

FACULTY COUNCIL
March 7, 2007
STRAND UNION 276
4:10 AM – 5:00 PM
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY-BOZEMAN, MONTANA
Minutes

Members Present: Amin, Ashley, Bailey, Bandyopadhyay, Becker, Clark for K.A. Scott, Cherry, Dyer, Gipp, Jones, Levy, Lynch, Livingston, Neeley, Peed, Pinet, Prawdzienski, Seymour, Tang for Starkey, Watson, D. Weaver

Members Absent: Ag Econ, Ag/ED/AOT, Chem/Biochem, Christopher, Croy, English, Erickson, Idzerda, Jackson, Johnson, Lei, McClure, Jacobs, Nursing On-Campus, Political Science, Taylor

Others Present: Dooley, Fedock, Lansverk, Sherwood

Vice Chair Warren Jones called the meeting to order at 4:10 PM. A quorum was present. The minutes from February 28, 2007 were unanimously approved.

P&T IMPLEMENTATION SUBCOMMITTEE PRESENTATIONS– Marvin Lansverk , John Sherwood

- The P&T Implementation Committee (PTIC) was formed via the P&T Task Force (PTTF). FC responded to the items that came from the PTTF with a written document. With documents from the PTTF and FC, the PTIC was to incorporate both documents into one to be placed in the handbook.
- FC would like to ensure that a large document is not presented for approval with little time for discussions. Therefore, Marvin Lansverk suggested we engage the chairs of the P&TIC subcommittees in a dialog from time to time. Marvin Lansverk and John Sherwood are present to represent their respective subcommittees.
- Marvin Lansverk’s subcommittee is charged with addressing definitions, criteria and standards associated with the terms “promise of excellence” and “excellence and effectiveness.”
 - The “promise of excellence” is a concept still undefined however, departments still choose how they define it.
 - Discussions within the subcommittee are within the bounds of what FC has already discussed.
 - The subcommittee is also investigating the origins of their charge. FC was asked if they thought any merit would arise from changing the word “effectiveness” to “accomplishment,” and retaining the definitions under effectiveness.
 - This subcommittee is to have their task done by the end of March so it can be in front of the entire PTIC in April.
- John Sherwood’s subcommittee is charged with the external review process which includes number and type of reviewers, solicitation letter to reviewers, and expectations for content of external review. The subcommittee is also examining the quality and quantity of documentation for more explicit expectations for the in-depth assessment of teaching. This will not be discussed today, however.
- The external review subcommittee members are John Sherwood, Jodie Kawasaki, Richard Helzer and Patrik Callis.
- The subcommittee revealed that there were inconsistencies and confusion between the Faculty Handbook (FH) language and handouts provided faculty during P&T workshops. For example, what are external letters supposed to accomplish? The definition of external peer review in the Faculty Handbook states that a “...written evaluation from someone outside the university to evaluate the faculty’s performance in teaching research/creative activity and service.” Handouts provided during P&T workshops gives an overview of P&T policies and procedures, and it states that external letters only apply to evaluations of research. This is only one example.
- The last sentence of the workshop handout states “The MSU faculty handbook contains all the policies and procedures pertaining to the formal review of faculty at MSU Bozeman. If there are any omissions or inconsistencies between this material and the handbook, the handbook takes precedence.” It is believed that there should not be inconsistencies and that the Faculty Handbook should be broadly applicable throughout the colleges and campus and represent the minimal level that faculty must reach. Requirements outside the university minimum should be up to the colleges. The handout, which includes much detail not in the FH, should be updated to be consistent with the FH.
- Many issues regarding external peer reviews:
 - Some faculty (e.g., the art department), find it very difficult to find a peer to review their work.

- Sometimes the letter requirement is met, but the documents do not present enough data.
- When the Provost feels there is insufficient information to make a judgment, then he asks for more information. i.e., more external letters. Also, if there was much disparity between what is requested by the external reviewer and what is articulated in their letter, more letters are requested.
- Is it believed that there should be stronger language for “effectiveness.”
- What can be done to avoid having a dossier sent back by the Provost when it has been accepted by all levels leading up to him? It was suggested that the candidate take more time to make sure the dossier is complete, even if it is late. The Provost is amenable to that suggestion.
- It was stated that external reviewers do not have details about individual responsibilities on the MSU campus. John Sherwood stated that his department sends a candidate’s personal statement and hire letter. The more information given, the better.
- MSU external review letters are confidential.
- FC believes, as stated in their PTF review, that the levels of checks and balances work at MSU.

OTHER – Vice Chair Jones

- A FC member is needed for the Employee Recognition Committee. Please contact Gale if you are interested in participating.
- A proposal has been made that FC change its name to Faculty Senate. The word “council” has conflicts with other bodies on campus e.g., Graduate Council. We are the only body in the MUS system that is known as a council.

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

Signature

Warren Jones, Vice Chair

Signature

Gale R. Gough, Secretary