

FACULTY COUNCIL
April 18, 2007
STRAND UNION 276
4:10 AM – 5:00 PM
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY-BOZEMAN, MONTANA
Minutes

Members Present: Ashley, Bailey, Bandyopadhyay, Becker, Cherry, Christopher, Croy, Jones, Levy, Lynch, Marshall for D. Weaver, M. McClure, Neeley, Peed, Prawdzienski, K.A. Scott, Watson, Starkey for Zhu, Taylor

Members Absent: Ag Econ, Ag/ED/AOT, Amin, Chem/Biochem, Dyer, Ecology, English, Erickson, Gipp, I Idzerda, Jackson, Jacobs, Lei, Livingston, Nursing On-Campus, Pinet, Political Science, Seymour

Others Present: Dana, Fedock, Lansverk

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

WESTERN VIRGINIA TECH INCIDENT – Chair Taylor

- President Gamble has formed an ad hoc committee to examine the procedures in place for MSU's campus security. A campus alert system is being examined which might include a siren, or that all cell phones within a certain range would ring at once.

HB95 (TIAA-CREF/TRS) – Chair Taylor

- Made it through the senate after the third reading and it is on the governor's desk for signature. Chair Taylor will compose another letter encouraging him to sign it.

FACULTY AFFAIRS – Chair Lansverk

- The current BOR policy for emeritus status is available to tenured faculty members upon retirement and upon BOR approval. Procedures say each campus shall establish policies relating to procedures for nomination." The Faculty Handbook states that "the department shall establish appropriate criteria against which to judge a retiring faculty member's eligibility for emeritus rank." The chain of command for emeritus rank: department head nominates→ to dean→provost→president→BOR. No details about what happens if one person in the process says "No." are available. The retirees came up with a proposal that would make the emeritus process more available and less exclusive. There is a perception that it is a very political process and retirees would like to take the politics out, make it automatic for everyone, and expand the definition of what "everybody" means. The current BOR policy does not allow "every body." U of M awards emeritus to other faculty other than tenured.
- In the short-term, FA is to come up to a clear policy that does not require a BOR change. Long-term, perhaps there would be longer discussions that may include awarding emeritus to researchers, adjuncts, etc., and would require BOR changes.
- FA, as one proposal, would like general criteria with a time line (10 years of service in the institution) and three routes for emeritus nomination (dean, department, colleague, e.g.). Faculty Council would also be involved in the emeritus advisory process with the Provost.
- The institution defines what emeritus faculty receive. Campus-wide MSU offers free parking and library privileges. Departments may have specific things that it offers
- Emeritus faculty have an office; 212, 213 Hamilton Hall.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM BILL (HJ22) – Chair Taylor

- HJ22 was tabled.

RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION COMMITTEE–Chair Taylor

- Chair Taylor attended a committee meeting last week. The report the BOR requested, with recommendations, for the September BOR meeting, includes 30-40 things that can be done to improve recruitment and retention of classifieds, professional, and faculty. Some suggestions included:
 - Examination and recommendations (via a built-in metric) for making quick decisions in hiring in critical areas of employment. These employee strata may include, but are not limited to, janitors, accountants, food service workers.

- Union reps and non-union reps need to collaborate on effective strategies that are beneficial to all.

P&T IMPLEMENTATION TASK FORCE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT – Susan Dana

- How to Effectively Evaluate Teaching – Research evaluation methods are more sophisticated and applicable to our research efforts and not as rich for teaching.
- Even though the subcommittee has no formal recommendation, they have discussed what in-depth teaching would be comprised of (these are only suggestions):
 - A definitive definition of what an in-depth review of teaching would be. The in-depth teaching might include, but not necessarily be limited to, the following elements:
 - Assessment by at least 3 reviewers of the candidate’s teaching based on the candidate’s teaching portfolio and other materials as required by the University, the department or the College. It is not clear whether internal or external reviews should be required.
 - For candidates seeking tenure and/or promotion based on promise of excellence of excellence in teaching, letters from former students, evaluation of the candidate as an advisor, and direct observation of the candidate’s teaching.
 - Thorough review by the Department and College P&T Committees of the candidate’s teaching portfolio, the assessments of the reviewers of the candidate’s teaching, and other relevant material depending on whether the candidate is seeking tenure and/or promotion based on effectiveness or (promise of) excellence in teaching.
 - The Teaching portfolio assembled by the candidate:
 - All candidates seeking tenure and/or promise would submit with their P&T dossier a teaching portfolio. Departments and Colleges would establish detailed guidance to candidates on the required content of the portfolio and the process for collecting the information to be included. The teaching portfolio would contain at least the following:
 - Candidate’s statement of teaching/learning philosophy;
 - Course list, including list of courses taught during the review period, number of credit and/or contact hours for each course, and number of students per course;
 - Summary of student evaluations, including student evaluation scores for each course taught during the review period, comparison data for the department, and a summary of student comments;
 - Candidate’s course syllabus for the most recent version of each course taught during the review period;
 - Description of advising activities;
 - Evidence of innovations in teaching and of effectiveness of innovations;
 - Contributions beyond classroom , if any, including but not limited to such activities as research/creative activity relating to teaching and/or learning; writing teaching materials; involvement in relevant professional societies; other relevant activities
 - In-depth reviews of teaching. Following is a proposed summary of the items required for in-depth reviews of teaching:

<u>Item</u>	<u>Standard:Effectiveness</u>	<u>Standard: (promise of) Excellence</u>
Min. 3 reviewers’ assess. of teaching based on candidate’s teaching portfolio & other materials collected by the depart.	Required (internal/external?)	Required (internal/external?)
Evaluations from former Students describing Experiences in candidate’s courses	Not required	Required

Evaluation of candidate as advisor.	Not required	Required
Direct observation of candidate's teaching	Not required	Required
Assess. by department & College P&T Committees of candidate's teaching.	Required	Required

- The P&T Implementation Committee is still discussing whether in-depth reviews of teaching should be done by external reviewers, internal reviewers, or combination thereof. If in-depth reviews of teaching should be comparable in rigor to reviews of research/creativity activity, then teaching should be reviewed by external reviewers just as research/creativity is reviewed.
 - May be difficult to find enough external reviewers of teaching and may be unduly burdensome to the candidate, the department and the reviewers. The Committee is still trying to reach a consensus on a recommendation. Possibilities may include:
 - All candidates for tenure/promotion must be reviewed by external reviewers on both research/creative activity and teaching.
 - Perhaps a single external reviewer could assess both research/creative activity and teaching if in the opinion of the department P&T Committee that the reviewer is qualified to do so.
 - All candidates for tenure/promotion must be reviewed by external reviewers on research/creative activity, but internal reviewers for teaching;
 - A candidate seeking to show effectiveness in teaching must have internal reviews of teaching while a candidate seeking to show (promise of) excellence in teaching must have external reviews of teaching.
 - Other?

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

Signature
Shannon Taylor, Chair

Signature
Gale R. Gough, Secretary