

Draft Minutes
Faculty Senate Meeting
5:00 AM, September 13th, 2005
Mountain Con Room, SUB

minutes submitted by secretary A. Stierle

Members present: Chair- Grant Mitman, John Brower, Susan Leland, Rod James, Karen Porter, Mark Sholes, *Secretary -* Andrea Stierle

Member absent: Bruce Madigan, Paul Conrad, Miriam Young

In attendance: Chancellor Gilmore

Agenda for Faculty Senate Meeting - September 13th, 2005
MT Con Room - Student Union Building

1. Finalize election of Senate Vice Chair
2. Set agenda for visit with President Dennison on September 26th, 2005
3. Student Evaluations of teaching -- effectiveness of both the evaluation form itself and the implementation of the form
4. Evaluations of Department Heads and Deans
5. Terms of Appointment for Department Heads and Deans
6. Process of converting Deans from half-time to full-time positions

Meeting was called to order at 5 PM by Chair Grant Mitman.

1. ***The first order of business was to announce election of Susan Leland for Senate Vice Chair.*** The vote was conducted by email ballot of Senate members. All members voted and the Secretary has a record of the votes.
2. ***The Senate will meet with President Dennison on Monday, September 26th at 4 PM. We need to establish an agenda for the meeting.***
 - a. Dennison has made it clear at two previous meetings that UM would not consider an EdD an appropriate terminal degree for hiring or promotion unless it is generally considered the appropriate terminal degree for a particular field. Why is it considered appropriate at Montana Tech?
 - b. Where are we going with Engineering courses on the UM campus. What is the link to Montana Tech's Engineering program? Can UM feature Montana Tech Engineering programs on their website (more than just a general hyperlink)?
 - c. Can UM's recruiting ventures also include Montana Tech's programs, particularly those unique to Montana Tech (engineering)?

3. *Student Evaluation of Teaching*

Several faculty have expressed displeasure with the new student evaluation of teaching form. (I have included a copy of the form below). Complaints from faculty include :

- **this is a formative form being used in a summative fashion**

This was a major concern cited by several faculty. A formative evaluation tool provides feedback to the faculty member on possible methods for improving teaching effectiveness. For example, many of the questions involve value judgment weighted scores. Students are asked to evaluate faculty on their use of multimedia teaching formats. Very effective teachers may rely on what used to be called “chalk talks” (whiteboard talks?) without the use of PowerPoint, video, live demonstration, etc. The implication is that *single media is bad, multimedia is good*. If you look at the copy of the student evaluation form below, the questions highlighted in yellow were the ones cited as problematic.

- **too many questions on the form**
- **data not provided in bar chart form**

Action item: The student evaluation of teaching form will be discussed at the next General Faculty Meeting.

Course/Instruction Evaluation Form

(Based on a form used by the Center for Teaching and Learning, Idaho State University. Many of the items in the ISU form used with permission of Ctr. for Research & Development in Higher Ed., U of CA, Berkeley.)

Please use the following scale for your response to each item. Note that “Not Applicable” is a valid response. Questions 1-40 refer to the instructor of the course.

Strongly agree	5
	4
	3
	2
Strongly disagree	1
Not applicable	

Conveyance of Content

1. Is well prepared.
2. Stresses general concepts and ideas.
3. Uses examples and illustrations.
4. **Generalizes from examples and specific instances**
5. Gives references for more interesting and involved points
6. Discusses recent developments in the field.
7. Contrasts implications of theories.
8. Discusses points of view other than his or her own.

Organization and Clarity

9. Explains clearly.
10. Gives lectures that are easy to outline (or provides prepared notes that adequately serve this same purpose).
11. States objectives of each class session.
12. Summarizes to emphasize major points.
13. Is able to clarify or improvise in awkward communication situations.
14. **Makes a few major points during lecture rather than many.**
15. Appears to know if class is understanding him/her or not.
16. Appears to know when students are bored.

17. Uses a variety of instructional media/resources (films, slides, overheads, guest speakers, etc.).
18. Uses a variety of teaching methods besides lectures (demonstrations, field trips, writing, group work, etc.).

Fairness in Evaluation and Grading

19. Identifies what he or she considers important for purposes of testing and evaluation.
20. Uses exams and various assignments effectively for synthesis and understanding of course material.
21. Is fair and impartial in grading assignments, exams, quizzes, etc.
22. Keeps students informed of their progress.
23. Has students apply concepts to demonstrate understanding.

Involving Students

24. Encourages class discussion/participation.
25. Invites students to share their knowledge and experiences.
26. Invites questions, discussion or criticism about ideas presented in lecture.
27. Is able to accommodate and relate to students as individuals.
28. Asks questions of students.

Rapport

29. Is accessible to students outside of class.
30. Has genuine interest in students.
31. Gives personal help to students having difficulty in the course.
32. Has a concern for the quality of teaching and learning.
33. Encourages/motivates students to challenge themselves to do high quality work.
34. Treats students with respect.

Expressiveness

35. Has an effective style of presentation.
36. Gives interesting and stimulating assignments.
37. Effectively uses a range of gestures and movement.
38. Appears confident.
39. Varies the speed and tone of voice.
40. Is enthusiastic.

Overall

41. The quality of instruction was very effective in contributing to my learning.

Comments

What aspects of the course contributed to your learning?

What aspects of the course did not contribute to your learning?

Suggestions – what would you change to improve the course?

4. Evaluations of Department Heads and Deans

Chancellor Gilmore indicated that before he arrived at Montana Tech there was no evaluation of Deans or Department Heads and that the previous Faculty Senate did not want to see these positions evaluated. Andrea suggested that this was not quite as she remembered the Faculty Staff Handbook from previous years. (After the meeting, she sent to all members of the Senate and to Chancellor Gilmore a copy of the language in both the draft prepared by the Faculty Senate in 1999 and the copy eventually disseminated in the 2002 Faculty Staff Handbook concerning evaluations of Deans and Department Heads. This information is included in these minutes for clarification. All copies of minutes are taken directly from the minutes posted in the public folders)

Fellow Senators:

FYI: In our discussion yesterday there were some questions related to the development of the Faculty/Staff Handbook by the 1998 - 1999 Faculty Senate and evaluations of deans and department heads. Here are excerpts from the minutes of the 1998 meeting in which Dan Bradley charged the Senate with revising the handbook; the copy submitted by the Senate in 1999 (Stierle); and the final version published in 2002.

In the minutes from the August 24th, 1998 Faculty Senate Meeting, VCAAR Bradley told the Senate that one of their missions was to revise the Faculty/Staff Handbook.

“Dan Bradley expressed his thoughts on priorities for the Faculty Senate during the 98/99 year. These priorities are listed below.

- Faculty Handbook - critical review
- Privacy of E-mail written into handbook
- Promotion and Tenure - modify, clarify, toughen qualifications (?)
- Consider different criteria for different Depts. (Get Missoula and Dillon policies)
- Prep work for Northwest Accreditation visit - April 2000
- ABET visit - Oct. 18, 19, 20
- Northwest pre-visit Oct. 15. Facility tours, steering (10-12 people) committee meeting, (ca. 75% of the faculty will be involved in the various committees)
- Outcomes assessment committee - part of Northwest accreditation (Jan 14&15 training seminars)
- Steering committee will revisit mission statement
- Each Dept. must have own mission statement
- Outcomes based on mission statement
- Need multiple measures to determine outcome
- Grades, job placement, job performance and advancement, etc.”

The last copy was issued in 1994. In that document, Division Deans were evaluated, but Department Heads were not. The Senate spent 1998/99 discussing various portions of the handbook and Don Stierle agreed to implement the changes in the summer of 1999. He presented the draft version to the Senate in August 1999. The version posted in the Faculty Senate minutes 9/1/99 includes the following evaluation language:

Evaluation of Department Heads (1999)

Department Heads shall be evaluated periodically to assure the highest possible level of effectiveness. This evaluation can be initiated at anytime by the Dean or by written request of a majority of the members of the respective department who have been appointed on Board of Regents' contracts. Otherwise the Department Head shall be evaluated by the appropriate Dean during odd numbered years of his or her appointment (i.e., Years 1, 3, 5, 7, 9). It shall consist of:

1. An evaluative questionnaire which shall be sent to all members of the department and to other Department Heads and members of the faculty from other areas which closely interact with the individual under evaluation;

2. Invitation from the Dean to all members of the department and college or school to participate in confidential personal interviews; and,
3. Personal interview(s) with the Department Head.

At a minimum, evaluation criteria shall include consideration of:

1. The demonstrated ability of the Department Head to command respect as an academic administrator and to effectively represent the academic program to the administration and vice-versa.
2. Demonstration of ability to interact with faculty and peers in a fair and equitable fashion;
3. Demonstration of a commitment to the growth and continuing improvement of the quality of the academic programs (both research and instruction) of the department; and,
4. Ability to perceive the role of the department in the Institution as a whole and to facilitate the interaction of the department in institutional growth.

Department Heads may request reconsideration of their evaluations by the VCAA/R.

Evaluation of Deans

Deans represent both the academic faculty and the administration. They carry responsibility for maintenance and growth of the academic programs of the college or school.

Deans are appointed by the VCAA/R in consultation with the Chancellor and members of their relevant academic programs. Deans do not have tenure in the administrative component of their appointment.

To ensure that the administration of the academic programs is conducted in a fashion which best serves the institution, deans shall be evaluated regularly in accordance with the following guidelines:

The principal justification for evaluation of deans is assurance of the highest possible level of effectiveness.

Academic Deans shall be evaluated periodically in an evaluation cycle with a period not to exceed three years.

Evaluation of a Dean can also be initiated in any year by written request of a majority of those members of the respective college who have been appointed on Board of Regents' contracts, or by the VCAA/R. Requests from faculty must be submitted to the Office of the Vice Chancellor by November 1.

Evaluation shall be conducted by the VCAA/R and will consist of:

1. An evaluative questionnaire which shall be sent to all members of the college and to other Deans and members of the faculty from other areas which closely interact with the individual under evaluation;
2. Invitation from the VCAA/R to all members of the college to participate in confidential personal interviews;
3. Personal interview(s) with the dean.

At a minimum, evaluation criteria shall include consideration of:

1. The demonstrated ability of the Dean to command respect as an academic administrator and to effectively represent the academic program to the administration and vice versa.
2. Demonstration of ability to interact with faculty and peers in a fair and equitable fashion.
3. Demonstration of a commitment to the growth and continuing improvement of the quality of the academic programs (both research and instruction) of the College.
4. Ability to articulate the role of the college/school in the Institution as a whole, and to facilitate the interaction of the college/school in institutional growth.

Deans may request reconsideration of their evaluations to the Chancellor.

The Handbook was finally issued in 2002. This is the language that actually appears in the current version:

Evaluation of Department Heads (2002)

Department Heads shall be evaluated annually to assure the highest possible level of effectiveness.

At a minimum, evaluation criteria shall include consideration of:

- The demonstrated ability of the Department Head to command respect as an academic administrator and to effectively represent the academic program to the administration and vice-versa;
- Demonstration of ability to interact with faculty and peers in a fair and equitable fashion;
- Demonstration of a commitment to the growth and continuing improvement of the quality of the academic programs (both research and instruction) of the department; and,
- Ability to perceive the role of the department in the Institution as a whole and to facilitate the interaction of the department in institutional growth.

Evaluation of Deans

Deans represent both the academic faculty and the administration. They carry responsibility for maintenance and growth of the academic programs of the Institution.

Deans are appointed by the VCAA/R in consultation with the Chancellor and members of their relevant academic programs. Deans do not have tenure in the administrative component of their appointment.

To ensure that the administration of the academic programs is conducted in a fashion which best serves the Institution, deans shall be evaluated annually.

At a minimum, evaluation criteria shall include consideration of:

- The demonstrated ability of the Dean to command respect as an academic administrator and to effectively represent the academic program to the administration and vice versa;
- Demonstration of ability to interact with faculty and peers in a fair and equitable fashion;
- Demonstration of a commitment to the growth and continuing improvement of the quality of the academic programs (both research and instruction) of the Institution; and
- Ability to articulate the role of the Institution in the Institution as a whole, and to facilitate the interaction of the Institution in institutional growth.

5. Terms of Appointment for Department Heads and Deans

According to the Faculty Staff Handbook the term of appointment for Deans and Department Heads is one year. Chancellor Gilmore explained that this limit reflected a BOR policy that only allows 1 year appointments. He did indicate he would be willing to discuss “term limits” for each position.

Action item: to address in two weeks – term limits for Deans and Department Heads

6. Process of converting Deans from half-time to full-time positions

Many faculty have expressed concern over the summertime promotion of part-time Deans to full-time Deans. Questions were raised as to the way it happened, the necessity of full-time Deans, the necessity of having Deans at all, and where the money would come from to pay full-time Deans.

Chancellor Gilmore responded that “the Drew Commission” determined the need for full-time Deans. Although he acknowledged the faculty vote to eliminate the 3 Dean positions, Chancellor Gilmore determined that they are necessary. The money for the increased salary and benefits came from an initiative approved by the BOR (\$72,000). The Chancellor indicated that the Deans would use the extra time to fund raise. All three of the Deans were sent to Case training for fund raising, and that justified the full-time appointment.

The Chancellor was asked if there would be any “outcome assessment” of the Deans, and if failure to raise funds would be grounds for losing an appointment as Dean. He replied that they were evaluated already.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:25 PM.