

**Minutes**  
**Faculty Senate Meeting**  
**5:00 PM, September 27th, 2005**  
**Mountain Con Room, SUB**

*minutes submitted by secretary A. Stierle*

*Members present: Vice Chair Susan Leland, John Brower, Paul Conrad, Rod James, Karen Porter, Mark Sholes, Miriam Young, Secretary - Andrea Stierle*

*Member absent: Bruce Madigan, Grant Mitman*

*In attendance: Chancellor Gilmore, Vice Chancellor Patton*

**Agenda for Faculty Senate Meeting - September 27, 2005**  
**MT Con Room - Student Union Building**

1. Jim Handley - Inter-unit Benefit Committee
2. Discuss Dennison's visit
3. Evaluations of Department Heads and Deans
4. Terms of Appointment for Department Heads and Deans
5. Posting of minutes of all public meetings
6. Pay raises for College Presidents/Chancellors

The meeting was opened at 5 PM by Vice-Chair Susan Leland. Secretary Stierle distributed copies of the minutes of the Sept. 13<sup>th</sup> meeting (which were also distributed by email) and asked the members to please look them over and comment as soon as possible.

***1. Interunit Benefit Committee Report***

Jim Handley, one of the two Montana Tech representatives of the *Inter Unit Benefit Committee* (Maggie Peterson is the other MT Tech rep.) presented a report from the IUBC annual meeting. This committee has representatives from all of the colleges and includes 24 members, who are divided evenly between Union and non-Union representatives. All of the unions in the MUS units agreed earlier that benefits should not be subjected to collective bargaining. Members of the MUS can belong to many different Unions (or no Union). The bargaining position of smaller groups is not as effective as one cohesive entity, so the IUBC represents all members of the MUS. It is advisory in nature – the Commissioner of Higher Education has the final say in benefits issues. However, the Commissioner has only overturned one IUBC decision in recent memory – that of offering benefits to same sex couples. The Supreme Court later, in essence, overturned the Commissioner's decision. (To date, of the 8000 employees covered by the MUS benefits plan, only 9 same sex partners are covered.)

- ***The MUS benefits program is a self-funded benefits plan.*** Up until summer 2005 it was

administered by Blue Cross-Blue Shield. It is currently administered by Allegiance. Last year it paid out over 40 million. The budget is driven by number of employees so it changes from year to year. It currently covers approximately 8000 employees and 7000 dependents.

- ***As of June 30, 2005 there is a projected fund balance of \$18 million.*** There has only been a 0.5% increase in medical benefit useage this last year, compared to a 13% increase in health care costs nation wide Why is our benefit system “flush” and why is increased useage so small this year?

- Members of the MUS use their health dollars fully but are less inclined to rely on crisis care. This is good news but we must be careful or the legislature may make us “spend it down” or give each member a smaller allotment from the state budget. This year we received an additional \$46 per employee per month on July 1, 2005. Next year we will receive an additional \$51 per employee per month, so the state contribution would go from the current contribution of \$506 per employee per month to \$557 per employee per month on July 1<sup>st</sup> 2006.

- Use of the Wellness program

- Over 90% of eligible members use the mail order drug plan (90 days worth of prescription meds for the cost of 30 days worth of meds.

- Over 90% of members use generic drugs whenever possible.

- When faced with serious accidents or injuries many members use Case Management. (available at health care providers). These services help to coordinate treatments and medical care and usually at a savings to the patient and medical plan. Management would like more to do so especially in the chronic illness group. Please contact Cathy Reagor at 444-3853 for more info.

- ***The state benefit plan now covers “adult dependents” of employees.*** The dependent can not be a blood relative. Nineteen employees have taken advantage of this program.

Other items of interest related to our medical benefits program:

- Next year the IUBC committee will begin looking at proposals for the 403B plan.

- The IUBC committee MIGHT look into providing some assistance to retirees. Under the current system, retirees *can* retain the same medical benefit program, but they pay the full amount – there is no state match.

- The IUBC has set a lifetime cap of \$2 million per employee on medical benefits.

- Certain healthcare providers, including St.James Hospital offer a 25% cost reduction to members of the MUS medical plan.

For more information on the MUS benefit plan contact Jim Handley or Maggie Peterson.

## **2. Report on President Dennison’s Meeting with the General Faculty**

As part of his campus visit, President Dennison met with the general faculty at 4 PM, Monday, September 26<sup>th</sup>. Approximately 20 faculty members and Vice-Chancellor Susan Patton were present at this meeting with Dennison and Jim Foley, University Executive Vice President and Assistant to the President. I circulated an agenda proposed by the Senate to the faculty the previous asked and asked for additional agenda items. These were the main topics of discussion:

- *Life after the merger*

This is a perennial topic of discussion for these meetings as many members of the Montana Tech community have not been convinced that the merger strengthened Tech. President Dennison declared that the merger essentially saved Montana Tech, and several of the smaller units. University of Montana “gave” its smaller units \$5 million in “bale out” funds. I suggested that if the smaller units needed that money so desperately, it should have been included in their budgets in the first place. President Dennison stated that the legislature was changing the funding allocation model for the different units of the University system.

At the Faculty Senate meeting, Chancellor Gilmore provided additional information and suggested that the smaller units will do better under the newer funding model.

- *Differences between University of Montana and Montana Tech*

President Dennison has stated on two occasions that some of the hiring practices that have occurred recently on Montana Tech’s campus (“promotion” of lab directors to faculty positions and acceptance of Ed D. *in lieu of* terminal degree in one’s field of expertise.) We asked why he approved of these differences, if this suggested he perceived Montana Tech as a less academically rigorous institution. He responded that the lab director promotion was in the past and he trusted that it would not have to happen again. . As he understood it, it was a decision made by Chancellor Gilmore to fill positions that could not be filled by the usual search procedure. I commented I had not heard that this was a matter of exigency, but Dennison clearly did not want to discuss it. He concluded that there were areas in which a Masters was the appropriate terminal degree. He included a Masters of Fine Arts in his list, although an art historian should possess a doctorate. This has never been a concern of the Senate – it is well established that terminal degree is discipline specific. the concern is with hiring faculty who do NOT possess a terminal degree in their field.

- *Student Evaluation of Teaching*

I asked President Dennison how he used the student evaluation of teaching form on his campus. He started out by defending the need for such a document, although acknowledged that on the UM campus there was not a single form for everyone. I asked how the data was used in hiring/promotion decision. President Dennison commented that the evaluation forms are definitely part of the package of information considered in such decisions. But the evaluations are viewed as a pattern of teaching proficiency. UM would never take one or two “bad” evaluations out of a professors portfolio and use them as grounds for denial of promotion or tenure.

- *UM Website*

At the spring 2005 meeting with the President, Dennison said he would look into providing a presence for Montana Tech, particularly the engineering programs, on their website. He commented that UM would obviously not be willing to advertise our duplicate programs like Chemistry or Biology. He felt that the proposed Engineering 2+2 program will be a useful recruiting tool for Montana Tech. This program would encourage incoming freshman want an Engineering degree but who are placebound in Missoula, to take their General Education courses at UM, then to transfer to Montana Tech for their last 2 years.

- *Recruitment for Montana Tech through the UM recruitment program*

Both President Dennison and Jim Foley agreed that UM could do more to help with recruitment at Montana Tech. Despite all of our efforts at marketing and recruiting faculty report that fewer students seem to have ever heard of Montana Tech and those who have heard of it think it is either a VoTech program or a mining school. It was hoped that UM might be able to help spread the word that Montana Tech is still a four year college with many different programs.

- *Posting of Public Meeting Minutes*

Dennison was asked to endorse the Senate's request that all committees on campus post their minutes to public folders or an appropriate website. He strongly endorsed this practice..

Vice Chancellor Patton said she would make sure that this happens on the Tech campus.

- *Electrical Engineering Program*

Only one faculty member provided an agenda item – Dan Trudnowski asked if Dennison would endorse Montana Tech's pursuit of an Electrical Engineering degree program. Dennison made it clear that on his watch there would never be stand alone doctoral programs at Montana Tech, but he did see that an undergraduate program in Electrical Engineering would be of benefit to Montana Tech.

The meeting with the President adjourned at 4 PM.

### **3. Evaluations of Department Heads and Deans**

It was shown that much of the language originally intended by the Faculty Senate in its 1999 version of the Handbook did not make it into the 2002 version of the Faculty Staff Handbook. These two versions were passed out to the Senate members and are included here for the record.

#### 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.

Chancellor Gilmore invited the Senate to return the original language to the Handbook. He was surprised to see the differences between the copy submitted by the Senate and the copy distributed by the administration two years later.

The Senate will present this at the next Faculty meeting.

#### **4. Terms of Appointment for Department Heads and Deans**

Several members of the Senate thought that term limits were not appropriate for either position and the discussion was tabled at the time.

#### **5. Posting of minutes of all public meetings**

Vice Chancellor Patton agreed to make sure that meeting minutes were taken at all meetings, appropriately approved and posted to public folders or to an appropriate website.

#### **6. Pay raises for College Presidents/Chancellors**

Due to the lateness of the hour, this discussion was tabled until the next meeting when Chair Mitman would incorporate it into his report on the BOR meeting.

Meeting was adjourned at 6:20 PM.

na Tech, MSU-Northern and UM-Western would be set at \$151,306 apiece, which would amount to raises of \$25,000 to \$34,000 each, depending on the campus.

Chief Justice Karla Gray is the highest-paid state elected official at \$102,466 as of July 1, while the other six justices receive \$100,884 annually. Gov. Brian Schweitzer's pay was boosted to \$96,462.