

FACULTY SENATE
April 6, 2016
346 LEON JOHNSON
4:10 PM – 5:00 PM
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY-BOZEMAN, MONTANA
Minutes

Members Present: Adams (Art), Anderson (Film & Photo), Arnold (Ag Ed), Babbitt (Chair), Babcock (Chair-elect), Bennett for Downs (English), Berry (CE), Bolte (Music), Brown (JJCBE), Burrows (Ext), Gannon (ChBE), Greenwood (Math), Lawrence (BioChem), Martin (Mod Lang), Larson (MIE), Larsson (Nursing), Lawrence (Biochem), Lu (PSPP), Meyer (Hist & Phil), O'Neill (Arch), Olson for Mosley (ARS), Repasky (ECE), Scott (Psych), Swinford (Soc/Anthro), Sterman (Library), Weidenheft (MBI), Wilmer (PoliSci), Zabinski (LRES)

Others Present: Theo Lipfert, Chris Kearns, Alison Harmon, Kenneth Silvestri, David Singel, Marilyn Lockhart, Karlene Hoo, Ron Larsen, Bob Mokwa

Chair Babbitt called the meeting to order at 4:10 pm, and a quorum was present.

The March 30, 2016 Faculty Senate minutes were approved.

New Courses and Programs – Chair-elect Babcock

- Undergraduate courses now posted on the Faculty Senate website for review are:
 - ARTZ 131: Ceramics for Non Majors
 - BMGT 235: Management
 - BMGT 225: Marketing
 - ETEC 101: AC/DC Electronics with Lab
 - ISDN 150: Digital Technology Lab
 - MCH 160: Machine Shop Level 1
- Graduate courses posted on the Faculty Senate website for review are:
 - EDU 648: Participatory Research in Education
 - LRES 564: Fundamentals of Environmental Monitoring
 - PSCI 525: Non-Profit Management
 - PSCI 530: Tools of Public Administration

Announcements – Chair Babbitt

- University Council
 - Indigenous People's Day passed;
 - Statistics from a recent Bozeman's Citizen's Survey will be posted on the Faculty Senate web site. The information gleaned was part of a national survey and compares Bozeman to other cities in the US.
- Administrative Reviews
 - Deans' reviews closed Tuesday.
 - Dept Head reviews went out early Monday morning.
 - While problems with Survey Monkey seemed to be worked out, problems continue with invalid emails and Outlook 365 and other filtering software. We may need to postpone further reviews until next year.
- President Cruzado will come to senate on April 13 to discuss her review from last year. This portion of senate will be closed for this discussion; following, the meeting will be open to continue discussions of the P&T documents.
- Chair Babbitt is working with Chris Fastnow on the Prioritization status report.

Election of the Chair-elect of Faculty Senate for AY 2016-2017

- Chair Babbitt called out for other Chair-elect nominations/volunteers, of which there were none.
- According to the Faculty Senate Bylaws, Faculty Senate members voted, by a raise of hands, to unanimously elect Franke Wilmer, Professor from Political Science, as the next Chair-elect of Faculty Senate.
- As per Bylaws, Chair-elect is elected, serves for one year, then assume Chair for one year.

Faculty Handbook – Promotion & Tenure Documents

- Chair Babbitt gave a brief history of the Faculty Handbook and Promotion & Tenure documents from 2009 to the present.
 - In AY14-15, P&T committee worked to draft new retention, tenure, and promotion policy documents.
 - From the fall of 2015 to the spring of 2016, JAGS has been working on P&T documents which are now posted on the FS web site for senate to view and discuss.
- Babbitt noted that the Faculty Handbook policy, Appointment of Faculty, was previously passed by Senate; it will need to be re-examined by JAGS, reviewed, and passed again by senate as its content and implementation are dependent on the P&T documents. The Academic Responsibilities policy has not yet been approved by JAGS pending approval of the P&T documents.
- Although Senate and Deans' Council have passed many separate policies, OCHE must pass the entire Faculty Handbook for it to be official. Until that time, faculty will operate under the Interim Faculty Handbook instituted in 2013 by the OCHE.
- Faculty up for retention, tenure, and promotion review in Fall of 2016 will continue to follow the standards and procedures that are currently in place, which are the Interim Faculty Personnel Policies of August 2013.
- While departments are recognized for their individual cultures and flexibility, the revised P&T documents represent a more comprehensive approach that, hopefully, encompasses all academic nuances and will be accepted by University Council.
- When will new policies and standards take effect?
 - Once the entire FH is approved by OCHE, certain parts of the RTP documents will take effect.
- Standards in effect at a full year before promotion review govern Promotion to Full Review.
 - Repasky noted that it seems as if faculty are working on Promotion to Full more than one year and knowing rules in advance of one year would be advantageous.
- Workflow and Timeline for Approval of RTP Documents:
 - Draft documents are being reviewed by Faculty Senate and Deans' Council simultaneously;
 - Feedback goes back to JAGS for possible revisions;
 - Repeat 1 and 2 and until approved by FS and Deans' Council (DC);
 - Approval of Full FH by MSU Administration; and,
 - Approval of Full FH by COHE.
- How long will this take? Will the documents be approved in the next month or will discussion continue until next fall?
- Chair Babbitt would like to follow this plan:
 - Wed, 4/6/16
 - FS discussed the RTP documents conceptually; no editing in FS.
 - Questions are asked and hopefully answered.
 - Thurs, 4/7/16
 - Faculty Affairs reviews FS inputs and determines what to take back to JAGS
 - Mon, 4/11/16

- JAGS - Possible new proposed language
 - Tues, 4/12/16
 - Deans' Council considers RTP documents
 - Wed, 4/13/16
 - FS starts detailed discussions.
 - FS considers feedback from Deans' Council
 - Wordsmithing edits encouraged via email (no wordsmithing yet in Senate yet)
 - Thur, 4/14/16
 - Faculty Affairs considers FS Discussion and email suggestions AND SO FORTH . . .
 - Options: All faculty forum /Delay until Fall /The Interim Doc rules forever!
 - Wed, 4/28/16
 - Hopefully FS vote of approval on final version of proposed RTP
 - Tues, 5/10/16
 - Hopefully DC vote of approval on final version of proposed RTP
 - Senator asked if Department Heads might have the opportunity to provide input into the documents. Babbitt stated that DHs would be welcomed to attend Deans' Council and Faculty Senate where the documents are discussed.
 - Rather than sending complete sets of updated documents, summary of edits will be sent to senators.
 - Senator stated that in the past faculty had almost complete control of their handbook. Currently, it seems that faculty are negotiating with administration about content and when the content needs to be implemented. The senator asked about handbook amendment procedures and how important is it to get it right versus how important is it to subscribe and adhere to a timeline to make those changes? Babbitt noted that in the past the FH has always been negotiated with Administration [see amendment procedures in old FH]. Babbitt believes it is important to get the Faculty Handbook done right and noted that Faculty Senate and DC have already approved many policies that will go into FH. The new FH, itself, includes amendment procedures and may be found on the senate website at this link: <http://www.montana.edu/facultysenate/documents/New%20Handbook%20Process%20120414.pdf>
- Changes:
 - "Area of Responsibility" in the context of retention, tenure, and promotion, refers to the components of MSU's mission: teaching; research/creative activity; service. However, in the "Areas of Scholarship" the following have changed:
 - No more "check boxes" for Teaching or Research.
 - Now that no box is checked, a faculty member's personal statement could be a sentence, "My area of scholarship is research." or it could be a page and a half describing how faculty will integrate their teaching/research/outreach; whatever it takes to define what you want to be held to tenure's expectation of accomplishment.
 - "Area of Scholarship" is the faculty member's self-identified focus of scholarly activity that is evaluated against expectation of Accomplishment or Excellence in reviews for tenure and/or promotion to Full.
 - The university has adopted the following as acceptable Areas of Scholarship: teaching; research/creative activity; an integration of teaching and research/creative activity; and integration of teaching and/or research/creative activity with service.
 - Senator asked how these changes might impact one's letter of hire which clearly state percentages. Babbitt stated that the percentages relate to

faculty's areas of responsibility, which the faculty member still must be effective in; the LOH does not state what one is going up for with respect to tenure.

- Senator likes the new language as it is in line with the University's aspirations for interdisciplinary work connecting research and teaching.
- What was the rationale behind making these changes? Babbitt stated that changes were made for flexibility and clarity. When teaching was an option a faculty member could check that box as some thought that by receiving the highest grade on all their teaching evaluations, they would automatically get tenure. That was not what was meant by checking the box for teaching in the past and this policy now clarifies that although we do highly value good teaching, a faculty member needs to be recognized for their area of scholarship beyond MSU, by authorities in their field.
- Senator stated that there was a time when MSU attempted to distinguish those who chose teaching as their major focus for tenure, but it was ambiguous in its definition, and some faculty chose teaching because of that. The senator believes the new wording more clearly articulates the desired definition.
- New Standards/Expectations
 - Singel stated that the Standards are the things that follow the phrasing, "The standards for promotion to tenure are....." They combine effectiveness in all three areas of responsibility and accomplishment in the area of scholarship. The expectations are effectiveness, accomplishment, and excellence, which have to do with the levels of productivity in the areas of responsibilities.
 - The idea of integration of teaching/research/service in the faculty's area of effectiveness is mandate.
 - Senator asked how integration of teaching/research/service get evaluated. Babbitt stated that it would be determined by the departmental Role and Scope documents.
 - A senator noted that if a faculty member is hired to teach courses that are not closely related to their research, they are handicapped.
 - Singel noted that as part of self-governance and implementing the Strategic Plan, the integration of various activities should be worked out at the departmental level in detail. For example, a faculty member might state that while their research was not connected to anything that they ever taught in general chemistry they might express how they exemplified and modeled the thinking of a research scientist in the way they worked in the classroom; the way they discussed material with students. That kind of integration of the mindset of a scientist in confronting data is something you do even if your research is in a niche area and you are teaching the most fundamental things. To measure this is might be as simple as a statement in that section of the dossier, which might be compelling. The expectation is satisfactory performance so departments want reflect on what they would like that to mean.
 - Singel added: Those reviewing dossiers should not make comparisons between candidates; individual dossiers are reviewed, separately, and evaluated against standards, expectations, and indicators.
 - A senator stated that some definitions are vague. For example, the integration of teaching/research. The senator mentors graduate students one-on-one: Is that integration of teaching and research, as you are teaching them about the research they will be doing? Babcock stated that faculty, many times, are doing this anyway and hopefully the faculty member's department will think

about those things when faculty write and present their dossiers. The Strategic Plan has excellent examples and definitions of integration.

- Senator noted that if a faculty member is in the humanities and presenting their work in a public forum that is integration of your research/teaching and outreach.
- In R&S, the Expectations should not be equated with a numerical level of particular indicators. Departmental R&S documents should articulate what an example faculty member should produce to meet an expectation and discuss trade-offs/weightings of indicators.
 - A faculty member must be recognized for their products.
 - Senator asked faculty leadership to consider the following scenario, as an example of doing outreach not in their specific field: If faculty are doing outreach to a tribal college, bringing science to them and their instructor is not a science teacher, but you make such an impact with your presentation, some of the tribal students go on to universities to conduct scientific research. Singel noted that this is service/learning and the concept might need to be discussed further. Senator suggested that a category of “respected authority” might be in the candidate’s area of scholarship.
 - Regarding recognition of scholarly activity and products, a senator asked if in working with companies around the country who commercialize intellectual property developed at MSU, would that be a very different way of being recognized for scholarly activity? Singel noted that those who are qualified to judge faculty members’ original contributions to scholarship would be the ones to bestow scholarly activity and products on them.
 - Senator suggested that the wording, “relevant, respected and qualified authorities” without stating anything about the candidates’ field be considered.
- Indicators
 - R&S documents need to articulate and provide weighting of what they will count as indicators: Journal papers, conference papers, patents, outreach to a specified group; an art exhibit vs. larger exhibition?
 - How much do they weigh? Is a conference paper worth a journal paper vs. the Nobel Prize? Each department needs to document what indicators count in their reviews; and if they are not listed, they do not count. A list of indicators without discussion or weighting is not helpful.
- Response to Evaluation Letters
 - Faculty may respond to any factual errors in the Evaluation Letters at any time.
 - Previously there were ten (10) days for a response to anything negative, and this created a delay in the process: The calendaring of ten (10) days for a response is still being formulated.
 - In the past, if there is a negative vote, you could have asked for a summary of External Letters. Currently, the dept head write this up, causing delays, and this may be a conflict of interest in that the dept head writing the summary may be the entity with which the faculty member is having an issue.
 - Every five (5) levels of review will examine your External Letters, reducing the chances of bias.
 - Primary Review Committee must document every part of their assessment and evidence they used. Any evidence they used from your Review Letters must be documented.

- Each review committee and reviewing administrator shall conduct an independent, substantive review of the Dossier weighing all of the evidence in the Dossier and assessing the quality and significance of the candidate's work to determine if the candidate has met the appropriate standards and expectations, in accordance with the applicable Role and Scope documents.
- Babbitt stated that Faculty Senate may decide whether they would like to conduct a charrette/all-faculty meeting for the P&T documents.

The meeting adjourned at 5:06 pm.

Randy Babbitt, Chair

Michael Babcock, Chair-elect