

Department of Health & Human Development

Faculty/Staff Meeting

320 Guest Ranch

Friday, October 13, 2006

9:00 a.m.

PRESENT: Katie Bark, Janis Bullock, Christina Campbell, John Christopher, Suzanne Christopher, Nancy Colton, Mike Hahn, Alison Harmon, Deborah Haynes, Dan Heil, Holly Hunts, Milana Lazetich, Bethany Letiecq, Léhilina Marlow, Lynn Marlow, Laura Massey, Mary Miles, Mark Nelson, Greg Olson, Sandy Osborne, Lynn Owens, Lynn Paul, Beth Rink, Adina Smith, Jill Thorngren, Kathy Weaver

MEETING CHAIR: Department Council (John Christopher, Holly Hunts, Adina Smith)

I. Introduction

John welcomed everyone to the 320 Ranch and began the meeting with some Tai Chi. It was a new and enlightening experience and got everyone participating into a relaxed mind set...ready to begin the task of bringing a few issues to closure!

II. Curriculum Review and Discussion

A. HHD Core

Holly first asked which classes everyone could agree on that might be acceptable classes to introduce as Core classes. Faculty came up with the following list:

- HDCF 371
- HDFN 221
- HDCF 150 or Psych.
- Program Planning/Evaluation
- Management
- Strategies for Teaching/Learning
- Small Business
- Stress/Grants

1. Benefits of Having an HHD Core

Faculty discussed this topic and decided that having an HHD core would:

- a.) Eliminate duplication of classes.
- b.) Make sure all students have a foundation that's HHD from which they can build on.

We haven't been too effective in becoming leaner and meaner, even after having worked with Gene Allen, but hopefully we can...soon.

2. Core Considerations: 371, 464

- a.) There are restrictions on research classes for majors, so it's hard for our students to find classes to take and they end up going outside of our department to take these classes.
- b.) Our students can take 489 or 490, but these classes are one-on-one.
- c.) 371 could be a research core, but it has issues with rotating.
- d.) HDFN 451 is only offered alternate years.
- e.) 489/490 (Gender, Social Class, Race, & Family Diversity) meets the diversity core.

B. Vice-Haynes Position

Suzanne emphasized that we need to make motions and give demands on our issues in order to influence those who will decide...before someone else does what they want.

1. Social Equity from Salary Savings

One suggestion was that we redistribute George Haynes' salary money.

2. Program Proposals

Bethany said that we shouldn't give up our line. Adina asked if George's line was enough to make into two lines. Mark told us that any vacant line reverts to the Dean's office and that we should check before making any proposals, or else the suggestions we make won't be well-received at the Provost's Office. Lynn Owens added that we have to fight to keep our line. Janis stated that we need to figure out the process first.

3. Money Issues

Lynn Marlow gave us all a handout (Attachment 2: Family Pot) and explained it and a few other matters to us:

- a. Once George is gone, his line goes back to the Dean and Provost.
- b. To get George's line back, we must sell our request. For example, to get Beth, we had to put up a case as to why we need Ramona's line.
- c. There is no money to give to faculty.
- d. We did keep Ellen's line, though we lost \$2,000 from her line. It's better than Ramona's line...we lost \$29,000 from her line.
- e. Craig gets only \$12,000 as an administrator.
- f. After all the salaries, we as a Department get to keep \$200,000 from Ellen's line (now known as the fun budget or family pot). This money has assured we've been padded and been able to use these resources for our 320 retreats, etc.
- g. When we hire again, if the new Chair comes from outside our Department, they'll absorb Ellen's salary and we'll only have \$80,000 left. This means that if there's anything we need to buy, new computers, for example, we'll have to wait until the end of the year to buy them...IF there's anything left at the end of the year.
- h. If we hire a new Chair internally, they'll go from getting wages from 9 (or 10) months, to 12 months, but we'll still have Ellen's money. It's with Ellen's money that we're planning on getting a new room. Someone asked: If we hire someone internally, can we hire a new person for that position? For 3 years, we can't give up that internal person's line because that person will have the opportunity to come back when the 3 years as Department Chair are up.
- i. Payroll Calculation:

$$\begin{array}{r} 200,000 \\ - \underline{12,000} \text{ (decided)} \\ \hline \# \text{ of months} \times .8181 \text{ up to 12 months} \end{array} \quad \text{OR} \quad \text{Standard}$$

C. Department Head Search

A discussion ensued on the issue of getting a new Department Head:

- a. In the ad for HHD Department Head, there is no determined length of time for the new person to remain as Department Head.
- b. The deadline to turn in applications for HHD Department Head is October 15th.
- c. Does there need to be more than one person (hopefully more than two) internally, then national search?

- d.** Mark mentioned that a couple of years ago we made a mistake and didn't make any department policy. He asked: Will this quasi structure of HHD be fruitful? If no one will rotate through HHD, the Provost will be upset. He's traditional in his approach and we had proposed a non-traditional solution when we hired a department head last time. In bringing someone from the outside, we will not have continued with or been effective with our proposal. This will fortify the Provost's notion that our system doesn't work.
- e.** John then questioned: What is shared governance? When George and Sandy Bailey were 10% Department Head, it was clear what that meant. John's impression is that our governance doesn't seem shared anymore.
- f.** Mary interjected that our committees are shared.
- g.** Adina added that "there is no structure above us, so how can we be making any decisions?"
- h.** Laura clarified a point: When Craig was chosen as Department Head, there WAS a description. There was a three-year limit on the position. Other departments have Chairs and we have a Head. Laura said that she had, at that time, researched on how these were rotated.
- i.** Jill stated that Dean Larry Baker has made it clear that this is a "Head" position that we're trying to fill.
- j.** Mark said that it was his understanding that Larry informed us that the MSU administration doesn't recognize a "Chair." The distinguishing piece is that "Chair" connotes that the faculty elect this person and that this person serves at the pleasure of the faculty, and this person can consequently also be taken out by faculty. Larry has said that, "No, they work for ME, not the faculty." The Dean would remove the Chain of Command and this is understood by administration. Jill said that this came directly from the Provost. Laura added that this position is just as tenuous as his.
- k.** John remarked that it seems like there is no shared governance.
- l.** Mark answered that it is not dead. We're hopeful that there will be things we can do...there will be things the Head is responsible for. For example, as far as our committees go, Craig has, for the most part, said that whatever the committee decides, he'll sign off on.
- m.** Mary added that the Head is accountable, so the committees are more about advisory roles and sharing is a committee thing.
- n.** Lynn Owens said that the fact that we meet and discuss, that's in itself shared governance! The Department Head functions as to budget or Higher Administration only if they'll accept his proposals, but as for us, shared governance is the spirit of how we function as a collective whole. Lynn Owens said, "I think we do function, through meetings."
- o.** It was said that most of the issues our department had, according to the Provost, occurred when George and Sandy were also there and the Provost said, "No, just give me one person to answer to."
- p.** Laura held to the notion that just because you have a chair doesn't mean you have shared governance.

- q. Lynn Marlow interjected and said that shared governance comes when there's an interaction happening. If there is no interaction with the Department Council and the Department Head, then there's no shared governance, but if the committees go back and talk to the Department Council or the Head and then the Head makes the decision, that's still shared governance. The Head has to decide based on what comes down to him from the top. When faculty tell the Department Council what they want, that's shared governance because faculty have a voice through the Department Council! Unfortunately, the Department Head position takes about two years to get transitioned into, and then they're a trunkie because they know they're on their way out!
- r. Mark stated that compensation is an issue. The Department Head is broken in two because s/he hears stuff from above and below. Mark said he attended a conference where there were deans and Department Heads and that they all thought that having a rotating Head is CRAZY! They said that this way of doing it would work...if the objective is to destabilize the department! In our case, though, if the Department Head position is demoralizing, destabilizing, and there's no support from faculty, when we rotate through this position, maybe people will begin to understand and appreciate the person in that Department Head position once they know what it's like.
- s. Lynn added that Craig is our peer, not only the Department Head, and that he knows it's hard sometimes to take advice from him, since some people may think, "Who does he think he is telling me..." After being the Department Head, that person (Craig now and whoever it is after him and so on and so on) has to go back to being a peer from being the Head and if there's been animosity, it makes it that much harder.

III. Announcements

Between meeting times, a few announcements were made:

A. Exhibit

Lynn Paul told us about an exhibit being presented on Sunday and Monday, October 15th and 16th. She said that this program, called "Beauty as a Relative Concept," was designed to help people appreciate their bodies more help people realize how beautiful all bodies are. The exhibit showcased the artwork of Larry Kirkwood, who makes castings of real people's bodies. Lynn said she would send out an email to everyone, giving them more details. She also asked if anyone would be available to help put the exhibit up between 4 and 6 on Sunday. She said that because of physical issues, the artist cannot put up the body casts and needs people to help. Anyone interested can let Lynn know. Information on this exhibit can be found on the MSU website archives at the following address: <http://www.montana.edu/cpa/news/nwview.php?article=4126>.

B. Consortium

Suzanne Christopher let us all know that Sarah Young, a pro tribal member, is starting a consortium for tribal-based research and that she will give us a follow-up from last year.

IV. Workload

John Christopher informed us that we did a good job standardizing equations for teaching, but not research (40% of assignment for the most part). It ranges from 1 peer review a year, the number of published articles.

A. Promotion & Tenure

John told us that if someone is going up in teaching, they must show the quality of teaching and research. For those going up for research, they're asked to show the quality AND quantity of research. In more than one proposal, it was stated that some people are at a percentage of 70/30, but that most people are at 50/40/10. A few options were suggested:

1. One option was to explore the range. Do we want to consider if this is an accurate representation? For those chairing 3 graduate students/committees, there's a 3-credit release for that. This is not so much a liability if the faculty member is not doing traditional research. If the students are doing papers, then they can be an asset and not a distraction to one's career.
2. The simplest option is to distinguish between the teaching and the research tracks.
 - a. Research: 12 credits
 - b. Teaching: 15 credits

Craig and Larry are more inclined to see differences.

B. Discussion

A discussion ensued on the subject:

1. Alison said that graduate students are gone for those on the teaching track.
2. Mary added that if you decide to do research, there's no option for you to go up in P&T as teaching.
 - a. Some may not have the option if their program doesn't allow for only 12 credits.
3. Bethany asked, "What is quantity and the realizing bar?" In Annual Review, it's more meaningful if the quantity is needed and:
 - a. The criteria are already there.
 - b. Research expectations are minimal. Maybe we can up that to two peer reviews.
4. Lynn wanted to know if there were any implications for post tenure people.
 - a. If the goal is to become a full professor, then the person should still focus on research. After obtaining full professor status, maybe the person can figure something else out and still maintain productivity.
5. Mary mentioned that it's really hard to force productivity. Some years, she'll get 4 publications out, and some years, she's lucky to get 2 out. It's tricky and she wants to try to figure something out.
6. John added that there's no incentive to write books...that it's a liability. There should be an average that needs to be done across a certain number of years so there's a window of opportunity to write books.
7. Lynn asked that if someone were to decide to go on a teaching track, if that meant that they would not have graduate students.
8. John replied that for the opportunity to work with graduate students, one would have to weigh out the benefits.
9. Mary inquired whether a research designation replaces graduate students and the response was yes.

- 10.** Bethany then said that it's tenuous to have 3 graduate students and that one can do just as much with only 2 in a year. She also said that there's not much support in the department to recruit and maintain graduate students. Bethany's problem with the 3 graduate student requirement is that it's not meaningful to her. She would like to change how we designate the 3-student model.
- 11.** Janis asked if the percentages might change to reflect who teaches more and who researches less and vice versa.
- 12.** John answered that Craig has said that it would complicate things more, but that it is possible.
- 13.** Lynn added that those who research need that extra time to write grants.
- 14.** Bethany explained that this will influence how we hire faculty.
- 15.** Lynn Paul told us that last year she was on the University P&T Committee representing our college and that a few things were brought up:
 - a.** Issues have come up on how to support teaching as a primary area since it's not clearly defined.
 - b.** Is 60/30/10 and person decides to go up with 30 split and go up in teaching...
 - c.** Is the HHD Promotion & Tenure Document under review right now?
 - i.** It was said that Mark cleaned it up last year.
 - ii.** At the moment, no, our P&T Document is not under revision. It hasn't been approved or disapproved. Right now it's somewhere out in cyber space (in an electronic version).
 - iii.** The UPT Committee is not impressed by our Document. Our P&T Document is not well thought of.
- 16.** Sandy Osborne said we have an issue to consider: There may be beginning new faculty (junior faculty) who may not be clear in their head what they want to be...maybe they're not sure yet. Maybe these junior faculty would like to be mentored.
- 17.** Debby Haynes expressed that we have a Mentoring Committee in place and that maybe they should give guidance.
- 18.** Mark emphasized that if the percentages change, if 50 becomes 30 and 60 research and 10 outreach, one consequence is that if you have a large-scale grant and are considering buying out of research because no teaching left to buy out.
- 19.** John let us know that Craig has concurred with this.
- 20.** Lynn Paul stated a few concerns:
 - a.** The current P&T Document was developed in 2002. With minor revisions, it can go away from being a bean county document. We want to come away from that. We want to be more flexible so it will be finalized and accepted, but now the criticisms are that it's too flexible with its wording. The wording wasn't clear to the larger group. This was a pretty powerful message, though ours is not the only department with issues.
- 21.** Laura let us know that four years ago, the Office of the Provost said that our P&T Document was the gold standard for all P&T Documents.
- 22.** Mark added that as the P&T Committees change, so do the views and opinions, so from document to document, they waver. Sometimes, they just don't understand. They try to be literal in the wording of the document so as not to advantage or disadvantage anyone...they waffle and go back and forth on things.
- 23.** Beth asked that if research is one designation if there's ever a discussion.
- 24.** Lynn Paul answered that there is no overt discussion on this subject at the UPT level.

V. Lunch

After lunch, the groups met again and discussed more issues, and all administrative staff met together to discuss their personality profiles with Lynn Owens.

Meeting Adjourned: 4:00 p.m.