

FACULTY SENATE
April 9, 2008
REID HALL 103
4:10 AM – 5:00 PM
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY-BOZEMAN, MONTANA
Minutes

Members Present: Amin, Bandyopadhyay, Becker, Cherry, Dyer, Fleck, Gipp, Igo, Livingston, Locke for Ashley, Lei, Longcope, Leech, Lynch, C. McClure, Neeley, Pinet, Prawdzienski, Taylor, Watson, D. Weaver, Wojtowicz

Members Absent: Bailey, Bangert, Bennett, Gerlach, HHD, Jackson, Jacobs, Johnson, M. McClure, Mokwa, Nursing On-Campus, Peed, Political Science, T. Weaver, Zhu

Others Present: Joe Fedock, Marvin Lansverk

Chair Shannon Taylor called the meeting to order at 4:10 PM. A quorum was present. The minutes from March 26, 2008 were unanimously approved.

FACULTY AFFAIRS – Chair Marvin Lansverk

- Sabbatical process: The Provost sends out the call for sabbaticals → subcommittee of Faculty Affairs (FA) evaluates the proposals (usually 4-5 people from different disciplines; but not every discipline) and makes the recommendations.
- Because of limited funds, not everyone who applied was guaranteed a sabbatical. It is a competitive process and is grant-mirrored. All proposals are ranked in order, and the provost funds down the list. Some years more money is in the pool than others; not all of this year's sabbaticals were funded, as money ran out; there were 11 awarded from 14 submissions. The number submitted each year is somewhat stable; 14-15.
- There old form had five (5) categories for grading:
 - Potential for improvement in teaching and/or research/creative activity;
 - Potential for project to contribute to the faculty member's integration of teaching and research/creative activity;
 - Demonstrated ability to implement the project;
 - Significance of Project; and
 - Value to MSU.
- Problems that arose with old form categories and wording were:
 - Category #1: How to judge whether someone will improve, or not?
 - Category #4 and #5: Some find it difficult to know what this is getting at and thus, it is hard to evaluate.
- Sabbatical Application Review form has been updated. It now:
 - Makes it easier to score;
 - Makes it clearer for those writing proposals; and
 - Better articulates sabbatical philosophy.
- The form does not have substantive, directional changes; just rearranging to make it easier to navigate. FA would like FS feedback for approval.
- The new form is similar to the NSF grant proposal forms and now has three (3) categories for grading instead of five (5):
 - 1. Scholarly Merit:
 - How does the proposed activity contribute to the faculty member's teaching and/or research creative activity? (5)
 - How important is the proposed activity to advancing knowledge and understanding within its own field or across different fields? To what extent does the proposed activity suggest and explore creative and original concepts? (5)
 - How well qualified is the proposer to conduct the project? (Evidence of past meritorious performance) (5)
 - How well conceived and organized is the proposed activity? Can it be accomplished in the allotted time? (5)

- Has there been appropriate advance planning, arrangements with parties? Are there available resources? (5)

Or

- 1. Scholarly Merit:
 - How does the proposed activity contribute to the faculty member's teaching and/or research creative activity? (10)
 - How important is the proposed activity to advancing knowledge and understanding within its own field or across different fields? To what extent does the proposed activity suggest and explore creative and original concepts? (5)
 - How well qualified is the proposer to conduct the project? (Evidence of past meritorious performance) (5)
 - How well conceived and organized is the proposed activity? Can it be accomplished in the allotted time? Has there been appropriate planning? Are there available resources? (5)
- 2. Scholarly Integration:
 - How well the project contribute to the faculty member's integration of teaching and research/creative activity?
- 3. Broader Impacts:
 - What are the local/regional impacts? (3)
 - What are the benefits to the discipline? (4)
 - Will the results be disseminated broadly, through publication, etc.? (3)
- There are bonus points for years without sabbaticals and rank.
- Discussions ensued:
 - Some may want to do a teaching sabbatical, and this NSF language may be too "research" defined for some faculty participants e.g., nursing.
 - A FS member stated that a sabbatical should not be thought of as a *grant proposal.*
 - There is confusion about how grants and sabbaticals are funded if they occur simultaneously. Chair Lansverk will investigate.

CONCILIATION/GRIEVANCE/OMBUDS – Chair Taylor

- Currently, faculty who believe they have been treated unfairly may go through a grievance process, which may involve an ombuds who acts as a neutral, independent, and confidential resource providing informal assistance. Faculty do not have an advocate.
- Faculty Senate Steering Committee discussed modifying the ombuds process through:
 - Quality control management by conducting a satisfaction survey on past participants who were involved in the ombuds process;
 - Modifying the ombuds job description to include non-binding consultation;
 - Term limits.
- Chair Taylor noted that the legal counsel office at MSU is available to faculty for consultation. Leslie Taylor reports to the COHE; not the president.

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

Signature

Shannon Taylor, Chair

Signature

Gale R. Gough, Secretary