

## **Faculty Senate**

### **Minutes of March 26, 1999 Meeting**

**Attending:** Don Stierle, Doug Cameron, Celia Schahczenski, Larry Smith, John “Jocko” Evans, Courtney Young, Mary McLaughlin, Curtis Link, Steve Luft

**Recorder:** Courtney Young

**Guests:** Dan Bradley, Bill MacGregor

Start: 7:00 am

Finish: 9:15 am

Business Covered:

Old: Distance Courses, Faculty Definitions, Faculty Handbook

New: Faculty Promotion/Tenure, Service Learning Workshop

**Distance courses:** Dan Bradley stated that compensation will be the same as non-distance courses and that new distance courses will undergo the same scrutiny as non-distance courses; however, it is conceivable that a 2<sup>nd</sup> Curriculum Review Committee will be needed specifically for this. Release time may be available to develop courses but budget constraints will be a problem. The Board of Regents (BOR) is discussing the issues and has a tentative plan but nothing formally or informally written down yet except to say that any extra charges for the course is limited to \$100 and can only be used for delivery costs and that instructor charges are paid by the state. Internet courses are “virtually” free to deliver whereas, by comparison, MetNet costs several \$1000’s/course to deliver. Current programs that could offer web-based courses included MWTP and the joint MSU and Montana Tech M.S. Engineering Project Management program. New courses will be created by faculty who are willing. This campus should be involved but the market will determine what courses should be offered. In this regard it is worth noting that 30% of students registered in web courses are on-campus students.

**Faculty Evaluations:** Several documents were handed out (see attached). The first helped define faculty as full-time (instructional and research) and part-time (adjunct and visiting). Full-time faculty have BOR contracts and are further classified as tenured or probationary. Each position needs better defining in the Faculty Handbook and is important to understand because Evaluation Portfolios have different pathways depending on if it is from a tenured or probationary faculty and if it is being used for promotion and/or tenure (see second handout). “Remediation” procedures are not in place and should be in the Faculty Handbook. Furthermore, each step in the promotion/tenure process is supposed to take “5” days or less not more. Section II, App. A., page II-34 of F.Handbook on “Evaluation of Probationary Faculty Member” is not used and should be. However, two forms (third and fourth handouts) are being proposed to replace it. Tenured faculty confidentially evaluate each of the probationary faculty using one of the forms, and Dept. Heads or next tenured administrative members (Deans or VCAAR) summarize the evaluations on the other, which is to be signed by both the summarizer and the individual being evaluated. Problems with the current process are

that it is not standardized and that the Faculty Handbook is weak and unclear. A fifth handout from Bill McGregor was given to illustrate 11 points. Discussion on the 11 points centered around the following: (1) A flowchart and a check list are needed to help with the portfolio preparation process. (2) Documentation needs to be provided at every step, independent of whether it is for promotion/tenure or not. (3) What should the documentation be? For the current year and for just this year, as an ‘emergency’ action, it was suggested that the two Probationary Faculty Progress Report Forms (i.e., handouts three and four) be used. The Faculty Senate will likely modify the forms and implement them at the next meeting. (4) Further discussion on all but one of the remaining points occurred but was predominantly informational with future action asked for in the rewriting of Faculty Handbook. (5) Finally, Point 7 was emphasized. What constitutes service? A 43-page document about the “Engaged Campus” was handed out. This material is outlined below was obtained from Bill McGregor and Don Stierle as part of conference they attended March 4-6 in Missoula. These materials are briefly discussed below and are being distributed among the Faculty Senate. To see it, it was suggested to contact Bill or Don.

“Engaged Campus” material consisted of the following articles and examples:

1. *Picturing the Engaged Campus*, E.L. Hollander, Executive Director, Campus Compact, Brown Univ. et al.
2. *The Scholarship of Engagement*, E. L. Boyer, Past President, Carnegie Foundation.
3. *The University’s Social Covenant*, J. C. Votruba, Vice Provost Outreach, Southern Michigan University.
4. *Strategies for Building the Infrastructure which Supports the Engaged University*, M. L. Walshok, University of California, San Diego.
5. Tables from *Analyzing Institutional Commitment to Service*, B. A. Holland, Michigan
6. East St. Louis Action Research Project, [www.imbab.uiuc.edu/eslarp/](http://www.imbab.uiuc.edu/eslarp/).

These eye-opening communications are worth reading and discuss such things as the isolated student and institute, the engaged campus, and various historical observations relating past and current social positions of universities. Why have an engaged campus? It is particularly disturbing to note that faith in institutions is eroding. Outreach is not enough to correct the problem. Societal collaboration and more is needed.