

Faculty Senate Minutes
10/11/17
1 p.m.– 3:30
Mill 201 – Chancellor’s Lounge

Attendees

Scott Risser, Charie Faught, Rita Spear, Karen Wesenberg-Ward, Vickie Petritz, Tony Patrick, Atish Mitra, Dave Gurchieck, Abhishek Choudhury, Dan Autenrieth, Brian Kukay, Ron White, Micah Gjeltema, Rita Spear, Glen Southergill, Carrie Vath, Vanessa Van Dyk, Matt Egloff, Laura Young, Andrew Thomas, Katherine Zodrow

Welcome & Minutes

I. Welcome and Introductions

- a. Minutes for the September 9, 2017 meeting can be found here:
- b. *Motion and second to approve the minutes as written. Motion Passed.*

Action Items

II. Recommendations from the CRC

a. CRC minutes and attendance

b. CRC requests

- i. Curricula changes for AHSS and OSH- not clear that “electives” would cover gen ed requirements, but upon review did have enough math and science. Dan Autenrieth clarified electives to avoid course subs, and to have correct number of credits for the degree. The degrees still have the required amounts of math and science. Question about differences in requirements, since calculus is a requirement in other engineering programs. Can now transfer from another program without taking a lower level math or science.
- ii. Course and name change for LS
- iii. Create and change courses in Nursing
- iv. Change course requisites in EE

c. Motion to approve all of the CRC recommendations and seconded. Motion passes.

III. Appointment of member for the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee (AFTC) - “The committee considers appeals by faculty of administrative decisions that impair the faculty member’s academic freedom or violate the procedures for obtaining tenure. The committee attempts to resolve disputes in an informal manner, but formal hearings may also be held. Ordinarily, the committee will not offer judgments on the merits of a faculty member to qualify for tenure, but will only attempt to determine if the faculty member has had fair and due process in all proceedings. The committee may offer its judgments in matters concerning academic freedom. The committee submits a written report of its

findings to the appealing faculty member and the administration. Only tenured members of the faculty are eligible for membership on this committee.”

- a. *Miriam Young nominated. Matt Egloff nominated. Motion to vote by anonymous ballot. Matt Egloff won the vote.*

Informational Items

IV. Statement on Limited English Proficiency (LEP) from Dr. Vath, Dean of Students

- a. UM policy: <http://www.umt.edu/eo/equalop/lepqa.php>
- b. We have not had any known issues, but Dr. Vath provided an overview of the policy. It is not considered a learning disability. As such, disability services will not provide services, such as proctoring. Instructors get to decide, and department must provide accommodations if given. If student has been denied and believe they have a case for receiving accommodations, they can grieve to Vanessa Van Dyk. Dr. Vath stated that content related vocabulary should not come into play, as they have had exposure to vocabulary. Other types of questions, such as “discuss” and essay type questions may considerations for extra time. Since math is formula driven, students should not need extra time, as they should be familiar. Dr. Vath has a list of terms that can be used for all students, such as analyze. Also encourage that language is such that students are exposed to the terms. If a student is struggling with comprehension, should contact the instructor. Comment made that as instructors we will need to know well in advance if asking for accommodations. Question regarding what if a student passes the English Proficiency exam and asks for an accommodation. Dr. Vath commented that it may be an issue even if they do pass, and advises using exposure language. Question about document created previously from a previous meeting, which will be sent to Dr. Vath as the Dean of Students. Question about placing in the student handbook. Dr. Vath stated that LEP language does not currently exist in the handbook, but can be added. Students are advised to talk to instructors if issues arise. Question about “culturally appropriate testing”, which could be an oral exam (for example).
- c. *Motion to for Dean of Students to creating language in the Student Handbook of student responsibilities and seconded. Motion passed. Dean of students outlined the process- goes to ASMT, legal counsel, hope to be solidified by May, so back to Faculty Senate in November.*

V. Updates on our Service and Support Animal Policies from Vanessa Van Dyk, Director of HR

- a. Policy and procedures, reference guide, and student forms.
- b. Ms. Van Dyk is working on Service Animal and Emotional Support Animal Policy. Students and employees are in the same document in the draft. As a public institution we have public accommodations, but can only ask two questions to students. Further, we cannot ask for proof of need from students. With employees the requirements are different. For students, emotional support animal often functions like a service animal. The current draft allows students to have emotional support animals in halls (dorms). For employees, if supported by a doctor, employees can have in work space. We have to follow both federal and state guidelines, but since the state requirement is more generous it supersedes federal. The draft has not been to legal, but through to accommodation committee. The draft will also go to staff senate, and to Chancellor for final approval. We will also have a communication

strategy once approved. There are circumstances that we can ask animals to be removed. We can encourage that the service animal be registered, but cannot force. Exceptions are made for lab spaces and mechanical rooms. No breeds are restricted, but if violent, then can remove. Question as to why students are different for emotional support animals, Ms. Van Dyk will find out the information. Employees are protected under different laws. Currently Montana Tech has a no pet policy. The philosophy of the policy is to do the best for the University as a whole. Ms. Van Dyk requested that we send edits or comments to her via e-mail.

VI. Update from the Student Evaluations Sub-Committee from Dr. Glen Southergill, Senator for PTC/Writing

- a. Notes provided by Dr. Southergill, with thoughts on a new evaluation survey. Suggestions included: getting rid of the survey, departments and programs encouraged to revisit their own standards, ability to ask follow up questions, ability to personalize, ability to aggregate, mid-term evaluations to get early feedback, access to computer lab to proctor online version. Offered thoughts on questions and improvements, such as students required to give “due diligence”. The new survey draft has less questions than current survey, which should not take longer than 10-15 minutes, but can have some alterations. Advanced prototype did have some testing, but no further action. Brian Kukay and Abhishek Choudhury also members of the subcommittee. PA recurring problem is that not many students take the survey. Alternative is to have students take in class on a smart phone.
- b. Comment on adding student engagement, if department standards require certain standards, the engagement may lower scores, recommend a sub score instead of faculty performance score. Recommendation to add a spreadsheet or a csv file instead of a pdf. Some campuses require that must complete survey before final exam or reviewing of grades. An alternative route is that phrase of 80% requirement be removed from faculty staff handbook. Another alternative is for students to say that they “skip the survey” as a consciousness objector as part of the 80%. Can also add the question of why are you skipping, required or not required. Recommendation that students not be allowed to fill if they have not attended under a certain percentage. Recommendation to add an N/A choice for questions. Concern about submissions that are all 1s.
- c. *Dr. Southergill to send next to ASMT after changes have been made, as well as Dean’s Council.*

Discussion Items

VII. Discussion of faculty turnover and exit process with Vanessa Van Dyk, Director of HR

- a. Comment made that over 13 faculty member turnover in general engineering department in five year, as reason why we asked Ms. Van Dyk to respond.
- b. (notes)Ms. Van Dyk looked at five year attrition: 2012-4%, 2013-3.67%, 2014-7.4%, 2015- 4.1%, 2016-3.2%. Other surveys average in 2015 was 12.8%. Also includes those who retire. Divided by reason-44% other job, 25% non-renewed, 24% retirements and 7% other. Also reviewed by department and college for 2012-2015: CLSPS 17, MSE 17, Highlands 9. Higher in some departments. Also Assistant Professors 40%, Associate Professor 16%, Professor 12% , Instructor I- 21%, Instructor II- 7% and Instructor III 4%. Also divided by instructor in college and type. Not seeing any trends of high faculty turnover. Looked at other colleges, such as Purdue at 7%. Also tried to find other data sources.

- c. Since numbers are different from general engineering, curious to why numbers are different. No breakdown on leaving for another job. Ms. Van Dyk guessed that salary or research money were main factors. We do not currently have exit surveys, but often know with letter of resignation or tell us during exiting paperwork. Concern that surveys may “burn bridges”, doesn’t necessarily provide useful feedback or help them to stay. If we do exit surveys, different ways, such as HR or the manager. Can provide a questionnaire as a survey as an option. Paper exits are 30-35% participation in general. Often try to seek out information if an issue exists. Could do an exit interview upon request.
- d. Request for clarification of general engineering numbers. Potentially creates case for increasing salaries. Also potentially a department issue as opposed to a faculty senate issue that should be addressed through appropriate channels. Another suggestion is to have a faculty satisfaction survey, potentially anonymous.
- e. *Motion to recommend human services to create language for a survey for those exiting for full time faculty members and seconded. Motion passed.*
- f. *Because of the apparent discrepancies in faculty attrition within the General Engineering department, the chair recommended that Mr. Egloff and Director Van Dyk meet to reconcile these numeric differences. Both parties declined to comply with this recommendation.*

VIII. Faculty senate survey results (2017) dissemination

- a. Copies disseminated. Survey results have been presented to individuals as appropriate. Second document are changes between years. Chancellor asked for a joint meeting to also talk about the state of Tech.
- b. *Motion to request a joint faculty senate and Chancellor State of Tech meeting and seconded. Motion passes.*
- c. Topics suggestions include discussing WIRE committee progress, program prioritization, cohesiveness on Montana Tech and Highlands College, living learning center, research and where we are and we are going, updates on faculty senate activities, and survey result recommendations. Request that any other suggestions be sent by Friday, October 13 to Dr. Risser.

IX. Read comments from legal counsel and senate minutes

- a. When comments were read by the Vice Chancellor from e-mails (or paraphrased) from legal counsel at the last meeting, Vice Chancellor did not provide e-mails for record, said was “privileged document”. Concern was raised that information is being withheld, and that the reading in public makes it public (no longer privileged). Question about process and what should be considered. Paraphrased information are abbreviated in the minutes. Recommendation not to pursue, to foster an environment of trust. Recommendation to consider that comments were intended to influence deliberations. Recommendation to amend the minutes to contain further information. Comment that current minutes reflect further discussion, without complete recollection of discussion.
- b. Motion to amend last meeting minutes to include further information with language to Dr. Risser, with no further action. Motion withdrawn

X. Other Items

- a. Question about Intellectual Property form, which is being reviewed at the Research Committee.
- b. Concern about lower grades/rates of return on faculty surveys. Concern that non-tenured faculty are afraid of giving accurate feedbacks. Suggestion to ask Chancellor to address issue of fear of retaliation. A suggestion is to have less information so that people feel more comfortable/more anonymous to increase participation.
- c. Vanessa Van Dyk- New applicant tracking system now in use. No longer have to send thank you letters for applying. Also have new system for sending letters for those rejected. Also as new ways to screen applicants to remove from consideration (do not meet minimum). Now available on the web, with questionnaires. Automatically ask required and speak to the preferred requirements.