

FACULTY SENATE
January 23, 2008
REID HALL 103
4:10 AM – 5:00 PM
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY-BOZEMAN, MONTANA
Minutes

Members Present: Amin, Bailey, Bandyopadhyay, Becker, Cherry, Dyer, Gerlach, Jackson, Leech, Lei, Livingston, Lynch, C. McClure, M. McClure, Mokwa, Neeley, Pinet, Prawdzienski, Taylor, D. Weaver, Wojtowicz, Zhu

Members Absent: Ag/ED/AOT, Ashley, Bangert, Bennett, Christopher, Ecology, Fleck, Gipp, Jacobs, Johnson, Longcope, Nursing On-Campus, Peed, Political Science, Watson

Others Present: Susan Dana, Dave Dooley, Joe Fedock, Marvin Lansverk

Chair Shannon Taylor called the meeting to order at 4:10 PM. A quorum was present.

FUTURE AGENDAS FOR FACULTY SENATE/UGC – Chair Shannon Taylor

- Faculty Senate - January 23, 2008 – P&T Implementation; Accreditation
- UGC - January 30, 2008 – Tom McCoy – Who May Become a PI?
- Faculty Senate - February 6, 2008 – Dooley/UAE; Emeritus
- Faculty Senate - February 13, 2008 - MEA/MFT Union
- Faculty Senate - February 20, 2008 – ONE Team: Athletic success (Mike Redburn?)
- Faculty Senate - February 27, 2008 – Dooley – 1% Provost salary holdback plan for 2008 and data from 2007
- Faculty Senate - March 5, 2008 – Resume P&T Implementation discussion from January 23, 2008.
 - NOTE: Chair Taylor and Chair-elect Lynch will be at the BOR. Chair of Faculty Affairs, Marvin Lansverk, will head the meeting discussions.

FACULTY AFFAIRS – P&T IMPLEMENTATION – Chair Marvin Lansverk

- Brief history – In 2005, Faculty Senate requested that a P&T Task Force (TF) be formed to review the university P&T policies, procedures and standards at MSU. The TF convened and produced a document addressing issues of concern. Although Faculty Senate concurred with the majority of findings, they asked that certain issues be addressed including, but not limited to: moving target; what document does one go under for tenure; service component evaluation; a more systematic, thorough evaluation of teaching on par with research evaluations. The P&T Implementation Committee was subsequently formed, at the behest of the Provost, and are currently in the process of examining the requested changes and incorporating them into the Faculty Handbook. Since the process of reviewing P&T is organic it will, most likely, continue to evolve. Therefore, current policy will be the benchmark by which a faculty member comes up under for review. Until the current policy is changed (or if it even is), current practices will be implemented so the university is not operating in a vacuum.
- Recommended practices – formed by a faculty/provost group and will spell out university expectations for teaching assessment.
- All recommendations provided are intended to be broadly applicable at the University level of implementation. Colleges and departments will need to utilize these suggested changes (if approved) in considering revisions to college/department Role and Scope documents which will provide the desired degree of specificity in criteria, standards, and procedures that are appropriate for individual disciplines.
- The three major areas covered in the current document at this meeting were:
 - Definitions, criteria, and standards associated with the terms: “*promise/potential of achieving excellence*”, “*excellence*” and “*effectiveness*”;
 - Explication of the external review process, including number and type of external reviewers, solicitation letter to reviewers; and
 - Expectations for content of external reviews; clarity in the quality and quantity of documentation associated with “*In-Depth Assessment of Teaching*”.
- Discussions ensued:
 - Even if the minimum number of letters (3) are obtained, the Provost may send back dossiers for additional external reviews if he believes there is not enough information to make a decision.
 - A FS member noted that it would be difficult for an external reviewer to have the information necessary to do an effective job of reviewing teaching.

- Faculty Senate noted that teaching in laboratory environments is not a skill that can be quantified nor qualified because the instruction is usually conducted one-on-one.
- Chair Lansverk noted that the foundation of MSU's P&T process allows a faculty member to choose which area they wish to go up under, and within the three categories of evaluation for research and teaching, there will be overlap. This overlap should not be a cause for concern and, in fact, it is expected.
- A FS member noted asymmetry in the review process for teaching and research. Someone going up for promotion on teaching would be reviewed (externally) for both research and teaching, whereas someone going up for research would only be reviewed (externally) for research. The perception is that the person going up under teaching would have a more rigorous review than the person going up for research (no external review, thus diminishing the importance of teaching). This notation was just that. It is clear that the research review for those going up for promotion in teaching is necessary. FS members noted that it would be harder to find someone who would be willing to review BOTH areas. P&T Implementation Committee member Susan Dana stated that one could get separate reviewers for research and teaching. Are you going to specify, even more, how each department should conduct their in-depth assessment of teaching?
- It appears the definitions of "accomplishment" and "excellence" are based solely on teaching activities which is not only classroom teaching. It also should involve curriculum development. Boyer language is used for scholarship of teaching and involves curriculum and other activities involved in teaching.
- Faculty Senate members were encouraged to comment on the document and forward to Marvin Lansverk.

NORTHWEST ACCREDITATION – Joe Fedock

- Every ten years, MSU undergoes an institution accreditation process. We will engage in a comprehensive self-study which will culminate in a visit in early October, 2009 by our regional accrediting body, the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities. The accreditation will represent thousands of hours of self-assessing the institution, and how we meet the standards for regional accreditation. Joe Fedock is heading up the effort and faculty will be engaged in working with department heads, deans, associate and assistant deans primarily in the areas of educational assessment with student outcomes associated with the programs each department is affiliated with. Some of the areas MSU will demonstrate proficiency and success in will be in governance, faculty, evaluation processes, and institutional integrity.

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

Signature

Shannon Taylor, Chair

Signature

Gale R. Gough, Secretary