

Minutes
Faculty Senate Meeting
8:00 AM, April 1st, 2004
Mountain Con Room, SUB

minutes submitted by secretary A. Stierle

Members present: Chair- John Brower, Vice chair - Grant Mitman, Mary MacLaughlin, Denise Solko, Susan Leland, Rod James, Danette Melvin, Secretary - Andrea Stierle, new members - Mark Sholes, Elizabeth Harper. Absent: Chip Todd, John Metesh
Also in attendance: Chancellor Gilmore

Meeting was called to order at 8 AM. The prior circulation and approval of the March 4th, 2004 Faculty Senate meeting minutes by email was confirmed. Minutes were posted to Faculty Senate folder 3/9/04.

1. ***Committee reports.***

a. Chancellor's Advisory Committee - Denise Solko had circulated minutes of the CAC meeting by email. Of particular concern were issues related to transfer of credits.

b. Computer advisory committee - Susan Leland - The Computer Advisory Committee allocates money from student computer fees. The following agenda items were approved for funding by the committee:

1. money approved for the new computer lab in the Mill Bldg. This includes 28 student work stations and one instructor work station.

**A point of concern was raised that the Mill Building, as a space paid for by student fees, should not be used as a teaching classroom. Susan was going to ask the committee about this issue.*

2. the committee established a computer maintenance fee of \$47,000/annum

3. \$10,000 was allocated to the South campus for computer upgrades

Bill Schmidt is proposing to redo all computer wiring (coaxial cable) to bring it up to code. At present, much of the computer wiring on campus would be vulnerable in case of fire. Two options under consideration are to contract out the job or hire one person to a campus position who would be in charge of the rewiring project. Two students would be hired to work

under that hire (Ed Metesh's students) and the new hire would probably also teach one class in computer wiring, maintenance, etc. Bill would prefer the second option so that a person would be available at all times for wiring projects.

c. Board of Regents Meeting

(note: minutes of January, 2004 BOR meeting are available at <http://www.montana.edu/wwwbor/MinutesJanuary2004.htm>)

John Brower attended the 3/25/04 BOR meeting. Items of discussion included new PhD programs being approved at both UM and MSU. Athletic Department cost overruns of about \$1 million at UM-M and \$300,000 at MSU-B have raised serious concerns, however, and may have increased wariness on the part of the BOR about data provided to them by the campus CEOs .

John discussed various committees at BOR meeting, and said that the BOR's defunct Education Subcommittee may be resurrected. The informal group - the "faculty advisory council" comprised of Faculty Senate officers or delegates from the various colleges will propose that their group be formalized . (It could interface with Education committee.) Faculty do not currently have much voice at BOR meetings, and would like to be able to present unified input on upcoming considerations like the Regents' proposal to standardize the MUS academic calendar.

- The question was raised why Montana Tech is no longer allowed to offer Honorary Doctorates. *BOR precludes any institution that does not have a PhD program from offering honorary doctorate.*
- The question was raised why there were no faculty regents, when there is a student regent. Faculty members have no voting rights at BOR meetings. Chancellor Gilmore noted that the host institution gets to have a faculty member at "the table", although not in a voting capacity.

Brower noted that anybody has the right to directly contact any regent --- but it would be more effective if you go through a formal process. Contacting the faculty advisory council could be part of that process.

d. Committee on Student Evaluation of Course Instruction -

Mary Maclaughlin - Based on positive feedback to emailed requests to all faculty and presentation at general faculty meeting, the committee is proceeding with the "modified Nupher 40". One of the main concerns was the length of the form - faculty were concerned it was too long. Student representatives on the committee administered the evaluation form

to students in both informal settings and in a classroom setting. The evaluation process, including appropriate instructions, took approximately 15 minutes. The committee will have the form, including rating scheme and comments, available for the next general faculty meeting.

2. *Old/continuing business:*

John wants to solicit editing of the Handbook by Senate members using email for the following action items:

- a. Mission statement: review and comment.
- b. Handbook revision for “sanctioned events” language: defer to next meeting.
- c. Handbook revisions: dean’s council proposals.
- d. Handbook revision: responsibility for identifying early promotion potential candidates - Wolfgram memo.

3. *New business.*

a. Annual administrative satisfaction survey.

It is time to edit and administer the annual administrative satisfaction survey. Dave Carter will administer and collate. The survey will be mailed to all faculty by hard copy, same as last year.

b. Tenure-track and stepwise rankings for instructors.

Andrea commented that the Handbook already has Instructor listed as a tenurable position. She had proposed several years ago (1990) using *tenure-track instructor with steps within the ranks*, as an option for lab instructors and others who do not have terminal degrees but who regularly teach lab courses or entry level courses. Many colleges use this system. Susan Leland agreed this would be a good option for faculty who teach lower level courses and who do not plan to earn a terminal degree (doctorate) in their field.

Faculty/Staff Handbook

206.3

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.*

206.1

A tenurable appointment is an appointment to a teaching, research, or other faculty position that may lead to a tenured status as provided for in this section. Tenurable appointments shall be made at the rank of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, or professor.

At Montana Tech tenure is not automatic. Instructors would go through application procedures as defined. *A motion was made to clarify*

“instructor position” as described in the Handbook as a separate track, with include step increases. Seconded and passed unanimously

Meeting adjourned at 9:20 AM.