

FACULTY COUNCIL
November 15, 2006
SUB 275
4:10 AM – 5:00 PM
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY-BOZEMAN, MONTANA
Minutes

Members Present: Amin, Ashley, Becker, Catoira, Cherry, Christopher, Croy, Dyer, Erickson, Gipp, Jones, Levy, Lynch, Jacobs, Larkin, Lei, Livingston for Ryker, M. McClure, Prawdzienski, Scott, Seymour, D. Weaver, Yoo for Zhu

Members Absent: Ag Ed/AOT, Bailey, Bennett, Chem/Bio Chem, Idzerda, Johnson, Neeley, Nursing On Campus, Taylor, Watson, Stroup

Others Present: Lansverk

Vice Chair Jones called the meeting to order at 4:10 PM. A quorum was present. The minutes from November 1, 2006 and November 8, 2006 were unanimously approved.

Tenure Clock Stoppage (with respect to Parental Leave) – Vice Chair Jones

- A motion was made to approve the language as advertised in MSU TODAY and previously discussed in Faculty Council → seconded → all in favor → motion passed. The handbook change will go to the president for approval.

Administrative Review – Wes Lynch

- A preliminary first draft for the administrative review (“AR”) was distributed to FC members. Academic department heads will be evaluated by their faculty. The College of Nursing, Library and College of Business have associate deans as their department heads however, and some modifications of the review may need to be made. This will be a web-based survey. FC members are encouraged to provide input.
- The goals for this AR, as agreed upon by the Faculty Council Steering Committee, included:
 - Increasing faculty participation by keeping the survey short and concise;
 - Emphasizing essential performance dimensions for department heads by excluding non-evaluative, emotional language, style (such as goal oriented, humanistic characteristics, democratic, steadiness, openness, trustworthiness) or personalities dimensions. If FC members believe these dimensions should be changed, questions/comments were encouraged.
 - Leaving the evaluation scale alone and providing a space at the end of the AR where faculty may put their affective feelings.
 - Designing the AR in a way so it could be evaluated in the future by using psychometrics, factor analysis, dimensional characterizations, etc.
- Discussions amongst FC members ensued.
 - *Are these the relevant domains/dimensions (question headings) used to evaluate department heads? Should we add items?*
 - *Should the rank statement and classification of employee be optional or mandatory? Should employee classifications only be those the department head evaluates? What about adjuncts, research faculty? Also, the different strata of employees have different roles in the department. How would the survey reflect those roles versus how the questions are answered? Some FC members stated that adjuncts and tenurable faculty classifications be retained so data would be meaningful and measurable. If the information is optional, it may not make the analysis of the survey complete. If there is a*

small number of tenured faculty in a department and rank is noted, it would be easy to surmise who filled out the survey.

- The word “staff” is erroneously included in the AR.
- Some FC members believed that the less specific information asked, the more the AR participation.
- Confidentiality would be guaranteed by assigning a code number to a specific individual. A name/code relationship would be controlled by someone Faculty Council agrees upon.
 - The confidential code is assigned to make sure people who are actually eligible to participate in the AR, would. Once the AR is complete, it comes back to the Faculty Council office and anything identifiable is removed. A spreadsheet may be created that gives another number to each code number to ensure information confidentiality. The intent is that the FC office is the intermediary step between getting the AR filled out and having it show up in a dean’s office.
 - *There are some questions that are difficult to comprehend such as, “Recognizes and rewards faculty and staff contributions to the department.” Does this mean the department head gives monetary rewards? A pat on the back? There is no way to make the survey unambiguous. It is subject to a certain degree of interpretation. We could give a clarification, which would narrow the focus. If faculty believes this should be different, comments are welcomed.*
 - *Some questions may not be answered because there isn’t enough information. It was suggested a “non-applicable” or “I don’t know” choice be in each category of questions.*
 - *Should there be a “Recommendation to retain or not retain” at the end of the survey? Some department heads have a rotating chair and leave after a year anyway. Some language may be added that gives faculty the option to tell what problems they believe should be resolved. Most surveys that the Faculty Council Steering Committee researched have a summary judgment at the end of administrative surveys.*
 - *Should we remove the headings and make questions random so participants are unbiased in their decisions? Some FC members stated that the headings were helpful because it informs faculty what they should be astute to departmental head leadership by interpretation. Not bias. One suggestion is that is some headings may be combined such as department building and leadership. “Department building” should be worded differently. It is not clear what it means.*
 - *Some categories are more important in one department than the other. Maybe there should be an option to decide what categories are important to your department. Wes Lynch stated that evaluating the AR this way would make it more difficult.*
 - *Question #1 – Is the word “appropriate” appropriate?*
 - Vice Chair Jones asked that FC members pretend they were one of their colleagues filling out the survey. Does it read easily enough so that it may be filled out in a relatively thoughtful manner in a short amount of time? If so, then it may be appropriate. We don’t want to end up with a KNAPP form.
 - *For it to be meaningful, you need definitions of certain statements. For example, “What does it mean to foster excellence in effectiveness in teaching...?” Foster could mean awarding more grant money to the faculty member, it could mean giving them time off to do research. The meaning is not clear.*
 - *Questions #1 – Do I answer on behalf of myself or on behalf of the entire department? If I answer for myself, it would be different then if I answered for my department. Questions could be reworded that reflect only an individual’s response however, leadership behavior affects all in a department.*

- *How do you keep comments unidentifiable?* Perhaps a preamble may state that comments will be shared with the dean and the department head at the dean's discretion.
- A FC member suggested that there be a drawing for a prize once all ARs are completed.
- The survey will be sent to all FC members for questions and comments sent to wlynch@montana.edu

Other – Vice Chair Jones

- There is no meeting on November 22, 2006. The next meeting will be on November 29, 2006.

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

Signature

Warren Jones, Vice Chair

Signature

Gale R. Gough, Secretary