

**MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY
FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
September 22, 2004
301 Reid Hall
Montana State University-Bozeman
4:10-5:00 PM**

Members Present: Becker, Bennett, Bradley, Cherry, Conant, Croy, Dodd for Taylor, Gipp, Kommers, Levy, Lynes-Hayes, Mathenia, McDermott, Neeley, Prawdzienski, Peed, Seymour, Taper, D. Weaver, D. J. Young, Zhu

Member absent: Ashley, Babcock, HHD, Giroux, Hoffman, Erickson, Idzerda, Jackson, Jones, Kevane, Knight, McClure, Media & Theatre Arts, Pratt, E. Schmidt

Others: Bandyopadhyay, Lansverk, McLeod

Marvin Lansverk, Chair of Faculty Affairs, called the meeting to order at 4:10 PM. A quorum was present.

FACULTY AFFAIRS – Marvin Lansverk, Chair

Chair Lansverk recapped the charge of the Faculty Affairs Committee (FA): “Considers matters of policy relating to promotion, tenure, leave, standards of performance, professional ethics, faculty rights and responsibilities, academic freedom, affirmative action, faculty compensation and benefits.”

- Main tasks before FA involve the following:
 - Solving issues arising out of policy/procedure that are presented to FA by Steering Committee, FC, or individuals.
 - The ongoing task of revising and making sure the handbook sagacity is applicable to present standings of faculty and their activities at MSU.
- Amendments to Faculty Handbook presented for final approval were:
 - **Section 213.00 - an interim policy from July 1, 2003 through June 30, 2005**

ADDED: Department Head (Primary Administrator)

Pursuant to the Board of Regents' policies (Section 510, Item 5), the Head of a Department is the primary administrator of that academic unit. If the Department Head is also a member of the faculty, then he or she may not participate formally as a voting member on that department's hiring committee or on that department's promotion and tenure committee. In the case of a hiring decision, these procedures are addressed in the University's Recruitment and Hiring Manual.

- Because the previous wording was ambiguous as to which committees the department head was to serve, Faculty Council honed the wording to be more precise and easier to understand.

- **Section 622.00**

Section 622.00 Development of Department and College Criteria, Standards and Procedures Documents - an interim policy from July 1, 2003 through June 30, 2005

Department and college criteria for retention, tenure and promotion may recognize differential staffing and allow for individual uniqueness in faculty assignments. Standards should not make all faculty perform alike, but commensurate quality must be expected for all equivalent reviews.

The criteria and standards defined in this document are the minimum acceptable standards for the University; departments and colleges are expected to develop criteria and standards based on, and no less rigorous than, those described herein.

CHANGE, PARAGRAPH 3: (Bold italics indicate added verbiage.)

Role, scope, criteria, standards and procedures documents shall be approved by the department faculty *not including the department head (or primary administrator)*, the department head *servicing as the primary administrator of the academic unit*, the college review committee, the college dean, the UPT Committee, and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. *In the event two of these entities cannot agree on a document, the disputing parties will meet with the administrator at the next higher level in order to produce a document upon which the disputants can agree.*

Motion was made to accept wording → seconded → all in favor → passed.

CONTINUATION OF FACULTY AFFAIRS ISSUES FROM LAST YEAR

- Sabbaticals - Discussion
 - FA made changes to sabbatical letter; faculty are no longer required to have external recommendations.
 - Changes to letter were made in hopes of increasing number of sabbatical applicants.
 - Call for sabbaticals have gone out.
 - One of the tasks of FA is to rank/score them according to metric/criteria on form FC approved.
 - FA/FC encourages you and your colleagues to apply.
 - MSU has been lacking with respect to funding sabbaticals; we need to increase numbers so faculty feel it is worthwhile to apply.
 - 20 applied last year/10 were accepted.
 - Numbers of applicants should not be important rather, the idea being funded should be.
 - Some administrators were funded last year and treated as a faculty applicant.
 - Mixed review on whether sabbaticals are valuable or not.
 - Survey is going out to get feedback on whether faculty/admin supports sabbaticals.
 - Some admin wonder if sabbaticals are a high priority of faculty.
 - Faculty may not want to risk putting together a proposal, as it may be turned down.
 - Survey should make it clear that a trip out of Bozeman or out of the country is not necessary.
 - With additional teaching loads put upon our faculty, time may be the attractive point of a sabbatical.

- Philosophical debate as to what sabbaticals mean seem to point towards “research with an outcome.”
- Perhaps we should be putting resources into other programs such as a short-term leave/buy-outs instead of sabbaticals.
- What do we want the sabbatical program to look like?
 - If it resembles a grant entity, then people will go elsewhere for more money – NSF, e.g.
 - Should sabbaticals be given to someone relatively new so they may advance their career, or someone who has been at MSU longer (years of service), as scripted in the BOR policy?
- New Interpretation of Additional Compensation Policy.
 - Wording for policy has not changed, but interpretation of the word “normal” has. There is no money involved in the interpretation. Each faculty must negotiate to be paid extra for the additional courses taught, however.
- Course Evaluation Task Force.
 - Still being formed.
 - One of the issues the task force will be addressing is the software and computers used for faculty evaluations. They are becoming obsolete, and this is an opportunity for faculty to become involved in choosing a new evaluation format that is uniform, flexible and validated.
- Promotion and Tenure
 - FA to examine the mechanism whereby teaching or research may be the primary area of excellence, and one or the other may be used to grant P&T to a faculty member.
 - May create some odd asymmetries with respect to contracts matching up with what faculty excel in.
 - Right now, there are too many layers of review that need to be modified.
 - Task Force will be created to ask those questions and, “How is new P&T criteria working for your faculty?”
- Other Issues
 - Retirement tax TIAA (4.9%) participants are paying to buttress TRS (7.1%) participants.
 - Compared to peer institutions that pay more for a retirement package, it makes hiring and recruitment difficult. Our numbers are too low.
 - Other institutions offer faculty benefits in lieu of raises. MSU may investigate these if no raises are forthcoming: reduction in gym fees, free parking, e.g.

The meeting adjourned at 5:25 PM.

Signature

Marvin Lansverk, Chair, Faculty Affairs

Signature

Gale R. Gough, Secretary