

FACULTY COUNCIL
MARCH 8, 2006
STRAND UNION ROOM 276
4:10 AM – 5:00 PM
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY-BOZEMAN, MONTANA
Minutes

Members Present: Amin, Ashley, Becker, Catoira, Cherry, Dyer, Halonen, Jones, Levy, Lynes-Hayes, Marlow, C. McClure, M. McClure, Neeley, Prawdzienski, Scott, Seymour, Stringam, Taper, Taylor, Watson for Metz, D. Weaver, Zhu

Members Absent: Bailey, Bennett, Bradley, Brown, Christopher, Croy, Erickson, Idzerda, Jackson, Johnson, Larkin, Pratt, Psychology, Ryker, E. Schmidt, Stroup

Others: Bush, Dooley, Fedock, Lansverk, McCoy

Chair Shannon Taylor called the meeting to order at 4:10 PM. A quorum was present. The minutes from March 1, 2006 were approved.

FAMILY LEAVE – Chair Taylor

- The Women's Family Caucus believes that family leave is a gender neutral issue and should embrace all family members.

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW – Chair Taylor

- Chair Taylor asked FC members to share with their constituents that the Administrative Reviews are not being conducted this year. A new policy will be ready by fall 2006.

ANNOUNCEMENTS – Tom McCoy

- Faculty Council was instrumental in getting three new categories for research institutions with respect to the Carnegie classification. The new categories are:
 - Research institution – very high research activity
 - Research institution – high research activity
 - Doctoral/Research institution
- MSU is in the top category tier, the same as the top 94 institutions across the country which include MIT and Harvard.

WHO IS ELIGIBLE TO BE A PRINCIPLE INVESTIGATOR? – Tom McCoy

- MSU should have a policy in place identifying eligibility of a Principle Investigator (hereinafter referred to as "PI"). Eligibility of a PI is a fraction of the concerns, as the issue has many facets. Anyone on Faculty Council (i.e., tenured) may be a PI, for example, but MSU has a large and growing number of research faculty who are non-tenured, and carry titles of assistant, associate or research professor who are PI's. We also have research scientists and some contract professionals who are directors of large institutes. There are also concerns related to faculty affiliates, and we need to have clearly articulated policy that states if you are a faculty affiliate, you may not serve as a PI. Why? MSU needs to be effective relative to managing PI's. For example, a faculty affiliate is a non-paid affiliated person with the university. There is a misconception that a faculty affiliate may submit proposals to a grant agency, and should they become eligible, MSU should manage their grant. If a faculty affiliate does not submit a final report on, e.g., an NIH grant, MSU could receive a letter from the NIH stating that we would no longer be eligible for another grant. However, if a faculty member was in this same scenario, the Provost would be able to get their dean or department head involved, and MSU would maintain its credibility.
- Corky Bush remarked that the DRAFT Faculty Handbook Section 900.00 Project Management presented 15 years ago, focused on the PI and this might have been where the idea of a post doc becoming a PI came from. The paradigm of analysis when this was first put together was that a department would treat a promotion from a post doc (or research scientist, etc.) with the same level of concern and gravity they did for tenured rank; it was meant to echo the tenurable ranks without

requiring the teaching responsibilities to those researchers. The only thing that is really new from years ago is the idea of being a PI or not being a PI which requires a different cache and meaning. Offering people the ability to be an assistant research professor or to get promoted to associate research professor has now been allowed to be facilitated without a review or thought of regulation. There is no uniformity within departments.

- Students and post docs may not be PI's. NSF fellowships, however, are granted to students directly and in those cases there are no problems.
- There is an assumption that emeritus faculty cannot be a PI. The current policy does not state, clearly, whether this category of faculty may serve or not. The language of 352.00 MSU-Bozeman Policy only says "may act as a fiscal agent." Dr. McCoy is hoping that FA will clearly define this and make a policy.
- There are large discrepancies from department to department as to what "research faculty" titles mean, what responsibilities they have in the areas of teaching, research and service. Currently, in the Faculty Handbook, they are not well defined and these faculty do not know how they may advance. We have a number of departments that do not take into account what is already in the FH; that in order for these people to advance, the departments must have policy and procedure and many do not. Dr. McCoy would like Faculty Affairs/Faculty Council's help in establishing these procedures. It was noted that the Physics Department has very well established policies which are distributed with each new hire.
- A FC member suggested that post docs have a baseline salary even though they are on grant money. Sometimes grants only pay them \$12,000 a year. NIH, however, has new guidelines as to what post docs should receive, and it is something they can live on. Policy should be in place, but not necessarily what the pay should be. We need to mandate at least that minimum.
- Chair Taylor queried if FC should be the sounding board for adjuncts, research faculty, post docs, and they have no formal representation. FC may want to discuss this at a future meeting.
- Member M. McClure believes research faculty are covered under FC, and have caucuses. Post docs, however, are not represented by Council. There were some research faculty who worked with FC and called their group the Research Faculty Alliance. They reported back and brought issues to FC. It is believed this alliance has disbanded.
- The Faculty Handbook states that the difference between a research scientist and an assistant, associate or research professor is that the latter have Ph.D's; the former have a Masters, certification, but do not have a Ph.D.
- The distinction between post docs and assist research professor is that a post doc is a subordinate on someone else's grant. On the Bozeman campus, a post doc may submit a grant proposal. If the grant is funded, they may be elevated to an assistant research professor. Discussions ensued:
 - A FC member stated that if you do not let post docs advance then, you are perpetuating an indentured servitude position. Some post docs make significant material contributions to grants and enhance their mentor's work.
 - If a post doc is on someone's grant and faculty want them to be a peer, let them be independent by being an assistant research professor. Do you want a post doc who is a co-PI on a grant getting part of the money and letting them take it with them? Or do you want the post doc research to continue to be done at MSU?
 - It is a difficult situation when post docs are applying for PI status and then somehow automatically being moved to research assistant professor when we do not even have the space for the tenure track faculty on this campus. We are making commitments of space and time to people who are not tenure track. In the UC system, a non-tenure track faculty person I could not have their own space. They are under the wing of a tenured faculty member, and occupy space within their group. By keeping post docs at MSU in these glorified post docs positions, it does not encourage them to be nationally competitive.
 - A post doc is here to be mentored and I hope they would establish a lab that would be a strong collaborator with my lab and we would enhance each others' research. Not as a PI, however.
 - If you make a post doc on your project a program leader, that is your responsibility. However, their transition to an Assistant Research Professor status involves the whole department and at some level that becomes a considerable burden.
 - What to do about PI and Co-PI status when both parties are somewhat equal? Provost Dooley stated that it must be worked out between the two parties. The granting party does not care who it is; they just want to make sure all criteria are met.

- Provost Dooley stated that if you have talented people in your department that you believe have the kind of ability to rise to PI status, then write that into your policies and procedures, include how they are to be evaluated and what they have to demonstrate in order to achieve that status. Then they can achieve that status within the department and write grants; they have earned that right. From a federal accountability standpoint, it is very clear and you do not have to argue whether this an independent investigator or a surrogate for an ambitious principle investigator who wants to expand their empire by having post docs writing their proposals. What is the growth path of post docs? We can arrive at this via better definitions. We have to be careful that external grant agencies are not deciding for us post doc eligibility. Some grants agencies will write their Co-PI's criteria. If MSU assigns a post doc on it, the agency will seek this out and discard it. We need to decide whether we want our own policy or have an external entity decide.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 PM, as there was no other business.

Signature

Shannon Taylor, Chair

Signature

Gale R. Gough, Secretary