<div align="center">

Minutes
Faculty Senate Meeting
5:00 PM, October 25th, 2005
Mountain Con Room, SUB

</div>

minutes submitted by secretary A. Stierle

Members present: *Chair* Grant Mitman, John Brower, Paul Conrad, Rod James, Bruce Madigan, Karen Porter, Mark Sholes, Miriam Young, and *Secretary* - Andrea Stierle

Member absent: Susan Leland
In attendance: Chancellor Gilmore, Vice Chancellor Patton

1. **approval of minutes-Oct 11**

2. **Comparison of UM and Montana Tech description of the Faculty Senate in their respective Handbooks**

3. **dept head/dean evaluations**

4. **student evaluation of faculty form**

5. **other**

1.   Minutes from October 11th meeting.

Minutes from the October 11th meeting were approved and have been posted to the Faculty Senate posting. Grant Mitman will also append the minutes to the Faculty Senate website.

2.   Description of Faculty Senate

The Senate has been in the process of revisiting portions of the current version Faculty/Staff Handbook since its distribution in 2002. Some faculty members asked if we would compare the language describing the role of the Faculty Senate as outlined in the Montana Tech Faculty Staff Handbook and as outlined in the UM Handbook. The UM Faculty Handbook was written in the context of their union contract, which is not true of the Montana Tech Faculty/Staff Handbook. Andrea provided copies of both documents to each Senate member. Rod asked that any discussion be postponed until Senate members have time to study the language of both documents.

3.   **Department Head/Dean Evaluations**

In ongoing discussions of the evaluation of deans and department heads the Senate unanimously agreed to the following resolution:

Every year Department Heads will be evaluated by the faculty in their department and by their Dean. Deans will be evaluated by the Department Heads in their College and By the Vice Chancellor.

There was discussion as to timing of these evaluations. Chancellor Gilmore commented that Deans and Department Heads must be given notification of termination of their administrative appointments 6 months prior to their next contract. For Deans that would mean notification no later than December 31st.

4.   *Student Evaluation of Teaching Form*

The Faculty Senate promised to provide a venue for faculty feedback to the student evaluation of teaching form that has been in use for one year. In our September 13th meeting (see minutes) several faculty concerns were raised and the Senate decided to make this discussion an agenda item for the General Faculty Meeting.

Andrea began today's discussion of the student evaluation of teaching form, providing three major concerns voiced by faculty members.

- **this is a formative form being used in a summative fashion**
- **too many questions on the form**
- **data not provided in bar chart form**

The formative versus nature of the form is and its apparent implementation as a summative tool was the major concern cited by several faculty.
 Formative evaluation tools provide feedback to the instructor on possible methods for improving teaching effectiveness.

Summative evaluation tools assess how an instructor performed their tasks and are generally quantitative, with numerical "scores" assigned for performance.

Andrea tried to explain some of the fundamental differences between formative and summative evaluation forms. In essence, formative evaluations help a faculty member find concrete methods to improve their ability to impart information to students. So questions concerning teaching style -

- *Uses a variety of instructional media/resources (films, slides, overheads, guest speakers, etc.). ;*
- *Varies the speed and tone of voice.*
- *Uses a variety of teaching methods besides lectures (demonstrations, field trips, writing, group work, etc.).*

simply provide implementable possibilities an instructor can use to improve their lecture delivery, if necessary.   However, great teachers can effectively use a single teaching method - lectures for example, only using the white board, and do a superb job of teaching. (Although the monotone really doesn't work for most people.)

However, **Formative evaluations** are not appropriate as **Summative tools.** In the cases cited above, two reasons become obvious:

1.   Instructors who don't use multimedia would get a lower score, even though the use of multimedia is **not** a requisite of good teaching.
2.   Such forms essentially **give the same weight** to *suggested* methods for improvement (see above) and actual instructor preparedness, fairness, equity, etc.

Vice Chancellor Patton reaffirmed in today's meeting that the current form should be used *to see trends in teaching effectiveness and improvement over time, NOT to generate a single number that can be used to fire or deny promotion/tenure*. Several members of the Senate commented that in their departments the current forms were indeed used to generate a single number for each instructor. VC Patton was very clear that this is not the appropriate or intended use of this form – it should not be used to rate or to rank faculty.   She looks for improvement over time and for evidence that the instructor cares about their students and their teaching effectiveness.

Of equal importance, however, to evaluating instruction/instructors is the development of remedies for instructors who would truly like to improve their teaching effectiveness. Faculty have complained over the years that Department Heads simply admonish them to "get their numbers up" without offering any guidance as to how they can become better teachers. VC Patton has offered Boot Camp as an option, one that several faculty members have used. The Senate would like to propose and promote *on-campus* opportunities for teaching enhancement in the upcoming year. It is important to assess effectiveness; it is perhaps more important to provide good methods for redress. In essence, faculty are an important investment for a college and should be treated as such.

Action item: The Faculty Senate is asking all faculty members to respond to a student evaluation of teaching form satisfaction survey. The survey will be posted on the Montana Tech website discussion board.

A few Senate members are convinced that most faculty like the current form. They see no reason to proceed with discussion of the current form if the majority of faculty members are satisfied. The satisfaction survey will provide that simple "thumbs up/thumbs down" feedback that will facilitate further discussion.

5.   SGID's

Among the tools that faculty can use to help assess their own teaching effectiveness is the **Small Group Instructional Diagnosis.** The SGID initially involved a faculty member

from another department who would meet with an instructors' class and ask them a series of questions. This feedback was given to the instructor to provide feedback as to the effectiveness of his/her teaching. The methodology was derived from a website that Andrea promised to find. (Note -- http://www.ntlf.com/html/pi/9705/sgid.htm#tools).

One Senate member commented that certain Department Heads are now conducting the SGID's as a way of evaluating the faculty within their departments. He suggested that this was not in keeping with the original intentions of SGID's. Vice Chancellor Patton responded that Department Heads were entitled to run SGID's on the faculty within their departments. Faculty members can also hold additional SGID's using faculty outside of their departments for feedback.

6.   Collegiate Evaluation Committee

The first meeting of the Collegiate Evaluation Committee will be November 3rd, 2005. Committee members include Grant Mitman, Rick Appleman, Bob Zeigler and Bill Spath.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:18 PM