

FACULTY COUNCIL
April 5, 2006
REID ROOM 105
4:10 AM – 5:00 PM
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY-BOZEMAN, MONTANA
Minutes

Members Present: Amin, Bailey, Becker, Brown, Catoira, Cherry, Halonen, Jones, Levy, C. McClure, Neeley, Prawdzienski, Scott, Stringam, Taper, Taylor, Zhu

Members Absent: Ashley, Bennett, Bradley, Christopher, Croy, Dyer, Erickson, Idzerda, Jackson, Johnson, Larkin, Lynes-Hayes, Marlow, M. McClure, Pratt, Psychology, Ryker, E. Schmidt, Seymour, Stroup, Watson for Metz, D. Weaver

Others present: Dooley, Lansverk.

Chair Shannon Taylor called the meeting to order at 4:10 PM. A quorum was present. The minutes from March 29, 2006 were approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS – Chair Taylor

- Parental/Family Leave and Administrative Review approved and posted on the Faculty Council website: <http://www2.montana.edu/facultycouncil/index.html>, will be placed in MSU TODAY on April 6, 2006. They will remain there for 10 days and then come back to FC for final approval before going to President Gamble.
- Vice Chair McClure will be running the meeting next week, as Chair Taylor will be out.

PLAGIARISM – Chair Lansverk

- Faculty Affairs has been collecting data from departments about plagiarism and discussing what the university should do to prevent it. An email will be distributed to all faculty with three questions:
 - What department are you in?
 - Is student plagiarism a problem in your field and in your individual classes?
 - Would you be interested in using or trying an online plagiarism detection program?
- The results will go to Chair Lansverk.

P&T TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS – Chair Lansverk

- Provost Dooley is asking whether we should put a group together from Provost and FC to work on the implementation on any or all recommendations or not. FC should be thinking implementation, or it could negate the document entirely. Provost Dooley suggested that a subset of FC or FC itself make comments on any of these items such as, “Here is our take on this recommendation. We think you should look at this more broadly. We think that these model guidelines are potentially valuable foundation on which to build this recommendation. Then the suggestions/comments might go to Faculty Affairs for further review, etc.”

- **8.10** – Even though the document, “Model Guidelines for In-depth Assessment of Teaching” exists, it has never gone through a faculty approved process, and there was discussion whether the mandate to use it was wise or not. If the mandate is the case, then FC would have to review it. A FC member has done literature research on student evaluations as a measure of teaching effectiveness, and the overwhelming conclusion is that they are a non-existent indicator. Faculty should investigate other methods of assessing teaching. Chair Taylor suggested modified wording such as, “The Task Force recommends in-depth teaching assessment be developed that follow professions’ best practices. For example, the “Model Guidelines.....” FC agreed that this point needs more discussion before making a recommendation. Provost Dooley stressed that the model guidelines are a menu that suggest a host of things for departments from which to choose. It is not prescriptive.
- **8.11** – FC recognizes that the standards for teaching are nebulous. It is recognized that it is easier to get criteria that is evaluateable and accountable when it applies to research. And while this point is not trying to mandate a change of culture in departments, it encourages communications (especially the deans/department heads) amongst departmental members and the teaching path of tenure.
 - The conversations drifted to guidelines for quality versus quantity in research and teaching. Research is evaluated in both quality and quantity; teaching seems to be only quality. FC agreed that it is an issue of concern.
 - The P&T Task Force closely examined this issue and endorsed that there is a choice and that there is broad overlap. Chair Lansverk stated that he would revisit members of the P&T Task Force to ask why they arrived at their conclusion regarding this point.
- **8.12** – It was agreed that the current system of checks and balances was necessary, but a member of the UPT committee stated that many times, lower levels of review miss many things and the higher levels must send dossiers back. Departments need to examine their Role and Scope statement.
 - Provost Dooley believes it is a strength of our university to have all the levels of checks and balances for dossier review.
 - Provost Dooley suggests having UPT split into two committees: A Retention Committee (who also looks at Role and Scope), and another committee, more senior, for Promotion and Tenure. There are different standards for each, and two separate committees would be better equipped to facilitate reviewing the dossiers.
 - Another possibility suggested was that the final level of review could be done within the colleges.

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

Signature

Shannon Taylor, Chair

Signature

Gale R. Gough, Secretary