

MSU FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
February 4, 2004
301 Reid Hall
Montana State University-Bozeman
4:10 PM

Members Present:

Ashley	Joe
Becker	Jim
Bandyopadhyay	Prasanta
Cherry	Steve
Christopher	John
Conant	Jay
Coon	Brad
Fedock	Joe
Gipp	Wayne
Giroux	Mike
Giusti	Ada
Gough	Gale
Howard	Rich
Jones	Warren
Kommers	Peter
Lansverk	Marvin
Leech	Alan
Levy	Sanford
Lynch	Wes
Lynes-Hayes	Pat
McDermott	Tim
Monaco	Paul
Neeley	Mike
Knight	James
Pratt	Ray
Prawdzienski	Maryann
Rucker	Randy
Schlotzhauer	Howard
Seymour	Joe
Taper	Mark
Taylor	Shannon
Weaver	David
Yoo	Year-Back

Members Absent:

Atwood	Joe
Engel	Richard
Hoffman	Laurence
Idzerda	Yves
Jackson	Grant
Kevane	Bridget
Microbiology	
Schmidt	Edward
Weaver	Theodore
Young	Doug

Speakers: Jeff Adams, Glenn Puffer, Nancy Dodd

The meeting was called to order at 4:10 PM by Chair Warren Jones. A quorum was present. The minutes of

the January 28, 2004, Faculty Council meeting were approved.

CHAIR'S REPORT - Warren L. Jones

-Chair Jones asked for comments on the email distribution of Faculty Council minutes and Chair's Report. FC members thought email was more convenient and comments, overall, were positive. Two members requested hard copies.

-WJ asked if faculty found the CORE 2.0 seminar on advising held February 10 helpful. Feedback indicated that it was. Learning to use the web was easy when it was applied to most students; transfer students, however, would present a challenge.

-Subcommittee Program Review -U of M doesn't have a military science minor. The Chair of the Faculty Senate at UM inquired about our recently approved program and asked Chair Jones if he had any reservations about the military minor before it was passed. Chair Jones responded that the new program didn't come through FC and therefore had not seen it. The mechanism for the program approval: Military Science-> Undergraduate Studies Committee->Provost-> Regents->Approval

-Administrative review is complete. Copies of summary statistics and comments for individuals are being distributed to the individuals and administrators. Summary statistics on deans in general, department heads, in general, etc. will be made available next week, or so. Turnout was disappointing - 120 individuals out of a pool of 600, submitted a total of 228 reviews (less than two per reviewer). It is not yet clear if this will provide credible input to upper administration, and that the general message will be that supervisors must be doing "ok." Geoff Gamble and Dave Dooley have been given their copies of the review.

-FC has the go-ahead and offers of assistance from the provost to continue examination of alternative title and status for long-term adjuncts. It appears that the campus has 60 adjuncts that have been >.75FTE for 4 or more consecutive fall semesters. It is not clear whether this also applies to spring semester, as well.

-F/U to UPBAC FIVE-YEAR VISION FOR MSU FORUM (1/26), and UPBAC MEETING (1/27)

-P. Kommers suggested to the forum on 1/26, that concrete language be implemented for a definitive salary pay plan.

- The salary subject was again discussed in UPBAC and the following Tuesday.

-Faculty Council suggested that if definitive salary plans were not feasible the Council would expect, at least, a salary review study. Regents should divorce themselves from state pay plan and any statements that cap salaries. Funding salaries for people on campus should be a separate issue. By doing that, the Regents would have flexibility to move forward with a plan for MSU.

- The basic salary statement remained untouched, except statement referring to the ongoing Salary Review Committee at the Regents level. The primary reason the absence of definitive wording for salaries is a Regents policy issue.

- There are ongoing discussions and activities at multiple levels with Commissioner's office, UPBAC, Provost and Regents to keep the issue of sub-par salaries in view. It is important, however, not to alienate the Regents. It was advised that the committee exercise patience and wait to see what President Gamble would do.

-The BOR meet again in March. With their meeting in March, it was noted that they may reiterate their unsubstantial policy and there would be silence in UPBAC.

-A question was raised about benefits and retirement and if these were folded into the discussions of pay raises. Rich Howard stated that the salary negotiations included wording on benefits and retirement.

-PROGRAM REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE STATUS

-Additional comp issue received comments about aspects of the proposed policy that could prove divisive among faculty, particularly those who can participate easily and those who cannot. (both were in reference to faculty background and to workload), and how long-term funding will be maintained. Adjunct participation was an issue, as was the perennial problem of defining exactly what constitutes an overload. These concerns were shared with the Provost's office, and further discussion are to ensue.

GUEST SPEAKER - DR. NANCY DODD - UNIVERSITY OMBUDS

-Dr. Dodd is the university ombudsperson. She is available to resolve conflict, foster better communication and negotiate for a positive result within the workplace. She will be conducting seminars on the following dates:

All will be held in the SUB 271 from Noon - 1 PM

RESOLVING CONFLICT

Tuesday, 2/10/2004

Wednesday, 2/11/2004

FOSTERING BETTER COMMUNICATION

Tuesday, 2/17/2004

Wednesday, 2/18/2004

NEGOTIATION FOR A POSITIVE RESULT

Tuesday, 2/24/2004

Wednesday, 2/25/2004

Questions may be directed to Dr. Dodd via phone, 994-6105, or email ndodd@montana.edu.

GUEST SPEAKER - JEFF ADAMS - STUDENT OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT

-MSU faculty are "underselling" what they are doing and, as such, an assessment tool needed to be devised. Such a tool is the Student Outcomes Assessment. It has evolved into two drafts: Student Outcomes Assessment Policy and Student Outcomes Assessment Guide for Departments. These are attempts to measure our quality assurance and they either verify it or indicate we can improve.

-These are tools to help faculty learn how their students are learning, and how to become better teachers. Gathering data and having a participatory process at a unit (departmental) level will help to quantify/qualify these assessments.

-Each department should develop a plan where data may be shared, discussed, revisited and then posted to a central website.

-An outcomes committee would review it and make it public.

-Faculty participation is what drives this process.

Question: "Aren't we always assessing ourselves by participating in our classes, testing students, etc?"

Answer by Jeff Adams: Yes. But we should all share the information and talk about how this would impact university curricula structure at the degree level.

-Please communicate with Jeff Adams on your interpretations of this document. He may be reached at adams@physics.montana.edu

-Question: What happens when a department has 4-5 options? DO you want a departmentalized objective for te assessment, or one for each degree option? Answer (Jeff Adams): Northwestern accreditation wants one from each degree option.

(Please refer to Exhibit 1 and Exhibit 2 for more extensive information on Student Outcomes Assessments. These exhibits are drafts and for discussion purposes only.)

-I GRADE ISSUES

-Glenn Puffer, Chair of Professional Council, distributed I grade forms and policy with recommended changes for FC to review for next meeting.

As there was no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:04 PM.

Signature
Warren L. Jones, Chair

Signature
Gale R. Gough, Secretary