

Minutes
Faculty Senate Meeting
5:00 PM, March 21st, 2006
Mountain Con Room, SUB

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

Members absent: Susan Leland, John Brower, Karen Porter,
In attendance: Chancellor Gilmore, Dean Coe

Faculty Senate Agenda - March 21st, 2006

1. Update from the Chancellor
2. Evaluation of Department Heads and Deans
3. Student Evaluation of Teaching Form
4. Use of student drop rate as evaluation tool
5. Other

1. Update from the Chancellor

Chancellor Gilmore provided an update of news and events from the MUS.

- The University of Montana will be hiring an assistant legal counsel, whose salary will be paid through UM's IDCs.
- Montana Tech is hiring a new Director of Career Services (down to 4 candidates) and a Vice Chancellor for Development and the Foundation. The Chancellor will try to keep faculty informed of these searches as they progress.
- Budget Initiative Process – Each campus can request 0.5% of tuition as a budget initiative. Montana Tech requested 0.5% of tuition to help correct faculty salary inequities. There is also the possibility of a one time request through the Governor's office.
- Salary committee – the Chancellor was asked what happened to the Salary committee. It apparently has not met this year. He said he would look into it.
- Regent Mercer resigned. He was critical of Governor Schweitzer and the higher education budget.

2. Evaluation of Deans and Department Heads

Vice-Chancellor Patton sent the following memo to the Senate for consideration:

MEMO

TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: Susan Patton, Vice Chancellor
CC: Deans Council, Chancellor Gilmore
DATE: March 7, 2006
RE: Clarification of evaluation of department head and dean

I am submitting these proposed changes to the handbook in an effort to align the evaluation of department heads and deans with the changes in job description, selection and terms section of the handbook 223.1 and 223.2 that occurred November 1, 2001. On November 1, 2001 the faculty approved changes in terms and evaluation of deans and department heads that included wording that was in conflict with the evaluation methodology outlined in sections 223.1 and 223.2.

The proposed changes reflect the current process for evaluation in use since 2002 and based on the changes of November 2001. I have attached the November 2001 changes and the complete sections 223.1 and 223.2 for your reference. If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me.

IV. Evaluation of Department Heads

Department Heads shall be evaluated ~~periodically~~ annually by the Dean to assure the highest possible level of effectiveness. One important component of the evaluation includes input from the department faculty. The evaluation. 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. The collective input from the faculty in the department will be shared with the department head;
2. Invitation from the Dean to all members of the department and others the department head works closely with in carrying out the job responsibilities ~~and college or school~~ to participate in confidential personal interviews; and,
3. Personal interview(s) with the Department Head ~~The dean will discuss the results of the evaluation with the individual department head.~~

~~4-3.~~

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.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

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.

V. 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 Chancellor](#) in consultation with the [VCAA/R 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, institution](#), deans shall be evaluated ~~regularly~~ [annually by the VCAA/R](#) 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 department heads~~ [members department heads](#) of the college and to others ~~Deans and members of the faculty from other representing~~ [Deans and members of the faculty from other representing](#) areas which closely interact with the individual under evaluation. ~~The collective results of the input from the department heads in the college will be shared with the department heads ;~~
2. Invitation from the VCAA/R to ~~all members of the department heads of the college and others the dean works closely with~~ [all members of the department heads of the college and others the dean works closely with](#) to participate in confidential personal interviews;
3. ~~Personal interview(s) with the dean~~ [The VCAA/R will personally discuss the results of the evaluation with the respective 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 Senate unanimously approved the Vice-Chancellor's changes to the Handbook concerning evaluation of Deans and Department Heads. **We also moved (it was seconded and passed unanimously) that the following evaluation criterion be added:**

5. Demonstration of effective fund-raising and/or acquisition of other outside support.

3. Student Evaluation of Teaching Form

There has been no further move to change the Math Department's edition of the Student Evaluation of Teaching Form. The acceptance (or rejection) of the Math form will be brought to the General Faculty meeting as an action item.

4. ACT Scores vs. Drop rates

There has been concern among faculty that drop rates are being used as evaluation tools. Dean Coe had posted the Princeton Review ACT and SAT Math scores for several hundred colleges nationwide. I selected several of our peer colleges (how we like to see ourselves) and listed their ACT and SAT Math scores compared to ours.

I am including this memo that was sent to all faculty and to Senate members as part of the discussion:

<http://www.princetonreview.com/college/testprep/testprep.asp?TPRPAGE=295&type=ACT-LEARN>

This is an interesting website that lists average ACT and SAT scores for colleges around the country. If you scan the data you will notice that Montana Tech, a Science and Engineering College, has an average ACT of 22 and an average SAT Math score of 539. Our "liberal arts" parent, UM has a SAT Math of 540 and ACT of 23. Of all of the colleges listed there are only three or four with lower ACT averages than Montana Tech -- Xavier University of Louisiana, University of New Orleans, Fisk University and University of Louisiana Lafayette. The data for our "peer colleges", that is, technical colleges, universities and institutes, follows:

ACT score

SAT math

Colorado School of Mines	28	650
New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology	26	612
New Jersey Institute of Technology	NA	608
Michigan Technological University	25	619
MIT	32	755
CalPoly San Luis Obispo	28	639
Georgia Institute of Technology	28	690
Illinois Institute of Technology	28	675
Rensselaer Polytechnic University	26	687
Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology	29	680
Virginia Tech	25	611
Worcester Polytechnic Institute	29	674
Montana Tech of the University of Montana	22	539
University of Montana	23	540

At issue is the question of whether or not high drop rates are necessarily an indication of bad pedagogy. Particularly in large classes and in freshmen classes drop rates are an indication of immaturity or of a lack of readiness for the college experience. Montana Tech faculty see themselves as teaching to the same academic standards as faculty at the Colorado School of Mines. Yet our incoming freshmen may have ACT scores of 16. Our scores on average are significantly lower than those of our peer institutions. There are two problems:

1. How can faculty maintain high academic standards with poorly prepared students with weak math skills? Math placement exams have helped as they can pinpoint problems with math preparedness and get students into remedial courses.
2. The second concern is that the administration is using drop rates only against certain faculty. If this is indeed the case, this inequitable treatment is unacceptable.

5. Changes Proposed to Faculty Handbook concerning Promotion/Tenure timeline

Vice Chancellor Patton proposed the following changes to the promotion/tenure timeline. In essence, with her proposed timeline, a faculty member would submit his/her portfolio **AFTER the completion of 4 years of academic service**. This would mean that the faculty member would be evaluated during year 5 and, if promoted, would become an Associate Professor at the beginning of year 6. Under the current system, which is consistent with that employed by University of Montana, a faculty member submits the portfolio during the 4th year, is evaluated during the 4th year, and would begin service as an Associate Professor the beginning of year 5. The changes would be similar for promotion to Full Professor.

The Senate unanimously rejected the Vice-Chancellor's proposed changes and voted to maintain parity with University of Montana practices.

MEMORANDUM – ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: Susan Patton, VCAA/R
CC: Chancellor Gilmore, Deans Council
DATE: March 17, 2006
RE: Proposed handbook change in description of years of service

With the change in submission deadlines of portfolios from January to October that took place May 12, 2004, there is a need to further clarify the years of service in rank requirements in the handbook.

Complete years of service in rank are required before submission of the portfolios or the faculty member

CURRENT HANDBOOK
206.3 Procedures to Apply for Promotion in Rank

Years of Service Requirements

The following number of complete academic years of full-time service shall normally be required in rank prior to promotion. For promotion purposes, a complete academic year is defined as two semesters of the regular instructional sessions, not necessarily in the same catalog or calendar year.

Assistant to Associate Professor	4 years
Associate to Full Professor	5 years

PROPOSED HANDBOOK (*additional wording for clarification has been inserted in italics and in red*)
206.3 Procedures to Apply for Promotion in Rank

Years of Service Requirements

The following number of complete academic years of full-time service shall

normally be required *to be completed* in rank prior to *the portfolio submission for consideration for promotion*. For promotion purposes, a complete academic year is defined as two semesters of the regular instructional sessions, not necessarily in the same catalog or calendar year. See [Accelerated Promotion](#) in this section for exceptions to this service requirement.

Assistant to Associate Professor	4 years
Associate to Full Professor	5 years

Faculty Tenure/Promotion Timelines (approved May 12, 2004)

This section applies to tenured or probationary faculty applying for promotion or tenure.

On or before September 20

Faculty wanting tenure/promotion notifies the Department Head of intent in writing.

On or before October 1

Faculty sends tenure/promotion portfolios to Department Heads

On or before November 1

Department Head sends tenure/promotion portfolio to Deans

On or before December 1

Deans forward the tenure/promotion portfolio to the Collegiate Evaluation Committee

On or before February 21

The Collegiate Evaluation Committee sends faculty tenure/promotion portfolios to VCAA/R.

On or before March 15

VCAA/R sends faculty tenure/promotion portfolios to Chancellor with written recommendations.

On or before April 1

Faculty tenure/promotion recommendations made by Chancellor and sent to the President for approval.

On or before April 15

Notification of the President's tenure/promotion decisions provided to faculty candidates

The meeting was adjourned at 6:25 PM.