

Faculty Senate Minutes  
4/19/2018  
2 p.m.– 4:00 p.m.  
Chancellor's Lounge (Mill 201)

Attendance: Scott Risser, Charie Faught, Dan Authenrieth, Peter Lucon, Ron White, Stella Capoccia, Karen Wesenburg - Ward, Miriam Young, Glen Southergill, Tony Patrick, Phil Curtiss, Chad Okrusch, Scott Risser, Brian Kukay, Dave Gurchiek, Doug Abbott, Courtney Young, Rita Spear, Katherine Zodrow, Atish Mitra

I. Welcome and Minutes

a. Incoming and Outgoing Senators

Based on the list on the website- Along with those present, e-mails were sent to those whose terms needed to be renewed or changed, with e-mail confirmations and those present confirming. Chad Okrusch will be the senator for PTC. Atish Mitra has confirmed that he will be senator for two more years. Vickie Petritz will also serve another two years. Vacancies include General Studies, Adjunct Faculty, Electrical Engineering, and Geological Engineering.

b. Draft Minutes found here: <http://www.mtech.edu/about/facultysenate/minutes/index.htm> . Motion to approve pending updates to attendance and seconded. Motion passes.

**Action Items**

II. Emeritus Recommendations- no formal presentation at this time.

III. CRC Recommendations

a. Agenda/Minutes

b. Changes to Mining Engineering curriculum and courses (pt. 1)

c. Changes to Mining Engineering curriculum and courses (pt. 2)

d. Changes to Civil Engineering curriculum (with new course), Environmental Engineering curriculum, GPHY prerequisites, and Geological Engineering curriculum.

e. Changes to Biological Sciences (Cell and Molecular track) curriculum and add GRMN 201.

Move to approve all CRC recommendations and seconded. Motion passes.

IV. GERC Recommendations

a. M 105

b. HSTR 207

Question regarding M 105 being a part of a curriculum. Response that from may apply to transferring non-science majors and may apply to Liberal Studies. Comment that HSTR was a science and technology course for a long time, and can give an opportunity for coordination of the course. Move to approve both courses as Gen Ed courses and seconded. Motion passes. Will be forwarded to registrar for adding to the catalogue.

V. Senate Officers

a. Chair- Tony Patrick and Scott Risser nominated. Tony Patrick does not accept the nomination. Scott Risser has been elected to serve another term.

b. Vice Chair- Stella Cappoccia nominated and accepts the nomination. Stella Cappoccia has been elected to serve.

c. Secretary- Charie Faught nominated and Dan Autenrieth nominated. Dan Autenrieth declines. Charie Faught has been elected to serve another term.

**Informational Items**

VI. Committee updates:

a. Program Prioritization Committee –

Presented by Charie Faught- Committee discussed UM article with a brief discussion on the draft strategy plan (not enough time to review for an in-depth discussion).

Reviewed what UM is planning vs. what we have considered.

Comment at meeting that we should consider scale (as UM depts. Are much larger).

Considered Communities of Excellence, which we have not considered to this point.

Division head re-organization was part of the UM plan.

A comment was made that Tech will also need monetary cuts “proportionate” to what UM is considering (comment that we are not in the same position as UM and that the plan is not necessarily a “best practice” since it is done under duress without known outcomes, with response that orgs only do PP if there is a “dire” situation. One example of one that is now in the progress report stage is Northern Illinois).

Discussed ETS as a possible quality measure, with no support for it being used as such (since it reviews gen ed as opposed to specific programs). No further input into quality measures (other than having publications added).

Discussed reviewing enrollment and degrees by major (which really is more about efficiency). PPC seems to be leaning more towards efficiency to distinguish programs- concern that quality and opportunity not being addressed.

Brief discussion on meeting over the summer. Concern raised that faculty input not available, with comment that “faculty check their e-mail in the summer”.

Comment made to review Faculty Senate concerns, which was not discussed at the meeting.

Doug Abbott addressed during the meeting the response to the faculty senate concerns to be patient regarding the process. Concern one addressed rankings, but no further action at this time. Faculty and departments will have input and that it is an iterative process. Concern three about mergers- no discussion about merging departments in PPC, just brought forth as ideas. Committee is not very far down the process as the issues might suggest. The process will be a one to two year discussion. Abbott requests patience in the process and that input will be asked for.

Concern raised about “right sizing” and “low hanging fruit” and May recommendations. Response that we are beyond the date where positions will be cut for next year. Charge of the committee is in the first overview.

Comment regarding the use of PPC as a process and not a budgeting concern. Fear is that people will lose jobs, that will be ranked into “winners and losers” to no actual purpose or plan. Disheartening that has happened “to no good end”. Campus really needs a strategy and a process moving forward. One comment is that ideas may not be sent if not being used. Response that Computer Science program will not be cut at Montana Tech (per Chancellor Blackletter). Ranking will not necessarily be used for identifying programs that will be cut. Comment that use of “low hanging fruit” as a term should not be used because it may involve someone’s job.

Recommendation that communication moving forward should be considered if programs are being cut.

Comment that members have an agenda and have a list of those they would like to cut is a concern (adding more metrics until those they want to cut are highlighted).

Question regarding what work will happen over the summer. Response that Montana Tech faculty check e-mails over the summer, and that we need to keep up momentum. Plan on keeping with plan moving forward. Would not make major recommendations over the summer when faculty are not on contract.

#### b. WIRE

Since the last meeting, the group continued receiving feedback with constituents, both internally and externally about name change and that rebrand does not change shared services. Solidified to the three names previously discussed, recommendations will be sent to the chancellor. Question regarding a vote for supporting the process (as opposed to a particular name). Comment of feeling strongly to leave engineering as part of the name.

Comment that MTU is too narrow, but that MUSET is more inclusive. Comment that most donors are engineers, so should keep it. Comment that alumni was supportive of same name.

#### c. Student Evaluations Sub-Committee – see attached slides.

Final update for the term. Had productive conversations at the committee. Feedback received from departments, which is not a binding vote. Low response rate from departments, with some support and some qualified support, and most not supported. Glen Southergill will no longer be on the Faculty Senate, but he is

willing to forward the information to a new group. May be a reasonable goal to look at the interface, but may be more difficult to change questions. Comment that nursing does not use same student survey, the nursing survey is based on the course and program objectives and competencies. Response that it is good to know about the approach and the ability to improve the nursing department based on the surveys. Comment that it was talked about in a specific department, but did not forward feedback (was not aware that it was required). One department comment that it should be live/paper (unanimous in the department) and to also use an incentive. Comment that miscommunication may have occurred, but will confirm. The information was sent out in an e-mail and discussed in the last Faculty Senate Meeting. Recommend that it be brought up at a future meeting to determine path moving forward. Comment that ASMT have made this an issue, but that the change of officers evaporate the effort. Encourage connection with ASMT to gain feedback.

d. Teaching Community Leadership Team – (also part of Faculty Meeting Slides)

Group met this week and gave a framework with input from others such as dean's council. The group agreed a dual purpose to bring new faculty into academic pedagogy and also to share ideas. The group will be asking for incentives to attend, such as providing lunches. Question regarding use of uniform syllabi, response that topic should be a "best practice". Fall activities are being set, with more for the spring.

e. Research Mentors – (also part of Faculty Meeting Slides)

Met for the first time, who wanted to be responsive to new faculty. Comment that group decided that Amy Kuenzi will be leading the group.

## Discussion Items

VII. Topics for full Faculty Meeting Spring 18 – See attached presentation. Adding approvals from the meeting.

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

VIII. Other Items

Faculty Senate Survey is live with a 95 person responses as of today out of 174. Currently around a 36% response rate, which is in the range of being valid and reliable, but don't know if representative of the different areas. Request to remind colleagues to take the survey. Concern that not may not be anonymous, with reminder that paper copy is available. Request to extend the deadline.





# Spring Faculty Meeting

April 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2018

3 p.m.

MG 204



# Agenda



- I. Welcome
- II. Action Items – Approval of Graduates and Senate Seats Proposal
- III. Senate Activities
- IV. WIRE Presentation of Formal Name Change
- V. Faculty Feedback

I.

# Welcome and Reminders

You can find information concerning Senate Activities here:

Main Page: <http://www.mtech.edu/about/facultysenate/>

Agenda: <http://www.mtech.edu/about/facultysenate/agendas.htm>

Minutes: <http://www.mtech.edu/about/facultysenate/minutes/index.htm>

Senators: <http://www.mtech.edu/about/facultysenate/senators.htm>

II.

# Approval of Graduates



# Senate Membership Proposal

Current	Proposed
<p><b>Article III. Membership</b> (Art. III, Sec.1 replaced by following according to faculty action 10/21/2011. Revised according to faculty action 4/24/2016.)</p> <p><b>SECTION 1:</b></p> <p>The Faculty Senate shall consist of 26 members composed as follows:</p> <p>School of Mines and Engineering Faculty.....9 Senators            College of Letters, Science, and Prof. Studies Faculty..... 9 Senators            Highlands College Faculty.....4 Senators            Research &amp; Library Faculty.....3 Senators            Adjunct Faculty.....1 Senator</p> <p>The representation shall be subdivided and elected at the department level as follows:</p> <p><u>School of Mines and Engineering</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.Electrical Engineering</li> <li>2.Geological Engineering</li> <li>3.Geophysical Engineering</li> <li>4.General Engineering</li> <li>5.Metallurgical and Materials Engineering</li> <li>6.Environmental Engineering</li> <li>7.Mining Engineering</li> <li>8.Petroleum Engineering</li> <li>9.Safety Health and Industrial Hygiene</li> </ol>	<p><b>Article III. Membership</b> (Art. III, Sec.1 replaced by following according to faculty action 10/21/2011. Revised according to faculty action 4/23/2018.)</p> <p><b>SECTION 1:</b></p> <p>The Faculty Senate shall consist of 27 members composed as follows:</p> <p>School of Mines and Engineering Faculty.....10 Senators            College of Letters, Science, and Prof. Studies Faculty..... 9 Senators            Highlands College Faculty.....4 Senators            Research &amp; Library Faculty.....3 Senators            Adjunct Faculty.....1 Senator</p> <p>The representation shall be subdivided and elected at the department level as follows:</p> <p><u>School of Mines and Engineering</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.Electrical Engineering</li> <li>2.Geological Engineering</li> <li>3.Geophysical Engineering</li> <li>4.General Engineering</li> <li>4.Metallurgical and Materials Engineering</li> <li>5.Environmental Engineering</li> <li>6.Mining Engineering</li> <li>7.Petroleum Engineering</li> <li>8.Safety Health and Industrial Hygiene</li> <li>9.Civil Engineering</li> <li>10.Mechanical Engineering</li> </ol>

# Senate Activities

- a. Approved curriculum changes in the following programs and courses:
  - i. Behavioral/Mental Health Technician
  - ii. Biological Sciences
  - iii. Materials Science
  - iv. Safety Health & Industrial Hygiene
  - v. Business Information Technology
  - vi. Mining Engineering
  - vii. Civil Engineering
  - viii. Environmental Engineering
  - ix. Geological Engineering
  
- b. Approved recommendations for additional courses in the General Education Core:
  - i. Contemporary Mathematics – M 105 (Mathematics)
  - ii. Science and Technology in World History – HSTR 207 (Humanities & Fine Arts)

# Senate Activities

- c. Heard discussions on the following topics:
  - c. Complete College America ([Cvath@mtech.edu](mailto:Cvath@mtech.edu))
  - d. Student evaluation subcommittee ([Gsouthergill@mtech.edu](mailto:Gsouthergill@mtech.edu))
  - e. Proposal of a Common Hour ([ASMT.president@mtech.edu](mailto:ASMT.president@mtech.edu))
  - f. Underfunding of Montana Tech Library ([SJuskiewicz@mtech.edu](mailto:SJuskiewicz@mtech.edu))
  - g. Creating a process for Affiliated Faculty Members ([Bhartline@mtech.edu](mailto:Bhartline@mtech.edu))
  - h. Created the option for programs to have a required “core” set of classes required to be taken at Tech ([DTrudnowski@mtech.edu](mailto:DTrudnowski@mtech.edu))
  - i. Reviewed Research Integrity Policy ([Bhartline@mtech.edu](mailto:Bhartline@mtech.edu))
  - j. Inclusive Access for Textbooks ([LVandel@mtech.edu](mailto:LVandel@mtech.edu))
  - k. Budget Update ([Bwright@mtech.edu](mailto:Bwright@mtech.edu))
  - l. Student Satisfaction Inventory 2017 & 2019 ([Cvath@mtech.edu](mailto:Cvath@mtech.edu))
  - m. Changes to Faculty/Staff Handbook ([MEgloff@mtech.edu](mailto:MEgloff@mtech.edu))

III.

## Senate Activities

- d. Recommended Emeritus Rank:
  - d. John Morrison
  - e. Hsin-Hsiung Huang
  - f. Bill Drury
  - g. Bill Spath

# Senate Activities

## e. Creation of a Montana Tech **Teaching Community**

- i. The Montana Tech Faculty Senate shall establish a community of practice for pedagogical improvement. In the spring of 2018 the Faculty Senate shall appoint a leadership team to plan the structure, content, and schedule for this community. This team shall utilize evidenced-based best practices in higher education as guidance for this planning. Thereafter, the leadership team shall be appointed annually each April by the Faculty Senate from the full-time faculty, with special consideration given to Rose and Anna Busch Award recipients and Teaching Merit Award winners. This community will be open to all Montana Tech faculty beginning fall 2018.
- ii. Members: Thomas Camm, Katie Hailer, Julie Hart, Hilary Risser, and Bill Ryan
- iii. Sample Activities:
  - *“Finding your voice as an instructor”* Syllabus design, setting expectations, choosing course policies, choosing effective activities for class time, working with accreditation, etc.
  - *“Giving Timely Feedback”* Writing good exam questions, different types of feedback that can be provided, communicating grades to students, etc.
  - *“What to do when things go wrong”* How to get honest feedback from students, how to adapt when grades on an assignment are too low, what to do when you are behind, etc.

# Senate Activities

- f. Creation of a Montana Tech **Research Mentorship Program**, *partnership with Sigma Xi*
  - i. The Montana Tech Faculty Senate shall establish a mentorship program for fostering interdisciplinary scholarship and increasing successful research. In the spring of 2018 the Faculty Senate shall appoint mentor leaders to plan the structure, content, and schedule for this community. This team shall utilize evidenced-based best practices in higher education as guidance for this planning. Thereafter, these lead mentors shall be appointed annually each April by the Faculty Senate from the full time faculty, with special consideration given to Distinguished Researcher Award recipients and Research Merit Award winners. This mentorship program will be open to all full-time Montana Tech faculty beginning fall 2018.
  - ii. Members: Jerry Downey, Amy Kuenzi, Trisha Southergill (ex-officio), Ron White, and Katherine Zodrow
  - iii. Work with incoming and research-oriented junior faculty (as identified through Seed Grant proposals) on developing activities/program.

## IV.

# History of Montana Tech Names

- ▶ 1900 – founded as the *Montana State School of Mines*
- ▶ 1965 – Name is changed to *Montana College of Mineral Science and Technology*
- ▶ 1994 – During reorganization of the Montana University System, *Montana Tech* becomes affiliated with the *University of Montana* and is renamed *Montana Tech of the University of Montana*

## IV.

# Name Change Process

- ▶ Summer 2017: WIRE researched names of institutions across the United States that have similar scopes and missions. This research was used to generate a list of possible names
- ▶ October 2017 – January 2018: WIRE asked for and received feedback on the list of possible names
- ▶ March 2018: WIRE revised the list of possible names using feedback gathered
- ▶ April 2018: WIRE began collecting feedback from a wide range of groups including both on campus and off campus stakeholders

IV.

# MONTANA TECH

Branded Name  
Remains

Scope of a  
University  
(AAS, BS, MS, PhD)

Special Focus  
Designation

Shared Services  
Continue

#### IV.

### **Branded Name – Montana Tech Proposed Formal Name List -**

- Montana University of Science and Technology
- Montana Technological University
- Montana University of Science, Engineering, and Technology

v.

# Faculty Feedback



# Update From Faculty Senate Sub-Committee on Student End of Course Surveys

Final Presentation before the 2017-18 Senate

April 2018

# Background

- Charged by 2016-17 Senate to continue the work of prior Senates by developing recommendations for potential improvements to the End of Course Survey System (“Student Evaluation of Teaching” or “SET”).
- Drafted significant potential revisions to the purpose, instrument, and functionalities of SET based on published best practices and literatures, faculty feedback, and extensive conversation within the committee.
- The sub-committee requested faculty feedback from all represented departments in March 2018 (and accepted responses until early April) before drafting a suggested action plan.
- Today will provide an overview on the faculty responses to our last call for feedback, and suggestions from the sub-committee chair on potential ways to proceed.

# Faculty Feedback

- Conducted from March – April 2018.
- Written responses requests.
- All Senators reminded to discuss with their departments.
- Not a binding vote, but an indicator of faculty support (support, qualified support, do not support).

# Faculty Feedback

- Response rate = 35% (9 departmental responses out of 26 represented).
  - If we could two individual responses that did not clearly state whether representative of department or not, the response rate rises to 42%. Both would be best counted as “qualified support” with good questions/comments.
- 3 departments supported, 2 offered qualified support, and 4 did not support.

# Next Steps

- Senator Southergill will be succeeded by Dr. Chad Okrusch in the next Senate.
- The AY18-19 Senate may charge a new committee to continue the existing work, in whole or in part (next slide will elaborate with Southergill's suggestion).
- All materials developed and feedback received to date can be made available to the AY18-19 Senate by request.

# Remarks by the Sub-Committee Chair

- The low response rate **may** indicate systemic issues between the Senate and the faculty, and/or within departments. The AY18-19 Senate may wish to explore this further (see also the forthcoming Faculty Senate Survey).
- Faculty seem generally comfortable with interface improvements with existing student survey data and to the existing tool, provided the “paper option” is retained. **This seems like a reasonable goal for the next AY.**
- More substantive revisions to the SET’s purpose or questions received very mixed results. *Much more work will be needed to obtain sufficient faculty support for changes to the questions or philosophy of measurement.*
  - In light of forthcoming demands for Senate attention to Program Prioritization and WIRE, it may not be advisable to undertake this work right now (but that’s up to the next Senate!).

# Thank you, Sub-Committee!

- This WAS a successful result.
- Now open for questions, comments, etc.