

FACULTY SENATE
October 5, 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), Austin (Poli Sci), Babcock (Chair), Belasco (AgEcon), Berry (CE), Bolte (Music), Brown (JJCBE), Creel (Ecology), Conrad (Arch), Eggert (Emeritus), Ewing (LRES), Greenwood (Math), Haggerty (Earth Sci), Herman (NAS), Larson (MIE), Lu (PSPP), Lux (Ed), Martin (Mod Lang), Merzdorf (CBN), Mosley (ARS), Perry (Ag Ed), Rebane (Physics), Reidy (Hist & Phil), Repasky (ECE), Running (Nursing), J. Smith (Psych), Sterman (Library), Wilmer (Chair-elect), Yamaguchi (Soc/Anthro)

Others Present: Chris Fastnow, Larry Carucci, David Singel, Eric Lopez, Chris Murray, Bob Mokwa

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

Minutes from the September 7 and September 21, 2016 meeting were approved.

Steering Committee Report – Chair-elect Wilmer

- Undergraduate courses approved in CPC. If senators have no concerns, they will be voted upon in Steering on October 11, 2016. All are posted on the FS web site:
 - BIOM 460: Infectious Diseases Ecology and Spillover
 - ETME 309: Building Information Modeling in MEP
 - ETME 327: Commercial Building Energy Assessment Lab
 - SOC 308: Becoming and Adult in America
 - SOC 346: Rural Sociology
 - SOC 448: Society and Sport
- Graduate course will be voted upon in Steering on October 11, 2016:
 - EDU 611: Advanced Qualitative Research
- Program deactivation is posted on the Faculty Senate web site and if senators have no concerns, it will be voted upon in Steering on October 11, 2016:
 - Termination and Moratorium - Professional Masters in Science and Engineering Management.

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.
- Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Review- Definitions – Chair Babcock
 - From the last FS meeting, the following definitions were modified to read:

- **Accomplishment** is *sustained and commendable performance* reflected in the quantity, quality, and impact of scholarly activities and products. ~~Published in peer reviewed journals, in formal peer reviewed presentations at professional meetings, or in comparable peer-evaluated forums.~~ The activities and products must have impact and significance to the public, peers, or the discipline beyond the university.
 - **Excellence** is *sustained, commendable and distinguished performance* reflected in the quantity, quality, and impact of scholarly activities and products. ~~Published in peer reviewed journals, in formal peer reviewed presentations at professional meetings, or in comparable peer-evaluated forums.~~ The activities and products must have *a notable* impact and significance to the public, peers, or the discipline beyond the university.
 - Subsequent to the 9/21 FS meeting and after taking the senate changes to JAGS and Faculty Affairs, a peer review component was determined to be an important facet to the P&T process as faculty value peer review evaluations, and language was added to capture that:
 - **Accomplishment** is *sustained and commendable performance* reflected in the quantity, quality, and impact of scholarly activities and products. ~~Published in peer reviewed journals, in formal peer reviewed presentations at professional meetings, or in comparable peer-evaluated forums.~~ **These activities and products include peer reviewed publications, formal peer-reviewed presentations, or comparable peer-evaluated works appropriate to the discipline.** The activities and products must have impact and significance to the public, peers, or the discipline beyond the university.
 - **Excellence** is *sustained, commendable and distinguished performance* reflected in the quantity, quality, and impact of scholarly activities and products. ~~Published in peer reviewed journals, in formal peer reviewed presentations at professional meetings, or in comparable peer-evaluated forums.~~ **These activities and products include peer reviewed publications, formal peer-reviewed presentations, or comparable peer-evaluated works appropriate to the discipline.** The activities and products must have *a notable* impact and significance to the public, peers, or the discipline beyond the university.
- Discussions ensued:
 - Sterman – What if instead of “work,” we say “scholarship?” We decided that scholarship means all these things, so there is one easy word that covers it.
 - Mosley – I interpret this as scholarship not being included in teaching. If you have 100% teaching appointment and one is an expert in teaching, that deserves tenure. Extension agents currently don’t have a research component and most are teaching 90% and doing service at 10%. Their P&T is based on that.
 - Singel – The definition of teaching that has been applied in P&T is one that has been part of the FH, Interim document, CBA and

prior, and they have included that scholarly component.

Additionally, the guidelines for in-depth assessment of teaching, which has been part of the RTP process since at least 2000, specifically note that, and those guidelines recommend to departments that faculty “check the box” for teaching which would have to include evidence of innovation and direct impact beyond the classroom as in workshops, etc. Scholarly aspect so if teaching are now specifically included in the definition of scholarship.

- Wilmer – There is the word “or” comparable peer-evaluated works appropriate to the discipline,” and that language after “or” was specifically composed with Extension faculty in mind.
 - Babcock asked Mosley to continue to query Extension faculty about the RTP documents to ensure language is included to address their areas of expertise.
- Motion to accept language amendments to the Accomplishment and Excellence definitions → seconded → all in favor → unanimously accepted.
 - Integration
 - Concept came from MSU’s Strategic Plan (SP).
 - SP is not instructing departments on how to accomplish integration as each accomplishes it differently. Faculty are already integrating. Metrics for measuring integration should be articulated in the Role and Scope documents of the specific department.
 - Conrad - School of Architecture faculty are concerned that because “integration” is a defined element separate from teaching, research and service, a required separate section in the dossier would be heavily redundant and extensive. Babcock stated that he believes something as short as a paragraph in the dossier that articulates how one demonstrates integration would suffice and is hoping the departments compose simple and effective language in their R&S. Discussions about this topic will continue. Conrad stated that an alternative solution would be to have faculty assessed for teaching, assessed for scholarship and all would include this integration factor.
 - Singel – If you project out of integration in each of the categories it becomes “dis-integration.” A separate section in the dossier wouldn’t reproduce all the evidence of the components; you would, instead, point to teaching and research documents (perhaps by links) and then explain how they have been integrated. Reproducing the same evidence in different sections is counter-productive.
 - What about those teaching in an area that is not in their research area or area of expertise?
 - Babcock would advise those faculty to examine the definition of teaching; if faculty are mentoring students, career advising, that is integration and accounts for integration for faculty who are not teaching in their area of expertise.

- Creel – Integration is supposed to be evaluated in annual reviews for which there is not a dossier.
 - Martin – These criteria might lead to shaping research agendas in ways that define certain types of research that is acceptable.
 - Babcock – Teaching happens outside the classroom; mentoring, advising, public presentation on your scholarship; you have the latitude to decide in your R&S.
 - Austin – Would like to confirm that integration across teaching, research, and service at the departmental level may take place across any combination of two or three of those entities.
 - Babcock confirmed.
 - Rebane –Is MSU reaffirming the Humboldtian idea, a concept of academic education that emerged in the early 19th century and whose core idea is a holistic combination of research and studies. Sometimes called simply the Humboldtian Model (HM), it integrates the arts and sciences with research to achieve both comprehensive general learning and cultural knowledge? If so, then it should be stated as such.
 - Reidy – Each department should define their own R&S, which reaffirms what the university does and including the HM is a good idea.
- Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Review- Role and Scope – Chair-elect Wilmer
 - There is only one word change:
 - 3. APPROVAL OF ROLE AND SCOPE DOCUMENTS Role and Scope Documents of the academic units must be approved, as detailed below, before taking effect. Effective dates for approved Documents will be established by the provost. Role and Scope Documents of primary academic units shall be reviewed and approved by:
 - a. the ~~tenured~~^{tenurable} faculty and administrator of the primary academic unit.
 - Bolte, in reference to Section 2, Paragraph e., the word “quantitative expectations” how would a department which does not use numbers interpret that? Could the language be changed to “and/or”? Can we leave it vague in our R&S, as it applies to the arts?
 - Singel –However your department defines it is appropriate.
- Motion to accept language amendment in Section 3. Paragraph a. of the RTP Role and Scope document →seconded →all in favor →unanimously accepted.
- Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Review- Standards and Timelines– First Reading - Chair, Faculty Affairs, Larry Carucci
 - The following points were discussed:
 - **1. RETENTION, TENURE, AND PROMOTION REVIEWS**
 - Retention, tenure, and promotion reviews are *summative* reviews of the faculty member’s performance in teaching, scholarship and service over the designated Review Period.
 - Summative as opposed to yearly reviews.

- RPT – Become the summative pieces that fit together; acceptable yearly reviews will not necessarily result in automatic tenure, however.
 - Discussions ensued:
 - Should retention be summative and formative and, tenure and promotion be summative? During retention, we are providing feedback going towards tenure and tenure is a yes or no decision based on a body of work. This is a suggestion based upon NSF definitions of formative and summative.
 - True – but at associate level as you move forward you have a summative review to provide expectations for the future. You could also come up for retention and not be granted it and that is a different type of formative review.
 - Referring to the second paragraph which reads: “Only the standards and indicators in these approved documents may be used in the assessment of performance.” Is this referring to departmental R&S?
 - Carucci stated that university documents serve as an umbrella policy but the specifics of what will count in your department is captured in R&S.
 - **2. REVIEW TIMELINES AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS**
 - Sterman suggested a friendly amendment under second bullet “Tenure Review” to replace “unless” with “or” and it would read “...or extended under the Extending Tenure Review period....”
 - Grieving faculty are still included in the same timeline processes.
 - **3. EXPEDITED TENURE REVIEW AT HIRE**
 - Nothing new in the policy.
 - If you choose to go up early fail, you do not get another chance.
 - LOH addresses credit for prior years of service, limitations, etc.
-
- Terminal Employment Contract – For clarity, MUS might be written out.
 - Discussions ensued:
 - Dilemma in Arts & Architecture – Administrators are hired and applying without a portfolio. They are going through an expedited tenure review without those materials. May the college/school require those materials at the time of hire?
 - The Primary Review Committee is responsible for approving people who have ample evidence that they

are acceptable for the position for which they are applying.

- Repeat “Exceptionally Meritorious” language in the first paragraph after “is eligible for...” to make concept clear, or link to the MUS document so both are synchronized.
 - Clarification - The Primary Review Committee is from the department, and they would establish the acceptability, or not, of the candidate to return to faculty, if that was the case, initially.
 - Would apply to the same standards using this process.
- **4. PROMOTION REVIEW**
 - If you were denied promotion to full, you may reapply.
 - Language might repeat similar language in #8, “Unsuccessful candidates may reapply.”
 - **5. UNIVERSITY STANDARDS FOR RETENTION**
 - Discussions ensued:
 - Should there be language that speaks to the faculty member’s appointment to include those, for example, who are heavily engaged in research with minor teaching or service activities? Those discrepancies should not count against them. Language might be “consistent with the candidate’s appointment...”
 - Singel – Because percentage of effort is changing every year and becomes very complicated, the language should articulate something that is generally on that point.
 - Larson – 2nd bullet regarding integration repeats everything in effectiveness and, as stated in our previous conversations which directed faculty to add a simple paragraph in the dossier, perhaps that language should be relegated to a sub-heading under the first bullet. Standards for Retention are well-defined and Standards for Effective Integration are somewhat less defined and should not have that much weight in these standards.
 - Bolte – When one is going up for retention under one R&S and if a new R&S is being composed, you cannot go up under the new R&S.
 - Brown – Believed that faculty went up for tenure under the same standards you were retained under. The standards that are in effect the day you apply and are retained might be the year after you apply. Argument: You might receive advice from your committee at the time of retention that would improve your chances for tenure but is not necessarily responsive to the standards under which you might be judged. You might aspire to be retained and work toward certain goals and then you must change gears and work towards other goals at the time after retention. Therefore, College of Business faculty asked to bring forward a friendly amendment that would allow faculty to go up for tenure under the standards that were in effect when one applied for retention.
 - Singel – As an aside, during charrettes, a department head requested that the standards for tenure to be in effect at the date of first day for employment in a tenurable position.
 - Possible resolution from Arch Dept – standards could change on you two years before you presented your dossier for tenure and that didn’t

seem like enough time. Tantamount to changing requirements in a class syllabus 2/3 of the way through the semester. Could a faculty member choose whether to go under the new document or the one they were hired under?

- Austin – A faculty member in political science is going up for retention review; there is a high likelihood that there will be new standards for the university and certainly different than our current dept and college R&S. At some point, we will need guidance on how to manage integration as it is not in prior material or something that has been done previously.
- Carucci – JAGS will revisit this.

Public Comment

- There was no public comment.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 pm.

Michael Babcock, Chair
Franke Wilmer, Chair-elect
STOPPED 51:24