

FACULTY COUNCIL
FEBRUARY 22, 2006
STRAND UNION ROOM 276
4:10 AM – 5:00 PM
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY-BOZEMAN, MONTANA
Minutes

Members Present: Amin, Ashley, Bailey, Becker, Brown, Catoira, Cherry, Christopher, Croy, Dyer, Idzerda, Jones, Levy, Lynes-Hayes, Marlow, C. McClure, Halonen for M. McClure, Neeley, Prawdzienski, Ryker, Scott, Seymour, Stringam, Taper, Taylor, Zhu

Members Absent: Bennett, Bradley, Erickson, Jackson, Johnson, Larkin, Pratt, Psychology, E. Schmidt, Stroup, Watson for Metz

Others: Dooley, Fedock, Lansverk

Chair Shannon Taylor called the meeting to order at 4:10 PM. A quorum was present. The minutes from February 1 and February 8, 2006 were approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS – Chair Taylor

- With respect to the 4% pay raise /allocation, Chair Taylor believed discussions in Faculty Council have been thorough and feels confident that all points have been brought to administration's attention.
 - Different departments have their own plans for allocation and Marvin Lansverk, speaking for the English Department, believes that local control should be maintained and the equity adjustment should be done at the dean's level, not the provost's level. Therefore, there is no FC consensus.
 - Chair Taylor stated that there was a close working relationship with deans and the provost when the .5% was distributed last year. He stated that faculty and department heads should keep in close communication with each other and decide how they would like allocations to take place.
 - FC member Christopher believes that FC should keep the 1% holdback in perspective, and the focus be on the state of our retirement plans.
 - Chair Taylor would like to examine why the state of Montana has a surplus this year and if it will be a steady revenue stream or not. If it is, then it should be researched to find where the money is coming from.
- Steering Committee will be divided into two sections: The Faculty Council Steering Committee, 9:15-10:15 AM and the Shared Governance Steering Committee 10:15-11:15 AM.

FACULTY AFFAIRS – Chair Lansverk (Continuing FC discussion of the recommendations of the P&T Task Force, from a previous meeting)

- 8.7 – Now (in what is referred to as the “moving target policy implemented two years ago), when faculty go up for tenure, they go up under the same approved document as when they went up for their third-year review. There are two outstanding problems with the present system:
 - The current “moving target” rule assumes that any change in role and scope documents will be disadvantageous to faculty members, effectively preventing any positive changes from going into effect for three years, in addition to protecting faculty from moving targets. If a department fixes errors or problems in their R&S documents, and make it better, and it is better for the candidate within the three-year window of his/her tenure third-year review, they still do not get reviewed under that document.
 - The second problem is with documentation/paperwork. The current system relies on departments to keep good records of P&T documents, with the possibility of several versions in play at the same time. Under the current system, it is possible that a department could have two or more candidates, each going up under a different set of documents. And the problem is some departments don't keep very good records. It would be advantageous to fix the record-keeping facet of that process—which is the additional recommendation of the Task Force (see 8.8 below).

- Given these 2 problems, the Task Force recommendation is that faculty members be given a choice: “Faculty will normally be reviewed using the current P&T documents. If the Role and Scope of the department or college has been substantially changed since you were hired, you may then elect to be reviewed under the previous one. If the faculty being reviewed feels that he/she will be disadvantaged by recent changes they may elect to be reviewed using the P&T documents in effect at hire or retention.” This is not subject to any approval; it is faculty choice.
- Provost Dooley stated that this creates a scenario of chaos. For example, if two faculty go up for tenure within the same year and one picks old documents and one picks the new documents, both will have different outcomes. Provost Dooley stated that it is not a question of legal or illegal but rather what works for faculty involved. If you put the discretion as to which document gets applied at the faculty member level, you do not fix the moving target level. You still have multiple documents in effect for any particular year, depending on the choices, now ,of individual faculty members, and it is Leslie Taylor’s opinion, and one FC should consider carefully as stakes are much higher with respect to promotion and tenure than whether a certain prerequisite is required or not, what year you came in or not. That means two faculty would be reviewed under two completely different sets of documents and the outcome of equity and merit may not be the same. Those faculty could, say, then, “I was badly advised by the university.” Provost Dooley stated that it is not clear why the word “normally” improves this policy and gets the outcome FC would like to see. Chair Lansverk would like to explore this more.
- Discussion ensued.
 - A FC member asked if an analogous situation is when faculty go up for tenure and get a choice to go up for promise of excellence in teaching or promise of excellence in research/creativity. If they are equal in their level of excellence and, if they choose a wrong category, aren’t they also at risk by getting the wrong advice? Provost Dooley stated that this analogy is limited in the context of the situation being discussed. The critical components of these documents are the standards and criteria. That is what the previous FA and previous version FC approved. They thought it would be unfair to have the standards and criteria changed without giving the faculty member adequate time to change course if a course-correction were necessary.
 - A FC member asked, “With respect to role and scope in your department, what if you go through your review and it is pointed out that there is a lack of clarity in a certain issue that is relevant to you, but it would be overlooked. However, the next time it might be to your disadvantage. So if there is no clarity between retention and tenure or tenure and final promotion, you are aware of this potential glitch, but it may actually be modified and you can take advantage of this new modification. Perhaps there needs to be a distinction between a clarification and a change in target, making it beneficial both ways.”
 - One thing that might be useful is to go back to Leslie Taylor and ask what legal language might make this a better recommendation.
 - Chair Taylor is hoping that FC would make formal recommendations, directly, to Faculty Affairs.
- 8.8 – Currently, departments keep their files, which include current and historical documents. The Task Force recommendation is that when documents are changed, they must get approved and are then maintained and filed in the Provost’s office. There are cases where incorrect documents are utilized and it is not evident until a committee further up the chain of command is reviewing them.
- 8.9 – Each level would be able to see who voted how and what transpired. This creates accountability.
- 8.10 – There is strong perception that teaching is not evaluated as thoroughly or carefully as research. Therefore, the Task Force recommends that in-depth teaching assessments be developed that follow the guidelines set forth in the “Model Guidelines for In-depth Assessment of Teaching.” This new recommendation is asking for greater specificity and more data. Provost Dooley welcomes this, as the disparities in documents that are presented in dossiers are evident. A major responsibility at the departmental committee level must be that they conduct an in-depth teaching assessment and that is an aspect that needs to be given serious consideration..

- FC are not sure what it means, “To go up under teaching.” Does it mean you are an excellent teacher or that you are a pedagogy specialist? Is that our model? **It was later noted that the handbook states that pedagogy is under research.**
- A FC member stated that his department is confused because 8.10 seems to intimate that it is only for excellence in teaching, while Provost Dooley says, it is in the context of effectiveness of teaching also. He stated that The Model Guidelines for In-Depth Teaching Assessment written by Jeff Adams was never reviewed by any P&T Committee or anyone else, and it seems to indicate that faculty have to have video tapes and external reviews. He is concerned that the burden of effectiveness is too much. He does not believe that if faculty go up for research, they should not have to send out video tapes and an external packet.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 PM, as there was no other business.

Signature

Shannon Taylor, Chair

Signature

Gale R. Gough, Secretary