

FACULTY SENATE - DRAFT
November 4, 2009
REID HALL 453
4:10 PM – 5:00 PM
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY-BOZEMAN, MONTANA
Notes

Members Present: Cherry, Eitle, Fischer, Kaiser, Lawrence, Lansverk, Locke, Lynch, Meade, Neumeier, Schachman, Sobek, Thompson, Wisner, Wojtowicz

Members Absent: Bangert, Bessen, Chen, Eiger, Fields, Fleck, Frick, Gee, Gerlach, Jacobsen, Livingston, Mokwa, Mosley, Osborne, Political Science, Rotella, Savoie, Sowell, Versaevel, Waller, D. Weaver, Zhu

Others Present: Joe Fedock, Shannon Taylor, Greg Young

Chair Wes Lynch called the meeting to order at 4:10 PM. A quorum was not present.

Announcements –Chair Wes Lynch

- Chair Lynch will try to arrange a meeting with FS and President-elect Cruzado on November 19, 2009, the week of the BOR meeting.
- The summary of the Regents Workgroup (reinvention and reformation for the MSU system) meeting of October 22, 2009 is posted at:
<http://mus.edu/board/meetings/RegentsWorkgroup/RegentsWorkgroupMinutes10-2009.pdf> Chair Lynch and Chair-elect Lansverk requested time on the agenda to discuss how faculty would like to be involved and have a relevant role within this workgroup.
 - A FS member queried whether the PQO (productivity, quality and outcomes) metrics, which were instituted at MSU in 1995, might already address what the BOR are looking for with respect to meaningful and quality metrics of success for faculty. PQO were faculty based raises in return for a series of metrics that were met after a four year period.
- The most recent F&A distribution document of October 29, 2009 (and subsequent to the October 16, 2009 document) has been distributed and is being used in the deans and department heads meetings. The most significant difference is the distribution of excess, after fixed costs, funds between the deans and department heads (a 50/50 split), the allocation of block grants (at \$100,000 a piece) to unspecified departments/colleges, and, \$400,000 allocated to special programs.

Special Expedited Tenure Review Process – Chair Wes Lynch

- The Faculty Handbook references a policy on special reviews and has been used for a number of years as a way of granting tenure, in an expedited fashion, to those who are hired at MSU as administrators or full professors and who have tenure at other institutions. These tenure processes have been brought forward in the same order, but the review only takes one year to complete.
- Currently, we have 8 employees on campus (1 dean, 3 directors, 3 department heads, 2 full professors) who were hired last year and were promised a special expedited tenure review. After that time and in June, the BOR changed policy to allow early tenure reviews. The administration may decide the nature of the review and if approved by the president, the hiring letter goes to the candidate. The language is not clear whether it applies to tenure reviews or the nature of the review. Ambiguities with respect to timeline, deadlines, what committees were involved, what materials were to be provided, etc., exist. Chair Lynch would like to approve a modified, one-time temporary expedited review process. Currently, there are two processes.
 - Discussion ensued.
- The primary goal is to preserve faculty's role in tenure. Chair-elect Lansverk would like FS's input on the featured document reviewed and submitted by the FS Steering Committee. The key elements include the abbreviated dossier and do the candidates deserve tenure, according to our standards? Abbreviated dossiers need not contain: External peer review letters (candidates may choose to include letters of reference submitted as part of their MSU job application), an in-depth assessment of teaching, and internal peer reviews.

- *BOR policy use the phrase “exceptionally meritorious” and that almost suggests a different standard than what is listed in the FH. Do you have any interpretation of that with respect to what we are doing now? The BOR policy imagined a trigger.*
- *If I’m on a P&T committee and have one of these special things coming through, do I use the normal standards and criteria, or do I evaluate this person as exceptionally meritorious, and what does that mean? If this were a clean process that decision would have already been made in advance.*
- *Where did this draft come from? I don’t like it because it doesn’t say anything at all about teaching. It sets a bad precedent. The department may want to hire some hot-shot researcher, but they may not be such a great teacher and we can get them through the expedited tenure process because there is nothing about teaching. Therefore, we should make known that we, FS, do indeed care about teaching*
This is a concern and in the past all the standard criteria were in play; whether it was used or not is not clear. Legally, the president may be able to bypass criteria according to legal counsel, but FS would like to retain participation in the tenure process, otherwise its violates its right to participate.
- *Under this proposal, who makes the decision whether someone is eligible for special review? This policy is only eligible for the 8 hired and the new president and then this [old letter of hire] goes away.*
- *There is nothing in this new letter that precludes this from happening to the next batch of candidates who might be hired. This policy is only in place until some deadline is enacted and then a new, permanent policy should be in place. Nothing in the special review letters changes the criterion standards for tenure; then remain in pace. Our concern has been that is all the primary review committee has to look at is a CV and a personal statement, it is not sufficient for them to determine whether those individuals meet those criterion standards. We are trying to make it so the primary review committee has enough information. If someone wants to retreat back into the department, then the department has every right not to accept those individuals; it has worked all right so far, but there is no guarantee for the future.*
- *If a faculty member has tenure review process at another institution and is worthy of hire at this institution, I am in favor of a tenure-at-hire policy. It would save us a lot of effort of reading a dossier that has already been critically acted upon. That said, I am opposed to a one-time procedure; I would accept a provisional procedure otherwise you will establish a precedence. That would establish a phase where Faculty Senate would come up with a more definitive policy. Therefore, do not call it a “one-time” policy; call it a “provisional” policy. Because we cannot envision how this would be used in the future. The “authority” should have the right to ask for additional information.*

Chair Lynch will email FS members on whether they would like to proceed with what has been discussed in terms of the tenure-at-hire policy.

The Faculty Senate meeting ended at 5:00 PM, as there was no further business.

Signature

Wes Lynch, Chair

Signature

Gale R. Gough, Secretary