

**Minutes  
Faculty Senate Meeting  
5:00 PM, March 7<sup>th</sup>, 2006  
Mountain Con Room, SUB**

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

*Members absent:* Bruce Madigan, Paul Conrad

**Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda**

- 1. Approval of Minutes from February 15th Meeting**
- 2. Student Evaluation of Teaching Form Discussion**
- 3. Satisfaction Survey**
- 4. Meeting with Dennison**
- 5. Other**

1. Minutes from February 15th Faculty Senate meeting were approved by email by Senate members but Andrea also sent the minutes to Jim Handley for comments concerning his report on the Interunits Benefits Meeting. If Jim has any corrections Andrea will send them to the Senate before the minutes are posted.

**2. Student Evaluation of Teaching Form**

Approximately 23 faculty members commented on the two proposed student evaluation of teaching forms (the 41 question form created by the Committee and adopted for one year and the edited version of this form created by the Math Department). Of the members heard from, at least 20 comments supported the Math version of the form, although a few faculty members wanted the Senate to simply pick a form and stick with it. Changing forms made it hard to track teaching efficacy. It is important to remember that the faculty agreed to adopt the form for one year as a trial run. After one year the Senate would revisit the form and make whatever changes the faculty agreed to, to make it a fair and meaningful evaluation tool.

*The motion was made and seconded that the Senate would propose to the General Faculty the adoption of the math edition of the teaching form as the basic student evaluation of teaching form.*

The motion passed unanimously and will be presented to the General Faculty at the next Faculty meeting.

**3. Satisfaction Survey**

John Brower will disseminate the satisfaction survey this year. There was some discussion as to which questions should be eliminated or edited or if any new questions should be added. For instance,

8. *The Chancellor respects the wishes of the faculty.*

will be changed to:

*The Chancellor follows the policies and procedures as outlined in the faculty Staff Handbook*

*Question 16. Tech's web page provides a positive experience to prospective students.*  
will be dropped.

John Brower will be making the changes and will provide a copy of the new form.

#### **4. Meeting with President Dennison**

Senate members Mark Sholes, Miriam Young, Grant Mitman, Paul Conrad and Susan Leland were able to meet with President Dennison on February 28<sup>th</sup>. Key topics discussed included

A. The new, full-time Dean positions at Montana Tech.

One of the justifications for creating full-time Deans was the use of their time as fund-raisers. President Dennison was asked that, in light of this rationale, should an important part of the evaluation of the Deans focus on their fund raising. President Dennison agreed emphatically that this should be an important component of their evaluation, and success in fundraising should be a component of their continued employment as Deans.

B. Communication on Campus

President Dennison agreed that all committees on the Montana Tech campus should post their minutes regularly. At this point, only a few committees do so.

C. Administrative Updates

President Dennison recommended that either the Chancellor or Vice-Chancellor be invited to give a 5-10 minute update to the Faculty Senate at the beginning of each meeting.

D. Weekly "No-Host" TGIF

President Dennison suggested that Montana Tech adopt the UM policy of a weekly TGIF that provides a chance for relaxed, collegial interactions on a regular basis.

## **5. Board of Regents Meeting**

Grant gave a brief report on the recent BOR meeting in Dillon. A few of the items discussed included the transferability of credits between campuses, faculty salaries and CUPA.

- Last year there was a huge push to make all courses transferable, and in effect, interchangeable, between all units of the MUS. In essence the BOR decided that at this point transferability was a desirable goal and it is probably as good as possible at this point. (Historical note: This effort was instigated by a student complaint that courses taken at one campus were not accepted at another campus. There was strong opposition to this move from many faculty members at different campuses who believe that not all courses are taught with equal rigor on all campuses.)
- The BOR had been misinformed about salary equity on the various campuses and had been led to believe that salaries at MSU and UM were at 99% of their peer colleges and at Montana Tech was at 85% of their peer colleges. These numbers were not accurate.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:15 PM