

FACULTY SENATE
October 7, 2009
President's Conference Room, Montana Hall
4:10 PM – 5:00 PM
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY-BOZEMAN, MONTANA
Minutes

Members Present: Chen, Cherry, Clark for Wojtowicz, Eiger, Eitle, Frick, Fischer, Gee, Gerlach, Jacobsen, Kaiser, Lansverk, Locke, Marshall for D. Weaver, Meade, Mokwa, Neumeier, Schachman, Stewart for Osborne, Thompson, Versaevel, Waller, Wisner, Zhu

Members Absent: Bangert, Bessen, Chem & Biochem, Lynch, Fields, Fleck, Larson, Livingston, Mech & Industrial Eng, Political Science, Savoie, Sowell, T. Weaver,

Others Present: Larry Carucci, Joseph Fedock, Shannon Taylor

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

Announcements –Chair-elect Lansverk

- The NWCCU has completed their accreditation. Interim provost Fedock thanked the faculty for their participation in the process. He stated that the following are preliminary, and we will have a chance to correct any accreditation action when the board of commissioners of the accreditation meets in January 2010. In the meantime, below are the commendations and recommendations they reported while on campus:
 - Commendations:
 - Commended the institution for its achievement as a highest ranking Carnegie Foundation institution; as a high research category as a reflection of its productivity, primarily because of its faculty.
 - Commended MSU on the breadth and depth of our teaching and research activities and how we engage all elements of those activities across the institution.
 - Commended MSU in the demonstration of a “culture of collaboration” among all different constituencies on the campus in addressing issues of importance to the institution.
 - Commended MSU on the facilities condition inventory list that was established 15 years ago. We have done a very good job in monitoring and assessing our facilities and issues that feed into the long range building program and priority lists of repair and maintenance.
 - Recommendations:
 - Adequacy of resources and allocation of them to areas that support the fundamental mission of the institution. We need to look long and hard at potential reallocation to support the things that we say are important to this institution, specifically with regards to supporting the research mission of the institution and in terms of its graduate education mission.
 - We need to address the relationship between MSU and affiliated campuses e.g., efficiency of operations and better alignment of resources (e.g., purchasing – to class scheduling).
 - Work from a policy and practice perspective of appropriate compensation policies for faculty, staff and administrators that will serve to recruit and retain the quality of individuals that we seek to have at this institution.
 - Need to improve, substantially, the consistency of our educational assessment process and student learning outcomes. There is significant inconsistency at the level by which this is undertaken across the educational units of the institution, including its assessment of CORE 2.0 program.
- Regents Workgroup Letter – The BoR commented positively to the FS letter offering to provide some expert advice to their Workgroup on issues central to its goal of “Reinventing or Reforming” the MUS system. Chair Lynch and Chair-elect Lansverk will follow up and report to FS.
- There is ongoing review of tenure-at-hire (not in reference to these most recent hires) in Faculty Affairs.

Tenure Review Process for Current Hires – Chair-elect Lansverk

- Eight faculty recently hired this year at MSU have been granted tenure-at-hire in their letter of hire. Faculty Senate has been asked to approve a one-time expedited procedure for these faculty which would only involve a Special Review (a shortened time line and removes a few elements of the process e.g., in-depth assessment of teaching) involving Departmental review and, probably, concurrence by the Dean, Provost, and President before being moved forward to the BoR agenda.
- AAUP language on tenure states that tenure is, primarily, a faculty concern and it is a faculty-driven process.

- Two draft letters were presented and FS was asked to comment on their concepts with respect to tenure-at-hire.
 - Version One: Key elements include asking candidates to submit a CV (and not a dossier), running a P&T process concurrently instead of sequentially (which is what we usually do), and if the candidate has tenure at another institution (i.e., they have been vetted in a tenure process and, as such, preserves their role), it is good enough for us. It does not preserve our P&T processes or standards, however.
 - Version Two: Preserves the essence of MSU's current tenure process but allows for an expedited Special Review for P&T. An abbreviated dossier, and preserves a sequence of events in our P&T process; the burden is still on the candidate to put enough into the dossier for the committees to make a decision, but it does not take 6 months to put together a dossier, and external letters are removed.
- Discussion points:
- For decades and longer, MSU has never had a tenure-at-hire process; why for these Eight?
- Eight people accepted the job and knew they were going up for tenure. Why are we changing the process for people who have accepted? We have a process for hiring, and they were free to accept or reject it. I'm not in favor of changing the process when these people already accepted. Senior faculty hires were recruited because of their expertise and achievements
- When does this process kick in? Are we trying to make the tenure process happen faster than 7 months for those already hired?
- What of departmental faculty who had no input into an administrator's hire? Should they have veto power if an administrator was seeking retreat in the teaching arena? We have never had an administrator here that could have gotten tenure in the department.
- Perhaps there should be two review processes; one for faculty and one for administrators.
- Should external letters be obtained and if not, could reference checks be used instead?
- Some confirmation of teaching effectiveness, such as teaching evaluations from other institutions.
- What documentation can be waived in the case of special reviews and by whom? In the first sample letter items explicitly waived are the "internal review of research" and "in-depth assessment of teaching" but not "external peer review letters." Who has the prerogative to waive specific types of documentation?
- Administrators are given Special Reviews and who defines that?
 - At the department level, you use the department criteria.
- Chair-elect Lansverk took a straw Poll for the most recent hires, only:
 - Tenure somewhere else is good enough (although there would be some limited process) - 5
 - Conduct some version of our process - 3
 - Abide by [what](#) our letter of hire says - 6
- Chair-elect Lansverk asked FS members to discuss TAH with their constituents and send Chair Lynch or Chair-elect Lansverk email with questions/comments.

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

Deleted: ¶
¶