

FACULTY COUNCIL
MARCH 1, 2006
STRAND UNION ROOM 276
4:10 AM – 5:00 PM
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY-BOZEMAN, MONTANA
Minutes

Members Present: Amin, Bailey, Becker, Catoira, Cherry, Christopher, Croy, Dyer, Erickson, Jackson, Jones, Levy, Lynes-Hayes, , C. McClure, Halonen for M. McClure, Neeley, Prawdzienski, Ryker, Scott, Seymour, Stringam, Taper, , Watson for Metz, D. Weaver for Marlow, Zhu

Members Absent: Ashley, Bennett, Bradley, Brown, Idzerda, Johnson, Larkin, Pratt, Psychology, E. Schmidt, Stroup, Taylor

Others: Lansverk

Chair –Elect Cynthia McClure called the meeting to order at 4:10 PM. A quorum was present. The minutes from February 22, 2006 were approved.

FACULTY AFFAIRS – Chair Lansverk

- Faculty Handbook Section 618.20 – Post Tenure Review
 - The modifications made clarify that post-tenure review is not grievable, and they identify the correct committee, the Committee on Service.
 - Motion to accept the changes→seconded→all in favor→motion unanimously approved.
- Faculty Handbook Section 840.0 - Administrative Review
 - Discussions between FC leadership and Administration for the last six months have resulted in a proposal that expands the Handbook details on administrative reviews, specifying details on how it is to be done, when it is to be done, and to give it more teeth.
 - The result is noted below. Language underlined is Leslie Taylor’s suggestion; red is what Steering Committee suggested, and wording left alone is the original language from the Faculty Handbook:

Faculty Handbook Section 840 – Review of Administrators

1. For the purpose of this policy, Academic Administrators ~~for the purpose of this policy~~ shall be Vice Presidents, Deans and Department Heads.

2. ~~Immediate faculty supervisors (usually Department Heads and Associate Deans) will be reviewed annually.~~ Academic Administrators shall be reviewed at least once every three years. The method and manner of review shall be determined by the immediate supervisor of the person reviewed. The use of 360 reviews for Vice Presidents and Deans is encouraged.

3. Faculty shall have the opportunity to regularly evaluate academic administrators. The supervisors of the administrators being reviewed shall formally solicit faculty input concerning the performance of these administrators.

4. Formal mechanisms shall be implemented which guarantee the confidentiality of faculty input. Faculty input shall be solicited through Faculty Council for Vice Presidents throughout the college for Deans, and within the Department for Department Heads.

5. Faculty Council shall draft a set of model questions for each level of review which will be included in the solicitation of faculty evaluation. Faculty who are eligible to participate in the evaluation ~~may~~ will submit their responses to the questions confidentially by submitting their responses to Faculty Council, who will confirm eligibility to evaluate and assign a number to the evaluation and forward a copy to the appropriate supervisor.

6. The evaluator shall specifically address the evaluations received from faculty in the written evaluation of the administrator’s performance and issues raised shall be specifically addressed with the administrator under review.

7. The performance evaluations of academic administrators are matters of individual privacy and will not be disclosed by the evaluator.

8. The reviews shall be completed by April 15. Should April 15 fall on a weekend, it will be due the following week day.

Discussion ensued:

Paragraph 5 - Faculty would like to remain anonymous and have the review confidential, as verbalized in paragraph 5. The 360 reviews are not anonymous, so perhaps the admin review can supplement those. The data will come through council with a code number and the collection of data will be through council rather than the provost's office.

Paragraph 6 – In previous years, this data was looked at and forgotten. Now, reviewers of administrators have to make mention of this data to show awareness it exists.

Paragraph 7 – The data is not posted anywhere and it is not publicly accessible. It remains confidential. FC members stated that it may be helpful to explain who the “evaluator” is. They also noted that it is not evident who would faithfully record and be prudent about what is being done.

Paragraph 8 – Some FC members questioned the April 15 due date. It was noted that the annual review cards were due in mid-March.

The FC set of questions will be a one-time only endeavor. But who writes the questions? Because the language for this proposal originated from FC Chair Taylor, Chair Lansverk asked that questions be directed to FC Chair Taylor.

▪ Parental Leave Update

Faculty Affairs would like to clarify what is already in the handbook, namely tenure clock stoppage. The Faculty Handbook presently states, “...in exigent circumstances you may negotiate for tenure clock stoppage..” This wording is nebulous. The new wording would include specific language, such as, “Extension of the tenure review period for parental/family responsibilities is available to either parent or both parents and may be granted for up to one year per child, up to a maximum of two years.” Faculty Affairs will also include language about creating a friendly environment for family leave negotiations; but detailed language about front-loading, and back-loading teaching of courses will not be specifically mentioned.

- You may use your annual or sick leave for six weeks. Federal Law says parents get 12 weeks off, in any event.
- Leave, leave-without-pay, all overlap. A forthcoming memo will dovetail all these circumstances and be distributed.

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

Signature

Cynthia McClure, Vice-Chair

Signature

Gale R. Gough, Secretary