

FACULTY SENATE
November 2, 2016
Strand Union Room 168
3:10 PM – 4:30 PM
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY-BOZEMAN, MONTANA
Minutes

Members Present: Adams (Art), C.Z. Anderson (Film & Photo), R. Anderson (ChBE), Babcock (Chair), Bolte (Music), Burrows (Ext), Conrad (Arch), Ewing (LRES), Greenwood (Math), Herman (NAS), Larson (MIE), Lux (Ed), Martin (Mod Lang), Merzdorf (CBN), Rebane (Physics), Fiege for Reidy (Hist & Phil), Repasky (ECE), Running (Nursing), J. Smith (Psych), Sterman (Library), Thomas (English), Wilmer (Chair-elect), Yamaguchi (Soc/Anthro)

Others Present: Larry Carucci, Ron Larsen, Bob Mokwa

Chair Babcock called the meeting to order at 3:10 pm, and a quorum was present.

Minutes from the October 19, 2016 meeting were approved.

New Courses and Programs – Chair-elect Wilmer

- Undergraduate courses unanimously approved in CPC and will be voting upon at the next Steering Committee meeting are:
 - EGEN 365: Introduction to Mechatronics
 - PSCI 201: Scope and Methods of Political Science
 - PSCI 250: Introduction to Political Theory
 - PSCI 390R: Research Methods
 - Course Changes –PSCI 338: Comparative Politics
- New Programs:
 - POLS-BA: Political Science Bachelor's Degree
 - Pending APWG report.
- Undergraduate courses approved Steering on October 25, 2016:
 - ETEC 106: AC Circuit Analysis
 - ETEC 113: Circuit Lab
 - PLTT 101: Fundamentals of Light and Lasers
- Graduate course approved by Steering on October 25, 2016:
 - EDU 611: Advanced Qualitative Research

Policy Discussion – Chair Babcock

- Process Overview
 - Chair Babcock reminded senators to inform their constituents about the policies discussed in senate.
 - Subsequent to senate discussions last week, suggestions from senators and others were provided to Faculty Affairs and JAGS and incorporated into the document that are before senators, today.
- Faculty Responsibilities (First Reading):
 - Senate had no objections or discussion for Sections 1. and 2.
 - 4. SCHOLARSHIP RESPONSIBILITIES
 - Senate had no objections.
 - 5. SERVICE RESPONSIBILITIES

- c. If faculty are on review panels for proposals, there are also standards associated with the panel and should those professional standards be included in this section, as well? Or perhaps articulated in a separate letter?
- c. Might add "...with department/school/units, colleges...." throughout the rest of this section, as other RTP policies include this language.
- d. Change wording to reflect that faculty do not have to participate in all levels. "Participate in governance at the department and/or school and/or school, etc." Babcock will bring to JAGS for wordsmithing.
- a. and b. read similar. Another word for "others?" Senator suggested that if you reverse a. and b., then a. would be read as something beyond what b. describes.
- 3. TEACHING RESPONSIBILITIES
 - Was not in the original Faculty Handbook;
 - Was introduced as a result of the student's bill of rights and will now be included in the new faculty handbook.
 - d. Senator suggested a friendly amendment to remove "other". Aply advise students on degree programs within their academic unit, ~~other~~ educational and degree pathways, as well as future career decisions.
 - b. Senator, in reference to b., asked what happens with courses that never need updating, such as calculus. Babcock suggested adding the language "as appropriate."
 - In reference to ~~h~~ a senator stated that a large department might have frequent one-time class location changes. To alert department heads would put an undue burden upon them; would it be acceptable if all the students involved knew of the location change?
 - If the change is permanent, the Registrar should be informed.
 - Classes taught off-campus should be in compliance with the Student Conduct Code, which requires a participation list form. This is to protect against liability.
 - This policy came about because of student complaints about classes being moved. Also, the policy was created to avoid class space conflicts where a class is moved into a space already being utilized by another class.
 - How would this impact many (120) students all traveling to different locations (as in the School of Music and School of Architecture)?
 - Senator stated that sometimes a class is held off-campus, and if all students are notified that should be acceptable.
 - Senator does not believe some students want to meet in specific locations and feel uncomfortable speaking up.
 - Babcock will bring to JAGS, discuss and bring back to FS.
 - k Senator suggested removing the word "their" before "scheduled classes."
 - l. Senator suggested adding "and returning" before "class assignments and tests."
 - o. Senator asked why faculty would have information about a student's genetic information? Babcock and Carucci will check into this wording as it might already be articulated somewhere else and this is iteration.
 - p. Senator has had an experience with a FERPA protected student which presented a liability. If faculty are not allowed to know how are they to proceed?
 - There may be a "need to know" clause in FERPA. Babcock will follow up.
 - s. Senator stated that this language does not accommodate graduate students. For example, in some instances grad students do not receive grades; rather,

they are only being told whether they pass, or not and then not being told why. Additionally, oral exams are graded the same.

- Babcock will follow up and discuss in JAGS.
- Senator offered a friendly amendment to add language in the next to last sentence to read, “If a student questions their grade, the instructor has a responsibility to provide a reasonable opportunity to discuss the matter with the student.
- Although not stated and when there are complaints made by the student, before encouraging students to file a grievance, faculty should encourage the student to meet with the dept chair to discuss.
- t. Senator made a friendly amendment to include GTA in the third to last sentence.
 - Senator asked, in reference to D2L, how long faculty vs. MSU are required to retain student records. Babcock will find out how long D2L stores records, as they are supposed to be retained for five years.
- RTP - Faculty Rights and Responsibilities (First Reading):
 - Focus on First Four Sections
 - 1. CANDIDATES RIGHTS and RESPONSIBILITIES
 - Copious faculty feedback on the preparation and submission of materials for Dossier: “*Only scholarly products that have been accepted for publication, performance or exhibition within the Review Period may be considered in the review.*”
 - Faculty Concern: A manuscript submitted during the Review Period that was accepted after the Review Period (RP) would not be considered. Is this fair to the candidate?”
 - The issue is whether the faculty member is meeting a standard during the RP vs. or just meeting the standard.
 - It could become entangled in an endless loop of committee reviews, internally and externally.
 - Senator suggested that a faculty member announce that they have already submitted a publication/paper/book prior to their review; not begin at the onset of their review to begin to submit papers.
 - Carucci stated that the consensus of JAGS, et. al, was that the candidate, minimally, must have in hand, confirmation documents have been sent out for review.
 - Retention might be a category to rethink about this language, but beyond that it becomes difficult.
 - Babcock stated that when departments write R&S documents, they carefully articulate language that would not accommodate this situation. By including:
 - Realistic Expectations
 - Clear Language regarding status of products: *Submitted, under review, under contract, revise and resubmit, accepted pending.*
 - Stopping the tenure clock when appropriate.
 - Retention and tenure for assistant/associate is more critical than those at full professorial rank.
 - Babcock asked senators to discuss with colleagues.
 - Concern- “What if the candidate is *off the grid* during the review process?”
 - *1e5 Candidates shall notify their department head of any unavailability during the review period. A candidate may request an extension of the deadline for responding to requests for information*

or to Evaluation Letters only if there are unanticipated, extenuating circumstances. Any request for extension must be submitted to the Chair of the UPTC at least one (1) day before the deadline expires.

- Not all scenarios might have been captured in the verbiage therefore, Babcock requested that Senators discuss with their colleagues.
- 2. REVIEW COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP
 - Concern- “Previous documents required 25% women membership on committees. Is this fair, and does this practice actually reduce bias?”
 - Dr. Smith has done extensive research in this field and data shows that having women on committees does not reduce bias.
 - Irrespective of gender, anyone may be biased.
 - Suggested language (first blush), and Babcock encouraged feedback:
 - *“The university encourages gender and racial diversity in the composition of all review committees. Units are encouraged to adopt selection procedures for committee members that will promote gender and racial diversity membership.”*
 - *“All committees and administrative reviewers will participate in orientation sessions that promote bias-literacy in retention, tenure and promotion reviews. **Bias-literacy orientation must be taken within three years prior to conducting a review.** Orientation will be offered or approved by the university.”*
 - Training would be at the department level- Primary Review committee
 - Intermediate and University P&T, might keep the 25% and do the bias literacy since there is a bigger pool of individuals.
 - Smith added concepts for JAGS, et.al. to consider when writing the policy: In the three years training cycle, laws change; literature changes; and, hearing the message multiple times will make an impact. The compositions of your committees change/the person you are reviewing changes, and keeping track of those who have taken the training, logistically, is challenging.
 - Wilmer stated that the 25% rule was enacted in the 70’s when MSU’s women faculty was at 25%; it is now at 40%. Therefore, at the university/college level, there is a larger pool and the percentage is not a burden. At the departmental level, however, the pool is smaller.
 - 2. REVIEW COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP
 - *“Only tenured faculty members are eligible to serve on any review committees. **At least one-half of the members must have attained the rank of professor.** If the unit cannot provide sufficient numbers of professors for the committee, the unit may request approval from the UPTC Chair to make an alternate tenured faculty appointment. Emeritus faculty members are ineligible to serve.”*
 - Concern- “What if we don’t have enough full professors - are we going to be constantly making requests?” May be too overwhelming.
 - Option discussed: elimination of one-half member requirement and encourage it rather than making it a mandate (from associate to full).
 - Some faculty might feel outranked and intimidated to have full professors on their committees. Others embrace the feedback from

- their peers.
- Would a quid pro quo situation arise?
 - Would some departments have two committees, one with full's and another without?

Public Comment

- There was no public comment.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 pm.

Michael Babcock, Chair
Franke Wilmer, Chair-elect