

FACULTY COUNCIL
April 12, 2006
REID ROOM 105
4:10 AM – 5:00 PM
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY-BOZEMAN, MONTANA
Minutes

Members Present: Bailey, Becker, Catoira, Cherry, Christopher, Halonen for M. McClure, Jones, Levy, Lynes-Hayes, C. McClure, Mast (ART) for Larkin, Prawdzienski, Ryker, Scott, Seymour, Stringam, Taper, Watson for Metz, Zhu

Members Absent: Amin, Ashley, Bennett, Bradley, Brown, Croy, Dyer, Erickson, Idzerda, Jackson, Johnson, Larkin, Marlow, Neeley, Pratt, Psychology, E. Schmidt, Stroup, Taylor, D. Weaver

Others present: Fedock

Chair Elect Cyd McClure called the meeting to order at 4:10 PM. A quorum was present. The minutes from April 5, 2006 were approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS – FC Member Joe Seymour

- Joe Seymour presented rebuttals to the statement made in the April 5, 2006 Faculty Council minutes, “A FC member has done literature research on student evaluations as a measure of teaching effectiveness, and the overwhelming conclusion is that they are a non-existent indicator.” Faculty from Chemical Engineering presented research stating that student ratings are reliable, stable over time and positively correlated with results obtained using other forms of teaching assessment including assessment of learning outcomes. Education journals and psychology journals cite that surveys taken are not affected by instructor personality, gender, day/time the survey was taken, etc.

P&T TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS – Faculty Affairs Member, Sanford Levy

- Faculty Affairs member, Sanford Levy, continued discussions about the P&T Task Force document.
- **8.12** – From the survey conducted by the P&T Task Force, there was no faculty constituency for removing any of the current steps of review. However, some FC members thought this was ambiguous and presented no clear direction. Others believed that the suggestion of having UPT split into two committees was a good idea: A Retention Committee (who also looks at Role and Scope), and another committee, more senior, for Promotion and Tenure. There are different standards for each, and two separate committees would be better equipped to facilitate reviewing the dossiers. Another possibility suggested was that the final level of review could be done within the colleges. Shortening the process timeline was also suggested, as one FC member relayed that their dossier was dormant for a long period of time before moving to the next level of review.

- **8.13** – From the survey conducted by the P&T Task Force, faculty had no objections to the professional track, but felt that the standards and criteria for promotion and tenure should be as rigorous as the tenure track faculty.
Past Chair Jones moved that FC concurs with the P&T Task Force recommendation and, in addition to rigor, there also be clarity of definition for professional track (at the departmental level) and that it be part of a task assigned to any committee that is reviewing Role and Scope documents → seconded → all in favor → passed, with one abstention.
- **8.14** – FC members asked what the word “receives” mean and believed that service either counts or does not. FC members believe the Role and Scope documents of each department should definitively state whether service has credibility or not. Some FC members stated that national/international service versus university service seems to count differently; national/international service has credibility and university has none. The P&T process only reflects continuing effectiveness and it is up to each department whether service is counted. A problem arises with Extension because outreach teaching is not counted within the Delaware rubric, and it gets moved into the service component. There needs to be a distinction. A FC member stated that if each faculty member understands, clearly, their departmental Role and Scope documents, each contractual component of teaching, research and service will not be in question. There is concern that these FC discussions reflect what service on this campus receives, and given the present environment of acceptance/credibility, faculty would be remiss to ever want to participate in Faculty Council, Steering Committee, Faculty Affairs, or any other serious shared governance committees on campus. How do we deal with this discrepancy, and with faculty who want to make a contribution to the university? FC moved that they believe service on a local level is paramount to shared governance and on a national/international level, and that FC encourages departments to analyze their Role and Scope documents to include the importance of service activities → seconded → all in favor → passed.

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

Signature

Cynthia McClure, Chair Elect

Signature

Gale R. Gough, Secretary