

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
January 27, 2021
3:10pm-4:30pm
Webex

Name	Represents	Attended
Brody, Michael	Chair	x
Watson, Bradford	Chair-Elect	x
Amende, Kevin	EN/Mechanical & Industrial Engineering	x
Anderson, Ryan	EN/Chemical Engineering	x
Blaker, Amanda	Gallatin College	x
Brookshire, Jack	AG/Land Resources	x
Carson, Robert	EHHD/Education	x
Coffey, Jerome	Emeritus	x
Dale, Catherine	AR/Film & Photography	x
Dratz, Ed	LS/Chemistry & Biochemistry	x
Ellis, Colter	LS/Sociology & Anthropology	x
Gao, Hongwei	EN/Electrical & Computer Engineering	x
Gedeon, Tomas	LS/Mathematics	x
Haggerty, Julia	LS/Earth Sciences	x
Haynes, George	Extension/On Campus	x
Herman, Matthew	LS/Native American Studies	x
Hill, Andrew	AG/Agricultural Economics	x
Jeon, Minjee	ART/Art	x
Johnson, Jerry	LS/Political Science	x
LeClair, Chere	NTT	x
McPhee, Kevin	AG/Plant Sciences & Plant Pathology	x
McMilin, Colleen	EHHD/Health & Human Development	x
Neumeier, John	LS/Physics	x
Roberts, David	LS/Ecology	x
Scott, Brandon	LS/Psychology	x
Stein, Otto	EN/Civil Engineering	x
Thomas, Amy	LS/English	x
Thompson, John	LS/Modern Languages	x

Walter, Mathew	Extension/Off Campus	x
Young, Scott	Library	x

ALTERNATES	Represents	Attended
Black, Laura	JJCBE	x
Maher, Rob	EN/Electrical & Computer Engineering	x
Moyce, Sally	Nursing/On Campus	x
Reidy, Michael	LS/History & Philosophy	x
Stowers, Steve	AG/Microbiology & Immunology	x

OTHER ATTENDEES	Represents	Attended
Adams, Dean	Center for Faculty Excellence	x
Campeau, Tony	Registrar's Office	x
Fastnow, Christina	Office of Planning & Analysis	x
Mokwa, Robert	Provost	x
Peters, Martha	Provost Office	x
Sobek, Durward	Provost Office	x
Swinford, Steve	Provost Office	x

- I. Meeting was called to order at 3:12pm
- II. Approval of FS Minutes from January 13, 2021
 - a. Tomas Gedeon moves to approved. Robert Carson seconds. No discussion. None opposed. Approved.
- III. Information Updates:
 - a. Academic Calendar 21/22 (final/instructional week)-Tony Campeau
 - i. Normal is 15 weeks, also a federal financial aid parameter-on class at least one day of the week in 15 weeks.
 - ii. For Carnegie, 15 weeks is 75 instructional days.
 1. To get those 75 days, we work with 16 weeks.
 - a. Intention with finals: 22250 minutes spent with the material for every credit. 750 minutes of instruction, the rest is homework. Lab could be a different split.
 - b. One hour is 50 minutes, not 60.
 - c. 2, hour and 50 minutes classes in class
 2. This calendar removes that adjusted schedule during the last five days of instruction.
 3. Removed the high stakes final assessment and stick with the traditional calendar.

- a. The Friday of the last week is commencement, and not a class day.
 - 4. Start on August 18th
 - 5. Academic Break through Thanksgiving week. M-F, noninstructional days
- iii. Questions:
 - 1. Tomas Gedeon: Salaries start on August 15th, run 2 weeks of grad assistant training, comprehensive exams. We can't do that in three days. Will we get paid from the first of August?
 - a. Provost Mokwa: Contract period, length will remain the same, but we will shift the dates. We'll start earlier and will end earlier. HR is working on that.
 - i. We are working on transitioning back to where we were, but we are still trying things. We want to do Snowmester again to allow students to catch up from what they lost during the pandemic.
 - ii. Last fall was pretty intense for students and faculty.
 - iii. Consider this another step in our transition. Also, a learning experience.
 - 2. Julia Haggerty: Are there implications for turning in grades and not have class that final week.
 - a. Tony Campeau: Monday the thirteenth at noon is when grades are due.
 - i. Issue with turn around with academic assessment and transcripts, etc.
 - 3. Tomas Gedeon: Trying new things-Once we settle down a little, if faculty has some say in when we start and when we finish, that would be great.
- b. [Diversity Council \(BIOPIC update\)](#)
 - i. Website contains a number of reports
 - ii. Council met last week and are finalizing bylaws. FS has representation on the council.
 - iii. Group has been working over the Fall. Have formed four Core Challenges and are working on their prioritization. Those Challenges can be found on the website, which is linked above.
 - iv. Public meeting with time for public comment
 - v. Questions:
 - 1. Are the 4 Challenges, are the same as before?
 - a. Would need to confirm
 - 2. Students representatives: Where do they come from
 - a. There will be more than one
 - b. Still looking at where to pull them from
- c. Planning Council
 - i. Looking at different Metrics around the Strategic Plan for AY2023
 - 1. How do we set goals focusing on three?
 - 2. What do we see as faculty that they might need to work on?

3. Planning council page has numerous charts that show goals and accomplishments, etc.
 - a. Could be useful to faculty
 - b. If you have questions on the data, you can reach out to Chris Fastnow.
 - ii. Public meeting with time for public comment
- IV. Old Business:
- a. Undergraduate Course and Program Approvals (Second Reading)
 - i. [ERTH 484: Climates of the Past, Present and Future](#) (11/17/2020)
 - ii. [HSTA 220IH: Shaping of America: History of American Religion](#) (11/18/2020)
 - iii. [HSTR 331: Archaeology, Exploration, and Religion](#) (11/18/2020)
 - iv. [AAS: Heating, Ventilation, Air Conditioning, and Refrigeration \(12/18/2020\)](#)
 - v. [CAS: Heating, Ventilation, Air Conditioning, and Refrigeration \(12/18/2020\)](#)
 - b. Graduate Course and Program Approvals (Second Reading)
 - i. [ENGL 563: Topics in Teaching English Language Arts and Literacy in the Middle/High School](#) (12/2/2020)
 - ii. [AGSC 502: Enhancing Women's Roles in Agriculture and Natural Resources](#) (12/1/2020)
- V. New Business
- a. Undergraduate Course and Program Approvals (First Reading)
 - i. [ACT 167: Mountain Biking](#) (1/19/2021)
 - ii. [ACT 175: Orienteering](#)(1/19/2021)
 - iii. [ACT 203: Flag Football](#)(1/19/2021)
 - iv. [ACT 215: Climbing Wall Instructor](#)(1/19/2021)
 - v. [ACT 218: Ultimate Disc](#)(1/19/2021)
 - vi. [ECP 100: First Aid & CPR](#) (1/19/2021)
 - vii. [ECP 103: Basic Lifeguard Training](#) (1/19/2021)
 - viii. [HONR 319: The Transformative Power of Music](#) (1/27/2021)
 - b. Graduate Course and Program Approvals (First Reading)
 - i. [EDCI 521: Content Literacy](#) (1/22/2021)
 - ii. [ENGL 562: Place-based English and Literacy Curriculum](#) (1/22/2021)
 - iii. [MUSI 548: Ensemble](#) (1/22/2021)
 1. This included much discussion between Honors and the School of Music. There is a letter of support attached to the proposal.
 - iv. [NRSG 619: Advanced Primary Care Skills and Procedures](#) (1/25/2021)
 - v. [NRSG 629: Introduction to Advanced Practice Psychiatric Mental Health Nursing](#) (1/25/2021)
 - vi. [PSPP 550: Plant Disease Control](#) (1/25/2021)
 - vii. [ERTH 584: Climates of the Past, Present and Future](#)-Title change from Quaternary Env'r of Western US (1/22/2021)
- VI. Policies from JAGS (Joint Academic Governance Steering Committee)
- a. **Tenure track faculty are governed by the faculty handbook and accompanying policies and procedures.**
 - b. Non-tenure track faculty at MSU are governed by the collective bargaining agreement.
 - c. Senators can use the raise hand to be recognized, everyone can use the chat to pose questions.

- d. Would like to take our time and don't jump to a decision without consideration
- e. Policies up for Revision
 - i. [Consulting Revisions 12/11/2020](#)
 - 1. Revised because of the interest related to Extension, who are on 12-month contracts
 - 2. How much of that 12 months can they consult?
 - 3. What does "a day" mean?
 - a. Could it be 60 half days?
 - b. Cat Dale: Section three Says the consulting can't reflect badly on MSU. What does that mean for Art and academic freedom? Maybe we could redefine it?
 - i. JAGS was thinking about "extreme" things, like participating in a white supremacy movement, or something like that. This seems more subtle. Can you give an example?
 - 1. It's so vague that it could be interpreted in a lot of ways. Want to still have the freedom to do our work and research.
 - a. In the next JAGS meeting there will be a legal representative and they can go over that.
 - c. John Neumeier: Summer is not mentioned.
 - i. If you are not on contract with the university, you are okay.
 - 1. Shouldn't that be explicit?
 - a. Yes. It should be
 - ii. Page three says you can have more than one day per week of consulting in 30 weeks, but our contract period is 39 weeks.
 - 1. One a week, up to 30. 30 is the limit.
 - a. Why not 39?
 - 2. Other faculty felt the same. Even 36 would make more sense.
 - 4. Provost Mokwa: One day a week vs 20%, etc. We went over this for a year. Perhaps the 30 days is not the best way to understand this going forward. What would they preference be? I can take that info to JAGS. If it does have to be 30 days, we need to state WHY.
 - a. Michael Brody: Senators talk to your faculty and bring back your preferences. We can do a poll.
 - b. Kevin Amende: How does this effect Extension? Want to make sure this isn't figured around something they need.
 - i. Good question: Most extension agents are on 12-month contracts. How does that 30 days, or 20% affect them?

They have to take annual leave to do this. Not sure that the 30 days affects them.

- c. John Neumeier: The language in the document should be consistent. It is not currently.
 5. We will bring this info back to JAGS. Will work on defining what a day is and look at the 30 days.
 6. Had a lot of conversation around how a faculty member needs to coordinate this with their supervisor. The more explicit we can be the better off the faculty will be in that negotiation.
 7. Hongwei Gao: What happens if someone is contracted in the summer or doing research. Is it still 1 day a week in the summer?
 - a. Our understanding from JAGS is that if you are on Summer contract it is just for teaching. When on contract during the academic year, you have teaching, research, and service.
 - i. Provost Mokwa: Research contracts are a bit more confusing.
 - b. We will take this back to JAGS and get more information. Will ask Jason Carter as well.
- ii. [Annual Review Revisions 12/30/2020](#)
 1. Complicated/high stakes
 2. Important part of our work
 3. Today, received an email from Durward Sobek
 - a. Wants to add a friendly amendment
 - b. Durward Sobek: Amendment is to add the option to archive copies of annual reviews electronically.
 4. Concerns
 - a. Ed Dratz: Too much emphasis on student's evaluation of teaching. Would like to see a measuring system of how much students are learning.
 - i. Michael Brody: Student satisfaction could be misconstrued. They could just not like the subject matter.
 - ii. Bradford Watson: Faculty are presenting artifacts of student work as part of their Activity Insight.
 1. High, middle, and low pass examples
 2. Final student assignments
 3. Could be tied to other assessment artifacts
 4. Those accompany the student evaluations
 5. Shows student accomplishment
 - b. If you get an annual review that indicates in any area that is below expectation, you develop a Professional Improvement Plan (PIP) with your supervisor. If you meet the expectations of that plan, everything goes back to normal. If you don't, it goes into the post tenure review.

- c. Laura Black: What is the reason for this part of the policy change? Is it appropriate if someone in addition to the reviewer have input on a below average rating? What is the recourse if the faculty member is concerned review is not accurate?
 - i. Bradford Watson: Makes more sense to be located in the Annual Review than when it was part of Post Tenure Review.
 - 1. The performance improvement plan should include faculty feedback.
 - 2. If Post Tenure Review is triggered, it would oversight of the committee, not just those two individuals.
 - ii. Laura Black: What is the recourse for asking for another set of skilled eyes.
 - 1. We will have to go to JAGS with that.
 - 2. Provost Mokwa: Appealing the rating from the annual review. There is a process for that. It would go to the next level up. Dept Head to Dean, Dean to Provost, etc.
 - a. Ron Stowers: Depending on the situation, this could cause recourses against the faculty member. Would like to see the RPT committee involved in developing the PIP.
 - b. There are number of days to appeal the review. I believe it is 10 days. Section three, above the PIP.
 - iii. Laura Black: So, the reason for the change is just moving it from one policy to another?
 - 1. Yes, that is correct. It was only briefly mentioned in the faculty handbook. It has now been expanded and added to the annual review process.
 - iv. Laura Black: Is it appropriate to have someone other than the supervisor have input on a below average review rating?
 - 1. Only goes to that second person if you are appealing.
 - v. John Neumeier: PIP: Speak with supervisor one year after PIP is in place. That seems like a long time. If providing guidance, shouldn't they speak at least at the end of each semester?

1. Provost Mokwa: Sounds like a good idea. Could be crafted into the PIP. PIP could last more than a year if that's what is decided.
 - d. John Thompson: I have some edits.
 - i. Send them to Michael Brody and Bradford Watson and they will take them to JAGS.
- iii. Post Tenure Review 12/30/2020
 1. PIP as part of Post Tenure Review: Motivated by administration and faculty's interesting in making this a more positive experience and not a punitive experience.
 - a. We agree that we want ALL faculty to succeed.
 2. Comments:
 - a. Tomas Gedeon: What is the outcome of the review? Can your tenure be revoked if the PIP is in place and you still do not perform? What is the possible outcome of that review?
 - i. If the faculty member does not meet the expectations, it goes up the chain and ultimately reaches the Provost Office.
 - ii. Provost Mokwa: It would be reflected in the annual review. If still not performing it goes to the Post Tenure Review process. That is why the PIP description has been expanded.
 - iii. Tomas Gedeon: If you have below average rating in research, there could be issues with getting things improved in a timely manner. How this work in that case?
 1. Provost Mokwa: Dept Head and faculty member can design a PIP that goes up to two years, if that is the time that is needed to make positive progress.
 - b. John Neumeier: There isn't a lot of opportunity to add extra info about teaching to Activity Insight. Getting some ideas by adding a comment about teaching materials, or other methods to evaluate teaching would be helpful
 - i. Alternate artifacts of evidence
 - ii. We will take your idea and open up for discussion in JAGS.
 3. Serious process to get this revised. Process came out of a particular case who felt the process was egregious and did not benefit the faculty member. Want the document to be fair. Huge difference than what existed in the past. We appreciate your input and will continue this at our next meeting.

- VII. Senators Discussions
 - a. No discussion

- VIII. Public Comment
 - a. Provost Mokwa: The “egregious case” is your personal observation/opinion. That was not a JAGS discussion. This needs to be clear.
 - b. Scott Young: Faculty friendliness: Old policy states that the PIP would be triggered if faculty receives a subpar rating during the annual review process. New policy says the PIP would be triggered if they receive a low rating in ANY area.
 - i. Bradford Watson: Different ways of scoring could cause a faculty member to still receive an approval rating of satisfactory.
 - 1. Provost Mokwa: More of a clarification in the new version. That was the intent all along, but it wasn’t clear. Aligns the final scoring with the idea that if they do well in one area, but poorly in the other, it will be reflected in the annual review.
 - ii. Michael Brody: The expectation is you do well in all three areas, and if you need help in an area, that’s what the PIP is for.
- IX. How can we communicate and support each other in COVID time?
 - a. Senators’ Hours in Webex: Tuesdays 1-2 PM and Thursdays 11 AM to 12PM
 - b. [Faculty Senate D2L Brightspace](#): discussion area for topics of interest
 - c. Faculty Senate Email Group: msufacultysenate@montanaedu.onmicrosoft.com
- X. Adjourn
 - a. The meeting was adjourned at 4:32

REMINDER: Next meeting February 10, 2021