

**FACULTY SENATE**  
**February 11, 2015**  
**346 LEON JOHNSON**  
**4:10 PM – 5:00 PM**  
**MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY – BOZEMAN, MONTANA**  
**Minutes**

**Members/Alternates Present:** Adams for DeWeese (Art), Arnold (Ag Ed), Babbitt (Chair-elect), Babcock (Psychology), Berry (CE), Bolte (Music), Brester (AG Econ), Bonnand (Library), Branch (English), Brown (JJCBE), Burrows (Ext), Eggert (Emeritus), Gannon (CBE), Greenwood (Math), Hendrikx (Earth Sci), Herbeck (Ed), Hostetler (GC), Kaiser (ECE), Kohler (CBC), Larson (MIE), Martin (Mod Lang), McMahon (Ecology), Meyer for Waller (Hist & Phil), Mosley (ARS), O'Neill (Arch), Rossmann (Library), Vorontsov for Qiu (Physics), Reidy (Chair), Seright (Nursing), A. Smith (HHD), Swinford (Soc), Wiedenheft (Micro/Immuno), Wilmer (Pol Sci), Zabinski (LRES)

**Others Present:** Alan Dyer, Debra BeBode, Chris Fastnow, Dave Roberts, Terry Leist, Ron Larsen, David Singel, Seth Urick, Megan Bergstedt, Nicol Rae, Ilse-Mari Lee, Karlene Hoo, Larry Carucci, Nancy Cornwell

Call to Order – Chair Reidy

- Chair Reidy called the meeting to order at 4:10 pm, and a quorum was present. Minutes from February 4, 2014 unanimously approved.

Announcements

- Courses and Programs - Chair-elect Babbitt
  - Two undergrad courses posted on the FS web site are up for consideration:
    - AGED 315 - Electrical and Power Systems Operation
    - ARTZ 109 - Visual Language: Comprehensive Foundations
  - The Hospitality and Sustainability certificates are programs being considered and are also posted on the FS web site.
  - Comments about the courses and programs should be sent to Chair-elect Babbitt.
- Honorary Degree Cover Change – Larry Carucci
  - Faculty Affairs designed a cover sheet to be submitted with honorary degree candidate materials. The intent is to have a checklist of five items that are required for honorary degree candidate submission and consideration, as some honorary degree candidate applications are very complete; others are not. Two words on the cover sheet would be changed from “.....*may* be included” to “Items of this sort *must* be included.”
- Prioritization Document V3 with Mapping Document – Chair Reidy
  - Changes were made to the Prioritization Document (PD) per input from faculty and admin.
  - A vision document was added.
  - A Mapping Document (MD) was also added and clearly outlines where, according to the priorities and where they fit within the actual objectives and matrixes of the strategic plan and reveals where faculty want to focus their efforts.
  - Reidy is distributing the document to all chairs of working groups, councils, president, provost, associate provosts, etc., to describe what the document is, how it is to be used, how it should organize our thoughts and how it should be used as a template or guiding document for faculty interests. The goal is to have faculty members on councils will form working groups to work towards the document's implementation.

## Faculty Handbook – Chair Reidy

- Grievance Policy - JAGs groups combined the CBA and pre-CBA Faculty Handbook.
- Discussions ensued:
  - Kohler – The two aspects to the timeline are punctuated:
    - Grievant - The 14 days grieve period in the document is out of step with other universities. The grievance process might happen in the middle of a semester; faculty might be traveling to a conference; faculty might be teaching a number of sections, etc.
    - How many days the university (or next group) has to respond. Currently, our process has seven (7) days. Other institutions of higher learning usually give 30 days to grieve and 60 days for the university response.
    - Reidy asked Kohler to bring grievant and response timeline data from other institutions for comparison.
  - Kohler discussed the language prohibiting faculty from bringing an attorney as an advisor to the hearings. Typically, an individual coming to such hearings may bring whomever they wish. Reidy stated that the grievance process is a non-judicial process, and in keeping with that, hearings would be conducted without lawyers. If faculty bring an attorney, the university will also be allowed to have one present. Language was added allowing faculty to have an advisor who has a JD, but is non-practicing. Kohler understood the philosophy, but believes MSU should follow best practice - if best practice at research universities nationally is not to provide that specific restriction, then we should not follow this policy.
  - Wilmer noted that both parties are prohibited from having attorneys. If the grievance process fails and a faculty member must inevitably seek legal counsel, having an attorney witness (she surmises that the attorney is a witness, only) earlier in the process makes it easier. The faculty disadvantage is a big factor so we do not want the disadvantage to be more of a factor if an attorney witness was not present. Reidy stated that an audio recording would be made of the grievance and at the behest of either party, a transcription may be produced (and the requesting party pays associated costs).
  - Brown was a past-chair of the grievance committee and is in favor of maintaining the grievance process as administrative and not judicial. He believes the process would be much more complicated with lawyers calling us out on procedural matters. If faculty believe they have been materially damaged by the failure of their department, or administrators, to follow the guidelines in the faculty handbook, and elsewhere, they are allowed to have three (3) disinterested faculty members review why they believe that occurred. The Grievance Committee makes a recommendation to administrative ranks. If MSU is at odds with best practices, then we might rethink the process, but Brown believes this process to be a noble undertaking. Conversely, this was one reason why faculty favored the CBA. If this process fails, then faculty should go the legal route.
  - Kohler stated that the policies senate are reviewing are heavily convoluted with P&T policies. Approving policies piecemeal before viewing the whole document is anxiety-inducing. Reidy has discussed this very issue with senate leadership: Many things are interdependent. Two ways to go about approving (FH) policies: 1. Review the complete document, make changes and present to senate as one large document. That process would have advantages. However, every wheel and crank in the machine would have to be working at similar speeds and come out right at the end: The process would work like Newton's universe, but it doesn't (I had to put that in here). Inundating FS with such a complex document would be overwhelming.

2. Present policies individually with the acknowledgment that, for example, once University P&T complete their tasks, senate would amend a dependent policy accordingly. In the Appointment of Faculty policy, there is verbiage stating that amendments would be forthcoming once P&T completes their work. Carucci added that faculty are currently governed by the Interim Faculty Handbook and when senate approves specific policies, that means the interim policies are replaced. Babbitt noted that radical changes are not currently being made. Senate is trying to distill the best of the FH, CBA and Interim FH, make a few changes and pass them; after that, there will be amendments.

- Reidy would like input from senators, constituents, and hopes to bring back next week for a vote.
- Appointment and Employment of Faculty – Added “Creative Activity” and definition of Research Faculty have changed. We define faculty as Tenured, Tenurable, NTT, or Emeritus – all of whom who have representation on senate. Because research faculty are not defined, there is a question as to why they are included in the policy however, for clarity on how they are defined, it was included.
- Discussions ensued:
  - Mosley – Page 3, first bolded sentence in 211.10 PROBATIONARY APPOINTMENTS, first sentence, “shall normally not exceed seven (7) academic years.” Mosley believes that should read six (6) years at MSU. Reidy stated BoR policy, which is bolded in the document, may not be changed. BoR policy, previously not printed in the MSU policy, has now been shown. Following, MSU has inserted their policy verbiage which reads: “...faculty must apply for tenure no later than their sixth year.....” Mosley asks what faculty can do to revise BoR policy? Legal counsel usually works with the BoR. He further stated that a potential faculty member might look at the BoR policy and decide spending another year trying to get tenure is not a career move they would want to make.
  - Kohler believes that while the policies are not exactly in synch, they are not contradictory. The BoR policy discusses "acquisition of continuous tenure" and the MSU policy states when a candidate "must apply for" tenure. Those two events are at the end and the beginning, respectively, of the many months between when a candidate submits their dossier, and the first day of the new contract with continuous tenure. In the sixth year of service a candidate must apply for tenure (MSU policy) by submitting a dossier--deadline is near the start of the academic year. Six months or so later the case has received a recommendation from the Provost/President and that leads to a BOR vote officially granting tenure. The first MUS contract with tenure would then be for October 1 (about a year after the candidate submitted their dossier) in the start of the seventh year of service. Thus, MSU faculty “acquire” continuous tenure after completion of six full years of service. It does appear that the BoR policy could allow for submission of a dossier at the start of year seven (with a decision by the end of the year), but the BoR policy says "shall normally not exceed". Six does not exceed seven, so MSU is free to have a policy that requires candidates to go up for tenure at start of year six. The BoR policy appears to be setting an upper limit, and a unit in the MUS could use that policy as the basis for a system in which candidates apply at the beginning of year 7. Kohler is comfortable with MSU accelerating the process by one year, but believes start of year 6 is closer to practice.
  - Singel - BoR policy says that if faculty go up for tenure and are denied, they are not immediately terminated; they are given a terminal year contract for an additional year, hence the seven (7) years. Mosley understands the terminal year contract concept, but believes the wording “normally” makes it, in this context, confusing.

- Reidy iterated that the added paragraph beneath BoR language correctly instructs faculty. Should we drop BoR language?
- Re: terminal degrees, Kohler noted this document's appointments are closely related to P&T and although terminal degrees are mentioned only for visiting and research faculty, a terminal degree or possible equivalent experience required for appointment was not mentioned. Reidy noted that it is common in L&S, but is not certain what other units do and that might be discussed at P&T at the university level. Bolte stated that with regards to applied music, the School of Music has 4-5 TT faculty who have non-terminal Masters Degrees and who also have national recognition. Violinist, Angela Ahn, is such an example.
- Mosley understands, referring to 212.00 – Tenure at Hire, that hiring someone with tenure violates Montana state law. Reidy stated that this is still draft language only and 212.00 was intended to not restrict someone who is exceptionally meritorious when hired. Singel believes the verbiage was taken, verbatim, from the current Interim FH which was subsequently taken verbatim from the CBA. Brester noted that the “expedited” component means that tenure would be expedited within a year. Reidy will investigate and bring back to senate.
- McMahon noted that there are many research faculty in Ecology that co-chair on graduate committees. The wording in the policy says any instructional activity may not use research funding to support it. Reidy stated that research faculty may not use research dollars for instructional duties; the university pays for instruction. If you have an instructional component to mentor graduate students, then faculty need to be paid for that, and the research FTE would drop compensatorally as MSU would pick up the instructional salary component.
  - Wilmer suggested adding the language, “.....that time must be paid for from the instructional budget.”
  - Zabinski would be amendable if the following language was dropped, “advising graduate students.” As a research faculty and if she has a research grant, clearly part of the expectation of her work on that research grant is working with the student on their research.
  - Dave Roberts from Ecology noted that the way the sentence is written now, research faculty (RF) on grant funding cannot advise their own graduate students, and that same policy will be applied to TT faculty on summer contracts that are research funded if advising graduate students is an instructional activity. Zabinski's suggestion to strike “advising grad students” solves that problem. However, it eliminates the only clause in this document that says research professors (RP), as opposed to research scientists (RS), have the prerogative and responsibility to advise grad students - This is possibly a separate discussion that Roberts is having with Graduate School and Montana Hall. This current document makes no distinction between a RP and RS and it only references research faculty (RF) who have instructional responsibilities. Which one are those – RS or RP? Who decides that? On what criteria? When? In the previous document it was understood that RP had instructional expectations and RS did not and it was very clear in the (old) FH for NTT faculty. This current document obliterates some of the rights and responsibilities of RP and makes it so ambiguous as to be confusing. There used to be a descriptive difference between a RS, RP and Research Engineer and solves the dilemma of who serves of committees, instructional, etc. (Ref: Old Faculty Handbook 314.00 at this link [http://www.montana.edu/policy/faculty\\_handbook/fh300.html#340.00](http://www.montana.edu/policy/faculty_handbook/fh300.html#340.00))

- Reidy – That ambiguity should be solved when we go back to the original FH.
- Reidy will make handbook changes and bring back to senate for a vote next week. Please email Chair Reidy if you have other suggestions to this document.

### Graduate School Policies – Chair Reidy

- Babbitt is working with the Grad Council on publicizing new policies to senators prior to policy approval.
- Regarding the 12 credits beyond the Master’s Degree Credit and going towards your 60-credit PhD, below are some of the comments from faculty:
  - This policy is not a good tool for recruiting;
  - Not a good tool for students for their career development; and,
  - The NSF does not want to see in their funding.
- Alan Dyer, chair of the Grad Council, stated that these issues will come up at the next meeting.
- Feedback from Zabinski’s department:
  - How does this contribute to the quality of the graduate degree? If grants are paying for another semester where the student must take an additional 12 credits, it is another way of getting more money from us. Dyer responded that the main point of the 12-credit rule is that the student who has a Masters coming from another institute must take credits at MSU.
- McMahon – The problem is the wording of the policy: one takes 12 course credits as part of the doctoral program; with the new rule, one can only bring in 21 for a Masters and automatically you need 9 more credits from either courses or thesis credits. Babbitt – Under this proposed rule, you would need 39 credits to get a PhD after receiving a Masters if not en route or continuing instead of just 30 under current rules, but the 39 could be 27 theses + 12 coursework credits. Why do we need 9 more credits? Dyer - That is on the theses credit end of things. It’s very confusing process to work out, but the basics is to just provide opportunities to take extra credits to meet that requirement. We are trying to come about it from the point of view that the person requires 12 additional credits and how do we approach reaching 60 credits. The additional credits are all in these credits and 9 are where the expectation is. McMahon – This is just adding another semester to someone’s program, so it is an unfunded mandate and that is what I am hearing from our faculty. Dyer – We’ll bring it up in the meeting. We are trying to figure out a way work it out for the 12 additional credits beyond their masters and the rest are details that have to be worked out. If departments have concerns, they are welcomed to email Dyer and attend the Grad Council meetings.
- Please send comments to Chair-elect Babbitt.

As there was no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:00 pm.

*Signature*

*Michael Reidy, Chair*

*Signature*

*Randy Babbitt, Chair-elect*