

FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING
FEBRUARY 8, 2006
REID ROOM 105
4:10 AM – 5:00 PM
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY-BOZEMAN, MONTANA
Minutes

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

Members Absent: Bennett, Bradley, Brown, Idzerda, Jackson, Johnson, Larkin, M. McClure, Pratt, Psychology, E. Schmidt, Seymour, Stroup Watson for Metz

Others: Dooley, Fedock, Lansverk

Chair Shannon Taylor called the meeting to order at 4:10 PM. A quorum was present.

ANNOUNCEMENTS – Chair Taylor

- Chair Taylor believes further review of Parental Leave policies in the Faculty Handbook should take place before continuing discussions.

FACULTY AFFAIRS – Chair Lansverk

- The final P&T Task Force Report was commissioned by FC and the Provost and reviewed by a diverse committee.
- Does FC endorse the recommendations to carry forward to the various bodies who would implement it? Needs detailed scrutiny from FC.
- Reviewing the document, ***RECOMMENDATIONS (14 points):***
 - 8.1- Currently, the standards for tenure include choosing an area of excellence and an area of effectiveness. The standard you must reach for your chosen area is demonstration of the “promise of excellence,” with the standard in the other area being “effectiveness.” The original memo that created this Task Force and subsequent observations made were that in most every department’s documents, effectiveness is defined with some level of specificity and excellence is defined as the standard you meet when you go up for full professor. The promise of excellence is never defined, but inferred by reading the standards for excellence; the consequence of which is that the standard for effectiveness may, in practice, be higher than the standard for promise of excellence. The proposed recommendation is that every department write a definition for promise of effectiveness with their particular criteria. FC members observed that faculty doing reviews, many times, do not read their own departmental guidelines.
 - 8.2 - This recommendation is not mandating a “sameness” within departments. It is determining if faculty are satisfied with the level of specificity or not in their departments.
 - 8.3 - Throughout most departmental Role and Scope documents, “integration” does not show up. This recommendation asks departments to think about how to include it within their own discipline.
 - 8.4 - Reorganizes Section 200 in all Role and Scope documents.
 - 8.5 - Proposes a new university-level committee to review department and college-level P&T documents for consistency, policy, conformity and clarity of language. It should be comprised of people who have previously been on the university P&T committee. Currently, the university P&T committee does that, but with increasing workloads, a new committee might assume the above-mentioned responsibilities. FC members asked, once the review is made, who is contacted/who receives their report, and how much time is given for refinement of the document? How do you handle cases that come up while the document is under this new committee? How much authority would this new committee have? Also, there may not be a large enough faculty pool to draw from to staff this committee. It is not clear, and FC believes this recommendation should be reviewed again.
 - 8.6 – There is a general feeling that dossiers for people who are going up for teaching are inconsistent. Some dossiers have specific data requirements and full-spectrum analyses and others do not. This recommendation would mandate consistency in dossier contents.
 - 8.7 – Now, when faculty go up for tenure, they go up under the approved document when they went up for your third-year review. Therefore, numerous candidates within the same department have different documents under which they are reviewed. This current recommendation presents a choice and states that “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 who feels that they 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.

- This creates a scenario of chaos. For example, if two faculty go up for tenure at the same time and one picks old documents and one picks the new documents, both will have different outcomes. The specificity of this recommendation should be made clear and evident.
- FC recommended that this point be reviewed, again.
- Chair Lansverk asked that FC members to read the P&T Task Force document and entertain their own thoughts on new recommendations, if they were so inclined.

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

Signature

Shannon Taylor, Chair

Signature

Gale R. Gough, Secretary