

**MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY
FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
September 28, 2005
113 Linfield
Montana State University-Bozeman
4:10-5:00 PM**

Members Present: Ashley, Cash for Bailey, Catoira, Cherry, Christopher, Croy, Dyer, Erickson, Jones, Larkin, Levy, Lynes-Hayes, C. McClure, M. McClure, Neeley, Scott, Seymour, Taper, Taylor, Watson for Metz

Members Absent: Amin, Architecture, Becker, Bradley, Brown, Marlow, Johnson, Idzerda, Jackson, Pratt, Prawdzienski, E. Schmidt, Stringam, Stroup, Yoo

Others: Dooley, Fedock, Lansverk, Meeyung MacMurdie (Exponent), Bovard Tiberi (Protemp, ASMSU Senate)

The meeting was called to order at 4:15 PM. A quorum was present. Minutes from the September 21, 2005 Faculty Council were approved.

FACULTY AFFAIRS – Chair Marvin Lansverk

- Faculty Affairs presented the new form they will be using for sabbatical review. Chair Lansverk asked faculty to remember that imbedded in any metric tool is a philosophy. Our existing process emulates a competitive grant model, and faculty eligible for sabbaticals make proposals with teaching/research outcomes which are scored. The Existing Form poses three questions for sabbatical review criteria:
 - Potential for improvement in teaching, research/creativity activity. (10 pts)
 - Demonstrated ability to implement the project. (10 pts)
 - Value to MSU and the profession and the potential impact on future performance. (10 pts)
- It has been difficult for the committee to know whether Existing Form Question 1 has meant that proposals that address both teaching and researching creativity were better on a 10 point scale than ones that address only teaching or research creativity. The BOR policy laid the foundation for this question, and Faculty Affairs has endeavored to match the language of the question with that of the BOR. Originally, it meant either teaching or research creativity, but not necessarily both. Lately, when faculty ask about making a sabbatical proposal, Faculty Affairs advises stating something about both.
- Existing Form Question #3 was too cumbersome and was reworded.
- New Form Question #1 “Potential for improvement in teaching and/or research/creativity activity” – A faculty member’s proposal may have something to do with teaching and research/creativity; it may be an entirely research-focused sabbatical or teaching-focused sabbatical, or any combinations thereof.
- New Form Question #2 “Potential for project to contribute to the faculty member’s integration of teaching and research/creative activity” – Since MSU does have a priority with the key concept of, “integrating” teaching and research, the committee felt it was appropriate time to make that case. On a 5-point scale you address integration of teaching and research.
- New Form Question #3 “Demonstrate the ability to implement the project”- This question split out old question #3 into two additional questions, each worth five points, “Significance of project”, and “Value to MSU”. Additionally, our Existing Form did not take into account some elements mandated by the BOR policy. That policy stated sabbaticals must take into account the years of service to MSU and academic rank. The New Form brings this into compliance with BOR policy, with added point values.
- If a candidate has not had a sabbatical in 25 years and has the same score as a faculty member who just had a sabbatical within the last 7 years, the candidate who has not had one in 25 years will get more points.
- **II. Other.**
 - *#1. Previous Meritorious Teaching, Research, Service*
 - A FC member questioned how, if the sabbatical review form was to be quantitative, it is able to have a “yes” or “no” answer for Section II? Chair Lansverk stated that BOR policy requires evidence of previous meritorious teaching research service. The call for proposals has everyone writing two pages about their meritorious achievements, and the form did not have a

quantitative way of recognizing it, and therefore this question is a place holder for the question.

- #2 Years of Service
 - *Many Sabbaticals entail professors leaving campus to re-energize their research skills. How are you able to integrate your research with teaching when you are on sabbatical?* Chair Lansverk answered that you do not accomplish this while on sabbatical, but your project should contribute to integration when you return from sabbatical.
 - *The form states that faculty receive a 1/10 of a point per year since their last sabbatical, or since eligible for sabbatical. FC members believe this amount inappropriate. A motion was made to move it to a 1/5 of a point. Discussions ensued.* Chair Lansverk stated that he would be in favor of that motion. He stated that the point range for the top ten proposals tend to be bunched, and there is not a huge gap between them. If the gap was too large, a message would be sent that time and service would be sole criteria for a sabbatical. Chair Taylor stated that he believed a substantial element in considering sabbaticals is the length of time a faculty member spends at MSU as a good teacher, and not necessarily someone who is an active researcher. That element should weigh more heavily and allow faculty time to go on sabbatical to ramp up their research. Chair Lansverk stated that actual ranges could be analyzed to see how many incremental points are enough and are significant. Chair Lansverk stated that Faculty Affairs is not changing the philosophy of the sabbatical, but hoping to have discussions about it in the context of data, particularly from the sabbatical survey conducted last year.
 - Campus-wide consensus would like to see a model sabbatical that would allow for re-tooling and regeneration. The current model may allow for that, but is not specifically designed for it.
- #3. Academic Rank:
 - Professor – 2 points
 - Associate – 1 point
 - Assistant - Ineligible

- Motion to increase 1/10 to 1/5 → seconded → all in favor → passed.
- Motion to use the form as is → seconded → passed

POST TENURE TERMINATION POLICY – Chair Lansverk

- The BOR asked to have the standing committee, Committee on Service, created through the BOR policy and part of the post tenure procedure, populated with three faculty members. Faculty Council will appoint a tenured faculty member under current contract; the President's office will appoint a faculty member; and a faculty member will be appointed by the Commissioner's office. There will be three serving members and three alternates.
- Where will this committee sit in the post tenure review process? Chair Lansverk stated that Faculty Affairs would like to chart out the Committee on Service's position, and confirm its conformance with AAUP guidelines. AAUP's keystone is that a post tenure review process does not replace existing procedures for termination for cause, does not weaken them, and does not supplement them, but interfaces with them. The process MSU created states that if you flunk your post tenure review at all stages → the university initiates termination for cause proceedings → then the Committee of Service is part of the termination for cause, regardless if it is for post tenure review or not.
- The history of the post tenure review movement is an attempt to undo tenure.
- Dave Dooley stated that our current policy should be reviewed by Faculty Affairs to ensure that it is consistent with the BOR policy 710.2.2.
- There is no grievance in this process and allows the institution (President) to terminate a faculty member pending a review by the BOR. Grievance proceedings and how they relate to this post tenure review process should also be scrutinized by Faculty Affairs.

COMMITTEE REPRESENTATION – Chair Taylor

- Parking Committee – Shannon Taylor
- Steering Committee – Marcie McClure
- Undergraduate Studies Committee – Cynthia McClure
- Motion to have these members approved→seconded→all in favor→passed.

BOR REVIEW – Chair Taylor

- Even though we do not have an evaluation process that impacts presidents' salaries, Chair Taylor and student representatives spoke in favor of raising their salaries, as well as those of the chancellors. External factors were used to determine these raises.
- What really impacts tuition raises? Bovard Tiberi, protemp of the ASMSU senate, reviewed the correlation between tuition and, for example, the parking garage, as well as other issues on campus.
- Chair Taylor encourages shared governance, and as a result ASMSU has been attending Steering Committee and Faculty Council meetings.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:35 PM, as there was no further business.

Signature

Shannon Taylor, Chair

Signature

Gale R. Gough, Secretary