeting will be on January 24, 2007.

Signature
Shannon Taylor, Chair

Signature
Gale R. Gough, Secretary