

FACULTY COUNCIL
September 13, 2006
STRAND UNION ROOM 275
4:10 AM – 5:00 PM
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY-BOZEMAN, MONTANA
MINUTES

Members Present: Amin, Ashley, Bailey, Bandyopadhyay, Becker, Catoira, Cherry, Croy, Dyer, Gipp, Jones, Levy, Lynch, Merzdorf for Jacobs, Neeley, Prawdzienski, Scott, Seymour, Taylor, Watson, Zhu

Members Absent: Ag Ed/AOT, Ag Econ, Ag Land Resources, Bennett, Chem/Bio Chem, Christopher, Erickson, Idzerda, Johnson, Larkin, Lei, Livingston for Ryker, M. McClure, Nursing On Campus, Taper

Others present: Fedock, Lansverk

Chair Shannon Taylor called the meeting to order at 4:10 PM. A quorum was present. The minutes from September 6, 2006 were approved.

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW - Chair Shannon Taylor

- Joe Fedock presented the Administrative Review to the Assistant Dean's Council, and it was well accepted. The only concern was the time frame. The April 15 date, when the administrative reviews were to be submitted to Faculty Council and the timing of annual reviews did not coincide. The Council requested that the Administrative Review be done earlier, so results could be incorporated into the annual reviews.
- Chair Taylor would like to use Survey Monkey as the vehicle to deliver the questions to faculty.
- Faculty Council Steering Committee decided that questions should be standardized. Two Westinghouse surveys given to the US Government to review administrators was distributed amongst FC members. Questions in this document may provide a starting point from which to craft questions for the administrative review. Chair Taylor requested that FC members read the document and provide input. He would like questions incorporated into Survey Monkey by the beginning of the second semester, first or second week in January. If Deans want to review department heads during Christmas, it may be difficult to get questions done before then.
- A FC member who does survey research stated that the Administrative Review must measure something and affirm that the questions, as a unit, measure that entity. A grouping of questions should cohere, as a unit, on what is being measured. If an instrument is available that meets these psychometric requirements, it can be measured against other criteria, and coheres within those units, and it would be helpful to the administrative review endeavor. Otherwise, we may be measuring something we do not want to measure. Also, an open-ended question should be included in the review.
- A concern was expressed that faculty may read the questions and wonder why they weren't consulted. How do you balance the two interests of having questions already prepared and having faculty participate in the preparation? Chair Taylor suggested that each FC member talk amongst their peers about what they believe should be measured.
- A FC member asked who would use the information from the review. Chair Taylor stated that the deans will use it for the department head review and that Faculty Council is only a clearing house for the information which is stripped of its identity and kept

confidential. Final results at the deans' level will be confidential, also. Faculty will not see what the total survey results for their department will be.

TIAA-CREF/TRS

- Governor Schweitzer is against the spending cap, Initiative 97. Would this include equalization of funding for TRS/TIAA-CREF? It is not known. Chair Taylor has been in communications with faculty leaders from around the state. He would like to talk to the BOR at the September 28 breakfast meeting about passing a resolution to propose to correct TRS/TIAA-CREF. Chair Taylor is hopeful, then, that the BOR would then petition the governor to bring equity to TRS/TIAA-CREF by passing a resolution to do so.
- Faculty Council questioned whether this reallocation of TRS/TIAA-CREF funds is legal. The eight MUS campuses have been aware of this inequity for at least 10 years, and collective bargaining units have had the power to hire legal counsel to sue the state. Why haven't they done it? Can an academic body such as Faculty Council engage in hiring attorneys to pursue compensation issues normally done by collectively bargaining units? Faculty, privately, may hire outside legal counsel with their own funds to pursue as a class action suit.
- There was a review about 10 years ago on the unfunded mandate, and it should be reviewed again. There were two points in time that reviewed the status of the unfunded mandate.
- An actuarial study was done 4-5 years that reported on the unfunded liability associated with TRS and MPERS and the magnitude of that unfunded liability. The source of the unfunded liability is in question (i.e., defined benefits – TRS).
- There was a modest proposal during the last legislative session in the finance committee to begin correcting the TRS with \$30M. There was no second to that motion.

FACULTY AFFAIRS – Chair Lansverk

- Family Leave - Faculty Affairs reviewed what Leslie Taylor rewrote this past summer. Next week, the consequences of her suggestions will be presented to the Faculty Council for their response. Most of the changes are organizational, not substantive.
- Chair Lansverk would like Faculty Council involved in the choosing the course evaluation instrument since Knapp computers are becoming obsolete, and MSU will discontinue paying royalties for the patented Aleamoni evaluation form.

OTHER – Chair Taylor

- There are still no volunteers for Chair Elect.
- There is a vacancy on the Faculty Council Steering Committee. Anyone interested, please contact Chair Shannon Taylor, ext. 6197 or staylor@montnaa.edu.

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

Signature

Shannon Taylor, Chair

Signature

Gale R. Gough, Secretary