

**FACULTY COUNCIL**  
**October 4, 2006**  
**REID 102**  
**4:10 AM – 5:00 PM**  
**MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY-BOZEMAN, MONTANA**  
**Minutes**

**Members Present:** Amin, Bandyopadhyay, Becker, Catoira, Christopher, Croy, Gipp, Jones, Levy, Lynch, Idzerda, Jacobs, Larkin, M. McClure, Neeley, Prawdzienski, Scott, Stroup, Zhu

**Members Absent:** Ag Ed/AOT, Ag Land Resources, Ashley, Bailey, Bennett, Chem/Bio Chem, Cherry, Dyer, Erickson, Johnson, Lei, Livingston for Ryker, Nursing On Campus, Seymour Taylor, Watson

**Others present:** Fedock, Fox, Lansverk

Vice Chair Warren Jones called the meeting to order at 4:10 PM. A quorum was present. The minutes from September 27, 2006 were approved.

***PARENTAL LEAVE - Chair Marvin Lansverk***

- Three issues emerged last week regarding the Family Leave policy. The *first* involved policy process. Faculty Council already passed a form of the Parental Leave policy last year. However, the language has subsequently been modified and it needs to be posted in MSU TODAY, again, for 10 working days before coming back to Faculty Council for approval, then moving on to the President for final approval.
- The *second* issue involved the impact of the tenure clock stoppage component on third year reviews/retention review. Chair Lansverk gave an example scenario to illustrate the point: If a faculty member came to MSU, had a baby, instantly, felt encumbered with parental responsibilities, and believed they could not have a retention review after their first two years, there is nothing specific in this present policy addressing that. He stated that if departments have their own guidelines they use with respect to third year reviews, they will likely continue to do so.
- Chair Lansverk stated that there is a difference between the Family Leave and the Parental Leave policies. Faculty should keep in mind, however, that any leave may be granted when “Anything that interrupts your normal progression and ability to perform your work, delays your tenure clock gives you a two-year extension.” Refer to the Faculty Handbook for more descriptive language.
- The *third* issue dealt with dossier submission. When a dossier is submitted early in the review process and the faculty member decides that they should not have begun (because they believe they will not make it) and retroactively an extension is arranged. What is the consequence of that? Because these actions are happening outside of policy, maybe putting this explicitly in print may make this less likely happen?
- Faculty Affairs has decided, based on input from FC, that there should be a specific date for extension. The new language of SECTION 613.30 is as follows:  
“Any faculty member may request an extension of his or her tenure review date by submitting a request in writing to the department head as soon as possible after the need for extension arises. Since external letters are required for tenure, written requests for extension should be made by April 30 of the year of the tenure review. In case of extreme and unforeseen emergency, written requests for extension may be made no later than one week before the date of candidate’s dossier must be submitted.”

Chair Lansverk moved that the Parental Leave now go forward for advertising and review, coming back to FC for final approval and then going forward to the president to be placed in the handbook→all in favor→approved.

***BOR MEETING UPDATE – Vice Chair Jones***

- Chair Taylor believes the BOR meeting was one of the best because they spoke about compensation and academics in substantive ways.
- One of the ramifications of the raises for CEO's is that the COHE will talk meaningfully about comparative data for faculty salaries. They are examining CUPA data, and Jim Rimpau will make a very strong case that the BOR are looking at the wrong 22 comparative small schools that have a quarter of our research expenditures. The only reason we are in the same class is because we offer bachelors degrees and have the about the same number of students. This is the wrong basis for those kinds of comparisons. Jim Rimpau will propose that we use the comparisons we achieved last year in the Carnegie classification system, namely tier one schools. We will be at 60-80% of what our comparative schools get for faculty salaries. It was noted that the difference between Oklahoma State University listing of salaries data and CUPA data are different data sets used for comparisons. CUPA is more explicit.
- Chair Taylor stated that the head of labor relations in the COHE's office, Kevin McRae, is more attentive to academics.
- The Cost of Living DVD is anecdotal and makes the statement that there is a cost of living difference in Gallatin County that is fundamentally different from other cities in Montana. The BOR should think about that when making salary adjustments. Chair Taylor will show the DVD at the next FC meeting, and then bring it to the BOR in November.
- The recent governor's proposal states that there will be a zero percent tuition increase for the next two years, completely 100% contingent upon the legislature contributing \$50M of base budget to cover the lost tuition revenue (in-state tuition, only).
- U of M presented some 30+ new degrees, and the COHE provided input to the BOR stating that they did not approve of most of them.
- The BOR are still not sure what the MUS CORE should be and are still debating its status.
- The President's address will be on Tuesday, October 10, 4:00 PM in the SUB.

***VICE PROVOST FOR GRADUATE EDUCATION – Carl Fox***

- For graduate education to enter the 21<sup>st</sup> century, Dr. Fox would like to raise the visibility of Graduate Council and the role of graduate coordinators campus-wide.
- Initially Graduate Council will focus on three areas:
  - Governance. Dr. Fox would like a defined written structure for the Graduate Council.
  - He would like Graduate Council to focus on bringing policies and procedures into today's graduate education environment. Older policies do not apply or make sense any more.
    - FC members stated that they are often asked to be on doctoral communities within disciplines they are not familiar with. Vice Provost Fox stated that faculty are present, even though they may not be familiar with their discipline, to observe, make sure the process is fair and to guide and direct the students. He noted, however, that this procedure may need examination to make sure it is up to date.
    - Another FC member stated that before she came to MSU campus, she was not exposed to non-tenure track faculty overseeing graduate students and allowing

them to teach students. Why is it allowed at MSU and how does this compare to other schools? Vice Provost Cox stated that he has been to schools that had graduate faculty, but they did not teach. He stated that it is possible the people from the outside who have expertise to teach students who are graduate students.

- Vice Provost Fox believes that the curriculum should be reviewed by Graduate Council. Vice Chair Jones stated that in the past, the Grad Council would make policy and faculty would learn of it after it had been implemented. Hopefully, with a Faculty Council member on the Council, new policy will be discussed amongst faculty before being implemented.
- Vice Provost Cox would like to develop a strategic plan once the Graduate Council becomes strong and functioning. Presently, the council provides an oversight role of defining policies and procedures for graduate education.
- Other standards in Graduate Education that will be reviewed include:
  - Program Review – Would like to meet with Greg Young and Joe Fedock to review what we have now and where we should be from an accreditation point of view. What are your expectations to bring to students at the end of the semester
  - Recruitment – Some departments are spending money on recruitment, while others do not have resources or material to recruit. We need to bolster our abilities to recruit top students.
    - A FC asked where do we stand? He was under the impression that we were historically lax in the numbers of master and doctoral students that we ought to have given our size and research budget. Vice Provost Joe Fedock did a cursory study of all land grant institutions in the west and MSU's ratio of graduate students to undergraduate students is 9%. The other land grant institutions are 12% and 20%. This is a very broad statistic and probably varies from Masters and Ph.d's. MSU has barriers because we do not offer grad students full tuition waivers and they are on assistant-ships. Some professors stated it was easier to hire a post doc than an out-of state grad student, which is more expensive. We have to think about those kinds of things. International students in Montana have a significant barrier regarding citizenship.
  - Vice Provost Cox would like an assessment of quality of Ph.Ds at MSU. There is a radical difference between departments. The National Research Council and National Academy of Science assess doctoral programs, and MSU has just begun being reviewed by them. MSU was able to qualify 11 (out of 26) doctoral programs. The criteria included MSU graduating five Ph.Ds over the last five years. The National Assessment ranks all schools in a document that is available if faculty would like to review. Vice Provost Fox believes all major universities are known by the quality graduate students they produce.
  - Vice Provost Fox stated that we are resource challenged and will have to become more entrepreneurial. He strongly solicited faculty help

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

*Signature*

Warren Jones, Vice Chair

*Signature*

Gale R. Gough, Secretary