

**FACULTY SENATE**  
**September 21, 2016**  
**Strand Union Room 235**  
**3:10 PM – 4:30 PM**  
**MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY-BOZEMAN, MONTANA**  
**Minutes**

**Members Present:** Adams (Art), Austin (Poli Sci), Babcock (Chair), Belasco (Ag Econ), Berry (CE), Bolte (Music), Brown (JJCBE), Burrows (Ext), Creel (Ecology), Conrad (Arch), Eggert (Emeritus), Ewing (LRES), Gannon for Anderson (Chem Engr), Greenwood (Math), Haggerty (Earth Sci), Larson (MIE), Martin (Mod Lang), Merzdorf (CBN), Mosley (ARS), Rebane (Physics), Reidy (Hist & Phil), Repasky (ECE), Rogers-Stanton (Ed), Running (Nursing), J. Smith(Psych), A. Smith (HHD), Sterman (Library), Thomas (English), Wilmer (Chair-elect), Yamaguchi (Soc/Anthro)

**Others Present:** Larry Carucci, David Singel, Ron Larsen, Tracy Dougher, Tony Campeau, Galen Brokaw

Chair Babcock called the meeting to order at 3:10 pm, and a quorum was present.

Minutes from the August 31, 2016 meeting were approved.

New Faculty Senators were introduced: Aleks Rebane from Physics and Amy Thomas from English.

Steering Committee Report – Chair-elect Wilmer

- Budget Committee – Alice Running was nominated and unanimously approved.
- President’s Commission on the Status of Women – Julia Haggerty was nominated and unanimously approved.
- Undergraduate courses approved in CPC. If senators have no concerns, they will be voted upon in Steering on September 26. All are posted on the FS web site:
  - AMST 301: Reproduction in America
  - ECIV 406: Sustainability Issues in Construction
  - MCH 260: Machine Shop 2
- Grad courses were announced in senate and will be voted on in 10 working days. All are posted on the FS web site:
  - BIOH 520: Molecular Genetics
  - M 519 : Ratio and Proportion in School Mathematics
  - MB 560 : Infectious Disease Ecology and Spillover
  - MB 505: Host-associated Microbiomes
- Centers brought to today’s senate meeting for vote were unanimously approved:
  - Center for Wildlife Health and Disease Ecology (existing Center, name change to reflect current faculty interests)
  - Pollinator Health Center (proposed new Center)
  - Western Lands and Peoples Center (proposed new Center)

#### Academic Calendar approval- Registrar, Tony Campeau

- Chair Babcock introduced Registrar, Tony Campeau.
- Upon student/senate approval, the calendar progresses to the provost, who makes recommendations, and then to the president for final approval.
  - Students are conducting a first reading and will conclude a second reading next week.
- Regulations stipulate that we have the 2018 calendar built into Banner by October in order to award financial aid to students.
- The proposal is the same as 2017; essentially, everything is one day earlier.  
Changes:
  - University Day moves by two weeks as it is the Friday before Easter; and,
  - President's Day is moving to December 24 to give us a four-day holiday. Even though President's Day is moved, MSU is still calling it "President's Day."
- Registrar would like to come back in spring 2017 to approve the 2019 calendar and be able to explore accommodating the students' desire to have either a "Dead Day" or "Dead Week."
- MSU calendar drives the other four campuses and the Bozeman School District calendar.
- Babcock entertained that a motion be made to suspend the rule of waiting until the next FS meeting, which will occur in two weeks, and asked that senators vote this week to accept, or not, the calendar proposed → motion was made to suspend the rules → seconded → unanimously approved.
- Motion to approve the calendar → seconded → discussion
  - Senator asked if MSU is coordinating calendar with Bozeman city schools, now or in the future? Campeau noted that the Bozeman city schools currently await MSU's action and then follow suit. The hope is that in the future and with the 2020 calendar, MSU will have discussions with them.
  - Instead of "observed" for President's Day, might another word be used? Campeau stated it is important to state that we do observe President's Day, even though it falls on another day in another month, but he will consider using another word.
- → all in favor → one opposed → majority approved the proposed calendar.
- Repasky is concerned that precedence might be set in senate to approve items that have not been carefully vetted before the meeting. Repasky's concern was noted.

#### BoR "Intent to Plan" – Vice Provost, Ron Larsen

- May be viewed on the Faculty Senate web site:  
<http://www.montana.edu/facultysenate/BOR%20New%20Program%20Review.pdf>
- Babcock introduced Dr. Larsen.
- Process for reviewing new academic programs and new research centers is similar.
  - MSU Academic Plan
    - Courses must be submitted three (3) years in advance;
    - Updates may be made only once a year, in March; and,
    - Then approved on campus in April.

- Programs are placed on the BoR agenda for their May meeting to read; not approve.
- MSU Academic Pre-Plan is a holding place for ideas to be considered next April.
- The NCWCCU must approve these new programs and that process takes three (3) months.
- Intent to Plan (ITP) form
  - Intent to Plan piece was inserted after the MSU Academic Plan process and included a process for the new program or research center. This step is where all campuses communicate about whether the courses are a duplication, the idea about having a new course was spawned somewhere else and not at MSU, etc. The process:
    - Submitted any month;
    - One month review process ;
    - Online form to submit; and,
    - Automated approval process.
  - ITP previously took two (2) readings and two (2) meetings before going on to the BoR; now only one meeting and one reading takes place.
- Level II Academic Proposals
  - Only accepted during four meeting per year: September, November, March, May
  - New proposals submitted in May will not be ready for the following fall.
  - CIM Online Form creates the Level II document for a new academic program
  - New research center uses a different Level II form.
- Campus Review (CiM)
  - Typically takes two months
    - Department
    - College
    - University
      - Faculty Senate
      - Deans Council
  - The CiM questions are the same as those on the Level II proposal form.
- BOR Review
  - Decision is made in one meeting;
  - Submit 7 weeks in advance;
  - Level IIs accepted 4x per year: March, May, Sept., November
    - Best to get proposal in by March for the following AY.
- NWCCU Review
  - Taking over three months;
  - Substantive change proposal needed; and,
  - Need BOR approval documented prior to submission to NWCCU.
  - Stipulation that if you advertise and enroll students in a program before approval from NWCCU, the penalty is that they show cause on you institution's accreditation documentation.

- Overall Review Process Timeline
  - 9+ months
    - 2 mo. Intent to Plan Review
    - 2 mo. Campus Review
    - 2 mo. BOR Review
    - 3 mo. NWCCU Review
  - Not everything requires this complete 9-month review process
    - A new option does not require the entire review process;
    - A new course does not require the entire review process;
    - However, if something impacts multiple colleges, it impacts the University Scope and requires a full review
    - If something impacts multiple depts., it impacts the College Scope and requires review to the College level only.
    - If something impacts a single department and impacts the Dept. Scope it requires review at Department level only.
- A senator commented that if faculty write federal grants for research centers and receive the grant, they should be able to establish a research center without a prolonged approval process. Additionally, the senator noted that faculty are more familiar with what programs are needed at MSU than OCHE and is not sure why they are involved in vetting them to other campuses.

#### Policy Discussion – Chair Babcock

- Process Overview
  - Chair Babcock reminded senators to inform their constituents about the policies discussed in senate.
  - Subsequent to senate discussions last week, suggestions from senators and others were provided to Faculty Affairs and JAGS.
- Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Review- Definitions
  - Scholarship – Changes suggested by Senators and Faculty Affairs were discussed in JAGS and incorporated under the definition for Extension and now reads:
    - “The creation of partnerships, programs, and plans through Extension, or community-based research, that leverages the knowledge and resources of the university and the public/private sector to enhance learning, discovery, and engagement; educate and engage citizens; strengthen communities; address locally identified issues and problems; apply and disseminate knowledge; and contribute to the public good.”
    - This wording now reflects the Strategic Plan, Objective I.1 (“Increase the integration of learning, discovery and engagement.”), Metric I.1.3: “ By 2019, community-based research projects will increase by fifty percent.”
  - Discussions ensued:
    - A senator noted that in the “Metrics” section, there is a description about how to report on this, and if one reads the paragraph it states what community-based research (CBRP) is, which is actually research based. If faculty are in a department where CBRP is not the norm, what do you do?

- Wilmer stated that the Scholarship definitions have four (4) categories and each department may use whatever applies to their faculty; individual faculty members may determine how they are executed and measured. R&S documents will articulate what is specific for each department.
- A senator who does not conduct community-based research asked how it is different from “traditional” research.
  - Babcock stated that four bullet points in Scholarship are an attempt is to try and capture all scenarios and colleges/units would have more refined documents that address the faculty in their areas.
  - Smith stated that a faculty member in Psychology engages community-based research which sometimes does not immediately result in an “output,” yet it is fundamental to their work.
  - A senator from Extension stated that they have metrics for activity insight. Their faculty must develop a program for short/medium/long term outcomes associated with scenarios similar to those in Psychology, and that is how their goals are measured.
- A senator stated that their college P&T committee was challenged when a faculty member in their department was conducting community-based research and was not able to engage in university service. The research component of the candidate was juggled over to what was being done as community-based research (CBPR); there is the risk of the “double-dipping” meaning that the community-based research may count as research and also counts as service.
- A senator stated that there is language in the Service component that is almost identical to what is in Extension.
  - Each department is going to have to define what their Service is.
  - Wilmer added that it while the language sounds similar, Service has other things, and it does not say anything about disseminating; rather, it talks about problem-solving in communities as one of the examples of service but it does not say you disseminate anything as a result of that research. The Service component is much broader.
- How do we inform departments on the many different P&T issues in the future that came up in discussions in Faculty Senate? Perhaps a “FAQ” section on the FS website might be helpful.
- Math department liked the wording for research but is not sure whether what they do is “community-based” or outreach. They believed that the community-based wording might be restrictive and suggested wording “Other forms of outreach-based research” might be a broader umbrella; there is a technical term for community-based research and whether that is what the Math faculty are exactly doing, or not, isn’t clear. They train people to teach math better at different levels, etc. It can lead to grants but doesn’t often start with a great

deal of time spent developing materials for training and may not be published, immediately.

- Babcock – departments and units will be able to discuss and make the distinction in their R&S, “Community-based research is...”
- Faculty are teaching in the community where they could disseminate materials to their specific audience. That is why the concept of dissemination is important.
- The word “participatory” was dropped and may allow more and different scenarios to be included.
- An Extension senator’s primary appointment is teaching and research, but the teaching is not done to students.
  - Wilmer stated that some Extension faculty teach “clients” and those are their students. The R&S of the Extension College will determine what criteria fit their teaching activities.
- The intent of the definitions is to eliminate the checked boxes under which faculty go up under for P&T (currently in use but will be eliminated once the new FH is in place). Regarding teaching, the goal is to provide a focused definition that would articulate more than just teaching in the classroom. It now encompasses contributions, broad impact, textbooks, etc.
- Senator from Ag has the majority of his appointment in Extension. He went on to say that Extension continues to be recognized for its emphasis in teaching. The P&T language equating students with clients is well stated and recognizes what people in Ext do, in addition to teaching. If faculty are involved in creating a program, a partnership, a product in the community, that product is evidence of scholarship. If you are not creating a product, a partnership and program and simply assisting a public entity, that is public service.
- Senator stated that the basis of the current discussion is that she believes “Scholarship” is the only thing one must be excellent in. It appears we are trying to fit more and more things into scholarship. If there is a product, or could be a product, or a different activity, it will fall into scholarship. This means we value Scholarship more or differently and may confuse definitions.
- Rebane stated that the documents really do not explain why faculty need tenure and what the purpose of tenure is. Usually in this kind of document it states in the beginning that “Tenure is this...” to safeguard academic freedom. If we take that logic, then the definition of “Scholarship” would be narrower than it is right now, and those things included as scholarship would be included in the category of “Service.” If we don’t state what the main purpose of tenure is, anything goes. What is the point of academic freedom in providing some product; I don’t mean any specific product, but just in general. Product must require academic freedom. Do we want to protect academic freedom or not?

- ADVANCE, through a professional off-campus organization, conducted an in-depth, impartial interview of everyone who was going up for tenure in a specific year. One question asked: What would you change about the process? Second most suggestion was, “Articulate a philosophy of P&T in the policy.” So, what is tenure and what do we mean by it?
    - Austin stated that there was general agreement that the broader definitions in four (4) bullet points were positively received; concern arose there seems to be a disconnect between broader definitions, what is inclusive of Scholarship, and what follows in the next few sections about the Indicators of Accomplishment and Excellence which are narrowly focused on activities and products that are published in peer review journals, formal peer review presentations, etc. He suggested ending the first sentence of the two definitions of Accomplishment and Excellence at “activities and products” rather than describing what those activities and products are. The “peer review” language is in definition one (1) of Scholarly Research. He is concerned that if the language is written restrictively into the document, it may be applied restrictively thereafter to all; it makes more sense to have the language inclusive at the university level and allow individual colleges/units to make the decision about what the standard is at their level.
      - **Accomplishment** is *sustained and commendable performance* reflected in the quantity, quality, and impact of scholarly activities and products. ~~Published in peer reviewed journals, in formal peer reviewed presentations at professional meetings, or in comparable peer evaluated forums.~~ The activities and products must have impact and significance to the public, peers, or the discipline beyond the university.
      - **Excellence** is *sustained, commendable and distinguished performance* reflected in the quantity, quality, and impact of scholarly activities and products. ~~Published in peer reviewed journals, in formal peer reviewed presentations at professional meetings, or in comparable peer evaluated forums.~~ The activities and products must have *a notable* impact and significance to the public, peers, or the discipline beyond the university.
    - Austin offered to make a friendly amendment to edit both passages as indicated → second → discussion
      - Various scenarios regarding internal/external peer reviews were discussed. Mosley stated that faculty from Extension would be able to obtain tenure without publishing peer-reviewed journal articles or making peer-reviewed presentations at professional meetings.
      - → all in favor → 3 opposed / 2 abstained → motion carries.
- JAGS discussed the logic of what the promotions are as defined by Accomplishment (Associate) and Excellence (Full). Everything that was required

for Accomplishment, as an Associate, must be maintained at the level of Excellence and some things beyond with notable impact to be promoted to Full. Each department decides on those criteria. Therefore, the words “commendable” and “a notable” were added to the “excellence definition.

- Motion to accept the added words → seconded → all in favor → 1 opposed → motion passes.

Public Comment – Chair Babcock

- There was no public comment.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 pm.

*Michael Babcock, Chair*

*Franke Wilmer, Chair-elect*