

FACULTY SENATE
April 27, 2016
346 LEON JOHNSON
4:10 PM – 5:00 PM
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY-BOZEMAN, MONTANA
Minutes

Members Present: Adams (Art), Anderson (Film & Photo), Babbitt (Chair), Babcock (Chair-elect), Berry (CE), Bolte (Music), Gannon (ChBE), Greenwood (Math), Downs (English), Hendrikx (Earth Sci), Herbeck (Ed), Hughes (CBN), Martin (Mod Lang), McMahon (Ecology), Meyer (Hist & Phil), Mosley (ARS), Neeley for Swinford (Soc/Anthro), O'Neill (Arch), Repasky (ECE), Rossmann (Library), Running (Nursing), Scott (Psych), Smith (HHD), Sterman (Library), Wiedenheft (MBI), Wilmer (PoliSci), Zabinski (LRES)

Others Present: Garrett Leach, Chris Fastnow, Ron Larsen, Ryan Anderson, David Singel, Martha Potvin, Kellie Peterson

Chair Babbitt called the meeting to order at 4:10 pm, and a quorum was present.

The April 20, 2016 Faculty Senate minutes were approved.

New Courses and Programs – Chair-elect Babcock

- There are no undergraduate or graduate courses, centers or programs for review.
- CPC will not have any more meetings until fall 2016.

Announcements – Chair Babbitt

- New senators were introduced:
 - Ryan Anderson will be taking Senator Paul Gannon's place (ChBE) in Faculty Senate.
 - Senators who went up for P&T and were awarded:
 - Dean Adams – School of Arts & Architecture
 - Kevin Repasky – College of Engineering
 - Jordy Hendrikx – College of Letters & Science
- Status of Prioritization Document
 - Student/faculty ratio numbers will be updated in the fall 2016 as soon as data is available.
 - Potvin noted that \$1.5M has been set aside for new faculty lines (\$0.5M will go towards benefits) for spring 2016 consideration and notification has gone out to Deans.
 - Increase in graduate stipends data will be forthcoming.
 - Fund raising in terms of scholarships:
 - Money has increased in MSU Foundation AY 14-15 along with increased recipients.
 - Recipients have gone up in terms of MSU Scholarships, but fund have essentially remained the same.
 - Endowed chairs:
 - Two (2) new in Ag
 - One (1) new in History
 - One (1) in Civil Engineering
- Chair Babbitt nearly done compiling data for the annual reviews of Deans and Dept Heads.
- May 4th is the all faculty meeting in SUB 233:

- 4:00 pm – 4:30 pm will be closed where faculty vote on graduate recipients and honorary degree candidates.
- 4:30 pm – 5:30 pm will be a social gathering of senators and administrators; refreshments will be served.
- History of All-Faculty Annual Meeting:
 - Larsen stated that the event used to be an all-faculty meeting but process changed to have FS vote, instead. Reason:
 - First year Larsen attended the meeting with only two other attendees: Bonnie Ashley and John Carlton; both abstained and Larsen was representing all-faculty.
 - Absurd – changed it to FS reps to be the all-faculty reps.

Faculty Handbook – Promotion & Tenure Document – Chair Babbitt

- The infinite numbers of ways (or the six (6) ways) to define the Area of Scholarship (hereinafter referred to as “AoS”) discussed in the April 20, 2016 FS meeting were brought to JAGS, and their conclusion was that there are only three (3) ways or one (1) way to go up for tenure.
 - Can tenure be placed under one (1) category and still meet the definition that allows the candidate to choose which area makes them tenurable?
- Babbitt asked senators to think about how to define AoS and offered two choices, in addition to the suggestion from JAGS, as starting points for discussions:
 - Infinite number of ways; or,
 - Keep the original infinite (or six) ways to define AoS.
- The new proposed concept is to demonstrate accomplishment or excellence and combine them with research and creative activities, enhance and upgrade criteria for receiving tenure under “Teaching” by taking elements under teaching that are tenurable, placing them under “Research/Creative” activities (pedagogical section) and identifying that one area a candidate may go up in.
 - “Teaching” becomes direct interactions with students and clients, and development of courses.
- Senator asked how the new categorization would affect someone who receives national awards for teaching.
 - It would be categorized under pedagogy for research/creative activity.
 - Under the traditional research/creative activity it would go under teaching.
 - Could go under both areas depending on what you go up in.
- Senator asked what the motivation was for the change.
- Many think of education/research and pedagogical studies as research. When approaching tenure and a choice is to be made, do faculty go up under research or research/teaching? If there is a combined category, why can’t we put everything under research? Is quality teaching in the classroom, itself, a tenurable act? No. If we are raising the bar in that category, why do we separate it?
- Senator asked if that means teaching is no longer considered.
 - Teaching is still in effectiveness and we may want to up that. It is really only the interactions with students and what you need to do in teaching in terms of students in the classroom.
- Second paragraph reads: “Involves the generation of new knowledge in pedagogy and the dissemination of that knowledge. This work includes development, implementation, study, and publishing of pedagogical innovations (including textbooks and xxx); documented studies of curricular and pedagogical issues; and pedagogically-oriented research; innovation in “extension.” ” It is not sufficient to merely incorporate new things into a classroom and teach well; a candidate needs to generate, disseminate and put them into the classroom.

- Senator asked where teaching teachers go (faculty development) when part of one's teaching role is preparing faculty to teach.
 - That might fall in either category. Teaching is still an AoS but it is different from the scholarship that faculty have developed and disseminated externally and are recognized for.
- Senator asked how the current explanation of what teaching is differs from actually checking the "research" box. Although "teaching" now has been more fully explained, it doesn't eliminate the fact that one may choose teaching for tenure.
 - Two things are different, but the question that must be asked is: Is a faculty member who is excellent in the teaching category able to go up in tenure for just that?
 - Still must have effectiveness in teaching and that does not include pedagogical research and textbook writing; and,
 - You may not go up in tenure in teaching any longer; just being a good classroom teacher is not enough for tenure; this may be a change in your department, or not.
- Senator suggested that wording in the second category be used to clarify and correspond to descriptions such as "research, pedagogical and creative activity." The proposal distinguishes between teaching and pedagogy. Same with teaching – one category of our responsibilities, but you have to show excellence in some or one area of research, pedagogical or creative activity (separate them into three categories). The way you fulfill this category is something you can describe and we are adding pedagogical activities to it.
- Under the proposal to define the AoS, where would that definition appear?
 - AoS needs to be almost as well defined as it is when you go up in research. Your AoS is not just research – that was the check box – AoS is what under research you are really good in; or, what under pedagogy you are really good at and well recognized in.
- Is there a problem with someone who has an appointment of 75%, or higher, teaching?
 - This document may or may not cover those faculty. If you are 75-80% teaching; 15-20% research; 5% service, what is your bar for going up under these three things? Is it the same as someone going up in 50% teaching and a higher percentage in research, etc.? What is it under your teaching that you can apply to this area? If you are 75% teaching, how do you get recognized by respected authorities in your field for what you do outside of teaching if you are going up outside of teaching? Or, if you are teaching, what were you doing in teaching that you were recognized by respected authorities outside of your field, and could that be under this category now? (Addressing external reviews).
 - Babcock reminded senators that eventually depts. and colleges will rewrite their R&S. This will afford them an opportunity to formulate indicators where each distinct unit may decide what works for them.
 - Senator from music stated that percentages are a complicated problem across campus and discipline specific; R&S should address idiosyncrasies in each dept.
 - Senators approved of the way the proposal had split what faculty are expected to do in teaching internally (effectiveness), is recognized across campus (but may not be recognized by outside authorities), and when faculty go up for tenure, their teaching is recognized by outside respected authorities. Even though one does not go up for tenure in teaching, faculty should still be excellent in teaching, regardless.
 - Babbitt noted a caveat - Not only would faculty be well recognized, here, but there would also be indicators that faculty are putting it into practice in their classroom and this would be part of internal accomplishment and excellence in teaching.
- Proposal took time to craft because of difficulties in dealing with:
 - 75% teaching;

- Defining aspects of peer reviews or external recognition with respect to extension are challenging.
- Policy proposal places a lot of weight on R&S, but it also sets up the scaffolding to help departments highlight what is important in their discipline.
- As you read through this proposal it appears to be written as an “and” “or” scenario.
 - Babbitt - The document is trying to achieve, an AoS, by providing three (3) different areas that you would typically go up under; but if we want creativity included, if there is someone who could really mix and match, cohesively, into an AoS that is well recognized, they should be allowed to do so.
 - Sterman - Should scholarship be some combination of something instead of what is currently written in the proposal? Should there be a lead in phrase that says, “You don’t have to do all of this but your AoS may involve.....”
 - Potvin – This might be easily resolved by expanding upon what you consider scholarship - scholarship of teaching, scholarship of research, scholarship of creativity, scholarship of service, and it might be appropriate for some faculty to coherently formulate how to combine these things and how they hang together.
 - Babbitt – We could include a third list where faculty might choose what is to be included in their AoS.
 - Singel – This is removing boxes, defining an AoS that may include a coherent combination of all these things. This is better as people were confused and there are a lot of ways to define this. AoS can cover all aspects of our mission but must include research or teaching.
 - Repasky - You can also say research, pedagogy and creative activity are forms of scholarship; scholarship that contains one or more of these as defined in your R&S.
 - Babbitt - We need to work on the first line of this proposal. We could say this is a definition. Definitions help to explain policy. Policy is what you do with definitions. These are guides to R&S, but different from Standards.
 - O’Neill – Does this mean it is up to the departmental R&S to define what it means to integrate?
 - Babbitt – Got rid of the word integration when it comes to accomplishment and excellence; the R&S has to talk about what it is to integrate under effectiveness, however.
 - Greenwood –Feedback from peers indicates concern that supervising doctoral students is not required or evidenced in this section but is noted above. It’s in teaching, but should be in research as well when you are working with students who are doing research, as part of your research program.
 - Singel – It is in teaching and it should be there. It could be implicated in workload policy.
 - Greenwood – This also implies, then, that by not having doctoral students, it shouldn’t be a reason to not grant tenure to someone.
 - Larsen – Unless the R&S says that is an indicator of effectiveness, then it would be required by your department.
 - Scott – If you are mentoring a grad student who receives external recognition is that not evidence for the research part and not just the teaching aspect part?
 - Singel – If they are recognized for research, that is research and it is complimentary to your mentoring.
- Babbitt has copious comments from faculty and they will be discussed and incorporated into the P&T documents, or not, this summer.
- What other P&T docs should JAGS examine during the summer?
 - Downs – When will depts. begin to revise R&S?
 - Babbitt – Changes with the P&T documents are not much different from what we have been doing. Input from faculty does not require major changes.

- Each department should begin to think about new R&S this summer and in place, approved and completely done by the time people get hired at the end of next year. University R&S→College R&S→Departmental R&S.
- Potvin – Talking about a university R&S to set out minimums for a framework from which to work.
 - Babcock – Larsen is working on templates to be used by departments.
 - Meyer – Peers in his dept are not sure how to respond to evaluations that are not factually correct.
 - Larsen - JAGS has defined the Evaluation Letter as the document that has come back to the department from the Review Committee, and that is what the candidate is allowed to respond to. There seems to be a misinterpretation of what “evaluation” is defined as. External Letters are those that come from external sources.
 - Singel – Each level of successive reviews must affirm that the content of External Letters was faithfully represented in the Evaluation Letter. External Letters were to be summarized by administrators; faculty did not see the original letters.
 - Babbitt – While the candidate cannot see those External Letters, it is required that every level of review, look at Evaluation Letters and make sure they mesh.
 - Zabinski – Peers would like to see a summary of the External Letters. If the Committee is making a case against the candidate, the candidate must be able to discern if the Committee is cherry-picking from External Letters.
 - Babbitt – Reasons why candidates cannot view the External Letters:
 - We tell the external reviewers they are confidential;
 - When you summarize, they become less confidential;
 - If one committee is cherry-picking points from the External Letters, there should be five (5) more levels of review that catch that. Previously, it was the dept head who summarized the letters; now committees do it.
 - Was language changed re: the requirement of five (5) External Letters.
 - Babbitt – Still under discussion.
 - Meyer – Make up of committees is of concern.
 - Babbitt – JAGS is still discussing. Why do we not allow non-tenure track faculty to participate? What to do with faculty who come from other departments to be on someone’s committee who is not familiar with the discipline.

The meeting adjourned at 5:01 pm.

Randy Babbitt, Chair
Michael Babcock, Chair-elect