STANDARD FOUR: FACULTY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

STANDARD FOUR: FACULTY

4.A: FACULTY SELECTION, EVALUATION, ROLES, WELFARE, AND DEVELOPMENT

Introduction

The University of Montana's success rests on the quality of its faculty, and in the past decade UM has been highly successful in recruiting and retaining motivated, creative, and productive faculty. Educational, research, and service responsibilities fall to all tenure-track faculty as well as to the majority of non-tenure-track faculty, and this required combination of scholarship and its application to real world problems has greatly enhanced the instructional content and quality offered to undergraduate and graduate students. This section will articulate the multiple attributes that characterize The University of Montana faculty, providing illustrative examples of faculty working across the arts, sciences, and humanities.

Three separate arrangements (two representing formal collective bargaining agreements) govern faculty roles, working conditions, and relationships to the University and the Board of Regents (BOR). These include the following (Exhibit RE 4-01):

1. The Collective Bargaining Agreement[i] between the University Faculty Association (UFA) and the Montana University System (MUS) that pertains to faculty appointed to the rank of Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Full Professor with appointments that are half-time or greater in academic units at the Missoula campus, excluding the College of Technology (COT) and the School of Law. This covers tenure-track faculty and many adjunct and visiting faculty members in these units, representing the majority of the Missoula campus faculty. The UFA Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA, discussed in more detail in *Standard 6: Governance and Administration*) specifies many aspects of faculty rights, obligations, and working conditions.

2. The Collective Bargaining Agreement that pertains to COT faculty[ii]. This agreement is between all Vocational-Technical Educators of Montana, represented by the American Federation of Teachers/Montana Federation of Teachers/AFL-CIO and the Montana Board of Regents of Higher Education. The two bargaining agreements are broadly similar, with distinctions reflecting in large part the different missions of the Mountain campus and the COT campus.

3. A set of Law School and BOR policies that govern faculty in the School of Law.

In the following discussion of faculty issues at the Missoula campuses of The University of Montana, the awkwardness of referencing both agreements and all relevant policies has been avoided. The UFA CBA is referred to most frequently because it pertains to the majority of faculty at the University, with reference to separate COT and School of Law policies or practices only where distinctions are most relevant. Many specific issues addressed below that reference the UFA CBA (e.g., academic freedom, faculty evaluation, faculty development) are also covered in the COT CBA as well as in specific policies of the School of Law. All agreements have been reached in the context of Board of Regents and The University of Montana policies and procedures.

4.A.1: Faculty Selection, Quality, and Sufficiency

Since the quality of faculty is fundamental to the effectiveness of academic programs, The University of Montana has provided innovations in the past decade to ensure that its faculty is able to perform at the highest level. Faculty salaries for entry-level, tenure-track positions have risen to be competitive with peer institutions, and significant start-up packages for faculty, especially in the sciences, are now commonly offered to provide necessary laboratory facilities and graduate student support. Exhibit RD 4-02 provides data on faculty salaries and their comparison via College and University Professional Association for Human Resources (CUPA-HR) analysis with peer institutions.

The University of Montana's tenured and tenure-track faculty number approximately 540. Exhibit RD 4-01 includes a table with UM faculty counts by multiple categories, including instructional faculty, full-time research faculty, and administrators. Approximately 430 non-tenure-track visiting, research, and adjunct faculty also support the University's educational, research, and service missions.

Virtually all tenure-track and the vast majority of non-tenure-track faculty hold terminal degrees appropriate to their fields. Generally, faculty hold doctoral degrees, but some disciplines, such as the fine arts, recognize master's degrees as terminal degrees. Standard 4 – Required Table 2 identifies the institutions from which UM faculty have received degrees. Approximately 10% of current tenure-track faculty received their terminal degrees from The University of Montana.

A high percentage of The University of Montana faculty members have established national and/or international reputations for scholarship in their field. As examples, Regents Professor Steven Running of the College of Forestry and Conservation shared in the 2007 Nobel Peace Prize for his lead authorship of one of the technical chapters of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). Associate Professor Dan Reisenfeld from the Department of Physics and Astronomy helped design the Interstellar Boundary Explorer to map the edge of the solar system. Associate Professor Denise Dowling's guidance in the School of Journalism's Department of Radio-Television led students to create the documentary, *Dear Mom*, a poignant look at imprisoned mothers that was named "Best of Festival" at the Broadcast Education Association's Festival of Media Arts. Each department within the University features faculty on their individual websites, and it takes only a short time to discover the impressive array of faculty talent across the spectrum of human inquiry.

Although The University of Montana finds itself well-positioned to continue high quality academic programs across campus, each unit continuously evaluates its academic offerings to identify potential gaps in capabilities and areas for improvement.

4.A.2: Faculty Participation in Planning and Governance

Appropriately, faculty participate fully in issues and decisions about academic planning, policies, procedures, and curriculum and program structure at The University of Montana. Academic planning and course development begin at the department level with proposals by individual faculty members and units. All academic units have a system of curricular study, review and revision, and enhancement, although the structure varies

among departments. In some small departments, these functions are conducted by the faculty acting as a committee of the whole. In others, department or program curriculum committees, undergraduate studies committees, graduate studies committees (or a combination of these) scrutinize issues and develop proposals or recommendations for consideration by the entire departmental faculty. Some levels of decision may be made by the committees on behalf of the faculty. Departments determine entrance criteria for their programs and establish rules and procedures in the context of University-wide regulations and procedures.

Faculty participation in academic planning and governance at the University level occurs formally through the Faculty Senate, as contractually determined by specifications in the CBA and several committees of the Faculty Senate. This topic is discussed in greater detail in *Standard 6: Governance and Administration*. The membership of the Faculty Senate is proportionally representative and democratically elected; members of the bargaining unit are eligible to serve, along with designated representation from the School of Law and the College of Technology. The President, Provost, associate provosts, other vice presidents, two students appointed by the Associated Students of The University of Montana (ASUM), and other academic officers selected by the President are members of the Faculty Senate without vote. They and other administrators may request invitations to present and discuss administrative proposals in areas of Faculty Senate responsibility. Matters of academic concern may be initiated by the Faculty Senate or by the President or other administrators representing him/her. These matters include the following (from CBA Section 7.100):

- Specific curricular changes submitted by the faculties of departments, units, and schools through the appropriate University committee;
- General requirements for various degrees, including honorary degrees and nomination of candidates for graduation;
- General requirements for admission and retention of students and guidelines for student recruitment;
- Development, curtailment, discontinuance, or reorganization of academic programs; and
- Issues that pertain to the academic affairs of the University and matters of critical concern about the welfare and administration of the University.

The agenda of the Faculty Senate is determined by a seven-member Executive Committee of the Senate (ECOS). Much of the study, review, and approval of course and academic program proposals is conducted by two key committees of the Faculty Senate. The Academic Standards and Curriculum Review Committee (ASCRC) comprises 12 faculty members appointed for staggered three-year terms by the President from a list nominated by ECOS; representatives of the Office of the Provost and the Registrar's Office; and five students appointed by ASUM. The committee is charged with a continuing study of the academic standards and curriculum of the University; reviewing and recommending action to the Faculty Senate for all proposed alterations of the academic program; making recommendations to the senate regarding academic standards; and taking responsibility for the content of the University's course catalog relative to these other responsibilities. The Graduate Council comprises 12 faculty members who participate in graduate programs and who are appointed for staggered three-year terms by the President from a list nominated by ECOS; the Associate Provost for Graduate Education; and two graduate students appointed by the Graduate Students Association. It

reviews graduate policies, programs, and curricula. Academic proposals made by the units are forwarded to either ASCRC or Graduate Council for review, necessary modification, and approval. These committees also consider broad issues pertinent to undergraduate or graduate programs, and formulate recommendations to the Senate. Senate approval is a required step in the sequence of reviews and approvals for academic proposals presented to the Board of Regents.

Additional standing committees number about 100. Although these committees are not exclusively staffed by faculty members, they "are typically composed of members from the faculty, staff, and student communities," according to the University Committees website[iii]. Many of these committees deal with the management of campus, such as the Campus Recreation and Sports Committee and Parking Policy Committee. Others are specifically staffed by the Faculty Senate and guide numerous fundamental aspects of academic governance of the University and reflect key faculty participation in that function. The committees website includes current lists of members and the official charge for each committee. It makes clear not only the presence of faculty in nearly all of the committees but also the numerous committees in which faculty make up the majority of the membership. Some of the notable committees are as follows, with the number of faculty members on each committee in parentheses:

- Committee on Service (3): to conduct formal hearings in case of discharge for cause;
- Faculty Development Committee (9): to encourage faculty improvements, including review and recommend funding of proposals under several faculty development programs noted above;
- Faculty Elections Committee (4): to conduct Faculty Senate elections.
- Faculty Library Committee (8 of 10 committee members): to advise, consult with, and make proposals to the Dean of Libraries and the University administration in development of policies governing operation of the library; to review the library budget; and to submit a written evaluation to the Dean of Libraries and to the President with an annual written report on the Committee's evaluation of the library;
- Unit Standards Committee (10): to monitor faculty evaluation procedures and review unit standards;
- University Appeals Committee (7): to hear appeals concerning faculty evaluation procedures and contract non-renewals;

In addition to participating in and overseeing academic planning and governance through these committees and bodies, faculty representatives serve on a diverse array of committees under the charge of various executive officers. These committees study and discuss issues and formulate recommendations that guide decision making and planning relative to numerous aspects of institutional life and functioning. Faculty representation on each of these committees is generally less than on committees of the Faculty Senate but is sufficient to ensure a strong faculty voice in these matters. Such committees collectively include more than 100 designated slots to be filled by faculty members. Representative committees and the executive officers whom they advise include the following. (The number of faculty members is in parentheses.)

- President: Strategic and Budget Planning Committee (6), Commencement Committee (8), Diversity Advisory Council (6), International Committee (8), Quality of Work Life Council (4), Fulbright Scholarship Committee (3)

- Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs: Academic Court (4), Sabbatical Assignment Committee (6), UFA-Administration Committee (3)

- Vice President for Research and Development: Student Computer Fee Committee (3)

- Vice President for Administration and Finance: Administration and Finance Advisory Committee (4), Building Fee Advisory Committee (4), Committee on Campus Facilities (2), Classroom and Laboratory Renovation Committee (3), Inter-Units Benefits Committee

- Vice President for Student Affairs: Drug and Alcohol Advisory Committee (3), Scholarship and Financial Aid Committee (4), University Court (2)

- Legal Counsel: Student Complaint Committee – Graduate (3), Student Complaint Committee – Undergraduate (3), University Discrimination Grievance Committee (2)

In addition, faculty members participate in numerous committees and advisory boards within the schools and colleges. For example, most colleges and units have faculty boards and/or executive committees that assist the dean or the chair. And most programmatic divisions within a unit have a faculty board or section head to oversee such matters as new faculty progress, course offering schedules, and goals and outcomes of instruction.

Academic advising is a key component of faculty roles and responsibilities in all programs. University and faculty recognition of the fundamental importance of this role is underscored by reference to advising at several points in the CBA as a University-required component in all unit standards (including CBA Section 6.200: Academic Responsibility), and as a specific aspect of faculty effectiveness to be assessed by students during the faculty evaluation process. In addition, an Outstanding Faculty Advising Award is offered each year, along with distinguished scholar and teacher awards. Each award is accompanied by a monetary prize, usually $1,500.

4.A.3: Faculty Workloads

Reflective of this diverse institutional mission, faculty workloads incorporate expectations for undergraduate instruction, graduate education, research, scholarly, and creative accomplishment, and University, community, and professional service. The educational mission of some academic units focuses entirely on high quality baccalaureate programs. Others also incorporate master's, specialist, and doctoral programs. The unit standards of all academic units include expectations for faculty research or other creative scholarship. Those expectations are generally greater, and are given stronger emphasis in faculty advancement and workload specifications, in units with graduate, and especially doctoral, programs.

Consistent with that variation, CBA Section 6.210 specifies that the teaching load is not expected to be identical within and among units, and that the assignments are made relative to the total activity of the faculty member (including research, scholarship, creative service and activity). Deans are formally responsible for assigning faculty teaching workloads, with consultation and input from the department chair and the unit faculty. The instructional portion of the workload is that judged to be sufficient to meet programmatic needs. Consequently, average in-class instructional assignments for tenure-track faculty range from 10 to 12 credits per academic year, or 8 to 15 credits per year for nontenurable faculty. Standard 4 – Required Table 1 provides a summary of the UM faculty database. Faculty effort in directing graduate and undergraduate research, independent study, or advising are not included in the above figures. Exhibit OSM 4-01 includes the table Academic Unit Data, Fall 2008 Comparison to Fall 2006, which provides a unit-by-unit comparison of workloads in FY 2006 and FY 2008.

Management Information Systems Professor Gerald Evans

The University has generally been able to maintain undergraduate and graduate student course offerings and programs at the same time that faculty-generated external funding and other measures of scholarly research and creativity have been growing rapidly. In addition, advisement and research mentoring of students have expanded, and service contributions have been sustained. This outcome suggests that faculty workloads reflect the mission and goals of the University. Faculty workloads represent a compromise among sometimes competing values and responsibilities, and periodically faculty members in many units find it difficult to meet all responsibilities. While many find time for professional development, growth, and renewal, expanding these opportunities remains an ongoing challenge.

Faculty workloads are a source of ongoing deliberations both within the University, and among the University, the Commissioner of Higher Education, and state government. The instructional activity of all members of the bargaining unit has continued to receive attention. During the period from 1999 to 2008, the total tenure-track faculty instructional FTE rose from 359 to 449. In that same period, student credit hours per tenure-track faculty FTE declined from 263 to 198. While it is unclear whether the drop is due to a decline in average class size or a reassignment of duties, it should be noted that student-faculty ratios have remained constant at 16 or 17 student FTE per one faculty FTE.

Likewise, the number of organized class sections per faculty FTE have remained relatively constant. Exhibit OSM 4-01 includes a table summarizing Academic Unit Data for FY 2000-FY 2009.

Service

Service activities of faculty include a broad array of contributions to the public and to the functioning of the University and academic units within the University, to professional societies and organizations, and to a number of other outside agencies and organizations. The CBA is explicit that service contributions are to be given consideration in any evaluation for purposes, including participation in professional organizations or societies and "professional service demonstrated by consulting or other outside work for agencies, communities, schools, etc.; serving on advisory boards; and serving on campus committees."

Exhibit RE 4-09 contains two examples of service contributions of faculty and programs. There is a wide variety among units in the weighting given to service in faculty evaluation and advancement, as exemplified by the unit self-study reports. In some units (e.g., in the humanities), faculty have received merit awards largely on the basis of outstanding service contributions. In others (e.g., many of the sciences), service is rewarded and recognized but at a somewhat lower priority than research and teaching.

4.A.4: Faculty Salaries

For most faculty, salary policies are contractually determined and clearly defined in CBA Section 13.000. The separate policies and regulations of the School of Law and the College of Technology also define and regulate salaries and benefits. Minimum salaries for faculty at each rank (Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor) are specified in the CBA for each of the years covered by the contract. For example, for the Academic Years 2005-06 and 2006-07 salary floors were $47,175 for Professors, $37,503 for Associate Professors, $30,054 for Assistant Professors, and $26,187 for Instructors. Fiscal year faculty floors, where applicable, are 1.22 times the academic year salary floors. Yet based on the effort and the considerable success of the University to recruit high quality faculty over the past decade, all tenure-track faculty members are well above the minimums. Initial salaries of new faculty members are negotiated with the department chair, dean, and/or Provost. Salary adjustments and procedures for salary raises are defined in the CBA. Most faculty receive a "normal" salary increase based on the outcome of the faculty evaluation process (see Section 4.A.5, Faculty Evaluation and Development). The percentage increase associated with a "normal" salary increase is defined in the CBA for each year of the contract. The CBA specifies procedures for faculty members to receive a less-than-normal salary increase but does not specify a percentage level of such increases.

A fixed merit award pool is allocated to compensate outstanding faculty performance. This pool is awarded to a fixed number of faculty ranked most highly by the Provost among those recommended for merit through the faculty evaluation process. In the current CBA, 80 merit awards are specified for each academic year (2009-10, 2010-11) at a dollar value of $2,500 each. Salary raises for promotion in rank are specified in the CBA. Awards for merit and promotion are added to the base salary. As a result of the contract negotiation and as specified in the CBA, a pool of funds is allocated for market

adjustments for faculty who receive offers of employment from other institutions or present compelling evidence of their marketability.

However, in recent years issues of salary inversion and compression have come to the fore. Inversion and compression are conditions where salary compensation for productive senior employees does not keep pace with market forces. Compression is the narrowing of salary differentials over time between junior and senior people in the same job, such that there is a relatively small difference in salary between employees regardless of their experience. Inversion is an extreme form of compression, and it refers to a condition where a new junior employee is hired at a market-based salary that exceeds that of an accomplished senior employee at the same or higher rank within the organization – for example, an Assistant Professor whose salary exceeds that of a productive Associate Professor.

In its 2007 Advisory Report to the Board of Regents, the Montana University System Recruitment and Retention Task Force identified that the conditions of inversion and compression "have a long term effect of inhibiting an employer's ability to retain employees because these conditions are perceived as widely unfair." A letter of understanding was signed in 2007 by representatives of the UFA and UM administration to consider jointly a practical solution to the problem and a report was prepared in early 2008. The report of the Special Joint Committee on Inversion, Compression, and Salary Floors noted that normal salary raises by UM faculty have not kept pace with a rising market in faculty salaries. At the Assistant Professor level, UM median salaries are comparable to other institutions (90.6%), but at the Professorial rank, UM median salaries are only 78.3% of our peers (based on the CUPA-HR National Faculty Salary Survey of 2006-07). Recommendations presented to retain our engaged, innovative, and committed faculty will save financial resources over the long-term and sustain the academic quality of The University of Montana (Exhibit OSM 4-02).

Given these constraints to address the pressures of the market, the University continues to attract and retain highly productive, energetic faculty. Certainly, some candidates turn down offers because of unsuccessful salary negotiations. In some searches, department chairs and deans choose to limit salary offers to faculty candidates to avoid morale issues related to inverting salaries of present faculty who are performing at high levels. In the sciences, academic deans and the Offices of the Provost and the Vice President for Research and Development have made significant investments in new faculty over the past decade by applying financial recoveries from research awards. These investments, usually as part of start-up packages, improve the attractiveness of offers to new faculty by adding tailored assets, such as laboratories, graduate research assistantships, and equipment to jumpstart an individual's research program. Depending on the individual, these packages can exceed $100,000 and are often spread over two years. For example, a new forest ecologist with a doctorate was hired in the College of Forestry and Conservation with a $150,000 start-up to add existing laboratory facilities to advance his ongoing work. UM Policy 404.7[iv] is concerning spousal appointment and is implemented as circumstances and finances permit.

4.A.5: Faculty Evaluation and Development

The University of Montana provides for regular and systematic evaluation of faculty performance in order to ensure effectiveness in teaching, research and creative activities, and professional service. The University's evaluation standards and procedures, set out in CBA Section 10.000, apply to tenured and tenure-track faculty and 0.5 FTE or higher adjunct and visiting faculty, excluding the School of Law and COT (the School of Law and the COT use faculty evaluation procedures similar to those used by faculty under the CBA). All of these evaluation standards and procedures are used for review and decisions regarding merit increments, less-than-normal performance, promotion, and tenure.

Each academic unit has adopted institutionally approved unit standards that set out evaluation standards and procedures more specific than those found in the CBA regarding teaching; advising; funded and other research, scholarship, and creative activities; and professional service to the University, community, and professional organizations. Unit standards for all departments can be viewed on the department records website[v], managed by the Office of the Provost. Expectations for faculty performance in the School of Law are specified in that unit's Faculty Performance Standards. Quality and quantity expectations for teaching, research and creative activity, and service vary among disciplines, as can be seen in the different unit standards. These unit standards are reviewed and updated on a regular schedule. University standards are used in addition to unit standards for faculty evaluation – for example, CBA Section 10.110 specifies general expectations for promotion, tenure, and salary determination. Unit standards can contain more rigorous standards than the University standards, but unit standards may not conflict with or undercut University standards.

Full professors, pursuant to the CBA, are evaluated every three years on a three-year record unless they are candidates for a merit award or have received a recent less-than-normal performance evaluation. Associate professors are evaluated every two years, and assistant professors are evaluated every year. Adjunct and visiting faculty at 0.5 FTE or higher, including non-tenure-track research faculty, receive the same type of evaluation as tenured and tenure-track faculty. Less than 0.5 FTE adjunct faculty members are evaluated informally at the department level. Administrators outside of the bargaining unit who hold tenure in an academic unit and are not involved in teaching and research activities are not required to be, and normally choose not to be, evaluated pursuant to the CBA.

The CBA's faculty evaluation process begins with the faculty member submitting an Individual Performance Record (IPR) to the academic unit's Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC), by October 15. The IPR can be of varying length and complexity depending on the nature of the evaluation to be conducted. Each unit's FEC is constituted according to guidelines in the CBA and the pertinent unit standards. Therefore, the structure of an FEC can vary substantially from unit to unit. For example, the FEC for the relatively small Department of Political Science is made up of all tenured faculty members with the rank of Associate Professor and Full Professor, one of whom is selected as FEC chair. The FEC in the larger and more diverse Department of Modern and Classical Languages and Literatures consists of seven tenured or tenure-track members with at least one year of service who are elected by the entire faculty for terms of one year or two years and select their chair from among their number.

In another example, the Division of Biological Sciences has two programs (biochemistry/molecular biology, and organismal biology and ecology) and begins faculty evaluation in each of these programs with an FEC Subcommittee (SFEC) of all faculty members and a student. Each SFEC reviews and discusses the report of the Student Evaluation Committee and each faculty member's IPR and sends its recommendation to the Division's FEC. The FEC includes the directors of each program, an additional faculty member selected by and rotated among the programs, and a student observer. The FEC chair alternates annually among the program directors. The FEC prepares and sends to the Associate Dean, the head of the Division, its independent assessment of each faculty member's performance.

Student participation in faculty evaluation is an important part of the process. Each FEC includes a student observer, as required by the CBA. The CBA also requires each academic unit to constitute a Student Evaluation Committee (SEC), which has three to seven student members and reviews each faculty member's student evaluations of teaching and advising. A continuing issue regarding the SEC's work is whether students can effectively balance negative and positive student feedback on the evaluation forms and provide helpful comments. The CBA gives each academic unit substantial discretion in designing or selecting the student evaluation form it uses.

As previously mentioned, the faculty evaluation process begins on October 15. The FEC carries out its work during the next 30 days. Besides reviewing the IPR and SEC report, the FEC, if permitted by the applicable unit standards, solicits comments from outside the academic unit and considers unsolicited materials if they are signed and shown to the faculty member. The FEC report – which makes recommendations concerning retention, promotion, salary, and tenure and suggestions about improving performance – goes to the department chair by November 15. The chair reviews the IPR, the SEC report, and the FEC report and any other documentation solicited and placed in the record with notice to the faculty member. The department chair then prepares an independent report and recommendation that goes to the dean by December 15. The dean reviews the material received from the unit and other documents solicited or received and placed in the record, writes an independent evaluation of each faculty member being reviewed, recommends concerning retention, salary increment, promotion, and tenure as applicable, ranks the faculty members recommended for merit increments (the CBA specifies the total number of merit increments to be awarded), and submits the evaluations and ranking to the Provost by February 15. The Provost's decisions are based on the total evaluation record and communicated to each faculty member by April 25 (later in contract negotiation years – normally either May 15 or thirty days after ratification of the agreement, whichever is later). The Provost forwards recommendations for research faculty on an identical timeline.

Faculty members receive copies of the SEC report, FEC report, and department chair's report to sign, thereby indicating they have read the evaluation. In most colleges and schools, faculty members are not informed of the dean's rankings for merit increments. Deficiencies in performance that are identified in these reports are usually addressed by discussion among the faculty member, department chair, and dean. Remediation strategies have included temporarily changing a faculty member's duties to allow more time to rectify a problem, locating financial support to allow the faculty member to gain new skills or knowledge, or reassigning a faculty member to another department.

Faculty can appeal the recommendations of the FEC, department chair, and dean to the University Appeals Committee within ten days of receipt of the relevant decision. The Appeals Committee evaluates only whether procedures were followed and standards applied fairly; it does not make an independent assessment of the merits of the evaluation decision in question. CBA Section 10.280 stipulates the following grounds for appeal:

1. A prejudicial procedural error, defect, or omission;
2. A recommendation not supported by evidence or lacking a rational basis;
3. A recommendation based on bias adversely affecting the judgment of the decision maker; or
4. A recommendation based on clearly impermissible factors.

The process just described has important strengths, the greatest being fairness and transparency. All concerned parties have ample opportunity for participation and comment. The University standards and unit standards are well known and subject to modification, respectively, through collective bargaining and departmental action. Effective safeguards are present in terms of multiple steps and an appeals process. Besides fairness and transparency, other critical values reflected in the process include academic freedom, academic responsibility, and faculty growth. Faculty members generally submit to and conduct the evaluation process collegially. They recognize it is important to their professional development and to the continued quality of academic programs. In many units, the evaluation process results in improved communication within the department about both faculty and program strengths and weaknesses. Many regard the opportunity for junior faculty to provide feedback on the performance of colleagues and programs especially healthy.

In the CBA that was in effect between 1993 and 1997, the issue of faculty workload was formally addressed for the first time. The incentive for the faculty was substantial salary increases for each of four years; the incentive for the administration was the union's agreement to raise the faculty's overall instructional workload by 20%. The new provision led to the requirement that each faculty member, in consultation with the chair and dean, arrive at a highly specific and quantified workload. Between 1993 and 1999, the instructional workload of tenure-track faculty in fact increased 20% (from 15.03 instructional credits per faculty member in 1992-1993 to 18.06 in 1998-1999). But the task of implementing the contract's workload provision with empirical rigor, fairness, and consistency became so onerous that both the faculty union and the administration dropped the requirement of quantitatively determined faculty workloads in subsequent bargaining. Since 1997, then, the workload of an individual faculty member has been determined informally as described above. In general, the nature of workloads for individual faculty members have varied substantially between disciplines and program degree levels, but not substantially within a discipline or an academic unit.

Faculty at Commencement

CBA Section 6.210 now deals with workload as follows: "deans are responsible for assigning faculty teaching workload, subject to the approval of the Provost, giving consideration to the recommendations of the department chair. The instructional portion of the workload shall be that deemed sufficient to meet programmatic needs as determined by the dean in consultation with unit faculty. While it is not expected that the teaching portion of workloads be identical within and among units, assignments must be made relative to the total activity of faculty (including research, scholarship, creative activity, and service)."

Implementing this contract language with attention to the role, history, and culture of the different academic units has resulted in lower in-class instructional assignments for tenured and tenure-track faculty in units with doctoral programs and extensive research expectations, and higher in-class instructional assignments for tenured and tenure-track faculty in units primarily focused on baccalaureate programs. For example, after Anthropology added a doctoral program, between fall 2003 and fall 2007 teaching loads fell from five to four three-credit courses per year, and student credit hours per tenured/tenure-track faculty member dropped from 416 to 196. There is no reason to believe that the overall demands on a faculty member's time have declined, given that each department determines how to factor professional service, advising, and supervising graduate theses and dissertations and undergraduate research projects and internships into the workload.

This variation in teaching loads is presented in Table 4-0, compiled by the Office of Planning, Budgeting, and Analysis (OPBA). The table shows "organized class sections" per tenured/tenure-track faculty FTE and "student credit hours" per tenured/tenure-track faculty FTE.

Table 4-01 – Representative Data on Workload per Faculty FTE: Fall 2007 Semester

Academic Unit	Organized Class Sections	Student Credit Hours
Business Administration	2.5	297
Arts and Sciences	2.3	247
Biology	1.8	180
Geosciences	2.2	138
Economics	2.1	415
Sociology	2.0	294
English	2.6	161
Languages	2.5	219
Education and Human Sciences	2.5	208
Journalism	2.7	166
Law	2.5	156
Forestry and Conservation	2.2	164
Health Professions and Biomedical Sciences	2.7	153
Visual and Performing Arts	5.1	239

The variation in faculty workloads across campus provides faculty members with the flexibility to work toward several goals: making academic programs accessible and efficient; increasing faculty-generated external funding; stimulating high quality faculty research, scholarship, creative activity, and professional service; and providing the conditions for high quality academic achievement by both undergraduate and graduate students.

4.A.6: Full-time Faculty Recruitment and Appointment

Needs for new faculty lines are identified through department-level discussion and deliberation, focused especially on instructional demands and strategic programmatic initiatives, but also taking into account research opportunities and University goals to enhance graduate education and sponsored activity. Requests for new tenure-track lines and for soft-money instructional positions are reviewed by the dean, considered in the context of overall needs and budget within the collegiate unit, and final decisions are made by the Provost based on input from the dean. Decisions are made by the Provost on the basis of factors such as available budget or need to respond to unusually pressing needs in another unit. In most instances, replacement positions are retained within the department, where faculty discussion and deliberation may redefine a position to best address strategic needs within the unit.

In a typical year, The University of Montana recruits to fill approximately 25 tenure-track faculty vacancies and a larger number of adjunct or visiting positions. Most tenure-track vacancies result from faculty retirements. Searches are governed by well structured and clearly communicated procedures that are overseen by the Director of Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity and conducted in coordination with Human Resource Services. Searches require written authorization of the dean and the Provost. Approval includes identification of the funding source for the position.

Processes for each variety of recruitment, and the specific checklist for staff recruitments are located on the Human Resources Services[vi] website. The checklist ensures that

searches are conducted in compliance with the University's written Affirmative Action Plan. This plan was established according to Executive Order 11246 and was certified by the Office of Federal Contract Compliance. The checklist defines procedures for searches such as the recruitment period, exceptions to open recruitment, and necessary components of a recruitment plan, including essential Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action[vii] statements, recruitment sources, search committee composition, formalization of screening procedures, applicant notification, interviews, and hiring approval.

A separate policy, UM Policy 401.1[viii], defines exceptions to normal search procedures, including affirmative action appointments, individuals named in grants and contracts, and acting administrative appointments. The policy also waives requirements for national searches for partial FTE/non-renewable administrative and academic positions. Such searches are conducted on a limited (local or regional) basis through establishment of a pool of qualified candidates who can be appointed and re-appointed to nontenurable and partial FTE positions. Policies for establishing such pools are well defined and specify the involvement of tenure-track faculty in the process. All of these policies are made readily available to faculty, department chairs, and others. Typically, the Director of Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action meets with each search committee after the search has been authorized but before recruitment begins to explain procedures and requirements and to suggest recruitment strategies for traditionally underrepresented groups.

4.A.7: Academic Freedom

In its description of the Montana University System (MUS) in March 1990, the Board of Regents recognized that:

The community of scholars operates in an atmosphere conducive to free inquiry, unfettered exploration of the unknown, and honest examination of hypotheses and accepted bodies of knowledge. Moreover, the MUS affirms those commonly accepted principles of academic freedom that are hallmarks of American public higher education.

Academic freedom is safeguarded by BOR Policy 302[ix], effective March 11, 1963, and updated and issued April 8, 2004; by UM Policy 101.4[x]; by policies and procedures of the School of Law; and by the terms of CBA Section 6.100. Supporting policies are also referenced in *Standard 9: Institutional Integrity*, and in Exhibit RE 9-01. The language of the CBA explicitly recognizes and protects:

…full freedom of inquiry, teaching, research, discussion, study, publication, and, for artists, the creation and exhibition of works of art, without hindrance, restriction, equivocation, and/or Board or administration reprisal. This right extends to other facets of campus life to include the right of a faculty member to speak on general educational questions or about the administration and operation of his/her own unit and the Montana University System. The right of academic freedom shall be the right of every faculty member whether tenured or untenured.

The academic freedom policy, as stated in the CBA, recognizes that faculty members also are citizens and members of learned professions, and that faculty members expressing views as citizens shall be free from institutional censorship or discipline. The policy is

16

explicit that faculty members have an obligation, when acting as private citizens, to make it clear that they speak, write, and act as individuals and not as representatives of The University of Montana or the Montana University System.

BOR Policy 302 on Academic Freedom (issued April 8, 2004), though consistent with CBA Section 6.100, includes additional complementary and cautionary language. The BOR statement raises such issues as "research for pecuniary return," the avoidance of "controversial matter [in the classroom] which has no relation to its subject," and the awareness of a faculty member's own public face. Immediately following Academic Freedom in the CBA is Academic Responsibility, Section 6.200. The language of this section in a sense tempers that of Academic Freedom. It outlines broad expectations for faculty as effective teachers with interests in student progress and welfare; as scholars who maintain breadth, depth, and currency of knowledge in their fields; and as members of the University who assist in the proper administration of University affairs by serving on committees, attending University functions, and engaging in public service in areas of professional competence.

Language protecting academic freedom also is typically a component of unit standards, and appears in other University policies as well. For example, one of the explicit goals for the Office of Technology Transfer [xi] at the University is to protect academic freedom: "The role of the University, its faculty, staff and students is not to run a business but to create and disseminate knowledge. Any conflict in that process that impinges on Academic Freedom is always resolved in its favor."

Illustrative of the application of UM's policies on academic freedom and responsibility was the invitation of by Stephen Walt to campus in September 2006 (Richard Drake, "On Being Called an Anti-Semite in Montana," *Academe* (Sept-Oct 2007)). Walt, a political scientist at Harvard, co-wrote an article regarding the influence of the pro-Israel lobby on U.S. foreign policy in the Middle East. (London Review of Books, March 2006). Walt's arrival in Missoula was anticipated with enormous anger and virulence among some of the faculty members. In addition to calling Walt a venomous anti-Semite and Holocaust denier, his detractors feared for the University's reputation and demanded the speaker's cancellation, or at least that a second speaker join the discussion to provide equilibrium. Although the negative reaction to Walt's invitation and subsequently to his presentations on campus did not significantly abate, the University President, other administrators, faculty, students, and the public took ample opportunity through various media and fora to defend Walt's presence and position. Though hardly unanimously accepted, the arguments not only of academic freedom but those of responsibility were adduced by the defendants. The open analysis and exchange, however contentious and unresolved, were maintained by the policies found in CBA Sections 6.100, 6.200, and BOR Policy 302.

4.A.8-4.A.10: Part-Time and Adjunct Faculty

BOR Policy 702.1: Appointment of Faculty[xii] identifies that "appointments to teaching, research, or other faculty positions of each campus of the Montana University System shall be identified as tenurable or nontenurable." It goes on to clarify that "an appointment not specifically identified as tenurable is a nontenurable appointment." Thus, for the remainder of these three sections on faculty standards addressing "part-time" or "adjunct" faculty, the terms tenurable and nontenurable will be applied, with a focus on the nontenurable appointments.

The University of Montana employs several categories of nontenurable faculty to fulfill its academic, research, and outreach missions. UM Policy 101.2[xiii] sets out the titles, privileges, rights, and responsibilities of nontenurable faculty. There is no right of reappointment of any nontenurable appointment. Prior to initiating a search process to identify potential candidates for nontenurable appointments the appointing academic unit must first establish the need for such appointments and secure approval for them from the chair, dean, and Provost. Equal opportunity and non-discrimination procedures apply for all nontenurable appointments.

The categories within nontenurable faculty employees are as follows: (1) adjunct faculty; (2) visiting faculty; (3) lecturers; (4) research faculty; (4) faculty affiliates; (5) visiting scholars; and (6) international visiting scholars. Of particular interest are the following subsets of these categories: (a) adjunct faculty who teach within a specific discipline, either a single course or a few related courses on a one-time or recurring basis; (b) research faculty who fill programmatic roles that are long-term and are selected based on a national search; and (c) research faculty who are more short-term based on "soft-money" projects to complete discrete research tasks.

In all units, nontenurable faculty meet minimal degree requirements. In some cases the nontenurable faculty hold a master's degree in fields where a doctorate is the terminal degree. Frequently, nontenurable faculty hold the terminal degree, often a doctorate.

Several departments across the University use adjunct faculty to supplement the teaching demands for heavily subscribed entry-level courses. This is particularly important in disciplines where small class sizes are essential to learning, in areas such as mathematics, communication studies, and foreign languages. These adjuncts are frequently highly trained, experienced teachers with master's level degrees or higher. They also show a deep commitment to the educational attainment of their students. They are appreciated by tenureable faculty for their service, as they provide a foundation that allows tenureable faculty to concentrate on the expanding bodies of knowledge of their respective disciplines in more complex, upper-level courses. Academic units across campus that utilize nontenurable faculty have increasingly incorporated these individuals within faculty decision-making on curricular matters to ensure consistency, efficiency, and quality. Department unit standards typically specify the types of decisions for which nontenurable faculty members are awarded voting privileges.

Units contacted as part of this assessment all indicated that they pay careful attention to the hiring, orientation, supervision, and evaluation of nontenurable faculty, even though the methods and styles of selection and evaluation differ. For example, in the School of Music, performance ability is a selection criterion for adjuncts providing instruction. Required background for all nontenurable adjunct faculty commonly includes prior teaching experience. In the School of Business Administration, adjunct candidates must complete a teaching presentation such that their observed capacity in instruction is sufficient to meet classroom demands. Departments have generated well-articulated procedures to select candidates for short-term and low FTE instructional positions that periodically come available.

As research productivity of faculty across departments in The University of Montana has increased and financial support for these investigations has accelerated, additional research capacity has been sought by tenurable faculty via linkages to peers who serve as research faculty. Research faculty can fulfill long-term services and obligations of the

University as designated by the state legislature or executive, and they may fulfill responsibilities that are slightly different from tenurable faculty in their balance and distribution of teaching, research, and service. For example, the College of Forestry and Conservation hosts the State of Montana's Institute for Tourism and Recreation Research, headed by a long-term, nontenurable research faculty member selected via a national search, whose duties focus on presenting high quality, up to date research on tourism activities, visitor attitudes, and visitor expenditures for state-level tourism planning. Research faculty frequently support their respective department's instructional portfolio based on their specialized knowledge and skills, as they offer a valuable supplement to the courses offered by tenurable faculty. These long-term research faculty also present important opportunities for the University in attracting funding and graduate students, as well as demonstrate the University's responsiveness to recognized public issues.

Research faculty members are also appointed on a short-term basis to fulfill special obligations of research grants. As the complexity of research increases with advancing knowledge, the contribution of specialists such as short-term research faculty allows for more thorough, integrated investigations. Short-term research faculty require access to libraries, laboratories, and other research facilities so that they can support their colleagues effectively, and these appointments provide the necessary standing within the University to fully participate in the University's educational and research mission as well as refine their own knowledge and capabilities to propel them on a productive career trajectory.

The University of Montana revisits its tenurable and nontenurable faculty policies on a recurring basis. In addition to the periodic negotiation of the CBA, the aforementioned polices on nontenurable appointments have been fully examined and revised by the University administration and the Faculty Senate since the previous accreditation review of 2000. External factors such as the performance of endowment funds, the shifting levels of support due to state budgetary constraints, and the demands of an expanding student enrollment have highlighted the need for continued attention and analysis of the role and contribution of nontenurable faculty appointments.

4.B: SCHOLARSHIP, RESEARCH, AND ARTISTIC CREATION

Scholarship, research, and creative activities are at the core of faculty and student lives and academic programs at The University of Montana. Expectations are strong for faculty to engage in research and creative activity that results in published works, exhibitions, performances, and presentations. A deeply rooted belief at all levels within the University is that strong, active faculty scholarship is integral to the University's ability to offer high quality educational programs. The University's Mission Statements[xiv], for both the multi-campus University and The University of Montana-Missoula, refer explicitly to the centrality of research and creative activities in the University's programs. The recently completed Academic Strategic Plan (Exhibit RE 1-01) identifies the aspiration that "UM will continue to grow as a research University with an entrepreneurial spirit and a major force in the evolution of Montana's economy and culture." One specific initiative in that report is to "create a coherent vision for research and creative activity across all Colleges and Professional Schools."

A Brief History of UM Research

The Office of Research and Development at The University of Montana was formed July 1, 1968, when the position of Vice President for Research was created. This position was retitled several times over the years. In Fiscal Year 1976, a Director of Sponsored Program Administration was appointed prior to the hiring of an Associate Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate School. In 1990, this position became the Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate School. It was retitled in 1991 to the Associate Provost for Research and Economic Development and Dean of the Graduate School. In 1995, the position was retitled Vice President for Research and Economic Development. The title today is Vice President for Research and Development, and in 2007 the significance of the UM graduate program and its connection to research was elevated with the creation of the full-time Associate Provost for Graduate Education.

From 1968 to 1973, grant activity remained relatively level as reflected in the FY 1977 and FY 1985 volume figures, which were $4.2 million and $4.8 million, respectively. In 1984, the UM Office of Research Administration's annual publication, *Vision,* reported that UM had 460 scholars working with some 8,000 undergraduates and 1,500 graduate students.

Another decade brought grant volume to $22.5 million in FY 1995. That year, 555 proposals were submitted and the University awarded 26 doctoral degrees. In 1994, The University of Montana was reclassified under the nationally-recognized Carnegie Classification, from a Doctoral I Institution to Doctoral II, more accurately reflecting the doctoral degree production. The statement of Strategic Directions for The University of Montana [xv] specifies the aim to "attain the Carnegie Commission status of High Research Doctoral (50 or more doctorates in at least 15 fields annually, and funded research over $100 million) by 2011. Research award and grant volumes, by academic unit, are shown for the last three years in Exhibit RD 4-05. Sponsored funding supports a variety of research-related projects, centers, and institutes [xvi] across campus.

Table 4-02 – Grant Volume and Ph.D. Production: FY 2000-FY 2009

Year	Expenditures	Grant Volume	Proposals Submitted	Ph.D.s Awarded
2000	$32.3 M	$39 M	629	30
2001	$37.6 M	$48.2 M	665	27
2002	$42.4 M	$50.2 M	691	38
2003	$49.1 M	$60.9 M	742	33
2004	$55.6 M	$65.7 M	763	38
2005	$61.5 M	$68.7 M	782	60
2006	$60.1 M	$63 M	775	45
2007	$62 M	$58 M	796	40
2008	$62.3 M	$64 M	862	45
2009	$67 M	$71 M	763	44

The CBA specifies the role of being "a scholar" as an aspect of academic responsibility. The CBA also outlines University-wide expectations for scholarly and creative accomplishment that are to be reflected in all unit standards. Specifically, the CBA indicates that general activities that "shall be given consideration in any evaluation for

purposes of promotion, award of tenure, determination of salary increment, or recommendation for retention" should include: a) scholarly publication or creative works; b) participation in professional organizations or societies, receipt of awards in recognition of professional accomplishments, or speaking engagements related to one's professional field; and c) research efforts related to grants, contracts, direction of student research, or professional research efforts incident to publication. For promotion to Full Professor, a faculty member must have the necessary level of performance as defined in the CBA and unit standards in teaching competence, scholarship, creative activity, and service. However, no faculty member may be promoted to Full Professor on the basis of teaching and service alone. Faculty standards for the College of Technology specify a variety of types of scholarly activity appropriate to the mission of that unit but rather different from those in other academic units at The University of Montana.

Associate Professor Bambi Douma and Students Working on a Project

4.B.1: Faculty Scholarship, Research, and Artistic Creation

In accord with the University's Mission and Vision Statements and expectation for scholarly contributions, many faculty members at The University of Montana are extremely productive scholars and researchers, and sustain a high level of engagement in research and creative scholarship. The level of success is amply documented in the exhibits of faculty curriculum vitae, departmental statements of the most significant recent artistic creations, scholarly activities and research, and in University publications such as *Vision* and *Research View*[xvii], also available online. The Individual Performance Records that faculty members are required to produce each evaluation cycle must include information about research activity and usually include a vita with full grant and publication details. Combined, all those materials reflect a broad range of scholarly and creative contributions across all disciplines and units, a very high proportion of faculty who are active scholars, and the presence of numerous faculty members in many units who have attained national and international visibility as a result of their research, scholarly, and creative contributions. Faculty scholarship is disseminated and recognized through extensive publication of journal articles; semi-technical and popular publications; books and book chapters; reports and technical papers; artistic presentations and exhibitions; documentaries and broadcast productions; presentations at national, regional,

and local meetings and at other scholarly institutions; contributions to the functioning of governmental and other agencies; success in securing external funding; and research awards and recognition. Examples of representative and extraordinary scholarship and creative activity will be on display during the site visit (Exhibit RD 4-05).

Such successes clearly indicate sound and extensive faculty contributions to sustaining the University's research and creative mission. Furthermore, they reflect a key aspect of academic quality - the ability of the University to deliver courses and instructional programs taught by faculty who are at the cutting edges of their disciplines. The scholarly, creative, and research activities and programs of faculty provide a critical base for the University's diverse graduate programs by providing opportunities for students to learn content, methods, skills, values, and approaches of a discipline from faculty mentors and advisers who are leaders in their fields. Of course, funded scholarly/research programs provide direct financial and academic support to graduate students.

Current strategic plans include new academic programs at all levels (certificate through doctoral) and means of support in response to identified needs and opportunities. These specifically include:

- M.A. in Speech Pathology (2009)
- Ph.D. in Business (2009)
- Ph.D. in Western Studies (2010)
- D.A. in Audiology (2010)
- Ph.D. in Speech Pathology (2010)
- Ph.D. in Materials Science, joint with Montana Tech (2010)
- PhD in Systems Ecology (2011)
- P.S.M. (Professional Science Masters) in Water Resources (2011)
- Middle School Mathematics Education (2011)
- M.Ed. Special Education (2011)
- American Studies (2012)
- Ph.D. Creative Pulse (2013)

Included among the current academic priorities for The University of Montana is a goal to strengthen research at all levels and broaden the commitment to foster undergraduate research and creative activity. Opportunities for undergraduate students to participate in such activities are greatly enhanced by availability of vigorous faculty research programs and by the willingness of leading faculty to serve as mentors. The Davidson Honors College has placed a new emphasis on undergraduate research, and funds and coordinates a number of undergraduate research programs and opportunities. For the last seven years, UM has hosted an annual conference on Undergraduate Research, sponsored by the offices of the Vice President for Research and Development and the Provost. The UM Conference on Undergraduate Research (UMCUR) is a day-long conference offering opportunities for students from across campus to make poster presentations, research presentations, exhibits, and original creative works. The University is pleased to be hosting again the National Conference on Undergraduate Research (NCUR) in April 2010, a strong reflection of the commitment to integrate undergraduate research and creative accomplishment more fully into the academic fabric of the University. Approximately 100 University of Montana undergraduates will present the results of their research or creative activity at the conference, along with some 2,000 additional student participants from across the country.

There has been a tremendous increase in the attention and support given to research during the past decade. The creation of a number of centers[xviii] responsible to the Vice President for Research and Development is reflective of the University's increasing commitment to research. Examples include the Montana Biotechnology Center, Center for the Rocky Mountain West, Flathead Lake Biological Station, Montana Cooperative Wildlife Unit, Montana Natural Heritage Program, Montana University System Water Center and the Montana University Rural Institute on Disabilities. The priority given to expanding research contributions and programs at the University and the success of faculty in supporting those efforts are reflected in the continued growth in external funding, which has doubled between 1999-2000 and 2008-2009. The top five recipients in 2008 were Andrij Holian, Center for Environmental Health Sciences ($3 million), Jerry Bromenshenk, Division of Biological Sciences ($2.9 million), Jack Stanford, Flathead Lake Biological Station ($2.8 million), Rick Hauer, Flathead Lake Biological Station ($2.4 million), and Mike Kavanaugh, Center for Structural and Functional Neuroscience ($1.9 million). Other notable initiatives include UM's National Center for Landscape Fire Analysis, Center for Structural and Functional Neuroscience and Numerical Terradynamic Simulation Group. External funding is only one measure of research and scholarly activity, but it is a useful one for broad comparisons, and this increase indicates a significant expansion of research and scholarly programs and the success of faculty endeavors. While the University has access to few direct comparisons with other universities such as the Performance Indicators of the Association of American Universities, the Faculty Scholarly Productivity Index recently recognized the Forestry program as the third best in the country in 2006 and ranked the Wildlife Biology program seventh best in the nation in 2007. Of course, this expansion is accompanied by concern for how to achieve growth in externally funded research efforts without diluting undergraduate educational programs.

TANGENTS TO THE OVAL...

SEEING FOREST ECOSYSTEMS WITH NEW EYES

Diana Six, Professor of Forest Entomology and Pathology within the College of Forestry and Conservation, researches mountain pine beetles, and the fungi that act as their nutritional supplements. The recent impacts of pine beetles on western forests are unprecedented, and although the Forest Service and the public are concerned about this transformation, Six sees the native pine beetles like she sees fire — as a natural component of lodgepole pine forests. In that way, she focuses her research not on stopping the beetles, but on predicting where they will move next.

Photo by Todd Goodrich

With multiple research grants already in progress to examine pine beetle behaviors in North American, Six is now pursuing a major grant from the National Science Foundation to collaborate with several African universities to study beetle symbiosis.

- Condensed article from Fall 09 *Montanan*

4.B.2: Institutional Policies and Procedures

The Office of Research and Sponsored Programs (ORSP) is responsible for distribution, revision, and oversight of a variety of policies governing research and creative activities. ORSP has developed a clear, easy-to-use website[xix] that directs faculty and staff to relevant research policies, and policies are available in hard copy format as well. Capable assistance is readily available to clarify, interpret, and understand applicability of policies to particular projects. Relevant policies and oversight procedure include the following:

- Institutional Review Board Guidelines and Procedures: policies and procedures governing use of human subjects;
- Institutional Biosafety Committee: policies and procedures on use of potential biohazards in research and instruction;
- Environmental Health and Risk Management: oversight of hazardous materials management, chemical hygiene and chemical/compressed gas safety, radiation safety, biological safety, respiratory protection program, and blood borne pathogen policy;
- Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee: policies and procedures for use and approval of animals in research and instruction;
- Misconduct in Science: procedures for alleged misconduct in research and creative activities that establishes an administrative inquiry and hearing process.

4.B.3: Faculty Role in Research Policies and Practices

Several of the policies that govern research and its oversight are structured to comply with federal requirements. Specific language and components must be present to meet those requirements. Within that context, policies are developed with extensive faculty input. An example is the Conflict of Interest and Financial Disclosure Policy, whereby all University faculty and full-time employees must annually disclose any potential conflicts of interest. The draft policy was discussed extensively by working groups of faculty as well as by the Faculty Senate to resolve concern about particular aspects of the policy language. Current compliance policies[xx] can be found online. All of the committees that oversee these policies and that make decisions about particular research proposals and projects in the context of these policies have significant faculty representation.

4.B.4: Administrative and Informational Resources

The substantial rise in research activity across campus and the ability to recover a portion of research funding through indirect cost recovery (ICR) have greatly enhanced available resources and subsequent research capacity. The ICR for the past ten years have been as follows:

Table 4-03 – Indirect Cost Recovery: FY 2000-FY 2009

Year	Indirect Costs Recovered (millions of dollars)
2000	3.75
2001	4.71
2002	5.68
2003	6.68
2004	7.60
2005	8.00
2006	7.47
2007	7.93
2008	8.29
2009	8.82

State-based departmental and collegiate budgets typically contain only modest state funds to support faculty research and creativity. Therefore, University policy is to return 35% of ICRs to the academic unit of origin, to be used discretionarily in the support of research. The Vice President for Research and Development uses a portion of ICR funds generated by faculty to support start-up needs for new faculty, assist with bridge-funding for faculty between grants, assist departments with acquisition of shared-use equipment, or support emergency equipment repair or similar needs. Deans and other University administrators also are frequently asked to help fund such expenses, and they occasionally do, often from private funds or ICR funds at their disposal. Demands on these combined resources in most years far exceed the available budget, and recent budget rescissions have reduced some kinds of support for faculty research and development even further. A continuing concern voiced by many departments is that support for faculty and student research in inadequate.

The University has made substantial investments in computer and information technologies that advance research and scholarship as well as instruction. The advent of electronic access to major journals and the commitment of the library to University scholarship via subscriptions to major search engines for academic resources have vastly improved access to scholarly publications. Any loss of subscriptions to hard copy versions of journals has been more than offset by this increased capacity to acquire digital materials and continued access to the interlibrary loan system (see *Standard 5: Library and Information Resources* for more detailed information on library resources).

As stated, 35% of ICR funds are returned to the academic unit in which they were generated. Deans retain a portion of these funds to support research-related needs and requests prioritized at the collegiate level. In the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS), some of these funds have been used for modest support of scholarly activity in units that have limited opportunity to secure external funds. In CAS, however, the bulk of ICR funds are returned to the department in which they originated. Half of these funds typically are allocated to the individual faculty member, who uses them to support research needs (equipment or other equipment that are not allocable to a specific project, etc.). The remainder of departmentally allocated ICR monies typically is used to support a variety of departmental research needs or enhancements including participating in start-up needs for new faculty, equipment acquisition, repair, service contracts, seminar

programs, and the like. ICR distribution in other collegiate units is broadly similar, depending on administrative structure.

Faculty initiative in pursuing and securing external funding from a wide array of sources has been instrumental in the growth of research capability. For example, the University has been able to achieve recent significant gains in research-oriented faculty and related support as a result of funds provided by a broad spectrum of competitive grants programs, gifts, and special, federally sponsored research initiatives such as the National Science Foundation's EPSCoR program. Two examples of this last form of research commitment are the Large Rivers Ecosystems Program and the Computational Cyberinfrastructure Program. Despite significant gains, funds sometime remain inadequate to support many pressing research needs. Several specific issues recur: developing appropriate matching funds for many proposals is a significant challenge, and some otherwise highly competitive proposals have suffered as a result. Although the University has been able to create substantial start-up packages for several new faculty members in recent years, it has not been possible to meet needs in some fields. Institutional support for equipment upgrades or maintenance, facilities improvements, and other requirements to sustain research and scholarly activity could be improved. Many such needs are met through use of external project funds.

Through the benefits of an aggressive capital campaign that ran from 2005-2007, much of the campus infrastructure has been substantially upgraded. New buildings, steam tunnel improvements, and modernization remodels in many buildings have allowed far greater opportunity to conduct scholarly activity. The College of Health Professions and Biomedical Sciences recently completed a new building that houses its instructional programs and an expanding research program. A new building for the School of Journalism has placed state-of-the-art visual technologies at the fingertips of students and faculty. Not all programs have been able to see infrastructure upgrades, yet many current programs are successful despite space and facilities that are outdated. Space and facilities clearly are constraining future growth in a few areas. For example, some of the leading research units at the University, (College of Forestry and Conservation, Division of Biological Sciences) are experiencing especially severe space constraints. Although they have gained University and legislative approval for new buildings and are pursuing planning and fund-raising, new facilities are at least several years into the future. Sustaining growth of research and creative activities will require enhanced funding and new space.

4.B.5: Faculty Development

A sabbatical program, the only contractual faculty development program within the CBA, generally provides support for an average of 27 leaves each year. Sabbatical assignments may be granted for up to one-half of the regular contract period at full salary, or for the full academic year at three-quarters salary. Faculty members are eligible for sabbatical leave following six years of service on the faculty (sabbatical in seventh year); at least twelve semesters of full-time service are required between sabbaticals. Programs or projects which necessarily involve employment by an employer other than the University may not qualify for sabbatical assignment but may be approved as leave without pay. Faculty members are required to sign an agreement to return to full-time service with the University for a period equal to the length of the sabbatical or to refund the compensation paid to them by the University, unless this obligation is specifically waived by the

President or his/her designee. The sabbatical program is "funded" by a central pool, enabling departments to hire replacement instructors.

Faculty sabbatical activities may involve a variety of educational, research, and enrichment activities that contribute to professional development of the faculty member and show strong promise of future returns to University programs and students. Decisions on sabbatical leaves are made by the Provost on the basis of recommendations of the Committee on Sabbatical Assignments. The committee is guided by the following criteria (in order of priority):

1. Merit of proposed program, both for the faculty member and for the University;
2. The faculty member's teaching and research performance, especially over the immediately preceding twelve semesters;
3. The anticipated value to the individual, to students, to the department, and to the University; and
4. The faculty member's length of service with the University (with some weight given to longer service).

Although sabbatical leaves are awarded to faculty who propose activities focused on strengthening teaching capabilities, higher priority generally has been given to faculty with strong records of scholarly/research productivity whose sabbatical plans focus on research or on a blend of activities that will enhance both research and teaching capability.

As noted above, the CBA and all unit standards include components of expectation for research, scholarship, and artistic creation. The emphasis given to research and creative achievement in faculty evaluation, reward, and advancement varies among academic units at the University, according to such factors as the mission of the unit, the nature of the discipline, etc. In units supporting research-focused graduate programs at the master's and doctoral levels, considerable emphasis is placed on research accomplishments without ignoring expectations for strong teaching performance. In such units, scholarly productivity in the form of multiple publications, grants, presentations, etc., is virtually an absolute requirement for a merit recommendation. Promotion (both to Associate Professor and Full Professor ranks) and tenure decisions in such units involve intense scrutiny of the record of scholarly productivity, and expectations of significant national visibility and impact of the scholarly work. In primarily baccalaureate units, where in-class teaching may represent a higher proportion of the workload, expectations for scholarly and/or creative productivity may be different, but they are present. Many faculty in such departments are extremely productive scholars, researchers, and artists, and are rewarded and recognized for their productivity. As mentioned above, no faculty member may be promoted to Full Professor on the basis of teaching and service alone.

In most units, teaching assignments are adjusted according to variation in other aspects of the faculty workload, including research and artistic creation. Some departments (e.g., Computer Science, Economics) have somewhat formalized paths that individual faculty members may follow, choosing to emphasize heavier teaching if the engagement in research or creative scholarship is low, or to emphasize a research path that is accompanied by a lighter teaching load. In many units, such adjustments in workload are made through informal consultation and planning of course assignments between the department chair (or dean) and the faculty member, a process that is aided and illuminated by feedback during the faculty evaluation process. In some instances, faculty

members whose research programs have waned voluntarily assume additional teaching, advising, or service activities to sustain their contributions to the program. All of these mechanisms adjust the allocation of faculty time, effort, and talent to optimize the combined research and teaching achievements of the unit. Such adjustments occur not only within departments but among departments within an academic unit, and are evident in relative teaching loads.

Several of the University-funded opportunities for faculty development and renewal provide strong support for activities that will enhance faculty capabilities in scholarship, research, and artistic creation, although in all but one instance not to the exclusion of instructionally related activities. The Faculty Development Committee solicits proposals from long-term faculty for the Faculty Professional Enhancement Program[xxi]. Long-term is defined as tenured, tenure-track, adjunct, or visiting faculty who have been on contract at The University of Montana for two years or more and who anticipate being on contract during the project year. This solicitation is for proposals for the Instructional Development, Mini-Sabbatical, Visiting Scholar, and Short-Term Academic Enrichment Program. The programs are competitive and the maximum amount of funding per award is $1,500. The committee receives and reviews approximately 40 proposals per semester, with approximately $20,000 awarded annually.

- The Instructional Development Program is intended to help faculty members develop new courses, develop new pedagogical skills, or incorporate new technologies into teaching. Proposals might also include travel to a special seminar or workshop on instructional methods or sponsorship of a faculty development workshop or seminar series at UM.

- The Mini-Sabbatical Program offers faculty the opportunity to acquire new academic skills through travel off campus for a period of no less than five working days (excluding travel days) and up to one semester. For example, applicants are encouraged to work in a specialized laboratory, take courses at another university, work with a master artist or scholar, or undertake similar efforts of a professional nature.

- The purpose of the Visiting Scholar Program is to bring distinguished scholars to UM to conduct workshops or seminars, give guest lectures or performances, or otherwise work with UM faculty.

- The purpose of the Short-term Academic Enrichment Grant is to assist faculty members in research and creative activities on and off campus in areas that fall outside the other categories including include travel to present at conferences or workshops, sponsoring of a faculty research or seminar series at UM, or other research related projects.

Collectively, all of the competitive faculty development opportunities are funded centrally to the amount of $325,000, including the sabbatical replacement pool.

The Office of Research and Sponsored Programs assists faculty, as well as staff and graduate students, in their research and creative endeavors. This unit is responsible for coordinating and stimulating research and creative activity and contributes to the overall health of the University. ORSP staff members also assist with the preparation and

processing of proposals, including administrative review and signoff, negotiation of external agreements, and development of the proposal narrative and budget. Post-award responsibilities include institutional financial management of grants, contracts, and other externally funded agreements. All proposals that use the name and resources of The University of Montana, and that may result in an award to the University, must adhere to University procedures for submitting a proposal, accepting an award, and administering the project. ORSP oversees these processes.

ORSP staff assists with identifying potential sponsors for projects, and ORSP maintains a wide variety of current reference books, reports, directories, guidelines, and newsletters from federal, state, and private agencies that are useful for this purpose. The office continues to sponsor workshops for faculty and staff on proposal development, budgeting and cost practices, audits and pre- and post- award grant management that have been heavily attended and well-received. ORSP has a well-organized and effective email network for distributing program information, calls for proposals, and announcements of opportunity.

4.B.6: Sponsored Research and Externally Funded Programs

External funds that support research and creative activities are secured by faculty in a diverse array of programs, departments, colleges, and centers at the University. Programs sponsored by external funds sustain faculty scholarly activities; enhance research, educational, and training opportunities for undergraduate and graduate students; help build academic infrastructure that sustains both research and educational activities; and extend and apply University expertise and abilities to address problems in the state, region, and nation. Academic units with some of the most extensive external funds include many that are central to the core and profile of the University (e.g., environmental and natural resources areas, biological sciences, economic research and others) or that represent new strategic directions of the University (e.g., biomedical sciences, neurosciences, biotechnology). Some externally funded projects directly support enhancement of University educational programs. Others support research and collaboration between University personnel and external entities (government organizations, private industry, nonprofit/NGOs, etc.) in ways that promise and deliver benefit to local, state, and regional economic development. All of these programs and activities are strongly supportive of and consistent with the University's mission and goals.

4.B.7: Academic Freedom

Principles and policies assuring academic freedom were discussed above. These apply fully to the freedom of faculty to pursue scholarship, research, and artistic creation, within the limits of safety, use of humans or animals in research, and conflict of interest policies noted above.

WEBSITES REFERENCED

[i] UFA Collective Bargaining Agreement:

http://www.umt.edu/provost/facultyinfo/docs/UFACBA.pdf

[ii] COT Faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement:

http://www.umt.edu/provost/facultyinfo/docs/COTCBA.pdf

[iii] University Committees: http://www.umt.edu/committees/

[iv] UM Policy 404.7: http://www.umt.edu/Policies/400-HumanResources/spousalpartner.aspx

[v] Department Records (unit standards): http://www.umt.edu/provost/deptrecords/default.html

[vi] Human Resource Services Recruitment procedures, forms:

http://www.umt.edu/hrs/recruitment.html

[vii] Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Office: http://www.umt.edu/president/eeo/default.htm

[viii] UM Policy 401.1: Affirmative Action: http://www.umt.edu/Policies/400-

HumanResources/affirmativeaction.aspx

[ix] BOR Policy 302: Academic Freedom: http://mus.edu/borpol/bor300/302.pdf

[x] UM Policy 101.4: Academic Personnel Rights and Responsibilities:

http://www.umt.edu/Policies/100-AcademicAffairs/RandR-AcadPersonnel.aspx

[xi] Office of Technology Transfer: http://www.umt.edu/research/techtransfer/default.aspx

[xii] BOR Policy 702.1: Appointment of Faculty: http://mus.edu/borpol/bor700/7021.htm

[xiii] UM Policy101.2: http://www.umt.edu/policies/100-AcademicAffairs/Non-

TenurableAcadAppts.aspx

[xiv] UM Mission Statements: http://www.umt.edu/president/mission.aspx

[xv] Strategic Directions for The University of Montana:

http://www.umt.edu/president/strategic.aspx

[xvi] Projects, Centers, and Institutes: http://www.umt.edu/Centers /

[xvii] Research publications: http://www.umt.edu/research/VPRD/researchpubs/default.aspx

[xviii] Research Centers: http://www.umt.edu/research/VPRD/centers.aspx

[xix] Office of Research and Sponsored Programs: http://www.umt.edu/research/ORSP/default.aspx

[xx] Compliance policies: http://www.umt.edu/research/complianceinfo/default.aspx

[xxi] Faculty Professional Enhancement Program:

http://www.umt.edu/provost/facultyinfo/FPEP.html