

Faculty Senate Minutes  
4/5/2018  
2 p.m.– 3:30 p.m.  
Chancellor's Lounge, Mill Building

Attendance: Kahlid Mia, Courtney Young, Dave Gurchiek, Scott Risser, Charie Faught, Katharine Zodrow, Dan Autenrieth, Micah Gjeltama, Vickie Petritz, Jackie Timmer, Miriam Young, Glen Southergill, Phil Curtiss, Laurie Battle, Ron White, Karen Weisenburg-Ward, Andrew Thomas

I. Welcome and Minutes

- a. Draft Minutes found here: <http://www.mtech.edu/about/facultysenate/minutes/index.htm>

Motion to approve the minutes and seconded. Comment about being cautious about changing Faculty Staff Handbook. Motion was to have a subcommittee, but concern that may be too far into HR. Comment that it is our handbook, but also like CBA and should not be concerned about changing it. Motion Passes.

**Action Items**

II. Faculty Satisfaction Survey

Chair received two comments about adding WIRE and PP process, as part of the new survey.

- a. Changes- Draft version has a few new people, but questions the same. Recommendation to remove question about retaining for the Dean's, Directors, others, for new people. Question about receiving questionnaire twice (designed to take only once for one supervisor/program, etc.). Recommendation to break out areas such as athletics and graduate school. Goal is to receive feedback. Recommendation to add a suggestion area on how they addressed the charter section to WIRE, to include the charter of the group. Recommendation to do the same for Program Prioritization. Comment about CTS not reflective of the different groups, but will be changing in the future. Recommendation to keep CTS question. Recommendation to separate question on library services. Question about adding Vanessa Van Dyke as another person (as opposed to a single question). Recommendation to keep as is. Comment that campus security is a high concern for students in a recent survey. Recommend leaving as is. Comment regarding common hour, but a problem with certain programs with clinical rotation. No objection, but recommend language on pros and cons like a ballot and to remove the neutral (may be stricken given time constraints). Recommendation to add a question about FS to work with ASMT on a common hour (but may also be an e-mail instead). In the past have included a comment section for every section and group, and can add to faculty senate. Can add a prompt if negative comments or high feedback. No opposition to keep comment section for each person and group.

b. Preview:

[https://montanatech.co1.qualtrics.com/jfe/preview/SV\\_bef2cYsUIXqrZgF?Q\\_SurveyVersionID=current&Q\\_CHL=preview](https://montanatech.co1.qualtrics.com/jfe/preview/SV_bef2cYsUIXqrZgF?Q_SurveyVersionID=current&Q_CHL=preview)

- c. Deployment – Officers will work to send out by April 9th and submit by the 20th. Motion to deploy as written and seconded. Motion passes.

d. Dissemination- In the past have provided incentive, but no indication of improved rate. System does allow to send reminders. Request that senators prompt faculty to take. Concern that tenure track do not fill out for fear of retaliation. Potential to give a paper copy to fill out that can turn in and enter in manually (not concerned about turning in more than one ballot). Recommendation that central spot to enter as opposed to individual faculty.

III. CRC Recommendations – none at this time

V. Committee updates:

a. Program Prioritization Committee- see attached agenda items.

Charie Faught and Vickie Petritz reported on committee activities, starting with rankings of departments, and how they were performed. The Delaware Study data (external data) were also part of the information. Currently the committee does not have definitive plans and are not sure what to do with the rankings. The intent is that the rankings are about efficiency that need to be supplemented. This week the committee went back to working on “low hanging fruit” such as low enrollment classes and how the deans should handle determining when these classes should and should not be offered.

Comment that the process of ranking is “silo-ing and offensive”, and pits departments against each other. Further, if no action is to be taken, why use the data. Comment that we are at our finest when collaborative and communicate. Comment that it is useful to not be in a position for the e-mail to drop (would like to be more in the loop as opposed to the e-mail method currently using). More than one comment that the process is not constructive as it stands. Response that the rankings will be used, but that the committee is not sure what we are doing with it now, and that the committee with review quality measures as well.

Comment that departments are agonizing over results, with perhaps no reason. Fear that decisions will be made in the summer without input. Motion to recommend the committee not take any action until additional information is reviewed by faculty senate in the fall semester. Comment about low enrollment classes as part of the halt. Comment that moving through process is important. Motion withdrawn.

Comment on why rank and do nothing with it. Concern that only a small snapshot in time, and not representative. Comment that the committee has very little representation of faculty. Concern that decisions like mergers should be run through departments to have their say. Departments want to be part of the process and have input. Important thing that mergers should be processed carefully for good fits. Another comment that the concept of mergers can also be exciting. Concern that combining could be disastrous, with the example of University of Idaho no longer having the school of mines. Ultimately a poor alignment can impact on students choosing programs.

Question about high expense programs to be addressed in further review. Comment about looking at similar schools and common practices to determine future prospects. Need to look outside the institution to best practices in other schools. Greatest threat is to low enrollment and industries with volatile swings, how to balance for the benefit of the school. Also need to look at departments that have alumni that give (which has been presented). Trying to determine if this is an indicator for a larger evaluation or to make decisions.

Question about responses on collecting additional information and how they will be evaluated. Question regarding department mergers, many open questions. Response that the committee is right now just talking about options. Assuming a consolidation, how is the new evaluation going to look like?

Concern that the committee is missing a framework. Comment about great scholarships as a factor. Also a comment about low faculty to student ratio being of value. Committee should be setting the agenda and evaluation process, rather than reversed. Recommendation to bring feedback to the committee. Comment about having a merger considered without the framework may not have any benefit. Comments that currently not being productive. Comment that combining departments may be a culture shift, which may create

new opportunities. Looking to answer what program prioritization is going to benefit the campus. Good should also be measured. Outputs and objectives should be outlined.

Comment that “it is awful” on campus. Most departments have academic standards, such as service and teaching quality, that was not measured. Not everything being ranked, still questioning the goal. Recommend questionnaire/fill in the blank based on outcomes. Want to have rationale behind mergers, and may not have good management decisions with large combined departments. Comment about dual appointment model to share faculty, rather than combine departments. Other strategies should be considered. Would like to see the plan when decisions are made (investments and redirections).

Faculty Senate to communicate information to committee to address the concerns as listed above.

b. WIRE-

Glen Southergill report presented (see agenda attachment). Name change does not change shared services. Leadership team will decide on the one name from the three from the recommendations. Question about process in which leadership will decide the name (not sure at this time). WIRE will also have a series of public forums to discuss. WIRE will recommend one name. Board of Regents would have to approve. Will not be changing our branded name of Montana Tech. Request may be sent to May BOR meeting. Comment that preamble is just science and engineering (technology is the combination of the two). Also acknowledged past as School of Mines. Interested in bringing community together, so technology is a unity concept. Comment that Montana Tech is a small school, should reflect who we are and be realistic (what we could be). Comment about FS endorsing the process to help the BOR process in a future meeting. Trying to get feedback before May meeting. Recommend that WIRE send a document for us to endorse (document is in agenda).

c. Student Evaluations Sub-Committee – Glen Southergill looking for feedback about support or not of the process. Two categories: very helpful or no feedback. Hope that all feedback will be provided so that can move forward. Glen will send a reminder e-mail.

d. Teaching Community Leadership Team – have met, will look at assessment and educational technology. No word on third topic. Will be brown bag lunch format.

e. Research Mentors- Will meet tomorrow. Hopefully will be as constructive.

## Discussion Items

VI. Topics for full Faculty Meeting Spring 18 – Still need to schedule.

a. Amend Bylaws to subtract General Engineering seat and add seats for Civil Engineering and Mechanical Engineering

VII. Other Items – Next Meeting April 19, will include a transition of senators. VC and Secretary to contact for those whose terms are expiring (Miriam Young has been voted on for another term). Will also do officer elections on the 19th.