

Minutes
Faculty Senate Meeting
8:00 AM, Apr. 15, 2004
Mountain Con Room, SUB
submitted by Andrea Stierle, secretary

Members present: John Brower-Chair; Grant Mitman-Vice-chair; John Metesh; Betsy Harper; Denise Solko; Mary MacLaughlin; Mark Sholes; Chip Todd; Rod James; Andrea Stierle-secretary

Absent : Susan Leland, Danette Melvin

Others present: Chancellor Gilmore, Steve Anderson

The meeting was called to order at 8:00AM. Approval of minutes of April 1st, 2004 meeting was confirmed by Andrea Stierle. Minutes have been posted in the Faculty Senate public folder.

Committee Reports

- **Committee on Student Evaluation of Course Instruction:** Mary MacLaughlin reported that the committee would like to present the completed evaluation form to the faculty at the next general faculty meeting. Prior to the meeting, either the committee or the faculty senate can send the proposed evaluation form to the general faculty by email for final comment. The committee proposed that acceptance or rejection of the evaluation form will be a single action item at the next general meeting UNLESS several faculty members have a concern with a given question(s). For a given question to be discussed specifically at the general faculty meeting, at least 15 faculty members must email Mary with their concerns prior to the general meeting. One or two comments about a given question will not be sufficient to initiate discussion. The Senate must indicate on the general faculty agenda that there will be a vote on the evaluation form at the general faculty meeting.

Old/continuing business:

The Deans' Council proposed several changes to the faculty/staff handbook. Many of these changes are minor, but one generated discussion. At the April 1st, 2004 Faculty Senate meeting a motion was passed to support creation of tenurable instructor positions for lab directors and faculty without terminal degrees who teach entry level courses. The Deans' Council proposes to hire new faculty who are ABD at time of hire at the instructor level. These individuals must wait three years to apply for promotion to assistant professor. (The Deans' Council proposed changes are in blue):

206.3 Procedures to Apply for Promotion in Rank (*tenure and non-tenure track*)

Academic Rank

Montana Tech recognizes the following academic ranks:

Instructor: ~~The rank of Instructor is generally reserved for those who teach lower division and certificate-level courses. While levels may be available within the rank, it is not normally expected that an instructor~~

~~would become a Professor. Teaching excellence and continued effort and accomplishment in the areas of professional development and service are expected for continued employment.~~

Instructor: *The rank of Instructor is generally reserved for those who predominantly instruct at the lower division and laboratory level or for those faculty who have not achieved normal entry level rank in their discipline. An Instructor at the time of initial employment is not expected to possess an expertise in research, teaching and service. Accomplishment in all areas of evaluation must exist for consideration for promotion.*

EXPLANATION: *This proposed change reflects the need for North Campus to have the ability to make appointments at the Instructor level. An example is the hiring at the level of instructor those individuals who are ABD. Other examples are the heavy demand for teaching in math and laboratory instruction loads where full time teaching is required to meet the demand.*

After some discussion, the Faculty Senate members agreed that hiring new tenure-track faculty (selected as the result of an appropriate search) at the Instructor level because of being ABD is not a good idea. The current practice of hiring with assistant professor rank but with a contractual obligation to complete the terminal degree is satisfactory. But there must be a limit to the duration of the ABD status (3 years was recommended), and the limit be rigorously enforced.

The Faculty Senate recommends that the rank of Instructor be reserved for faculty hired to teach lower division and laboratory courses. An Instructor can be promoted to different levels, i.e., Instructor II; but will not be eligible for promotion to Assistant Professor, Associate Professor or Professor.

The motion to accept the changes proposed by the Deans failed.

The motion was made to keep the original language from the current handbook with the following changes:

The rank of instructor is generally reserved for those who teach lower division and laboratory courses. While levels may be available within the rank, i.e. from Instructor I to Instructor II, an instructor will not be promoted to the professor track, i.e. assistant professor, associate professor or professor. Teaching excellence and continued effort and accomplishment in the areas of professional development and service are expected for continued employment. The motion passed.

The following changes recommended by the Deans' Council were also discussed and a motion was made to *accept* each change:

1. 204.d – The Department Head, *Dean*, VCAA/R or MBMG Director shall assist the Search Committee in filling out required paperwork, providing salary guidelines, placing advertisements in appropriate journals, interviewing candidates, and insuring compliance with the Institution's responsibilities for AA/EEO and proper search and selection procedures. (See Section III of this Handbook.)

Motion passed.

2. 204.h - The appointing authority, or as delegated to by the VCAA/R or MBMG Director, informs all final candidates of their rights as a prospective faculty member and negotiates specific contract terms such as credit toward promotion and tenure, faculty rank, and salary in accord with the

Personnel Requisition and Authorization (PRA).

Motion passed

3. Recruiting and Selecting Part-time Faculty

In recruiting and selecting part-time faculty, it is the primary responsibility of the Department Head, in consultation with the faculty of the department where the part-time faculty member shall teach, to describe the academic and professional qualifications of the position to be filled. *Adjunct faculty shall complete the application process including criminal background checks and credential verification.* The VCAA/R shall establish and maintain an orientation process for part-time faculty and ensure that new faculty participate in said program.

Motion passed.

4. 206. Evaluation, Tenure and Promotion - North Campus Faculty

This section applies to all faculty regardless of rank who are not members of the COT bargaining unit and not on the staff of the MBMG.

Collegiate Evaluation Committee (applicable to tenure and promotion applications only)

Representation on the Committee

A Collegiate Evaluation Committee, comprised of full-time, tenured, full professors and representative of each school/college of the Institution *and 2 representatives from the School of Mines and Engineering*, will be established each academic year. Each academic Dean will arrange for the election of a representative from his/her school/college, no later than October 1 and report the name of the representative to the VCAA/R. In addition, each faculty member being evaluated may select a faculty representative as a voting member of this committee. (This person need NOT be a full professor). Representation of the one additional member, therefore, may differ with each case being evaluated.

EXPLANATION: This proposed change accounts for the merger of the School of Mines and the College of Engineering. Since that time, there have been 2 appointments to the CEC from the School of Mines and Engineering.

Motion passed.

5. **Professor:** The rank of Professor is reserved for those who have reached the top of their profession. In order to be promoted to the rank of Professor, it shall be necessary for a candidate to demonstrate excellence in two of three areas evaluated (teaching, research and service). ~~Above average~~ *Good* effort and accomplishment must be demonstrated in the third area.

EXPLANATION: The description of the ranks of Associate Professor and Professor are not as clear as previous handbooks in their qualification measurements. This makes the evaluation and preparation by the faculty members more difficult. The previous use of a regional reputation was much easier to quantify. The nomenclature of Good is proposed to replace above Average because of the connotation associated with the comparator. A faculty member has to demonstrate "excellence" in two areas, but in the third they merely need to be "above average". A simple change of wording from "above average" to "good" is probably sufficient to indicate the level of the bar that must be surpassed. Faculty Senate consideration of further clarifying these definitions is requested.

Motion passed.

6. a. Required Evaluation Materials

- ~~Every individual responsible for a course shall conduct a student evaluation of~~

- ~~the instructor and course every semester.~~
- *Every individual responsible for a course shall have a student evaluation conducted of the instructor and course every semester.*
- **EXPLANATION:** *This brings the handbook into compliance with confidentiality requirements o Board Policy 705.3*

Motion passed.

- **7.** The student evaluation for each course ~~must~~ *should* include responses from ~~at least 80%~~ *a majority* of the enrolled students.
- **EXPLANATION:** *While 80% participation is a good goal it is not always achievable, especially in small courses.*

Motion passed.

- **8.** The faculty member shall include a copy of the instrument and summarize the results of the student evaluations for each course taught in their evaluation portfolio. The ~~faculty member~~ *department* shall also maintain the originals on file for review, if requested.
- **EXPLANATION:** *This brings the handbook into compliance with the requirement of NASCU that the administration has access to raw data. This protects the integrity of the data.*

Motion passed.

Motion was passed to allow Department Heads to recommend faculty for accelerated promotion.

b. Finalization of comments/revisions on Satisfaction Survey questions.

Senate members are asked to revise questions on survey as needed.

Satisfaction survey --- replace “no opinion” with “not applicable”.

Rewrite questions to obtain more pertinent data.

Chancellor Gilmore raised strong objections to the Satisfaction Survey. President Dennison, however, was supportive of the Satisfaction Survey. University of Montana Missoula has a Faculty Senate office and administrative assistant who maintains documents. We use Senate folder in the library.

John Brower will send out a notice and reminder

Other business

- Concern was raised at the manner in which Karl Burgher was “selecting” his own replacement without an appropriate search. Steve Anderson attended to provide some historical context as to hiring and promotion in the Mine Waste Technology Program.
- The next Board of Regents Meeting will be in Havre May 19th and 20th. It is the multi-campus faculty representative’s turn to meet for an hour with the BOR.

Meeting adjourned at 9:55 AM.