In Prof. Brower’s absence, Grant Mitman called the meeting to order.

Senate members present: Todd, James, Lelan, MacLaughlin, Mitman, Solko, A. Stierle. Absent: Brower, Melvin, J. Metesh.

Others present: Chancellor Gilmore.

Mitman called for committee reports. Stierle began the presentation by noting that there are now four students on the evaluation committee. The committee’s formal title is the Committee on Student Evaluation of Course Instruction (CSECI). The missions statement and objective(s) of the committee is “To ensure quality instruction in all Montana Tech courses by developing a tool to solicit constructive input from students, and developing guidelines for a process to collect and summarize the input.” The committee is looking once again at a standardized form. Nationally recognized forms have been tested for validity and have a cost of up to $50,000 per year for their use. Chancellor Gilmore noted that the form does not have to be uniform across the institution; the Regents’ policy does not dictate such usage. The Regents’ policy does state that student evaluations must be part of the tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review. In spite of this requirement, the ultimate goal of this process has been stated as the improvement of instruction. The CSECI will sponsor a speaker from Idaho State University on faculty evaluation the week before spring semester starts. It was noted that there need to be mechanisms for improvement of faculty teaching. A list of methods is included in the Faculty/Staff Handbook.

In further discussion about evaluations, review of deans and department heads came up. Several noted that no feedback is provided to the faculty supervised by those persons. The Chancellor stated that feedback will be provided as long as Susan Patton is Academic Vice Chancellor.

A question was raised about a charge from the Chancellor to the ASMT to form a committee on faculty evaluations. The Chancellor said that he gave no such charge to the ASMT.

The next Chancellor’s Advisory Committee meeting will be held tomorrow morning at 7:00.

Discussion turned to the issue of class absences for campus-sanctioned events. Most faculty agree that accommodation should be made but the teacher should be left with the discretion of what that accommodation should be. A motion was made with wording to clarify the policy as stated in the catalog. Discussion revealed that the senators did not believe that the wording would resolve any of the stated problems with the policy. The motion did not receive a second and failed. A motion was made and seconded to request discussion of the policy in a general faculty meeting. A friendly amendment was added to seek feedback from students as to whether or not they see the current policy as a problem. Both the original motion and the amendment were seconded and passed. A. Stierle volunteered to get the feedback from the students. Mitman said that he would poll the deans to determine whether they felt the current policy presented problems.

Motion was made and seconded to adjourn. Meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Denise E. Solko
Secretary