

FACULTY SENATE
February 25, 2009
REID HALL 104
4:10 PM – 5:00 PM
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY-BOZEMAN, MONTANA
Minutes

Members Present: Amin, Becker, Cherry, Eitle, Fields, Fischer, Gerlach, Jacobs, Jacobsen, Lansverk, Livingston, Mokwa, Neumeier, Osborne, Prawdzienski, Simpson, Sowell, Taylor, Varricchio, Watson, Wojtowicz, Yoo for Zhu

Members Absent: Bangert, Bennett, Chem/Biochem, Fleck, Gee, Igo, Jackson, Larson, Lei, Lynch, Maskiell, Political Science, Versaevel, D. Weaver, T. Weaver, Wisner

Others Present: Warren Jones, Joe Fedock, S. Taylor, Geoffrey Poole

Chair-elect Marvin Lansverk called the meeting to order at 4:10 PM. A quorum was present.

Announcements –Chair-elect Lansverk

- February 28, 2009 Union Meeting – Information about the union bargaining unit make-up and processes were presented.
- March 4, 2009 – No meeting; BOR.
- The survey on improving Faculty Senate communications and processes is still being crafted.

Union Discussions – Faculty Senate Members

- A FS member requested that reminders be sent on the union voting dates. It was noted that ballots will be sent to faculty at their home address. Faculty are encouraged to read and become informed. Discussions ensued:
 - Some FS members encouraged all to read bargaining contracts of the other MUS campuses, especially U of M's.
 - FS would like links to websites and information on the union disseminated on a regular basis until the voting begins.
 - Many FS members would like a pro/con union debate, as it is believed more transparency and information are needed. Many felt the union forum on February 18, 2009 was pro-union.
 - Sandy Osborne stated that she would be glad to steer faculty who had questions about the union to union reps on campus.
 - It is understood that the union voting ballots are to go out some time at the end of March.

Accreditation – Warren Jones

- Why accreditation? One reason is to allow students to be able to receive loans so they may attend school.
- The first step in the accreditation procedure entails preparing a self-study document.
- Every “Standard” is composed of many different elements, which site requirements, and each requirement must be satisfied. The Faculty Standard (Standard 4) has been relegated to faculty by administration, and Warren Jones is asking FS members for their input.
 - Are objectives and correct tone being met? Do they say the right things about faculty at this university, and we do meet the standards and goals for accreditation?
 - Is it being done correctly and in the spirit of self-study?

- The accreditation does reflect the fact that MSU is a land grant institution.
- The accreditation is a snapshot of where the university is now. Woven throughout the document is what we have done in the past and what we intend to do in the future.
- The methodology in responding to this section (of which Faculty Senate was part of) included a process of describing what faculty does, and then surveying them. Focus groups included Faculty Senate and department heads. Outcomes from those groups produced not only a narrative, but quantifiable results. Noted was the fact that the norm for institutions does not include survey results.
- To review all of Standard 4, go to: www.montana.edu/accreditation/workingdocs.html
 - 4A is focuses on teaching and 4B focuses on research. There is overlap, however.
- Document discussion on highlighted sections (examples of what is being done):
 - Section 4.A.4. - Faculty Salaries and Benefits.
 - Faculty Senate focus group and department head discussions were summarized and included in this section.
 - Warren Jones utilized separated data (from a joint data Survey Monkey survey) to construct a list of criteria.
 - Discussions about how raises were dealt with over the past couple of years were included. FS members discussed mechanisms, in detail, by which raises were implemented and the question was posed: To what extent does perceived inconsistency between the evaluation process and the merit awarding process warrant inclusion in the current text?
 - FS members discussed the internal and external adjustments wording. Some believe that the language accurately represents what transpires on this campus; others, however, believe it does not accurately describe how the provost actually distributes the raise pool. Warren Jones asked that FS members email him with their feedback.
 - Section 4.A.5. - The Evaluation Process. Annual review procedures, P&T procedures and teaching evaluation procedures are described in this section.
 - Because annual reviews are not centralized and idiosyncratic to each department, according to a survey, there is an overall satisfaction with the process.
 - MSU conducts annual reviews; the accreditation requires that faculty are reviewed once every five years.
 - There is no mention of teaching evaluations of online classes versus face-to-face in Standard 4. It is believed that topic is addressed in Standard 2.
 - Section 4.B.3. – Research Policies and Practices.
 - F&A policies from this fall were discussed.
 - Survey data provides a basis for faculty satisfaction and data was used

The Faculty Senate meeting ended at 5:00 PM, as there was no further business.

Signature

Marvin Lansverk, Chair-elect

Signature

Gale R. Gough, Secretary