

**FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING
NOVEMBER 2, 2005
STRAND UNION ROOM 276
4:10 AM – 5:00 PM
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY-BOZEMAN, MONTANA
Minutes**

Members Present: Ashley, Bailey, Becker, Catoira, Cherry, Christopher, Dyer, Erickson, Jones, Levy, Lynes-Hayes, C. McClure, M. McClure, Neeley, Ryker, Scott, Stringam, Taper, Taylor, Watson for Metz, Yoo

Members Absent: Amin, Bradley, Brown, Croy, Marlow, Johnson, Idzerda, Jackson, Larkin, Pratt, Prawdzienski, E. Schmidt, Seymour, Stroup

Others: Fedock, Lansverk

Chair Shannon Taylor called the meeting to order at 4:10 PM. A quorum was present. Minutes from October 19 and October 26, 2005 were approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS – Chair Shannon Taylor

- There are a few entities/programs that the university enters into agreement with that are not officially housed within MSU or controlled by university funds. They are usually of a non-political educational nature. One such entity is called FREE. This organization displays the MSU logo on their web site however, some of their philosophies are of a political nature. Chair Taylor would like to further discuss this with Faculty Council when Vice Chair McClure has finished researching this issue.
- Chair Taylor would also like to discuss a proposal from HHD regarding professional practice reassignment of duties.
- Administrative Review – Chair Taylor spoke with the President, who gave positive feedback. It still needs to be reviewed with Leslie Taylor. When that discussion He is hopeful that the review will be ready by July, 2005.

FACULTY AFFAIRS – Chair Marvin Lansverk

- Handbook change – Post Tenure Review policy. The BOR inquired if MSU had constituted a committee at the end of the Post Tenure Review (hereinafter referred to as “PTR”) process namely, the Committee on Service. This committee exists at a juncture when initiation of termination begins and is at the end of the PTR process. When examining the language of the PTR process in the Faculty Handbook it was discovered that the language was incoherent and needed clarification.
- Faculty Affairs proposed the following change:
 - **Faculty Handbook Section 618.02 POST TENURE REVIEW** - “If the Post-Tenure Review committee, by majority vote, concurs with the recommendation for the revocation of the faculty member's tenure, the President may initiate proceedings for termination for cause for substantial failure to carry out the responsibilities of a faculty member, by referring the matter to the Committee on Service (See Sec. 1432). This process must be initiated by January 1. If the Post-Tenure Review committee, by majority vote, disagrees with the recommendation, then no further action will be taken.” Sec 1432 references the Committee on Service but in 618.02 this committee is erroneously referred to as the Committee on Grievance Hearings. Faculty Affairs examined whether there should be language included in Section 618.02 that indicates the PTR process is a grievable. Their findings indicate that the process was not intended to be constructed that way; the PTR process is not mirroring the P&T process. Rather, it already contains a series of checks and balances and establishes our policy as a remediation mechanism that parallels AAUP guidelines.
 - There is an appeals process, however, within the following BOR policy which states: “While the decision of the Committee on Service may be appealed to the Commissioner Of Higher Education, (if the majority votes to have you terminated, the appeals process takes it to the COHE) neither the PTR process nor its outcomes” Neither the decision of the PTR committee nor the decisions of the Committee on Service may get appealed to the Grievance Committee, thus clarifying it is out of the grievance cycle.
 - Administration inquired whether faculty had to go through the PTR process before being brought up before the Committee on Service for failure to perform his or her duties. The answer is “no.” The university may initiate proceedings for termination for cause against a faculty member, whether he or she has gone through the PTR remediation process or not, subject to the proper termination for cause policies and procedures.

- FC members expressed concern that “cause” was not clearly articulated within the parameters of “failure to meet expectations two years in a row.” It was stated that each college establishes and provides their own standards, and that these standards should be consistent and dovetail with university definitions. FC members found inconsistencies in the annual review criteria initiating the PTR process and the criteria that places a faculty member into the termination process. Chair Taylor stated that he would examine this more closely. It was also noted that tenure does not afford faculty an absolute contractual guarantee.

SABBATICAL REVIEW – Chair Lansverk

A sabbatical survey was sent out to faculty last spring with a 62% response rate. Generally, the survey shows that sabbaticals are seen as the premiere faculty development opportunity to change a faculty member’s career. There should be an increase in sabbatical funds by getting new money, as the budget for sabbaticals has remained stable, but salaries have gone up. There was no consensus as to why there are so few sabbaticals. To view the survey you may refer to this link: <http://www.surveymonkey.com/Report.asp?U=95194488676>

Signature

Shannon Taylor, Chair

Signature

Gale R. Gough, Secretary