

**FACULTY SENATE
SEPTEMBER 30, 2015
346 LEON JOHNSON
4:10 PM – 5:00 PM
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY-BOZEMAN, MONTANA
Minutes**

Members Present: Arnold (Ag Ed), Babbitt (Chair), Babcock (Chair-elect), Berry (CE), Branch (English), Brester (Ag Econ), Brown (JJCBE), Burrows (Ext), Cantalupo (Ext), Gannon (ChBE), Greenwood (Math), Hendrikx (Earth Sci), Herbeck (Ed), Herman (NAS), Lawrence (ChBC), Lipfert (Film & Photo), Lu (PSPP), Martin (Mod Lang), Meyer (Hist & Phil), Merzdorf (CBN), O’Neill (Arch), Prashant (Ag Research Cntrs), Repasky (ECE), Running (Nursing), Scott (Psych), A. Smith (HHD), Serman (Library), Rossmann (Library), Swinford (Soc/Anthro), Wilmer (Pol Sci), Yost for Bolte (Music), Zabinski (LRES)

Others Present: Sara Rushing, Bill Shields, Levy Birky, Marianne Brough, Josh Soares, Ron Larsen, Matt Caires, Shawn Stanley, Chris Kearns, Martha Potvin, Kellie Peterson, Chris Fastnow, David Singel, Adam Edelman, Ilse-Mari Lee

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

The September 23, 2015 Faculty Senate minutes were unanimously approved.

Courses and Programs – Chair-elect Babcock

- Undergraduate courses that were approved at the 9/29/2015 steering committee meeting were:
 - SPNS 333: Jorge Luis Borges
 - HONRS 124: Ski and Read
 - IDSN 255: Environmental Design
- There are nine (9) new undergraduate courses and two (2) programs that are on the FS web site for senate review. If no comments are forthcoming, Steering Committee will vote to accept on Tuesday, October 6, 2015.
- A motion was made to approve the ARTB-BA: Bachelor of Arts in Art - Art Education K-12 Broadfield Option → all in favor → unanimously approved.
- Babcock complimented CPC for their in-depth and rich discussions of courses/programs.

Steering Committee Member Election and Council Appointments – Chair Babbitt

- Alice Running, representing Nursing, was unanimously appointed as a member of the Faculty Senate Steering Committee.
- Steering Committee now has representation from all colleges.
- How Steering Committee membership is determined, its function, etc. should be formalized this spring.

Clarification of Informational Announcements Brought to Senate – Chair Babbitt

- Information that assists faculty in developing policies and making decisions is welcomed in senate.
- Informational items that need a faculty-at-large broadcast and do not require feedback or action are not appropriate agenda items for senate. The more efficient routes to get this kind of information to the faculty-at-large might include MSU Today or faculty list serves.
- Babbitt does not want to impede the process of communication by Faculty Senators and their constituents by injecting information that does not require action.
- When a request is made, usually by email, Babbitt replies to the requestor explaining the policy and asking if it is an item that senate needs to know or is it an item for the faculty-at-large .
- Babbitt takes requests to Steering to discuss and Steering decides if it should be brought to senate.
- If there is an informational item that needs immediate action by faculty-at-large, then it should be brought to steering and we can bring it to the floor or we can email it to senators and faculty so they can act on the item.

Faculty Handbook Items

- Academic and Professional Responsibilities
 - Friendly changes, senate may vote to accept. Substantive changes will be sent back to JAGS.
 - O’Neill – Difference between academic and instructional responsibilities?
 - They are related and instructional is a subset of academic (classroom) responsibilities. Both, however, are different than scholarly and creative activity.
 - Zabinski (#3 Responsibilities to Scholarship/Creative Activities and Service) suggested splitting out the teaching (academic), research and service activities, each should be put under their own headings.
 - Babbitt noted that this is a “friendly” edit and would bring back to JAGS.
 - Meyer, after reviewing #1 (Academic Responsibilities) believes areas mentioned should be better aligned with responsibilities and concurs with Zabinski. He is not sure of the difference between academic and instructional; they appear to overlap..
 - Babbitt – #1 is the curriculum as a whole, not one class; instruction is what faculty do in front of the classroom, and; c. is part of what faculty do in a classroom; a. is curricular rather than instruction. Maybe the list could be realigned into academic, curricular, and instruction categories.
 - Regarding f., Lawrence uses a textbook that addresses all his class requirements; by not integrating library materials, is he not fulfilling his responsibilities?

- Rossmann, in reference to Lawrence’s comment about library use, suggested the edit “and/or” – “integrate the use of library **and/or** other information resources into the learning process.”
 - Potvin – Language came from the NWCCU standards and MSU will be assessed on how well faculty integrate the use of the library in instruction.
- O’Neill - Realign duties in #1, as this is the way faculty do their job in the three categories and are assessed in their annual reviews and for tenure; a. could almost could be a service; it’s a course related to teaching and instruction, but it is actually a service you provide to the college as your role in providing curriculum.
 - Potvin – If that is so, what do we do with g. and h. within the classroom, department and university community? That’s why we had the overarching category and then #2 specific to one’s teaching.
- Wilmer - Language should correspond with our LOH, review processes (the three categories, percentages). The Academic vs. Instruction wording is misleading. The first category list is from NWCCU, and other sources and are broad statements; the Instructional categories are more specific. “Academic” and “Instruction” might not be the correct words to use.
- Meyer –Broad overarching ideas are fine. Three groups, research, teaching, service, should follow however, as those reinforce the important components of the faculty’s job. Rework #3, Scholarship, as it is being combined with service.
- Brester – Concerned about increasing use of vulgar language by students and faculty. Senate might articulate what the expectations are and provide examples?
 - Potvin - #1, g. h. addresses that.
 - Babbitt - Student Bill of Rights addresses ethical behavior.
 - Meyer - At times and in a particular context, vulgar language discussions are pedagogically useful and professional behavior covers this.
 - Yost –Limiting vulgar language might involve censorship. Sometimes faculty discuss vulgar language in the arts and when there are no other words to be used. My preference is to reference the professional behavior standards.
 - Senators may submit language; if there is none, the policy will remain as is; if there are comments, they will be brought back to JAGS.
- Babbitt noted that the Academic and Professional Responsibilities policy will go back to JAGS to improve organizational structure.

University Council (UC) – Chair Babbitt

- Meets the morning before our next FS meeting on October 7; old items up for vote are:

- Fiscal Misconduct Policy
 - Senate reviewed and approved.
- Sponsored Programs for Children and Youth
 - Change provides more flexibility to the department.
- Student Bill of Rights
 - Leslie Taylor worked closely with ASMSU when crafting the document. Senate doesn't vote on it; it's a university-wide issue and will be brought to UC. Babbitt is the only TT faculty rep on UC.

Update and Discussion of the Sustainability of ADVANCE – Sara Rushing

- Five-year, \$3.5M grant, Institutional Transformation Grant that works around three (3) initiatives:
 - Enhancing research capacity and opportunity;
 - Enhancing work/life integration;
 - Enhancing cultural attunement
 focusing specifically on TT women in STEM and social behavioral science.
- The five year grant expands on the aforementioned initiatives as much as possible to all faculty regardless of gender, rank or discipline, as well as staff and students, and so Rushing and others would like MSU to think about changing the culture of the grant by expanding it and creating by-ins by all constituencies. ADVANCE will phase out in 1.5 years (2017). What will MSU sustain? Currently, program administrators are:
 - Getting programs up and running;
 - Collecting data from the community to determine what worked/what was not successful;
 - Determine what MSU would like to continue to do once the NSF grant ends. Many of the things we do NSF does not pay for, as there are institutional commitments to receive the grant.
- Overview of the three initiatives:
 - Research capacity and opportunity initiative is in good stead.
 - Boot camp and grant mentoring by Nika Stoop, grant submission and training coordinator, has received kudos from faculty. Data has indicated Stoop's position is sustainable and valuable.
 - Work/life integration
 - Donated sick-leave pool is sustained.
 - Faculty accommodation partner program has been successful, as MSU has engaged in 33 TT hiring of dual academic couples. Commitment and sustainability of the program might entail shifting resources from other things.
 - Two Faculty Handbook policies will be coming to senate for review: Faculty Modified Duties and Extending the Tenure Clock (changing opt-in policy to an opt-out).
 - Elder, child, pet healthcare – Care.com – sustaining it was a challenge since we are broader state-wide university system.

Please comment if this has been a useful tool and meaningfully increases job satisfaction and job productivity.

- Cultural attunement initiative has spearheaded:
 - Cultural transformation by doing diversity depth hires;
 - Formation of search tool-kits useful for search committee members;
 - Institutional education and training;
 - Equity advocate program sustained in the OIE;
 - Equity data analyst, who is sustained in OPA and a contributor to social science research team. Will her role include some of the original research gathering once ADVANCE is gone?
 - The departmental annual self-studies report, a reflective self-study of each unit's vision for diversity and inclusion, has resulted in positive feedback. Departmental values and goals have been articulated and, after four years of the self-study, how we take that annual exercise and turn it into some kind of meaningful progress towards clear goals?
 - Second call is out for the Women in Science Distinguished Professorship. It is a two-year position with a \$4M per year award. ADVANCE's MSU Alumni Foundation Endowment money is funding this award and will only be available until 2020; fund-raising is crucial, now.
- ADVANCE website provides overview of accomplishments of the program, three initiative items, and background information on the grant.
- Rushing would like to focus on the large issues:
 - What is MSU's long-term commitment and vision for diversity?
 - Who is accountable for long-term diversity at MSU?
 - What does it mean, with MSU's size and type with our context and history, to meaningfully make progress to whatever we see as the right diversity to MSU?
 - Is that reflecting Montana, the world at large, and how are we going to get there?
 - What is the long-term diversity vision for faculty at MSU?
 - The commitment must come from a grassroots effort and go up, and requires a concerted effort from people being engaged and orchestrating the effort.
- Discussions:
 - Is the definition of diversity "diverse" and beyond gender?
 - Rushing – This is what is meant when we move beyond ADVANCE and spoken about diversity on a broader scale. Currently speaking with underrepresented minority faculty and what support systems exist here and allow them to have a community if they desire. Current generations embrace diversity in many forms. When speaking about gender, race, we are talking about the classic types of diversity we don't have at

MSU.

- Babbitt –This is an informational piece that faculty senate should consider. The vast majority of faculty support diversity. Senate should discuss what we want to sustain and at what level. Senators should consider this and discuss with faculty. It will be brought back later.

Faculty Review of Administrators – Chair Babbitt

- In the next few weeks, senate will have a closed meeting to discuss results of administrative reviews done last AY.
- Faculty review of deans:
 - How do we want to do the reviews?
 - Do we want to conduct them in the fall?
 - Do we want to review President, Provost, again, in spring?
 - Do we want to review dept heads, VP's?
- Last year's reviews were successful because of a promise of feedback and a plan for the reviewee's improvement. How to address that?
 - If there is collaboration, the outcomes will be better.
 - How would feedback be done?
 - Who would see the results of the review?
 - Who decides on the questions? Is it collaborative?
 - Do the questions reflect the broad nature of what the person does?
 - Is the review a type of overall job review or should the review be focusing on concerns of faculty? If the questions focus on certain issues, you might miss successes the person has accomplished, but if it is not a summative review, that may be fine.
 - In the past, all categorizations of administrators got the same set of generic questions. As a result, the review is not specific and addresses too many broad issues.
 - Do we want our review to be part of a job review – a 360 in which our review is part of reviews by staff senate, classified, professionals, and external reviewers?
 - Should the review be something more informal?
 - Do we discuss the results only in senate? There are issues of confidentiality to explore
 - Who in the college will see the dean's review? College senators?
 - Will the dean's review be formative, or do we make them summative?
 - Are the review results a discussion we should have with the deans or with the supervisor, who speaks with the dean about the review? If it is a job review, it has to go to the supervisor. Do we want that?
- Repasky would like the reviews to be more defined and focused on 2-3 specific areas of which faculty may collaborate with deans to make departments more productive. Additionally, there are many different things happening in the different colleges and perhaps we should focus on those issues. For example, Engineering is experiencing an explosion in enrollment.
- Faculty want feedback from the reviews and that needs to happen this year.

Discussions have been productive and senate leadership is trying to make it happen in a meaningful and productive way.

- Babbitt will bring this topic up at the end of every senate meeting and encourages senate feedback.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 pm.

Randy Babbitt, Chair

Michael Babcock, Chair-elect