Montana Tech Faculty Senate Meeting
Wednesday, September 28, 2016 - 3:30-5pm

Senators present: Jim Aspevig, Stella Capoccia, Abhishek Choudhury, Conor Cote, Bill Drury, John Getty, Atish Mitra, Scott Risser, Jackie Timmer, Michael Webb, George Williams, Laura Young, Miriam Young

Guest: Matt Egloff

I. Welcome and Minutes
   1. Quorum met
   2. Review of previous meeting minutes
   3. Motion (John Getty; 2nd Miriam Young): To approve minutes
   4. Vote: Motion carried unanimously

II. Curriculum Review Request (see attached)
   1. Scott Risser presented a CRC request from the PTC department for an undergraduate Research Methods course. The course has been reviewed and approved by the CRC, though there was some discussion by the CRC about the course not incorporating enough Quantitative methods. Several senators supported teaching more Qualitative research methods.
   2. Motion (John Getty; 2nd Bill Drury): For Faculty Senate to approve CRC request.
   3. Vote: Motion carried unanimously

III. Academic Dishonesty and Student Behavior Policies
   1. Current policies:
      i. Student Conduct
      ii. Student Handbook
   2. Specific Proposals for Changes from Senators:
      i. "The faculty senate shall create a workgroup to update the Academic Dishonesty policy of Montana Tech. The members of this group will include four faculty members representing the four academic colleges, two appointments from ASMT, the VCAA, the Dean of Students, and the Director of Student Success. This group will have a draft policy for Senate and ASMT review by November 2nd."
      ii. "The senate requests that Provost allocate some monies for training members of campus as test proctors. This same pool of proctors can be used for the F.E. or large academic test taking."

      iii. "The FS asks that cameras be added to the SUB conference rooms, MG 204, and the Library Auditorium for the purpose test monitoring and loss prevention."

3. Senate Discussion
    i. Scott Risser presented the above proposals submitted by faculty for Senate discussion.
    ii. Proposal (ii)
        1. Bill Drury commented on proposal (ii), suggesting that money be available to pay proctors in addition to training. Proctors should be paid, otherwise how would you recruit qualified proctors? FE exam proctors are paid. John Getty asked how this currently works for faculty who are proctors? Is this considered a course overload?
        2. Miriam Young said there should be a testing center on campus to accommodate exams. It can be difficult to schedule a room on the Main Campus that is appropriate for testing. Student accommodation requirements can make this even more difficult. The Highlands College has a testing center, why not the Main Campus?
        3. Laura Young described the testing center at Highlands College. It is a centralized location that allows for computerized testing. College entry exams and COMPASS tests are administered there. Online nursing assistant certification exams are held there.
        4. Scott Risser said that Paul Beatty and Joyce O'Neill have been invited to an upcoming Senate meeting, so that would be a good time for the Senate to ask about the testing center as well as student accommodations.
    iii. Proposal (i)
        1. John Getty said he supported proposal (i), it is serious work. Stella Capoccia said that the outcome should aim for clear written expectations and parameters. She provided the Senate with a plagiarism quiz that was used at Rutgers. She likes this example because it provides clear and distinct definitions of Academic Dishonesty that are pulled directly from policy.
        2. Scott Risser asked what the Senate would like to see come from this workgroup.
        3. Matt Egloff would like to see specific guidelines for handling situations. Legal counsel should be sought to determine the appropriate actions to take. He said that for exams he provides guidelines to proctors in order to minimize interruptions. Scott Risser said that these suggestions might fall under the proposal (ii) to provide training to proctors.
        4. Stella Capoccia said that she would like to see broader policies targeted rather than having them be reviewed with a fine toothed comb.
        5. Motion (John Getty): Recommend Senate take action on proposal (i)
        6. Scott Risser asked if the motion was for proposal (i) in its entirety.

7. Conor Cote asked for clarification of the four colleges mentioned in the proposal. Scott Risser said it refers to SME, CLSPS, Highlands College, and the Graduate School.

8. John Getty added that the workgroup should review the Academic Dishonesty sanction processes in addition to the policy itself. Stella Capoccia agreed that these issues concern more than just policy, suggesting that "sanctions, and processes" be added to the proposal.

9. Miriam Young said that the November 2nd deadline is not enough time to complete this work. Scott Risser asked what would be an appropriate timeline? John Getty suggested January 2017.

10. Motion (John Getty; 2nd Stella Capoccia): Senate recommend proposal (i) with the following changes:

    a. "The faculty senate shall create a workgroup to update the Academic Dishonesty policy, **sanctions, and processes** of Montana Tech. The members of this group will include four faculty members representing the four academic colleges, two appointments from ASMT, the VCAA, the Dean of Students, and the Director of Student Success. This group will have a draft policy for Senate and ASMT review by **January 2017.**"

11. Vote: Motion carried, unanimous

iv. Proposal (iii)

1. Scott Risser asked the for the Senate's thoughts on the proposal to place cameras in some of the larger classrooms.

2. Abhishek Choudhury asked that signal jamming be considered a viable option. He suggested that the college go high-tech to resolve these problems. For example, remodeling to create signal-blocking classrooms.

3. Scott Risser said one problem with signal jammers is that some students might be using a signal for good reason. Abhishek Choudhury responded that the jammer can be localized so that students can step outside if they have to take a call. A landline could be installed nearby in case of an emergency. Miriam Young suggested that if students are need to be available for a call then perhaps they should not be taking the test that day.

4. Stella Capoccia asked how jammers would affect individual cell phone use on campus. Abhishek Chodhury said they can be localized to a small area and are commercially available. John Getty asked about the legality of signal jammers and suggested that the Senate look into the technology and research what is available. Matt Egloff said the FCC may have issues with jammers but some rooms on campus are already a "Faraday cage" like the basement of ELC. Others rooms could be remodeled for this purpose. Many of the rooms on campus are showing

their age. Some rooms could be redesigned so that there is a more of a gap between table and seating rows.

5. John Getty suggested that cameras are a separate consideration. The proposal for cameras in major classrooms seems like a doable and reasonable expense. In addition to the fixed cameras in large classrooms, he suggested portable cameras that could be set up in smaller rooms as need.

6. Stella Capoccia said that on campus you can record as long as you post a notice. Even if it is not actually recording, the presence of a camera could deter cheating.

7. John Getty motioned that the proposal be submitted to the administration, but are the rooms listed in the proposal enough? Stella Capoccia suggested adding CBB 101. Abhishek Choudhury suggested that the recommendation be based on room capacity over a certain size. The Senate continued to discuss the size of specific rooms and the appropriateness of cameras for those rooms.

8. Scott Risser suggested a senator speak to Janet Friesz in Enrollment Services for a list of rooms over a certain number. John Getty withdrew his motion to send the proposal to the administration until that information is obtained. He asked what would be the magic number? Abhishek Chodhoury offered to contact Enrollment Services. He will try to get a list of rooms based on three different size tiers and will bring that back to the Senate.

IV. Training Recommendations

1. Scott Risser received the following proposal for faculty training on Academic Dishonesty.

   i. "The FS requests that staff senate schedule two "Lunch and Learn" sessions focused on student cheating. The topics should include: 1) Preventing academic dishonesty and promoting academic honesty through course syllabi and assessments. 2) Being prepared for test cheating – A Proctor's guide to clever test takers and their cellphones."

2. Scott Risser asked what kind of training would the Senate would like to recommend for faculty, if any? Stella Capoccia suggested something similar to the Safety training that all faculty and staff receive would be helpful. A detailed presentation that would place attendees on a list of certified proctors. Jim Aspevig suggested that the Senate determine the experts on this topic on campus and ask them to participate in this training.

3. Matt Egloff offered to pull together the resources he has on this topic. He already provides guidelines for his proctors, for example: how to handle cheating when it is identified; assigned seating; names marking exams; signaling; privacy issues; and test conditions. On the other hand, proctors are flown out for training for the FE exam, shouldn't there be external resources available for this kind of training?

4. Miriam Young noted that as far as test cheating is concerned, the legal interpretation she has seen is that 50% of the responsibility falls on the instructor. The Nursing Department faculty has agreed to standardize testing for this reason. The instructor's responsibility lies with how they establish a testing environment. For example, making sure the test space is adequate, assigning seating, and ensuring that students turn over any items not required for testing.

5. Scott Risser said that the administration has the right to call a campus meeting once a semester that faculty are required to attend. This could be an opportunity to bring an external trainer in to get everyone on the same page.

6. Conor Cote liked this idea, as the Lunch & Learning series might not be well attended enough to be impactful.

V. Invitations for Meeting Guests

1. Scott Risser asked if the Senate wanted to extend an invitation to meet with Provost Abbott at the next meeting. The Senate discussed inviting him as the chair of the Academic Standards Committee in a previous meeting in order to discuss the role of the Committee and its processes. Faculty Senate meetings are open, so a direct invitation is not required.

2. Conor Cote said it would make sense to extend an invite, so that the Senate can prepare questions in advance. John Getty said that the Senate has discussed questions for the administration and he would like to see them answered.

3. Motion (Stella Capoccia; 2nd Abhishek Choudhury): For the Senate to invite Provost Abbott to the next Senate meeting.

4. Vote: Motion carried, 12 in favor, 1 abstained

Informational Items

VI. Feedback on Maxient (online Student Conduct Form – See attached from Melissa Kump)

1. Scott Risser shared a response from Melissa Kump to the Senate's request that the Student Conduct reporting page be made more user friendly. The form currently allows reporting multiple students at the same time. It does not sync with the Student Information System do to FERPA considerations. Currently the reporting faculty or staff member will need to enter their Name and ID, but this enhancement request will be shared with the vendor Maxient.

2. Matt Egloff encouraged the faculty to continue to ask for improvements to the system. Scott Risser recommended being cautious for now and allowing the system to become more widely adopted before asking for too many changes. This will prevent having to undo changes later.

VII. Other Business

1. Meeting Times

   i. Scott Risser asked if the Senate would like to meet in one week or to return to the normal bi-weekly schedule. Conor Cote said that attendance has dropped a

bit since we've gone to weekly meetings, it might help attendance if the Senate returned to bi-weekly meetings.

ii. Abhishek Choudhury asked whether the Senate would consider an alternative meeting time, as he teaches during the current regular Senate meeting time. He asked if the Senate would consider returning to 7am meetings? Scott Risser pointed out that the 7am meeting time is difficult for faculty members with families and is outside of most regular work schedules. Conor Cote mentioned that Senate meeting attendance has been strong so far this year, so the current time may be what works for most people. Scott Risser mentioned that the faculty requested a "dead-time" during the week in the past and this request was turned down. Scott suggested Senators speak to their department heads to arrange a schedule that would allow them to attend.

iii. Scott Risser said that based on this discussion the Senate will return to the bi-weekly schedule, but that he will send out another online poll for availability to try to determine a secondary meeting time.

iv. The Senate's next meeting will be held on October 12th

2. Full Faculty meeting

i. Scott Risser would like the Senate to hold a Full Faculty Senate meeting soon to discuss items brought up by the results of last year's Faculty and Student Satisfaction Survey, and to provide a formal update of the Senate's activities so far this year. Based on the Senate's current schedule the Full Faculty meeting would be tentatively held on October 26th. This should give the Senate time to prepare an agenda and materials for review.

3. Additional Comments

i. Matt Egloff added that this summer was an overwhelming and unexpected circumstance for faculty and staff that encountered a sudden spike in student cheating. However it was ultimately a success as the cheaters did not succeed. This was due to faculty and staff efforts and support of one another, and hopefully it was a learning experience that will prevent this from happening again.

ii. Scott Risser asked senators to send him any questions they have for the administration in advance of the next Senate meeting on October 12th.

4. Adjourn

i. Motion (Miriam Young; 2nd Conor Cote)

ii. Meeting adjourned