

Montana Tech Faculty Senate Meeting
Friday January 20th 2017
Pinter Room - noon-1:30pm

Attendance

Senators present: Diane Wolfgram, Glen Southergill, Tony Patrick, Scott Risser, Laura Young, Miriam Young, Vicki Petritz, Atish Mitra, Conor Cote, Dan Autenrieth, George Williams, Brian Kukay, Michael Webb, Bill Drury, Jackie Timmer, Stella Capoccia, Charie Faight, Michael Webb

Guests: Doug Abbott, Leslie Dickerson

Welcome & Minutes

- I. Welcome and Minutes
 - a. Found online at <http://www.mtech.edu/about/facultysenate/minutes/index.htm>
 - b. *Motion to approve. Passed.*

Action Items

- II. Strategic Plan Review – Senators have had a month to solicit departmental feedback.
 - a. Feedback suggestions
 - b. Suggestion to better define faculty engagement
 - c. Discussion about communication with faculty, how can we emphasize two-way communication, conceptualize that better.
 - d. *Motion to approve Strategic Plan. Passed.*
- III. Diversity Resolution – Two proposals, senators have had a month to solicit departmental feedback.
 - a. Discussion:
 - i. What purpose do these statements serve?
 - ii. For the students – statement that students can expect to be treated fairly.
 - iii. Since this statement has already been sent out, is it not already campus policy? Is there a need for the Senate to approve/discuss?
 - iv. This is a position statement, rather than policy. The original statement from Blackletter, our approval would reflect the position of the Faculty. The Senate impacts the tone and culture of Montana Tech.
 - v. Biology, Chemistry and SHIH fully support the first proposed statement. More support from other departments.
 - b. *Motion to approve. Passed.*
- IV. Recommendations from the GERC (attached) – Add CJUS 121 as a General Education Social Science Elective.
 - a. Already approved by Gen Ed Rev committee
 - b. *Motion to approve. Passed.*
 - c. Scott Risser will inform the registrar.

Montana Tech Faculty Senate Meeting

Friday January 20th 2017

Pinter Room - noon-1:30pm

- V. BOR Policy on Prior Learning Assessment will require some changes to the Permission to Challenge and Portfolio Assessment forms. This has been reviewed and approved by the Dean's Council. The Senate should review as well. Guest Leslie Dickerson.
- a. Leslie Dickerson introduced the proposed changes to the Permission to Challenge forms due to BOR Policy.
 - b. *Permission to Challenge Form*: Changes due to new BOR policy. A student can now challenge at any point, and do not need to be enrolled in the course before challenging, but must still abide by add/drop dates if they choose to register for the course. The new procedures require changes to the Permission to Challenge form. Requirements are noted in bullets on the form.
 - c. *Portfolio Assessment Form*: There is now a new option for students to complete a Portfolio Assessment. Unlike a Challenge, the student does not take a challenge exam. Instead they must demonstrate they have met the outcomes of the course. There is no guidelines described for Portfolio Assessments, instead the burden is on student to demonstrate completion to instructor. There is now a new form for the Portfolio Assessment option. Requirements are noted in bullets on the form.
 - d. *Discussion/Clarification*:
 - i. Challenges are assigned traditional grades. Portfolio Assessments are assigned a Pass/Fail grade.
 - ii. PLA credits cannot exceed 25% of credits for a degree/certificate.
 - iii. A student cannot fail a Challenge and then attempt a Portfolio Assessment and vice-versa.
 - iv. What happens if a student fails a Portfolio Assessment? Does the F show up on their transcript? We would not accept an F as a transfer credit. Leslie Dickerson will look into how to handle this.
 - v. Challenge Form requires signatures from the student's advisor and instructor. Portfolio Assessment Form requires signatures from the instructor and department head. Suggestion – both forms should require signatures from the advisor, instructor and department head. In this case, if there is a disagreement, the final decision would fall to the department head.
 - vi. *Motion to approve the forms with the minor revision to include advisor, instructor, & department chair signatures on both forms. Motion Passed.*

Discussion Items

- VI. Recommendation for preservation of equipment in NRRC (Tinius Olsen). Suggested display similar to NW Energy lobby. Sample pictures of (a.) equipment and (b.) lobby attached.
- a. *This item was tabled as there was no one present to speak on this topic.*
- VII. Other Items
- a. Next Senate meeting will be Friday, February 3rd at noon.
 - b. Agenda items:
 - i. Academic Honesty Policy - Feedback from 2 departments; please forward feedback to Scott Risser.
 - ii. The State of Tech meeting on Tuesday, January 24th will likely guide future discussions.

Montana Tech Faculty Senate Meeting

Friday January 20th 2017

Pinter Room - noon-1:30pm

- c. Glen Southergill – The Student Evaluation sub-committee is looking for documentation of past Senate work regarding student evaluations. The Senate, under Jerry Downey worked on it, but can't find the paperwork. Please forward any information you have.
 - d. George Williams – Suggestion to shorten the date of last day to add a class. Retention Group proposed this in 2013/2014, but may not have made final recommendations approved by the Senate. Students can currently add through 10th day; drop through 15th day.
 - e. Laura Young – Question about in-state residency status for students that have fled a state because of domestic violence. Do they qualify for residency?
 - f. Leslie Dickerson – This proposal has gone to the Board of Regents and did not pass. BOR defines in-state residency criteria.
- VIII. Meeting adjourned.