

**FACULTY SENATE**  
**September 16, 2009**  
**SUB 235**  
**4:10 PM – 5:00 PM**  
**MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY-BOZEMAN, MONTANA**  
**Minutes**

**Members Present:** Bangert, Cherry, Eitle, Fischer, Frick for Igo, Lansverk, Lynch, Marshall for D. Weaver, Neumeier, Osborne, Savoie, Schachman, Waller, Versaavel, Waller, Wojtowicz, Zhu

**Members Absent:** Bessen, Chem-Biochem, Chen, Eiger, Fields, Fleck, Gee, Gerlach, Jacobsen, Kaiser, Larson, Livingston, Locke, Meade, Mech & Industrial Eng, Mokwa, Political Science, Thompson, Sowell, T. Weaver, Wisner

**Others Present:** Larry Carucci, Connie Strittmatter, Shannon Taylor, Greg Young

Chair Wes Lynch called the meeting to order at 4:10 PM. A quorum was present.

**Announcements –Chair Lynch**

- Two system-wide proposals for budget reductions were distributed to the deans and others. The first involves a consolidation of holiday schedules (Christmas and New Year) for eight (8) day, and would represent an overall 2% pay cut, if implemented. The other proposal is for a 4/10 work week. It would save energy, but class schedules would need to be rearranged.
- Tenure-at-Hire – Since BoR approved tenure-at-hire (TAH), administration would like FS to consider crafting a TAH policy/process. Many questions need to be answered before such a policy is in place, and Chair Lynch would like to discuss it with the Steering Committee. Input from FS members is encouraged. Currently, there are 8 pending early (or expedited) tenure cases involving faculty, department heads and other administrators.
- Accreditation review takes place on campus, October 5-7. The NWCCU team evaluators will be speaking to standards committee heads, department heads, and other groups.
- BoR Workgroup – Chair Lynch will request that the BoR place a faculty member on the workgroup committee. A memo to the BoR workgroup concerning this matter was subsequently circulated approved and sent to the BoR workgroup Chair, Todd Buchanan.

**Call for Sabbatical Applications – Larry Carucci, Representative of Faculty Affairs**

- The deadline for sabbatical applications is November 30, 2009.
- Faculty Affairs, a subcommittee of Faculty Senate, is charged with judging those candidates who are most deserving of sabbaticals. Currently, Faculty Affairs is asking Faculty Senate to approve minor changes in the form and application language; modifications are due in two weeks.
- Sabbatical Form
  - The new language is clearer, correcting ambiguities in the original form. The new guidelines align more closely with what is asked of the applicants. Comparison language is noted in the table.

<u>Old Sabbatical Form</u>	<u>New Sabbatical Form</u>
<p><b>I. PROPOSAL</b></p> <p>1. Potential for Improvement in teaching and/or research/creative activity. 10 point scale.</p> <p>Potential is difficult to look at in advance. Additionally, “potential for improvement” for someone who has won multiple awards theoretically should receive a “0” or “1” as they already achieved the goal. New wording gets away from that.</p>	<p>This first section has been renamed and renumbered: #1. <b>“Scholarly Merit”</b></p> <p>Three sub-questions, each with a 0 – 5 point scale (totaling 15 point), are under that heading.</p> <p>-- How does proposed activity contribute to the faculty member’s teaching and/or research/creativity activity?</p> <p>The new wording gets away from “potential” and asks for activity “contributions.”</p> <p>-- To what extent does the proposed activity explore creative and original concepts?</p>

	<p>“Improvement” is now eliminated and new wording asks for something “original.”</p> <p>-- How well qualified is the applicant to conduct the project?</p>
<p><b>2. Potential for project to contribute to the faculty member’s integration of teaching and research/creativity activity.</b> 0-5 point scale.</p> <p>Still has the problematic “potential” language.</p>	<p><b>3. Scholarly Integration.</b> --How well does the project contribute to the faculty member’s integration of teaching and research/creativity activity? 0-5 point scale</p> <p>Again, the word “potential” has been changed to “contribute.”</p>
<p><b>3. Demonstrated ability to implement the project</b> (i.e., the likelihood that the applicant will be able to accomplish the purpose of the proposal.) 0-10 point scale</p>	<p><b>2. Planning and Organization</b> Three sub-questions, with point scales totaling 10 point, are under this heading.</p> <p>--How well conceived and organized is the proposed activity?</p> <p>--Has there been adequate practical planning and intellectual preparation to carry out the project?</p> <p>--Are there adequate resources and can the project be accomplished in the allotted time?</p>
<p><b>4. Significance of Project</b> (i.e., value to profession, etc.) <b>5. Value to MSU</b> Both totaling 10 points</p> <p>These two questions have been combined</p>	<p><b>4. Broader Impacts</b> Three sub-questions, with point scales totaling 10 point, are under this heading.</p> <p>--What impact will this project have for MSU, the State of Montana, and the Rocky Mountain region? (Will it be disseminated through local/regional publication(s), performance(s), presentation(s)?)</p> <p>--How important is the proposed activity to advancing knowledge and understanding within its own field and/or across different fields?</p> <p>--What impact will the project have nationally or internationally? (Will it be disseminated through national/international publication(s), performance(s), presentation(s)?)</p> <p>The questions now focus on: Will the proposed activity advance knowledge and understanding within its own field or potentially across various fields?</p>
<p><b>II. Other</b> <b>1. Previous Meritorious Teaching, Research Service.</b> Yes No <b>2. Years of Service</b> (1/5 point per year since last sabbatical, or eligible for sabbatical) <b>3. Academic Rank</b> (Academic rank: add 2 points for Professor, add 1 point for Associate)</p>	<p><b>II. Other</b> <b>1. Years of Service</b> (1/4 point per year since eligible for sabbatical – i.e. after banking 7 years)</p>
	<p><b>2. Meritorious Performance</b> a. Teaching (0 – 1 point scale) b. Research &amp; Creative Activity (0 – 1 point scale) c. Service (0 – 1 point scale)</p> <p><b>3. Academic Rank</b> (Academic rank: add 2 points for Professor, add 1 point for Associate)</p>

- Discussion:
  - A FS member stated that the language in the questions had to be aligned so that they could be assigned a scale ("strongly agree", "disagree" etc). Question 4 was used as an example because it was a yes/no question and could not be given a scale. Faculty Affairs stated that they would make the correction; no amendment voting was needed for such a request.
  - A FS member stated that he believed the old form treated teaching or research equally and that some of the questions in the new form bias this process towards published research.
  - A FS member stated that the questions in the application should ask "Can people do what they are planning do to (whether teaching or research) , and address these questions effectively?" Dr. Carucci stated that he would examine the semantics of the language.
- Motion to approve the new review form→seconded→all in favor→passed.
- Voting to Approve the revised Sabbatical Application will be carried out online following this meeting.

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

*Signature*

Wes Lynch, Chair

*Signature*

Gale R. Gough, Secretary