

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

**Members Present:** Adams (Art), Anderson (Film & Photo), Berry (CE), Babbitt (Chair), Babcock (Chair-elect), Bolte (Music), Brown (JJCBE), Burrows (Ext), Cantalupo (Ext), Downs (English), Gannon (ChBE), Greenwood (Math), Herbeck (Ed), Larson (MIE), Lawrence (Bio Chem), Lu (PSPP), Martin (Mod Lang), McMahon (Ecology), Meyer (Hist & Phil), Olson for Mosley (ARS), Repasky (ECE), O’Neill (Arts & Arch), Rossmann (Library), Running (Nursing), Scott (Psych), Smith (HHD), Swinford (Soc/Anthro), Vorontsov (Physics), Wiedenheft (MBI), Zabinski (LRES)

**Others Present:** David Singel, Ron Larsen, Kellie Peterson, Kenning Arlitsch, Donna Negaard

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

The February 3, 2016 Faculty Senate minutes were approved.

**Courses and Programs – Chair-elect Babcock**

- The following undergraduate courses and programs are posted on the FS web site for senate review:
  - **COURSES**
    - EDEC 453; P-3 STEAM
    - EDEC 455: P-3 English Language Arts and Social Studies
    - FCS 260: Middle Childhood and Adolescent Development
    - LIT 169 IH: Literature as Popular Culture
      - On hold for senate review/approval until CPC chair approves in CIM
    - LIT 202 CS: The Environmental Imagination
    - LIT 203 IH: Great Books
  - **PROGRAMS**
    - BSCD-BS: Bachelor of Science in Early Childhood Education and Child Services-Child Development Option
    - FCSI-BS: Bachelor of Science in Family and Consumer Sciences-Human Development and Family Science-Option
      - Renaming and adding one new class are the only modifications to this option.
    - Individual Interdisciplinary Program (PhD)
  - **POLICY**
    - Doctoral Graduate Committee Representative Language
      - Eliminating the grad rep

**Announcements – Chair Babbitt**

- Agenda items for Faculty Senate, February 17, 2016:
  - A 15-minute report on parking and transportation.
  - Prioritization discussion. If senators have thoughts on what should be discussed, please send them to Chair Babbitt/Chair-elect Babcock.
- ASMSU is working on an Indigenous People’s Day resolution whereby October 12 would be designated as such.

**Annual Review Policy – Chair Babbitt**

- Continuation of discussion from 2/3/16 meeting
- Senator: Re: 2. (c). language in the policy, the Department of Education has expressed concerns that if a faculty member is engaged in long-term research and the departmental priorities change, sometimes quickly, that could affect the faculty member’s individual role and impact their research.
  - Potvin noted that the language is more teaching oriented.
- Another senator from the social sciences stated that their research is less directed and faculty follow their own interests and set their own goals. What if, in the midst of their research, they are told that the department will no longer support or be funded for that research project?
- Potvin stated that a conversation did not transpire about the impact it might have on what faculty choose to do for their scholarship. As an example, if someone is sick, maybe someone says that you need to teach this course in their area, you discuss it and as part of what the dept. needs to accomplish.
- If the dept. decides, as a whole, the teaching load will go up for a given percentage, that individual needs match that but that should be spread across the entire dept.. If an individual would want to have an increased teaching load to meet this need, they could initiate an increase in their percentage of effort
- A Faculty’s annual assignments, percentage of effort, and goals are three different things.
- It does not seem reasonable that the dept. head would not be able to negotiate, as they need to be able to ensure their dept. reach their goals.
- It will force a dialog between the faculty member and unit person which could be positive. One enters the year knowing what is expected instead of waiting to find out during the annual review.
- Senator asked if a review committee does the reviews and the policy implies they must meet with each faculty member to review them. Do we meet with dept. head after we meet with the review committee?
  - New Departmental Role and Scope document will spell out how each department handles their review process, consistent with the university policy.
- Re: 4. Change in Assigned Percentages of Effort  
“Unless a change in assigned percentages of effort is initiated by the faculty member, tenure-track faculty will maintain the assigned percentages of effort as outlined in the letter of hire until they achieve tenure. Thereafter, either the faculty member or the department head can propose changing the faculty member’s percentages of effort, but mutual agreement must be reached before the change can be made.”
  - Why do you need that sentence? Not sure why after faculty receive tenure either person initiates, because both will have to sign off, regardless and there is no need for that first sentence.
  - Deans believed it should also be removed.
  - Motion to strike first sentence and the word “Thereafter” and begin the paragraph with “Either”→seconded→discussion→all in favor→majority wins (2 to 3 margin)
- When do extra duties that are assigned randomly (as in the case of accreditation) translate into a change in percentage?
  - When faculty are given extra duties and believe it changes their percentage, they should initiate the change of percentage so that extra work is recognized and accomplishments get evaluated as such. If the extra duties include, for example,

teaching one class due to someone's illness and does not affect the overall productivity, then the percentage should be left as is.

- As a workload policy is developed, duties will align better with percentages and provide more clarity.
- Annual assignments should be commensurate with your current percentage of effort or your agreed upon your changes of percentage of effort; dept. head cannot arbitrarily give you twice what would be normally assigned (double one's duties) for your percentage of effort.
- Bolte noted that the Annual Review Policy, R&S, and Workload Policy are all interconnected and use definitions that have not been defined, as yet. Should we be discussing a basic understanding of what teaching means in the context of what we are speaking about? In the School of Music, everyone is 60/30/10; my research and teaching is looked at as a combination. This policy makes my teaching appears twice as much as my research. We should be examining the differences between the different depts. and we cannot make everyone the same.
  - There is nothing in the policy that says the dept. head cannot go numerical or will not allow the dept. heads to continue to assess faculty compared to minimum expectations. The proposed Annual Review can be modified to better handle these cases.
- Definitions of teaching, research and service are essentially the same as they have been in the interim document, CBA and Faculty Handbook.
- Potvin stated that the policy is an attempt to be fair and equitable across the university in providing leeway within the depts. without singling out a faculty member; the goal is to examine what we do and there may be some shifts in percentages without workload changes, or vice versa, perhaps without changing anything that the faculty member does.
- Motion to approve Annual Review Policy with the change → seconded → discussion
  - The form component of the policy lends itself to being automated, and that would be a mistake given the very subtle nuances that distinguish departments from one another. This policy and draft form would be more beneficial if reviewed by the dept. head who would be familiar and able to expound on such nuances.
- → all in favor → 21 in favor; 3 opposed.

#### **Faculty Review of Deans – Chair Babbitt**

- Chair Babbitt met with Deans and has drafted a formative review policy for their review. Discussions are ongoing.
- Faculty Senate voted to entrust the Steering Committee to be in charge of the review. There was no objection raised to Steering Committee continuing in this capacity.
- An agreed upon item with the Deans was that there be roughly 12 questions in which 4 are standard and every dean will be asked them; 4 questions that are specific about their college; 4 questions the deans may add themselves.
- Chair Babbitt would like to have the reviews completed by mid-March.
- Dept. Heads would also have the same survey this year and they would not be individualized.
- What questions would you ask Deans/Dept. Heads? Chair Babbitt asked senators to send him and Chair-elect Babcock questions they would like to see on the surveys.
- Dean will be able to address the questions with a narrative.
- What would happen after the reviews have been completed?
  - Action plan
  - Feedback loop
  - Progress made

- Deans will be required to prepare, after their review, orally or written narrative that addresses all or part of the review. They will also discuss where the college is going and what their goals are and plans to accomplish them.
- What to do with colleges that have no dept. heads (nursing, business, and library)?
  - In such instances, senate leadership will work with Deans to determine who should be reviewed.
- This year those being reviewed will be:
  - President
  - Provost
  - VP's
  - Deans
  - Dept. Heads
- Potvin has been working with Dept. Heads to outline what their duties are. Deans will be forthcoming.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 pm.

*Randy Babbitt, Chair*

*Michael Babcock, Chair-elect*